Mr. Harms concurred but said the reaffirmation of the previous policy request that tuition not be set on a flat percentage would not be inconsistent with the proposal.

Mrs. Carpenter said it would be premature to express interest until there had been an opportunity for the Board's staff to develop data for examination by the Board.

Dr. Olson said he had not anticipated a specific answer. He stated that the Commission is still committed to the wisdom of the view that students should pay a fixed percentage of the cost, but it is appropriate for the Board to exercise discretion about tuition levels at individual institutions within their purview.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, and Wyss. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time in order to be present at legislative hearings.

Report of Professional Services
for Accessibility
for Handicapped, OIT

Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon Institute of Technology, the professional services agreement of October 3, 1978, with The Amundson Associates, P.C., Architects, Springfield, has been supplemented to include within the scope of their services the design and contract administration of proposed facility modifications on the campus to improve accessibility for handicapped persons. This work is included in high priority within the 1979-1981 capital construction requests for the educational and general plant and for auxiliary enterprises.

Compensation to the architects for their services and those of their consultants is to be based upon time and materials, but the maximum charge is limited to 10% of the direct construction costs (tentatively estimated to be approximately $597,712).

Funds required for the schematic design phase of planning are being provided from several resources: (a) the General Fund appropriation in 1977 for accessibility for handicapped; (b) the Board's reserve for architectural/engineering planning; and (c) excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees. The amount advanced from the Board's reserve for architectural/engineering planning is to be repaid following legislative authorization for the facility modifications.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

The request to the State Emergency Board, as approved by the Board at the November 17, 1978, meeting, for an increase of $300,000 in the expenditure limitation for the Student Union Addition and Alteration at the Oregon Institute of Technology to meet the costs of proposed essential utility improvements was approved on December 29, 1978. Based upon drawings and specifications prepared by The Amundson Associates, P.C., Architects, Springfield, and their engineering consultants, Gordon and Associates, Inc., Corvallis, bids for utility improvements were received on December 7, 1978. Four bids were received for the work ranging from a low of $238,900 to a high of $371,400. These amounts are net of an alternate which was exercised. Inasmuch as the low bidder, R. A. Chambers & Associates, Eugene, is the prime contractor for the major work of the Student Union Addition and Alteration, currently under construction, the additional work for the utility improvements was covered by a change order.
The following is a budget breakdown of the $300,000 increase approved when the total project expenditure limitation was revised to $2,915,000:

Direct construction costs:
- Tunnel work (as bid) $238,900
- Other change order modifications to revise connections within mechanical rooms of Student Union $13,741
Subtotal $252,641

Professional services fees $29,453
Contingencies and miscellaneous costs $17,906
Total $300,000

(1) Includes $10,000 for initial utility systems study

The tunnel work includes the construction of approximately 520 lineal feet of new walk-in concrete utility tunnel equipped with a geothermal hot water supply line and chilled water supply and return lines. The tunnel is to be constructed between the existing mechanical and electrical building, where the campus chiller is located just northwest of Snell Hall, and the Student Union building. A reconnection to Snell Hall is included. The modifications within the Student Union Building include revised geothermal supply, chilled water supply and return, controls and related work in the existing and new mechanical rooms.

The additional expenditure requirements of $300,000 are to be financed from the following resources:

(a) From the balance of state fund "savings" realized on the 1977-1979 capital construction project for Utility and Energy Conservation Improvements (Heating Plant Interconnection and Metering) at Southern Oregon State College, authorized within subsection (5)(a) of Section 2 of Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977:

(1) General Fund appropriation within Section 1 of the Act $47,250
(2) Proceeds from bonds sold under the provisions of Section 5 of the Act and Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution $47,250
Subtotal $94,500

(b) From self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $205,500

Total $300,000

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OIT Student Union Addition and Alteration (including Utility Improvements)

Architects - The Amundson Associates, P.C., Springfield

Board's priority - No. 4 in 1977-1979 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Meeting #454

Report of Appointment of Architects for Crop Science Building, OSU

January 26, 1979

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977 and State Emergency Board action on December 29, 1978

Estimated total project costs (total project) $2,915,000

Estimated total direct construction costs (including Change Order No. 1 for Utility Improvements) $2,431,641

Scheduled final completion - February 1980

Tentative financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $47,250
- Article XI-G bond proceeds 47,250
- Subtotal $94,500

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendations of officials of Oregon State University, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 580-50-020, arrangements were made with Architects: Martin, Schultz and Geyer, Eugene, for professional services relating to the design and contract administration of Phase I of the proposed Crop Science Building and for the schematic design of Phase II thereof. Authorization for the construction of both phases is being requested within the Board's capital construction program during 1979-1981. The initial unit has been assigned Priority No. 6 in the listing of items for the educational and general plant and is estimated to have a total project cost of $2,800,000. Phase II has been assigned Priority No. 28 in the same listing, and is estimated to cost $3,780,000.

Compensation to the architects for their services and those of their consultants is to be based upon time and materials, but the maximum charge is not to exceed an amount determined from a fee curve incorporated within the agreement. Illustratively, if the direct construction costs of Phase I are $2,295,000 within multiple prime construction contracts, the maximum charge would be 8%, or $183,600. For the schematic design phase of planning for both Phases I and II, combined, the maximum charge is limited to $57,000.

Funds required for the initial planning are being advanced from the Board's reserve for architectural/engineering planning with the understanding that they will be repaid following legislative authorization for the construction of the facilities.

Report of Inspection and Acceptance of Safety Deficiency Corrections

Report of Backflow Preventers, OSU

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on July 28, 1978:

Report of Inspection and Acceptance of Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, (Nash and Dryden Halls Backflow Preventers), OSU

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and C. W. Timmer Associates, Inc., Beaverton, project engineers, the work of the prime contractor for the installation of backflow preventers in the water service lines serving Nash Hall and Dryden Hall on the campus of Oregon State University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of November 27, 1978.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on July 28, 1978:
The work of the contract included the installation of a water booster pump and a backflow preventer at Nash Hall and a backflow preventer, only, at Dryden Hall within the water lines serving these buildings.

Expenditure requirements for this work were charged against the budget allocation for safety deficiency corrections, Phase II, at Oregon State University as part of the program authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977. A portion of the design was financed from resources provided within the 1975-1977 authorization of Phase I of the safety deficiency program; however, the earlier appropriation was not sufficient to fund the contract requirements so the work was deferred to Phase II.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, (Nash and Dryden Halls Backflow Preventers)

Engineers - C. W. Timmer Associates, Inc., Beaverton

Board’s priority - Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $30,075

Estimated direct construction costs (this portion only) $26,652

Financing plan:

General Fund appropriation $15,037

Article XI-G bond proceeds $15,038

Total $30,075

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Report of Bids
and Contract
Award for Safety
Deficiency
Corrections,
Phase II (Oceanography I,
Benton Hall,
Social Science
Building, Chemical Engineering,
Industrial Building,
Oceanography II, Mitchell
Playhouse,
Apperson Hall,
Milam Hall,
Batcheller Hall,
Kent House,
Administrative
Services Building
and Agriculture Hall
Electrical Deficiencies), OSU

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and
specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Morrison,
Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., project engineers, Portland, for the
correction of electrical deficiencies within thirteen buildings on the campus
at Oregon State University were accepted on behalf of the Board. Three
bids were received for the work on December 12, 1978, ranging from a low
of $8,458 to a high of $13,854. Inasmuch as the low bid was within the
estimate and resources were available for the work, a contract award was
made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs:
  Benton Electric, Inc., Corvallis  $ 8,458
  Professional services fees  762
  Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs  500
  Contingencies  780

Total  $10,500

The work of the contract includes the installation of motors, motor starters
and motor disconnect switches on various pieces of equipment, including
heating, ventilating and cooling equipment.

Expenditure requirements for the project are being charged against the
allocation of $575,000 for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, at Oregon
State University, as part of the program authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Oceanography I,
Benton Hall, Social Science Building, Chemical Engineering,
Industrial Building, Oceanography II, Mitchell Playhouse,
Apperson Hall, Milam Hall, Batcheller Hall, Kent House,
Administrative Services Building and Agriculture Hall
Electrical Deficiencies)


Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only)  $ 10,500

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only)  $ 8,458

Estimated final completion date - April 1979

Tentative financing plan:
  General Fund appropriation  $ 5,250
  Article XI-G bond proceeds  5,250
  Total  $10,500

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Report of Bids and Contract

Award for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, (Batcheller, Gilmore, Graf and Kidder Halls, Industrial Building, Kerr Library, Marine Science Center, Mitchell Playhouse, Pharmacy and Social Science Buildings at Oregon State University) were accepted on behalf of the Board. Three bids were received on November 28, 1978, ranging from a low of $9,326 to a high of $17,136. Inasmuch as the low bid was within the estimate and resources were available for the work, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct construction costs:</th>
<th>$9,326</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LINNCO Electric Co., Albany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the contract includes the installation of motor starters and disconnects on various pieces of equipment, including heating, ventilating and cooling equipment.

Expenditure requirements for the project are being charged against the allocation of $575,000 for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, at Oregon State University, as part of the program authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, (Batcheller, Gilmore, Graf and Kidder Halls, Industrial Building, Kerr Library, Marine Science Center, Mitchell Playhouse, Pharmacy and Social Science Electrical Deficiencies/Motor Starters and Disconnects)

Engineers - Gordon and Associates, Inc., Corvallis

Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $11,500

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $9,326

Estimated final completion date - March 1979

Tentative financing plan:

| General Fund appropriation | $5,750 |
| Article XI-G bond proceeds | 5,750  |
| Total                      | $11,500|

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Report of Bids
and Contract
Award for Safety
Deficiency
Corrections,
Phase II,
(Batcheller,
Bexell, Covell,
Kidder, Oceanogra­phy I,
Rogers, Shepard
and Wilkinson
Halls Handrail
Revisions), OSU

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Gordon and Associates, Inc., project engineers, Corvallis, for the revisions to handrails throughout Batcheller, Bexell, Covell, Kidder, Oceanography I, Rogers, Shepard and Wilkinson Halls, on the campus at Oregon State University were accepted on behalf of the Board. The project was advertised for bid originally on August 15, 1978, and no bids were received. Only one bid was received at a rescheduled bid opening on November 7, 1978. Inasmuch as the amount thereof exceeded the engineers' estimate and the resources budgeted for it, reductions were negotiated with the bidder and were covered in a change order issued simultaneously with the contract award.

The following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td>$162,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Ramsay Construction Co., Corvallis:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic bid amount</td>
<td>$162,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less reductions included in a simultaneous change order</td>
<td>$43,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>$118,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>10,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>3,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$137,650</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the contract includes installing handrails and making modifications to existing handrails to provide safe use of stairways and exitways. The change order modification authorized the substitution of steel and oak wood in lieu of brass originally specified for some of the railings.

Expenditure requirements for the project are being charged against resources of $575,000 allocated for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, at Oregon State University, as part of the program authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Batcheller, Bexell, Covell, Kidder, Oceanography I, Rogers, Shepard and Wilkinson Halls Handrail Revisions)

Engineers - Gordon and Associates, Inc., Corvallis

Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $137,650

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $118,942

Estimated final completion date - April 1979

Tentative financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $68,825
- Article XI-G bond proceeds 68,825

Total $137,650

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Report of Bids and Contract Award for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Cordley Hall, Wiegand Hall and Milam Hall Mechanical/Deluge Showers and Eye Washes), OSU

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Morrison, Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., project engineers, Portland, for the addition of deluge showers and eye wash fountains within Cordley Hall, Wiegand Hall and Milam Hall on the campus at Oregon State University were accepted on behalf of the Board. Three bids were received for the work on December 12, 1978, ranging from a low of $32,223 to a high of $40,200. Inasmuch as the low bid was within the estimate and resources were available for the work, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

| Direct construction costs | B & C Contractors of Oregon, Bend | $32,223 |
| Professional services fees | 2,900 |
| Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs | 600 |
| Contingencies | 1,927 |
| **Total** | **$37,650** |

The work of the contract includes the installation of deluge showers and eye wash fountains in laboratory areas in three buildings.

Expenditure requirements for the project are being charged against the allocation of $575,000 for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, at Oregon State University, as part of the program authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Cordley Hall, Wiegand Hall and Milam Hall Mechanical/Deluge Showers and Eye Washes)

Engineers - Morrison, Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., Portland

Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) | $32,223
Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) | $37,650

Estimated final completion date - April 1979

Tentative financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation | $18,825
- Article XI-G bond proceeds | 18,825
Total | $37,650

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Report of Architectural Services for Memorial Union Remodel Phase III, OSU

Staff Report to the Board

Arrangements have been made with Architects Jeppsen, Miller & Tobias, Corvallis, by means of a supplement to the earlier agreement applicable to student union facilities at Oregon State University, for professional services relating to the design and contract administration of the proposed third phase of the Memorial Union Remodel project on the campus in Corvallis.
Authorization to proceed with this work within an expenditure limitation of $605,000 is now being requested from the Legislature as part of the Board’s capital construction program for auxiliary enterprises during 1979-1981.

Compensation to the architects is being provided on the basis of 9.5% of the direct construction costs, tentatively estimated at $490,854. Funds required for the schematic design phase of planning are being allocated from excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Morrison, Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., project engineers, Portland, for the improvement of handrail deficiencies within nine buildings on the campus at Oregon State University were accepted on behalf of the Board. Two bids were received for the work on December 12, 1978, one in the amount of $135,900 and the other for $142,027. Both bid amounts shown are net of a deductive alternate which was exercised. Inasmuch as the low bid amount exceeded the engineers' estimate and the funds available for the work, reductions were negotiated with the low bidder (with the written consent of the other bidder) and were covered by a change order issued simultaneously with the contract award.

The following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Ramsay Construction Co., Corvallis:</td>
<td>$135,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less change order reductions</td>
<td>$29,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net</td>
<td>$106,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>$9,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>$642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$118,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the contract includes installing handrails and making modifications to existing handrails to provide safe use of stairways and exitways. The change order modifications authorized the substitution of bronze plated handrail supports in lieu of solid bronze and deleted the interior handrailing within Kerr Library.

Expenditure requirements for the project are being charged against the resources of $575,000 allocated for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, at Oregon State University, as part of, the program authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Milne Computer Center, Gilmore Annex, Administrative Services Building, Kerr Library, Oceanography II and Agriculture, Wiegand, Benton and Milam Halls Handrail Revisions)

Engineers - Morrison, Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., Portland

Board’s priority - Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)
Report of Acceptance of Construction Documents Phase of Planning for College of Education Addition and Alterations, UO

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $118,800
Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $106,200
Estimated final completion date - May 1979

Tentative financing plan:
General Fund appropriation $59,400
Article XI-G bond proceeds $59,400
Total $118,800

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

On September 29, 1978, the Board gave conditional approval to the design development phase of planning for the proposed College of Education Addition and Alterations at the University of Oregon, prepared with the assistance of Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson, architects, Portland.

Based upon the recommendation of institutional officials, following the completion of the construction documents phase of planning by the architects, acceptance was acknowledged on behalf of the Board. The project has been advertised for a bid opening late in January 1979. (When the State Emergency Board authorized the release of the funds for the project on October 13, 1978, it stipulated that the bids should be scheduled after the first of the new year.)

The description of the work of this project remains essentially as described to the Board in the September 29, 1978, minutes. The bid documents propose the construction of a two-story addition having an assumed equivalent gross area of approximately 15,078 square feet including faculty offices, teaching laboratories and support spaces as well as the remodeling of various spaces within the existing buildings used by the College of Education. Also included are safety deficiency corrections, such as fire protection systems and an update of the electrical system, within the present structures. The total direct construction allowance for the project is $1,443,079, including sitework and the requirements for safety deficiency correction items.

The total project budget of $1,975,000, previously approved by the Board, was authorized by the Legislature as part of Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977. This amount reflects the sum of the expenditure limitation of $1,810,000 for the College of Education Addition and Alterations and $165,000 for the correction of safety deficiencies.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - UO College of Education Addition and Alterations
Architects - Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson, A.I.A., Portland
Board's priority - No. 4 and Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Law 1977

Estimated total project costs $1,975,000
Meeting #454
January 26, 1979

Estimated areas:
New additions, excluding connector:
  Basic unit - enclosed space - 13,283 sq. ft.
  - covered exterior space - 3,590 sq. ft.
  Total - 16,873 sq. ft.
Assumed equivalent gross sq. ft.
  (using 50% of covered exterior
  space, excluding connector) - 15,078 sq. ft.
Remodeling of offices and toilet rooms - 1,455 sq. ft.

Estimated direct construction costs:
New addition, excluding connector
  Average per sq. ft. (based upon area of 15,078
  sq. ft.) - $65.44
Remodeling (excluding correction of safety deficiencies) - 156,416
  Sitework, including ramps, walks, bike shelters,
  landscaping, new sanitary sewer, etc. - 174,850
Subtotal - $1,318,034
Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II - 125,045
Total - $1,443,079

Tentative schedule:
  Bidding - January 1979
  Completion - April 1980

Tentative financing plan:
  General Fund appropriation - $ 987,500
  Article XI-G bond proceeds - $ 987,500
  Total - $1,975,000 (1)

(1) Breakdown of total project costs:
  College of Education Addition and Alterations - $1,810,000
  Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II - 165,000
  Total - $1,975,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and
specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of SRG Partnership,
PC, project architects, Portland, for the installation of a pre-engineered
building on the roof of the Clinical Laboratory Building and the routing of
electrical cable to other buildings on the campus at the University of Oregon
Health Sciences Center were accepted on behalf of the Board. Four bids
were received on November 9, 1978, and, taking into account two additive
alternates which were exercised, they ranged from a low of $130,497 to a
high of $146,799. Inasmuch as the lowest bid was well within the estimate
and the funds available for the work, a contract award was made and the
following tentative budget was approved for the project:
Direct construction costs:
Bart Hess Building Contractor, Inc., Portland $130,497
Professional services fees 16,500
Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs 13,698
Works of Art (1%) 1,305
Contingencies 13,000
Total $175,000

The indicated total of $175,000 is considerably less than the expenditure limitation of $250,400 previously authorized by the Board and the State Emergency Board on September 8, 1978.

The work of the contract includes the erection and interior finishing of pre-engineered temporary building on the roof of the Clinical Laboratory Building as well as the installation of computer related mechanical, electrical and fire-detection equipment. Also included is the installation of approximately 30,000 linear feet of low-voltage cable to remote computer terminal locations located within various buildings on the campus. One of the alternates exercised provides for the installation of a protective canopy over the entrance door to the 12-foot by 48-foot building and the other provides for the acceleration of the construction completion period.

The expenditures for this work are to be funded from the proceeds of the sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds as authorized previously by the Board and the State Emergency Board.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project UOHSC Clinical Laboratory Building Mini-Computer System Installation
Architects - SRG Partnership, PC, Portland
Board's priority - Not applicable
Legislative authorization - State Emergency Board on September 8, 1978
Estimated total project costs $175,000
Estimated direct construction costs $130,497
Scheduled final completion data - June 1979

Tentative financing plan:
Proceeds from the sale of bonds under Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $175,000

The Board received the report as presented.

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Campus Services Building Computer Services Center Remodeling, UOHS C

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of SRG Partnership, PC, project architects, Portland, for the remodeling within the interior of the fifth and sixth floors of the Campus Services Building on the campus at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center were accepted on behalf of the Board. Seven bids were received on November 8, 1978, ranging from a low of $222,596 to a high of $284,500. Because of an error, the lowest bidder requested release from his bid and bond. Following verification of
the error, this request was granted and a contract award was made to the
next lowest bidder. The following tentative budget was approved for the
project:

Direct construction costs:
- Demolition - Cloyd R. Watt Construction Co., Portland $25,177
- Remodeling - Bart Hess Building Contractor, Inc., Portland $230,392
Subtotal $255,569

Professional services fees 48,670
Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs 25,457
Works of Art (1%) 2,304
Contingencies 23,000

Total $355,000

(1) Bid separately and reported to the Board on July 28, 1978.
Work completed and accepted October 2, 1978.

The indicated total of $355,000 is somewhat less than the expenditure limi-
tation of $390,323 previously approved by the Board and authorized by the
State Emergency Board on September 8, 1978.

The work includes upgrading approximately 3,200 square feet of space on
the fifth floor and 510 square feet on the sixth floor of the Campus Services
Building to accommodate the hospital computer services staff and equipment.
It includes new wall finishes throughout the remodeled area, suspended
ceilings, an access flooring system in the computer areas, and mechanical
and electrical systems to meet the requirements for the new computer equip-
ment and support spaces. For fire protection, a Halon system is to be
provided. Ionization and smoke detectors are to be installed within the
computer space and below the access floor. Appropriate alarm and warning
systems are to be incorporated with the detection devices. The major demo-
lition work preparatory to this remodeling was completed earlier under a
separate contract. Some minor demolition is included in the current contract.

The expenditures for this work are to be funded from the proceeds of the
sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds as authorized previously by the Board and
the State Emergency Board.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - UOHSC Campus Services Building Computer Services Center
Remodeling
Architects - SRG Partnership, PC, Portland
Board's priority - Not applicable
Legislative authorization - State Emergency Board on September 8, 1978

Estimated total project costs $355,000

Estimated total direct construction costs:
- Demolition - $25,177 (previous separate contract)
- Remodeling - 230,392 (current contract award)
Total $255,569

Scheduled final completion data - June 1979
Tentative financing plan:
Proceeds from the sale of bonds under Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises
$ 355,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Report of Appointment of Architects for Correction of Safety Deficiencies, Phase II (UHS Storeroom Alterations), UOHS

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendations of officials of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 580-50-020, arrangements have been made with Boutwell, Gordon, Beard, and Grimes, Architects, Portland, for professional assistance in the design and contract administration for proposed modifications within University Hospital South for storeroom facilities as part of the Safety Deficiency Correction Program, Phase II, authorized by the 1977 Oregon Legislature.

Compensation to the architects for their services and those of their consultants is to be based upon time and materials, but the maximum charge is limited to 10% of the direct construction costs (tentatively estimated to be approximately $258,000).

Funds required for the planning are being provided from the General Fund appropriation within Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Report of Appointment of Architects for Pharmacy Relocation within Outpatient Clinic, UOHS

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 580-50-020, arrangements have been made with Hanson Dunahugh Vaivoda, Architects, Portland, for professional assistance in the design and contract administration of the proposed Pharmacy Relocation project within the Outpatient Clinic Building on the Marquam Hill campus in Portland. This work constitutes a portion of the major capital construction project identified as the "Clinical Lab/Outpatient Clinic Remodel and Improvement" item within the 1979-1981 program requests for auxiliary enterprises.

Compensation to the architects for their services and those of their consultants is to be based upon time and materials, but the maximum charge is limited to 12% of the direct construction costs (tentatively estimated to be approximately $200,000).

Funds required for the schematic design phase of planning are being provided from hospital and clinic patient income.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Modifications within Seven Buildings), UOHS

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Hicks/Chilcote & Associates, project architects, Portland, for the correction of safety deficiencies within seven buildings on the campus at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, were accepted on behalf of the Board. The seven buildings are Baird Hall, Clinical Lab Building, Dental School Building, Katherine Hall, Mackenzie Hall, Outpatient Clinic Building and the Physical Plant Building. Two bids were received on December 14, 1978, for the combined work--one in the amount of $104,079 and the other for
$133,400--net of a deductive alternate which was exercised. Inasmuch as resources were available for the work, a contract award was made and the following budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs:
- Cloyd R. Watt Construction Co., Portland $104,079
- Professional services fees 12,098 (1)
- Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs 3,000
- Contingencies 6,737

Total $125,914

(1) Net of $4,391 charged to Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I for initial study and cost estimate.

The work of the contract includes general and electrical work for exitway, finish hardware, flammable storage, fire alarm equipment and other safety improvements within Baird Hall, Clinical Lab Building, Dental School Building, Mackenzie Hall and the Outpatient Clinic Building. Also included is the installation of automatic fire sprinklering work within the Dental School Building, Mackenzie Hall and the Physical Plant Building. The general and electrical work was bid as Basic Bid "A" and the mechanical work for the sprinklering was bid as Basic Bid "B". Provision was also made for a combination bid, Basic Bid "C". The contract award was made on the basis of the lowest combination bid. The deductive alternate which was exercised deleted all of the work specified in Katherine Hall, inasmuch as this building is located on the site now proposed for the new Shriner's Hospital.

Expenditure requirements for the project are being charged against the allocation of $550,000 for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, as part of the program authorized by Chapter 550, Oregon Laws 1977, supplemented by a balance of $5,314 remaining from the Phase I program.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - UOHS C Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Modifications within Seven Buildings)

Architect - Hicks/Chilcote & Associates, Portland

Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $125,914

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $104,079

Estimated final completion date - April 1979

Tentative financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $60,300
- Article XI-G bond proceeds 60,300 $120,600

Unencumbered balance from 1975-1977 authorization for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I 5,314

Total $125,914

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Keith Kruchek Consulting Engineers, Inc., Portland, project engineers, the work of the prime contractor for the addition of fire protection systems within University Hospitals North and South at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center was accepted on behalf of the Board on September 25, 1978. Previously, an acceptance was made of a portion of the work as of August 15, 1977.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on November 25, 1975:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget 9/25/78</th>
<th>Original Budget 11/25/78</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cosco Fire Protection Division of Zurn Industries, Inc., Milwaukie, Oregon</td>
<td>$1,096,479</td>
<td>$1,029,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>$92,359</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision</td>
<td>19,874</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>30,939</td>
<td>20,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1,239,686</td>
<td>$1,245,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes the addition of four smoke detectors; relocating 4-inch fire sprinkler main to UHN; deleting two printers from the annunciator control system; relocating control console; deleting, adding, or relocating selected sprinkler heads; revising annunciator system serving portion of Outpatient Clinic; separating sprinkler system in sub-basement of UHS; installing steel ladder in backflow preventer vault; adding flow switch to sprinkler system serving Parking Structure I; installing ionization detectors in ducts behind sidewall return air grilles in selected rooms; integrating existing photo-electric detectors into system; adding fire sprinkling to selected rooms in UHS; adding ionization detectors in selected areas; revising automatic door closers on selected doors in both buildings; repairing buried conduit, wiring, and piping damaged by core drilling; and other minor modifications all included within eleven approved change orders.

(2) "Savings" of $5,314 were applied to other Safety Deficiency Corrections at UOHSC, as noted in separate agenda item reporting bids and contract award for Modifications within Seven Buildings.

The work of the contract included the installation of automatic fire sprinkler systems complete with alarm valves, alarm bells and hose connections for use by the fire department. Automatic door closers, ionization detectors and annunciator panels were also included.

Expenditure requirements for this work were charged against the expenditure limitation of $5,920,000 for safety deficiency corrections, Phase I, authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UOHSC Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I (Hospital Fire Protection Systems)
Meeting #454

January 26, 1979

Engineers - Keith Kruchek Consulting Engineers, Inc., Portland

Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1975-1977 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975

Estimated total project costs $1,239,686
Estimated total direct construction costs $1,096,479

Financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $619,843
- Article XI-G bond proceeds $619,843

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

In response to the recommendation of officials of Portland State University, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 580-50-020, arrangements have been made with two additional architectural firms to provide professional services relating to proposed modifications needed for improved access for the physically handicapped. Chilless Nielsen, Architects, Portland, will provide assistance in the design and contract administration of work expected to be undertaken within Lincoln Hall, Cramer Hall, University Services Building, Neuberger Hall, East Hall, D.C.E. Building, Science Building I and Millar Library. Compensation is to be provided on a time and materials basis but shall not exceed 10% of the direct construction costs (tentatively estimated to be approximately $240,000).

Allen L. Greene, AIA, Portland, will provide assistance in the design and contract administration of work expected to be undertaken within Shattuck Hall, including not only the facility modifications for handicapped access but also the correction of safety deficiencies. Compensation is to be provided on a time and materials basis but shall not exceed 11% of the direct construction costs (tentatively estimated to be approximately $120,000 for accessibility for the handicapped and $100,000 for the correction of safety deficiencies).

Funds required for the initial planning of those items of work relating to improved access are being provided from the General Fund appropriation provided for this purpose by the 1977 Legislature. The expenditure requirements for the initial planning of corrections of safety deficiencies within Shattuck Hall will be financed from resources available to the institution from the 1977-1979 Phase II program or from the Board's reserve for architectural/engineering planning. Funds required for the alterations are being requested as part of the 1979-1981 capital construction program.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon College of Education, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 580-50-020, arrangements have been made with The Amundson Associates, P.C., Architects, Springfield, for professional services relating to the design and contract administration of proposed facility modifications on the campus to improve accessibility for handicapped persons. This work is included in high priority within the 1979-1981 capital construction requests for the educational and general plant and for auxiliary enterprises.
Compensation to the architects for their services and expenses is to be based upon time and materials, but the maximum charge is limited to 10% of the direct construction costs (tentatively estimated to be approximately $661,469).

Funds required for the schematic design phase of planning are being provided from the General Fund appropriation in 1977 for accessibility for handicapped and from excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Report of Appointment of Architects for Updating Long-Range Campus Plan and for Accessibility for Handicapped, SOSC

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of Southern Oregon State College, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 580-50-020, arrangements were made with The Amundson Associates, P.C., Springfield, for professional consulting services and assistance to the administration, staff and students at that institution in the review of the basic planning objectives and planning assumptions upon which the updating of the long-range campus plan should be based, and for performing the following additional services:

a. Prepare a new report and campus site plan to portray graphically existing structures, proposed land-area reservations for future structures, site development, land use and assignment. It is expected that the report and plan will serve as guidelines for decisions regarding buildings and other facilities as well as roads, walks, utilities and land forms in implementing the long-range campus plan.

b. Accomplish the following work items which would be needed to produce the new report and plan, in consultation with the institution's staff, students, alumni, and representatives of city, state, and other governmental agencies, as appropriate:

1. Revise the previous long-range campus plan to accommodate an enrollment of approximately 4,000 FTE students.

2. Incorporate within the plan a reflection of the institutional mission and guidelines and academic and service objectives of the institution.

3. Include within the plan the institution's projected facility needs for all campus programs, including instruction, student housing, student union, health services, intercollegiate athletics, recreation, etc.

4. Study the College's exterior environment, including vehicular circulation, service and parking needs, accessibility for handicapped provisions, as well as bicycle and pedestrian needs, correlate with land use planning of the City of Ashland and Jackson County, and incorporate recommendations in the plan which would satisfy the land-use needs of the College commensurate with those of the community.

5. Identify continued or potential use of existing permanent structures and facilities as part of the plan.
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7. Present the report and plan following review by the campus planning committee, other institutional officers, faculty and student government and representatives of local government, as appropriate.

For their services and expenses, the Architects shall be compensated on a time and materials basis with the understanding that the maximum charge shall not exceed $30,000 without prior written authorization from the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning. This amount is being financed in equal shares from (a) excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees; (b) capital outlay credits from real property rentals; and (c) the Board's reserve for architectural/engineering planning. The $10,000 being advanced from the last source is to be repaid when and if resources are made available by the Legislature for the proposed Drama Laboratory (Theater), the project having highest priority in the institution's requests for new construction for the educational and general plant.

By means of a supplement to the agreement, the Architects will also provide professional services relating to proposed facility modifications on the campus of Southern Oregon State College to improve accessibility for handicapped persons. Compensation therefor is on a time and materials basis not to exceed 10% of the direct construction costs (tentatively estimated to be $619,440). The initial planning costs are being financed in part from the 1977 appropriation for accessibility for the handicapped, from the Board's reserve for architectural/engineering planning, and from excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees. Legislative authorization for the proposed construction or remodeling work is being requested as a high priority item within the 1979-1981 capital construction program.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Marquess & Associates, Inc., Medford, project engineers, the work of the prime contractor for the construction of six tennis courts on the campus at Southern Oregon State College was accepted on behalf of the Board as of December 18, 1978.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on July 28, 1978:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 12/18/78</th>
<th>Original Budget 7/28/78</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Steel, Inc., Medford</td>
<td>$140,795</td>
<td>$139,755</td>
<td>$1,040 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>13,164</td>
<td>13,860</td>
<td>(696)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>14,398</td>
<td>(13,222)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,987</td>
<td>(6,987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$155,135</strong></td>
<td><strong>$175,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ (19,865)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes the installation of shale rock fill in areas where buildings were removed. Four change orders were approved, including extensions of the final completion date.

The work of the contract included the construction of six regulation-size tennis courts on a site south of the Physical Education Building, McNeal Hall, with fencing, lighting and minimum landscaping. The asphaltic concrete slab was finished with an acrylic colored surfacing.
Expenditures for this work were charged to resources available for auxiliary enterprises, such as Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds and/or excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees as authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - SOSC Recreation Facilities (Tennis Courts)

Engineers - Marquess & Associates, Inc., Medford

Board's priority - No. 14 in 1977-1979 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs $155,135

Estimated direct construction costs $140,795

Financing plan:
Proceeds from sale of bonds under Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $155,135

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Included within the design for the interconnecting utility tunnel under Siskiyou Boulevard, as part of the Utility and Energy Conservation Improvements project at Southern Oregon State College, was a 10-inch steam main interconnecting the south and north heating plants. This main was shown connected to the existing steam main under Churchill Hall. This section was believed to be an 8-inch line which could continue to be utilized; however, upon a more thorough examination following the removal of insulation, it was found to be a 6-inch pipe. Considering the capacity and pressure of the steam requirements, this 6-inch line was determined not to be adequate for the design requirements. Consequently, negotiations with the prime contractor for the major project work were instigated to arrive at a cost of making this change. The quotation received was considered to be too high for the additional work, so a separate bid invitation was extended for replacing the existing 6-inch line with a new 10-inch line.

Based upon documents prepared by Marquess & Associates, Inc., Medford, project engineers, two bids were received on September 26, 1978, one in the amount of $24,497 and the other for $29,500. Inasmuch as the low basic bid was within the estimate and resources were available, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for this portion of the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Plumbing Co., Inc., Medford</td>
<td>$24,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$28,697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-73-
This work will be accomplished as part of the Utility and Energy Conservation Improvements (Heating Plant Interconnection and Metering) project authorized by the 1977 Legislature. An adjustment of $10,000 was authorized in the total project budget, utilizing some of the "savings" realized from the original bid under-run reported to the Board on March 24, 1978. As amended, the estimated expenditure requirements for the utility improvements are $760,000.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - SOSC Utility and Energy Conservation Improvements (Heating Plant Interconnection and Metering), Churchill Hall Steam Main Replacement

Engineers - Marquess & Associates, Inc., Medford

Board's priority - Part of No. 9 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant) and Part of No. 2 in 1977-1979 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

| Estimated total project costs (this portion only) | $28,697 |
| Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) | $24,497 |

Scheduled completion - December 1978

| Tentative financing plan for revised total project: |
| General Fund appropriation | $266,000 |
| Article XI-G bond proceeds | 266,000 |
| Subtotal | 532,000 |
| Article XI-F(1) bonding and/or auxiliary enterprise balances | 228,000 |
| Total | $760,000 |

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Base Budget Review

At a meeting of the Committee of the Whole on December 14, 1978, Board members reviewed in detail the 1977-78 expenditures for instruction in seven disciplines. The report was intended to provide data that would facilitate Board review of the effectiveness with which the financial resources of the institutions are used in support of instruction. A copy of the material provided is on file in the Board's Office and was distributed to Board members and others.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Condition of Board's Special and Plant Rehabilitation Reserves

As of January 26, 1979, for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1979

| I. Board's Reserve for Plant Rehabilitation |
| Balance as of November 17, 1978 | $193,270 |
| Less: Amounts Approved by the Chancellor: |
| For Refurbishing of President's Residence, SOSC | (5,000) |
| Balance as of January 26, 1979 | $188,270 |
Earlier this year, several Board members asked that the Board's Office begin preparation of a series of reports concerning equal opportunity and affirmative action with respect to education and employment. The purpose of these special reports is to give Board members a greater understanding of institutional efforts in these areas and to give the Board a more adequate basis for formulating policies and monitoring institutional performance. It was agreed that after reviewing a series of special reports, the Committee on Instruction, Research and Public Service Programs would identify the kinds of data and reports it will wish to have prepared and forwarded on a regular basis.

The first of these special reports follow. They include:

1. A summary of financial aid to women and minority students
2. A review of special student programs

Financial Aid to Women and Minority Students

Financial aid available to students (other than part-time employment) consists of three major categories:

2. Institutionally-administered short-term loans and scholarships from private sources.

The report focuses on the first and third categories, which account for the large majority of financial aid resources. Limited data is available concerning financial aid to minority students (Federal aid only).

Table I (attached) displays the number of recipients of Federal financial aid by race or ethnic group and by sex for each of the three universities and for the three institutions combined. For example, the table indicates that of 2,269 students at Portland State University receiving Federal aid, 192 or 8.5% were classified "Black Non-Hispanic." The table also shows that of these same 2,269 students, 1,239 or 55% were female. In order to have a better basis for comparison, the table also lists the enrollment of full-time students by race or ethnic group and by sex. Although not totally accurate, full-time enrollment data are used because Financial Aid Officers report that little Federal aid goes to part-time students. Again using Portland State University as an example, it may be observed that Black Non-Hispanic students represent only 3.3% of enrollment, but are 8.5% of the aid recipients. Thus 71% of the Black Non-Hispanic students receive aid compared to 28% of the total. Similarly, 34% of the women students but only 23% of men students received financial aid. With few exceptions, racial or ethnic minority students receive a higher proportion of Federal aid than their representation among full-time students. Although 1,123 minority students received such aid, it should be repeated that part-time minority students, of which there were 613 in these three institutions, received little or no aid from these sources.

Racial and ethnic group data for enrollment in the three colleges was not available, so Table II (which also includes OIT) displays only recipients of Federal financial aid. The trends appear to be about the same, however, with non-whites accounting for 10.4% of the recipients compared to 13.3% for
the universities. It is further noted that a significantly higher proportion of full-time students received Federal aid (32.7%) at these four schools than did those at the universities (23%). Again, a higher proportion of women students received aid than did men.

The State Scholarship Commission has not heretofore collected information concerning race or ethnic group of recipients although they are attempting to do so this year. During 1977-78 the Commission awarded scholarships to students in OSSHE institutions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need Only</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>$744,326</td>
<td>2,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need &amp; Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>$85,406</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>$829,732</td>
<td>3,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information concerning financial aid to handicapped students is not readily available at some institutions because it is administered directly by outside agencies. Eastern Oregon State College has identified 13 students receiving aid from the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, seven from Veterans Administration Rehabilitation and one from the Blind Commission. Oregon College of Education reports 77, 8, and 3 students receiving aid from the same sources respectively while Southern Oregon State College knows of 32, 39, and 6 students receiving such aid.

Among the problems identified by Financial Aid Officers are these:

- Insufficient funds to meet the needs of part-time students
- Difficulty of disadvantaged students in understanding and completing complicated financial aid forms
- Coordination with social service agencies - often one will not make an aid commitment before the other
- Students - particularly female and older students - seeking aid who have substantial indebtedness and/or non-educational obligations when they enroll
- Inadequacy of communication regarding student rights and responsibilities concerning financial aid
### Table I: Comparing Federal Financial Aid Recipients with Enrollment by Race or Ethnic Group and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland State University</th>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
<th>University of Oregon</th>
<th>Three Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>270 3.3</td>
<td>192 8.5</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/</td>
<td></td>
<td>97 1.2</td>
<td>60 2.6</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td>351 4.4</td>
<td>171 2.2</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td>84 1.0</td>
<td>42 1.9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td>8800 84.3</td>
<td>1804 79.5</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>461 5.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>6800 84.3</td>
<td>1804 79.5</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>461 5.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8063 100.0</td>
<td>2269 100.0</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td>4410 55.0</td>
<td>1030 45.0</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>3653 45.0</td>
<td>1239 33.0</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8063 100.0</td>
<td>2269 100.0</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**
- Enrollment Data - HEW Higher Education General Information Survey, Fall 1977.
- Financial Aid Data - HEW Fiscal Operations Report, 1977-78 Fiscal Year

December 15, 1978
TABLE II - FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID RECIPIENTS BY RACE OR ETHNIC GROUP AND SEX, THREE COLLEGES AND OIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnic Group</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>Total for Institutions</th>
<th>Enrollment %</th>
<th>Recip. as % Enroll.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recip.of Fed. Aid</td>
<td>Recip.of Fed. Aid</td>
<td>Recip.of Fed. Aid</td>
<td>Recip.of Fed. Aid</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>1190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HEW Fiscal Operations Reports, 1977-78 Fiscal Year

December 15, 1978
Special Student Programs

Introduction

The institutions of the State System offer various programs and services to meet the needs of special student groups. In order to present an accurate report describing these programs to the Board, the Board's Office staff surveyed the institutions for descriptive information regarding them. The texts of those responses appear in the appendices of the full report.

All of the institutions except Oregon Institute of Technology offer specific programs designed for special student groups. Oregon Institute of Technology does not rely on special programs, but instead offers individualized advising and services to all students who demonstrate the need.

At the seven other institutions, the greatest number of programs provide special services for minority students. Program objectives include the provision of academic, cultural, personal and financial support, recruitment, instruction, and community liaison. Women's programs are offered by five of the institutions (OCE, OSU, PSU, SOSC and UO). These programs offer services of orientation, guidance, and general support. In addition many include advocacy for institutional issues of concern to women, instruction, and the inclusion of women's history and scholarship in the general educational and research efforts of the institution among their objectives. Programs for handicapped students are offered at Oregon College of Education, Oregon State University, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon. Southern Oregon State College includes services for handicapped students within their general student services but notes some separate costs associated with their efforts. Handicapped student services provide student support, advocacy and resource referral at these institutions. In addition, the Oregon College of Education program recruits deaf students to the college.

Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon State University and Portland State University have programs which are designed to provide services for all disadvantaged students although the Educational Opportunities Program at Oregon State University fulfills the role of a minority student program as well. These programs all provide academic and general student support services to students who are considered educationally disadvantaged.

Other special student programs include those for non-traditional or older students, veterans, high school students who might not otherwise attend college (including the BOOST Program operated directly out of the Board's Office) and high school equivalency programs.

Impediments to Reaching Program Objectives

Several problems which programs throughout the System felt impeded their progress in achieving their objectives emerged. The most prevalent concern was with inadequate funding. Inadequate funding occurred both in state- and federally-funded programs and was not only a concern for the present but was expressed as a serious concern for continued operation of the programs. As the report from Portland State observed "[inadequate funding] may not be a situation that is unique to programs which are enhancing educational opportunity or affirmative action goals. Many of these programs, however, started at a time when budget constraints prevented establishment of a sound supportive fiscal base and thereafter prevented any additional resources from coming into the programs because of the overall budget situation for higher education."

Inadequate staffing was also considered a serious impediment to many of the programs. The inadequacies were the result of inadequate funding which did not permit a sufficient number of positions, or the inability to attract qualified candidates to existing positions, and the lack of available qualified candidates.
The responses of many programs mentioned various types of attitudinal barriers as hampering program efforts. These included intra-institutional attitudes (lack of support and an appreciation of the need for special programs within the institutional community, lack of acceptance of the validity of special studies, stereotyping of special students by faculty members, failure of the instructional staff to be aware of the special programs and the services which they offered, a lack of trust between the special program students, staff, and the institution, and the need to integrate special program concerns into the basic educational, academic and research activities of the institution) and extra-institutional support (lack of support generally for special programs, withdrawing from programs which could be interpreted as preferential and lack of support on the State System level).

Programs for minority students and the handicapped showed concern over an insufficient student population and were joined by women's programs in their concern over the lack of faculty to serve as role models for the specific groups.

Many of the responses of the programs expressed frustration with problems occurring prior post-secondary education and the inability of the programs to recruit adequately. The respondents expressed the need for students to be prepared academically and attitudinally for the wide variety of career and educational options which could be open to them, and the need to recruit minority and handicapped students especially at the graduate level. They displayed frustration over their inability to do out-of-state recruiting both because of fees and tuition costs and because of state policies to discourage such recruiting. Inadequate financial assistance for students, especially at the graduate level, further frustrated recruitment attempts. A respondent at the Health Sciences Center questioned the validity of some of the admission requirements.

Finally, the respondents mentioned the lack of adequate support services for their students, which led to the attrition of special students, and architectural barriers for handicapped students as problems which impacted on the students' ability to achieve academic success.

Achievements

In spite of the many impediments which the respondents listed as barriers to achieving their program goals, most have experienced significant achievements. Many of the responses from the programs listed various measures of student success as their most important and notable accomplishments. Included in these accomplishments are high retention rates; above average academic success, although the programs often work with students who have below average educational skills; high graduate rates and the employability of graduates (which runs as high as 100% in the Bilingual Educational Program at EOSC). The Program respondents also cite their educational and cultural contributions both to the institutional community and to their communities at large, numerous events and workshops which they sponsor, the establishment of campus advisory groups and committees, instructional opportunities, referral, and the successful use of existing resources to meet the needs of their students. The programs provide cultural support for their students and act as community liaisons to the special populations which they serve. Many report the development of respected reputations in those communities, their increased ease of recruitment in the same communities and increased program size. Lastly many of the programs have applied for and received outside funding for ongoing support of their programs or to sponsor special events.

Current Issues

The primary concern of the programs was the impact of reduced support, especially as a result of what could be termed fiscal conservatism. While many of the program respondents were concerned that this general mood would limit their ability to maintain their programs even at the current level, respondents from programs for handicapped students were especially
concerned that they would be unable to meet the needs of a projected rapidly expanding clientele. In times of fiscal conservatism, the respondents expressed concern that faculties and administrators would withdraw support from programs no longer needed to quell turbulent students and would be most concerned that services for special students would limit the services for other students. In addition minority program respondents pointed out that many potential minority students opt for the quicker economic returns of vocational programs in proprietary schools or community colleges. Another area of current interest is the increasing number of non-traditional students and the services necessary to help them be successful students. Of course two most publicized issues still remain to be fully resolved—the need to provide full program accessibility to handicapped students and the determination of athletic equity between the men's and women's programs. To solve concerns raised by both questions, the institutions are progressing as they are able and are looking to the State Legislature to give financial assistance and to the Board's Office and the federal government to provide policy direction.

Student Treatment Grievances

Chapter 204, 1975 Oregon Laws (ORS 659.150) prohibited discrimination on the basis of age, handicap, marital status, national origin, race, religion or sex. It further requires that rules be established to insure compliance with the act. The Board adopted Administrative Rules Division 15 pursuant to the statute. Under those rules grievances may be filed at each of the institutions with appeal of the response of the institution to the grievance to the Chancellor. Three hearings have been conducted under the Division 15 Administrative Rules. One hearing related to the denial of admission to the Medical School, one to restrictions on certain types of housing, and one related to athletic equity. A precis of the grievances was included in the full report on file in the Board's Office.

Discussion by the Committee

During the discussion, it was emphasized by the staff that one of the aims in presenting the information was to obtain Committee and Board guidance as to the type of information to be included and the format and frequency of future reports.

Mrs. Carpenter said the question of part-time student aid represented a substantial discriminatory issue. Federal aid is limited for part-time students and there are urgent needs in that group. She asked Vice Chancellor Lemman to outline the issues.

Mr. Lemman said most financial aid officers believe it is more important to use limited aid funds to support full-time students than to support part-time students. In other instances, part-time students are working and thus have outside income. In some instances, part-time students applying for financial aid have excessive amounts of outside obligations in terms of family support or indebtedness. When total resources are measured against total needs, the obligations become disproportionately excessive.

President MacVicar said if it is assumed there is an obligation to assist a student to get an undergraduate education through federal financial programs, the public insists that the programs be well managed and under strict surveillance and control. Consequently, in preparing the regulations, the decision has been made that a reasonable period of time should be established for completion of the program. The issue is a matter of concern at the national level, but the weight of equity tends to support providing aid for the full-time student who will reach the goal more quickly.

Vice President Orcilia Forbes of Portland State University said a part-time student may receive a partial award which will help with tuition, but it will not be adequate to meet other needs. She also pointed out that the institutional process for granting aid is the same in the case of awards for both full-time and part-time students.
In response to a question concerning State System requirements that might be considered barriers by the part-time student, Vice President Forbes said many of the part-time students at Portland State University have been graduate students and the fees have been a source of complaint. Federal programs are limited for graduate students and scholarships within the institutions are usually awarded to individuals pursuing courses on a full-time basis.

Vice President Paul Olum of the University of Oregon said restrictions on part-time students are actually discriminatory toward women because, due to family responsibilities, they are frequently unable to attend on a full-time basis. It was also pointed out that these restrictions discriminate against handicapped students who are sometimes unable physically to take a full course load.

Mr. Wyss asked at what point efforts to assume leadership in eliminating discriminatory barriers to education reduces the ability of the institutions to deal with more conventional education. Vice President Olum said the most serious problem is in the legislation pertaining to the handicapped. Funds have not been appropriated to assist in fulfilling the regulations. He said since these are societal obligations, the institutions should have state and federal help to meet them. With respect to leadership in this regard, Dr. Olum said there should be pressure for less restrictive requirements under state and federal legislation so that certain classes of part-time students would be eligible for aid.

The question of child care programs was discussed in terms of the impact on alleviating discrimination. It was indicated the provision of child care was very important in this regard. Child care programs are offered under the auspices of the educational activities segment of the institution and are financed from student incidental fee allocations, charges to parents, and in some instances from other social service agencies.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Lemman to indicate any special situations of inequity that might require remedial action by the Board. Mr. Lemman said the problems identified by financial aid officers were summarized on page 2 of the report. Insufficient funds were of primary concern and were due to the general financial stringency at the institutions and reductions in federal funding.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Batiste said it was very important to evaluate the effort which has been made. When problem areas have been identified, some plan of action should also be submitted.

The Board should establish priorities, Mrs. Carpenter said, and referred particularly to the need for financial assistance for part-time students.

After further discussion of possible procedures, it was agreed that when all of the reports had been received, it would be possible for the Board to establish priorities and a plan of action to alleviate problems in affirmative action which have been identified in the reports.

The Board received the report as presented.
The December 15 meeting of the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs is the third monthly meeting at which either the Board, sitting as a Committee of the Whole, or its Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs has given consideration to a revision of the Portland State University guidelines.

At its September meeting, the Board heard testimony from a number of Portland State University faculty, staff, student, and administrative spokesmen on the subject of the mission and role of Portland State University.

As background for the hearing, the Board's Office prepared and presented to the Board a report entitled, Portland State University Guidelines - Present and Projected.

At the October meeting, the Board heard testimony from Portland State University faculty, student, and administrative representatives, as well as from a number of interested citizens.

As background for the October hearing, the Board's Office prepared a brief report entitled, Portland State University Guidelines.

At the close of the foregoing hearings, it was concluded that the work of preparing for Board consideration a draft of a new set of guidelines for Portland State University should be undertaken by the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs.

This December 15 meeting of the Committee is the beginning of that process.

As background for Committee discussion, the Board's Office presented a document entitled, Portland State University Guidelines, which included:

1. A preliminary draft of proposed guidelines for Portland State University as a point of departure for discussion by the Board's Committee at its December 15 meeting.

2. A summary of the testimony heard by the Committee of the Whole at its September and October meetings and copies of papers submitted by some who testified at the October meeting.

The complete report is on file in the Board's Office.

It was anticipated that the Board's Committee will wish to use that portion of its December 15 meeting that is to be devoted to the Portland State University guidelines, for a discussion of a number of key issues relating to the future of Portland State University. The preliminary draft of proposed guidelines included herein, the summary of testimony given at the September and October meetings, and the background materials (cited above) presented by the Board's Office at the September and October meetings will, the Board's Office believes, provide a sound basis for the discussion.

It is believed that by the close of the December 15 discussion, the Board's Office will have been provided by the Board's Committee sufficient guidance as to the Committee's views and wishes that the Board's Office would then be able to prepare a revised draft of the proposed PSU guidelines for subsequent consideration by the Board's Committee, ultimately, adoption by the Board of Higher Education.

The Guidelines prepared for consideration at the December 15, 1978, meeting follow:
Guidelines for Portland State University -
A Preliminary Draft

Portland State University is a public urban university situated in the heart of Oregon's largest metropolitan area and serving the state and the Portland metropolitan area through programs of undergraduate and graduate instruction, research, and public service, based upon curricula in the arts and sciences, and in selected professional and preprofessional fields, as authorized by the State Board of Higher Education.

During the 1980's, Portland State University's capacity to respond vigorously and effectively to the postsecondary educational, research, and public service needs of the clientele it is to serve will depend upon PSU's ability to use its resources effectively in pursuit of well-defined goals and objectives. To guide the development of these goals and objectives, these guidelines are set forth by the State Board of Higher Education.

1. The urban university concept.

The urban university concept has broadened significantly in recent years from one with a primary emphasis on a geographic definition, to a broadly philosophical concept involving an admixture of educational, social, cultural, and economic relationships between the university and the city.

The urban university and the city are seen as two mutually dependent organisms living in a truly symbiotic relationship in which the university is distinguished not so much by its presence "in the city" as by the evidences that it is "of the city" - evidences to be found in its objectives; its instructional, research, and service programs; and in the characteristics of its student body and faculty.

More specifically, an urban university is defined as one which:

Is located in an urban area.

Draws a substantial portion of its undergraduate students from among residents of the urban area in which it is located.

Carries out programs to make postsecondary educational opportunities more accessible to students living in the urban area.

Has a demonstrated capacity to carry out urban-oriented educational, research, and public service activities.

Has demonstrated and sustained a sense of responsibility to the urban area in which it is located and to the people therein by its service to the educational, cultural, social, and economic needs of the area.

Uses the urban area as an educational resource - as an instructional laboratory, to give added purpose and realism to the instructional effort.

Uses the rich human resources of the urban community in augmenting the university's teaching faculty, and in otherwise drawing upon the area's resources to strengthen the university.

2. Portland State University's primary focus - service to the Portland metropolitan area.

Portland State University has statewide and regional (interstate) responsibilities, and serves a national function, too, but its primary focus is on contributing to meeting the postsecondary educational, research, and public service needs of the Portland metropolitan area.
Its primary service area is the tri-county area of Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties, from which it draws more than 85% of its students.

There are (1977) in the tri-county area an estimated 970,000 people (40% of the total estimated Oregon population), of whom nearly one-quarter consist of persons between the ages of 17 and 29, the age group most likely to be served by college and university instructional programs.

Portland State University's statewide and regional (interstate) functions relate to enrollment of students from outside the Portland metropolitan area; offering of some graduate programs not offered by other State System institutions; participation in planning, instruction, research, and public service programs having statewide, regional, and, in some instances, national import.

Periodically, PSU's enrollment ceiling (currently 10,000 fall term FTE students) will be reviewed by the Board for its relevance to PSU's mission and the educational needs of the state and the Portland metropolitan area.

3. Portland State University to coordinate with other agencies serving the Portland metropolitan area.

In fulfilling its urban function, Portland State University will coordinate its planning and other activities with agencies and institutions offering services to the Portland metropolitan area similar or related to those offered by PSU (e.g., other institutions of the State System, including the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, the independent colleges and universities, Oregon Graduate Center, community colleges, educational service districts, public schools, and other governmental and private agencies engaged in offering services similar to those offered by Portland State University).

As the only comprehensive public university in Portland and the largest comprehensive four-year postsecondary institution in the Portland metropolitan area, Portland State University should continue its efforts to fill the role of innovative leadership in encouraging cooperation among colleges and universities, and other educational agencies in serving Portland metropolitan area postsecondary instructional, research, and service needs.

4. Portland State University's clientele.

Portland State University's clientele is in some respects similar to clientele in other universities; in some respects, quite dissimilar.

Other State System institutions also serve students from the tri-county area though not in such numbers as PSU does. Fall term 1977, the tri-county area contributed 22,182 (44.4%) of the 49,987 Oregon residents enrolled in the seven State System colleges and universities (UO, OSU, PSU, SOSC, OCE, EOSC, OIT). Of these 22,182 tri-county students, PSU enrolled 61.5% (13,638). The remaining 38.5% (8,544) were served by the other six institutions (UO, OSU, SOSC, OCE, EOSC, OIT), with the largest number enrolling at OSU (3,697) and UO (3,516).
Portland State University's clientele is made up of:

- **Instructional clientele** consisting of (a) degree-oriented persons wishing to earn a baccalaureate or graduate degree, (b) non-degree oriented persons interested in taking credit or non-credit courses to meet career and/or personal self-fulfillment needs, but disinterested in meeting degree requirements.

- **Research and public service clientele** (e.g., individuals; business and professional agencies; city, county, state, and federal governmental agencies; labor organizations; cultural and social groups of various kinds) who or which look to Portland State University to serve important research and public service needs of the Portland metropolitan community.

Portland State University's instructional clientele differs in some respects from the instructional clientele of the traditional university, and may be characterized as follows:

- They are predominantly from the tri-county area (e.g., 86.2% of PSU's fall term 1977 enrollments were from Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas counties).

- On the average they tend to be older than students enrolled in residential colleges and universities.

- The majority are living at home and attending PSU as commuting students, reflecting, in part, the shortage of student housing.

- A significant percentage of them are part-time students (e.g., fall term 1977-78, almost one-half 41.9% were enrolled for six or fewer credit hours of work).

- A significant percentage work part-time while attending school.

- Being principally residents of the area and sometimes property owners and taxpayers, they tend to have close relationships with the broader community in which PSU is located.

- An increasing proportion are women and minority students.

5. Portland State University's instructional role.

Portland State University has a major commitment to instruction. The goals of the instructional program include the following:

- **General education.** To provide students with a sound general education that will enable them to gain an appreciation of the arts, letters, and sciences that undergird civilization, and that will offer students opportunity to develop the ability to think critically and to communicate effectively orally and in writing.

- **Lifelong learning skills and incentives.** To foster in students an appreciation for scholarship and to assist them in the development of the intellectual skills and abilities that will encourage them to pursue knowledge independently so that they may continue learning throughout a lifetime, serving thereby their career needs as well as their cultural and social needs.
c. Special abilities. To assist students to develop:

(1) social skills that contribute to effective interpersonal relationships.

(2) an understanding of value systems and value formation.

(3) psychological and emotional stability built upon reasoned personal values.

(4) physical health and well being.

d. Citizenship skills and motivation. To develop in students an understanding of and appreciation for their responsibilities as citizens in the broader local, state, national, and world communities; to encourage the development of democratic ideals basic to political, social, and cultural processes in a democratic society.

e. Economic self-sufficiency. To offer students the means to develop the knowledge, skills, and abilities that will enable them to become economically self-sufficient through employment reasonably related to their capacities, interests, and preparation.

6. Portland State University curricula.

As a public urban university with moderate admissions requirements, Portland State University must offer a diversity of curricular programs to serve the needs and interests of a diverse student body.

The present - In keeping with the foregoing need, the Board has authorized PSU a wide array of undergraduate and graduate programs, in contemplation of which the PSU faculty said in its mission and goals statement, adopted in May 1978: "The program offerings of the University have expanded from the modest beginning of 1955 to a point where they are now respectable for a school located in the major population center of a state."

These programs include:

- A wide array of baccalaureate and master's degree programs in the arts and sciences (1) serving the general education needs of PSU's students, (2) undergirding the professional programs offered at PSU, and (3) providing major programs of study in the arts and sciences leading to baccalaureate and master's degrees.

- Baccalaureate and master's degree programs in a variety of high-student-interest, high-enrollment professional fields (e.g., business administration, teacher education, applied science, social work, criminal justice, engineering, baccalaureate program only, urban planning and public administration!master's programs only).

- Doctoral programs in:

  Urban studies
  Environmental sciences and resources
  Systems science
  Public school administration (jointly offered by UO/PSU)
  Community college education (jointly offered by OSU/UO/PSU)
The future - The future seems always to have a way of both offering opportunities and presenting problems. So it is with postsecondary education in Oregon, and more specifically, with Portland State University.

Portland State University's growth in capacity for service over the past decade, and its location in the heart of Oregon's largest metropolitan area, provide the thrust for its future, giving it strengths and opportunities upon which it will capitalize in the decade of the 1980's.

Portland State University's growth has been determined largely by the needs of the metropolis in which it is located. If the past is prologue to the future, the changing needs of the metropolis will play a dominant role in defining PSU's future growth and development.

As PSU marshalls its resources to fill the mission assigned it by the Board, it will do so in the realization that as a university it shares with universities everywhere dedication to three basic commitments:

- Instruction
- The generation and dissemination of knowledge
- Public service

In PSU's continuing pursuit of excellence in the service of these commitments - within the context of the urban university mission assigned it by the Board - lies the enormously challenging and satisfying future to which the faculty, staff, and students of Portland State University may look.

As assistance to PSU in its planning for the future, the Board includes immediately below a brief review of long-standing Board policies, and some planning assumptions.

It is the policy of the Board of Higher Education to seek to be sensitive to and aware of the educational needs of the State which the State System of Higher Education ought, within its general mission, to seek to serve.

The Board welcomes the efforts of its institutions to plan vigorously for meeting the changing needs for public higher education in Oregon, consistent with the Board-assigned mission of the institution, and bearing always in mind that the Board must assess institutional requests for new programs in the light of whether the program can be demonstrated to be in the best interests of the State as a whole, and within the economic capacity of the institution and the State to support.

In considering new program proposals from its institutions, the Board of Higher Education weighs the three closely interrelated issues of accessibility, cost, and quality. The Board's aim is to assure adequate availability of educational programs without unnecessary duplication, as cost and quality considerations will allow.

- Planning assumptions

The following planning assumptions should guide PSU's efforts to identify additional curricular proposals for consideration by the Board of Higher Education.
a. That, given the fiscal constraints under which the public postsecondary educational institutions in Oregon must operate, unnecessary program duplication, particularly at the advanced graduate level, must be avoided. The people of Oregon ought not to expect to find a full range of advanced graduate programs on the campuses of each of their public universities.

Indeed, in the future, in reviewing proposals from any of its institutions for authorization of new advanced graduate programs, the Board will expect that due attention has been given to the possible alternative of meeting identified needs through a regional (interstate) program.

b. That Portland State University is committed to a continuing pursuit of quality and excellence as an urban university.

In selected areas related to its mission and geographical location, Portland State University should aspire to national leadership - to becoming one of the best institutions of its kind in the nation. The basic problems of urban areas and the fundamental concerns of urban dwellers are similar from urban area to urban area; hence, what Portland State University achieves in extending mankind's understanding of these problems and these concerns will be significant to inhabitants of urban environments most everywhere.

c. That program development at Portland State University must be seen as a continuous process which balances existing or foreseeable resources against emerging needs.

d. That the key characteristic of future academic program development at Portland State University will be that it will augment and combine existing educational resources in a creative manner in producing programs of maximum social utility.

e. That new program proposals will generally grow out of opportunities perceived at the points where the University interfaces with the various segments of its metropolitan environment.

f. That the expertise needed to provide greater service in proposed new areas or programs may already exist at the University. Creative academic program development on an ongoing basis is needed in order to maintain a close relationship between the University and the needs of a metropolitan environment.

g. That in examining potential new areas of future service, particularly at the advanced graduate level, it will be important to consider whether the service can be provided more effectively, and/or with less cost through a regional (interstate) program or through joint and cooperative efforts of PSU and other Oregon public and/or independent colleges and universities, similar to the PSU/UO
and OSU/UO/PSU joint programs in public school administration and community college education, respectively, or the PSU/Lewis and Clark program in public administration.

h. That new instructional areas of greatest interest are likely to be in fields (1) in which the resources in the Portland area are uniquely appropriate to the program (social work is an illustration of a current program of that kind), or (2) that serve the place-bound in the Portland metropolitan area, e.g.:

(1) employed business, professional, and governmental practitioners desiring to upgrade their skills and their education through work leading to a master's degree (e.g., illustrative are the master's programs in public administration and taxation recently authorized PSU), others who for employment, family, or financial reasons are, in effect, place-bound.

(2) persons living in the Portland metropolitan area who, for career or personal, cultural, self-fulfillment reasons, desire access to graduate and post-baccalaureate courses without reference to a graduate degree.

It is anticipated that at the doctoral level, Portland State University will offer a limited number of carefully selected programs which are not unnecessarily duplicative and which are relevant to the needs of the Portland metropolitan area.

i. That it will become increasingly vital that PSU continue and expand its present offering of educational programs in a format, at locations, and at times convenient to the non-traditional student. This will involve (1) scheduling on-campus courses and programs at times (e.g., late afternoons, evenings, weekends) and in formats (e.g., independent study, internships, block schedules of concentrated periods of instruction interspersed with extended periods of freedom from classes) which take into account the fact that much of PSU's student clientele is employed full- or part-time, and (2) offering outreach (off-campus) courses and programs at locations, times, and in formats convenient to student clientele. In these efforts PSU should seek the cooperation of employers who are often willing to make adjustments in work schedules of employees to accommodate employees' educational interests.

Continuing education programs will be expanded with concern for professional development, self-enrichment, and liberal studies for mature adults.

To develop the outreach programs to their full stature will require budgetary policy changes which are to be considered by the 1979 Legislative Assembly.
That special attention will need to be given to involving representatives of the public in PSU's academic planning, in an effort to articulate institutional mission with educational need, and to assure broader public understanding of Portland State University's instructional, research, and service contributions to the Portland metropolitan community as well as to the State and region more broadly.

7. Portland State University's research role.

Research is an integral part of Portland State University's mission serving, as research does, as an important base for teaching, and for service to the urban community, and to society in general.

The research carried on may result in knowledge for knowledge's sake, or it may result in the discovery of "visible, practical, and immediately applicable new knowledge" related to problems and issues, locally or universally (e.g., crime, transportation, pollution, poverty). Given PSU's urban setting and mission, it is expected that they will necessarily be involved in problem-centered research relating to urban problems and issues, which is not to exclude an interest in basic research appropriate to the instructional areas assigned PSU.

Universities are generally dependent on sponsored (outside) research funding in meeting the research needs of their graduate programs, and since these outside funds are to be won only in the fiercely competitive academic market, universities new to the field require time, patience, perseverance, commitment, and resources if they are to become competitive for the limited research funds allocated by the federal government and the private funding agencies.

The dependence of universities on sponsored research funding in meeting the research needs of their graduate programs places upon the universities responsibility for assuring that the sponsored research activities undertaken are fully compatible with the university mission and goals and contribute to, rather than detract from, their fulfillment. This is an obligation that PSU has taken on as it has entered the research funding market to a degree commensurate with the present extent of its advanced degree programs.

Portland State University's expressed commitment to teaching based upon a solid research base is aimed at fostering student inquiry which challenges established ideas and methods and which is directed toward a solution of current or foreseeable problems.

That commitment may be expected to be reflected in the characteristics of the staff PSU assembles, the environment PSU provides the staff (recognition in salary and promotion decisions of the importance the University places on faculty achievements in research), and the protection afforded staff from outside pressure groups that would seek either to divert staff from their legitimate research pursuits or from the dissemination of research results.

Evidence is that Portland State University has, within the context of its advanced graduate programs, made genuine progress in attracting outside funding for research, and that it is prepared to expand its efforts in that respect.

8. Portland State University's public service role.

As a public urban university, service to the urban community is, by definition, a significant responsibility of Portland State University.
It is in its public service role that the urban university, like the land-grant university, seeks to apply knowledge of which it has custody to the practical needs and problems of the society the university seeks to serve.

Beyond the social merit of applying the University's expertise to the solution or amelioration of important social and technological problems plaguing society, is the value that the public service function adds to the educational process itself. The teaching/learning and research functions of the university in many fields can be effectively tested and improved as a result of the testing of knowledge through its application to the practical problems of society, and students and faculty are enabled to work with successful professionals in their chosen fields.

The general public and the public decision-makers too often have insufficient knowledge of all that is being done by the universities in the way of public service. We believe this to be the case with the public services rendered by Portland State University.

Whatever form these public service activities take, they must be evaluated in terms of their consistency with and the contributions they make toward the accomplishment of the educational mission assigned Portland State University by the Board.

(Public service activities take a variety of forms, of which the following are but illustrative:

a. Development by the University of a variety of field experience/internship programs designed to provide students and faculty with effective learning experiences in dealing with the issues of the real world, and at the same time offering to the community or its agencies the help that competent faculty and students are able to give in analyzing the issues and weighing alternative courses of action relating to the resolution thereof.

b. Contributions by the University to the quality of life of the community through the provision of cultural and clinical services to the community. This may involve any of a number of approaches: provision on campus of cultural and recreational events of interest to the community; making campus facilities available to the community for cultural, social, or academic use; offering clinical services to the community.

c. Faculty provision of technical assistance to business, industry, government, labor, and the like, to the extent consistent with the benefits derived therefrom in contributing to the achievement of the institution's mission.

d. Provision of learning opportunities serving the lifelong learning needs of the residents of the urban area. These may be either credit or non-credit activities as indicated in a later section of these guidelines.

e. Fostering and participating in programs of public service focused on the needs of specific target groups (e.g., women, senior citizens, minorities).

f. Issuance of publications relevant to the problems of the urban community.

g. Conducting research studies and investigations for urban groups - governmental and otherwise).
9. **Admissions**

As a publicly-supported urban university, Portland State University's admissions requirements will be maintained at a modestly selective level in order that the University may serve the educational needs of the wide range of urban students who look to PSU for service.

10. **Attrition**

Given PSU's modestly selective admissions requirements, and its commitment to making educational opportunities broadly available, the University will be responsive to the need for effective programs of student advisement and counseling and for supplementary assistance to students (e.g., skill development activities to improve reading, writing, study skills, tutoring where appropriate) in order that students may have the optimum opportunity for academic success.

The University will continue its efforts to discover the causes for student attrition stemming from inadequacies of the counseling, instructional, or other programs of the University and will seek to reduce the causes of such attrition.

11. **Staff development**

The University will continue its efforts to develop and maintain an effective program of staff development as provided for in the Internal Management Directives (IMD 4.001).

There was a time in the immediate past when increasing enrollments and faculty mobility enabled universities and colleges to maintain or increase their vitality and to build and change instructional and research programs by adding faculty. That period is largely past. Enrollments have stabilized and the rate of faculty turnover is greatly reduced. The institutional renewal which formerly resulted from faculty additions, must now be provided for largely through faculty self-renewal on the job.

**Discussion by the Committee**

Dr. Romney stated that the Board's Office had now prepared a preliminary draft of a set of guidelines for Portland State University, but was not asking that the Board's Committee approve them at the December 12 meeting. Rather, the preliminary draft was to serve as a point of departure for the Committee's discussion out of which would emerge additional insights and instructions from the Board members to guide the Board's staff in developing a re-draft for consideration by the Committee at its February meeting.

In developing the preliminary guidelines draft, the Board's Office had not been unmindful of the statement of the mission and goals developed and adopted by the Portland State University faculty in May 1978, and had incorporated in the preliminary draft a good many ideas drawn therefrom.

At the same time, Dr. Romney said, the Board's Office had not been unmindful of the Board's long-standing emphasis on the need for differentiation of function among its institutions in order that needed instructional programs might be made adequately available without unnecessary duplication of programs. He noted that the State System does not have on any one campus a "complete" university in the sense that the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, or the University of Wisconsin at Madison are complete universities (i.e., having the characteristics of a traditional State University and those of a Land-grant University encompassed within a single institution). Each State System institution is limited in some degree by its Board-adopted guidelines in the range and kinds of programs it may offer. This fact was borne in mind by the Board's staff in developing the preliminary draft of
guidelines for Portland State University. An effort had been made to define for Portland State University a significant role in the State System while maintaining the concept of differentiated function among the institutions.

Mrs. Carpenter then invited Portland State University representatives to comment on the preliminary draft of the guidelines.

President Blumel asserted that Portland State University had had insufficient time in which to undertake with the faculty a systematic review of the draft document. He would, nonetheless, like to make a few comments about the document and would like Professor Grubb, chairman of the Portland State University faculty committee that developed the mission and goals statement (May 1978), and Vice President Richelle to have an opportunity to comment on the draft. President Blumel stated that his general reaction was that the draft is not likely to be greeted with a high degree of enthusiasm at Portland State University.

Elaborating on that generalization, President Blumel said:

1. That he felt the draft had a somewhat negative tone and is restrictive in its view of Portland State University's future. Although it emphasizes service to the metropolitan Portland area as a primary function—a declaration with which he concurs—the draft statement also suggests that a "great many other institutions have similar responsibilities" and that "there is nothing in the document to suggest that Portland State University should be the leading institution."

The preliminary draft appears to keep open within the narrow function identified for Portland State University, options for a great many other institutions to participate, President Blumel averred, a fact he found distasteful.

2. That the document holds out only faint hope for further graduate program development at Portland State University. And it does not emphasize the point that there are some advantages in locating certain kinds of academic programs in the metropolitan setting.

3. It does recognize research as a legitimate function of Portland State University, which is a positive aspect of the draft guidelines, but, he went on, it also articulates at several points in the document some Board policies which presumably apply to all State System institutions, but which are set forth in institutional guidelines for the first time in the Portland State University guidelines draft. He identified as illustrative the comments relating to regional cooperation.

Another such general Board policy included in the draft sets forth the Board's intention to seek to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs in the State System. President Blumel suggested that the Board may wish, in making future allocations, to consider the placement of some new programs in Portland where they can serve the large population of the metropolitan area and thus lessen the need for duplication of programs in the State System.

Vice President Richelle commented that he found the statement a little restrictive and a little negative in its totality. Portland State University would welcome some encouragement and recognition of certain things they have done in the past and are interested in doing in the future.

He said that although Dr. Romney had indicated that many of the ideas contained in the draft statement reflect faculty statements found in the mission and goal statement adopted by the Portland State University faculty in May 1978, he felt that insufficient attention had been given to emphasizing that Portland State University can become a first-rate urban university only if it is first a university in the true sense of the word. The faculty statement on mission and goals emphasized two important elements in the mission
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of Portland State University: (1) the acquisition and development of components of the traditional university (including research, both basic and applied, and scholars), and (2) a university structure in its own right. Having these two elements, Portland State University will then be able to make application of their expertise to societal, metropolitan, urban problems, he said.

Professor Grubb said that he concurred with the emphasis upon Portland State University's need to be permitted to build upon its present foundation as a traditional university. The faculty statement on mission and goals he considered a living, dynamic document; and that while many of the ideas contained therein are to be found in the preliminary draft of the guidelines, the latter could go a little farther and be a more positive Board commitment to Portland State University, making the document a more dynamic document that would more adequately serve Portland State University's purposes.

Dr. Romney commented briefly on the foregoing observations, to the following effect:

1. That the draft guidelines do state clearly that Portland State University shall have a leadership role in meeting the postsecondary educational needs of the Portland metropolitan area. He read from p. 5 of the draft:

As the only comprehensive public university in Portland, and the largest comprehensive four-year postsecondary institution in the Portland metropolitan area, PSU should continue in its efforts to fill its role of innovative leadership in encouraging cooperation among colleges and universities, and other educational agencies in serving Portland metropolitan area postsecondary instructional, research, and service needs.

Such Portland State University cooperation with other postsecondary educational agencies serving the Portland area as is suggested in the foregoing statement is essential, but Portland State University clearly is assigned a leadership role by the foregoing language.

2. That relative to the hope of expansion of graduate programs at Portland State University, the draft statement does not foreclose expansion, but on the other hand clearly provides for consideration of expanded offerings in the following terms, taken from pp. 9 and 10 of the draft guidelines:

... program development at Portland State University must be seen as a continuous process which balances existing or foreseeable resources against emerging needs.

... new program proposals will generally grow out of opportunities perceived at the points where the University interfaces with the various segments of its metropolitan environment.

... new instructional areas of greatest interest are likely to be in fields (1) in which the resources in the Portland area are uniquely appropriate to the program (social work is an illustration of a current program of that kind), or (2) that serve the place-bound in the Portland metropolitan area, e.g.:

(1) employed business, professional, and governmental practitioners desiring to upgrade their skills and their education through work leading to a master's degree.
(e.g., illustrative are the master's programs in public administration and taxation recently authorized at PSU), others who for employment, family, or financial reasons are, in effect, place-bound.

(2) persons living in the Portland metropolitan area who, for career or personal, cultural, self-fulfillment reasons, desire access to graduate and post-baccalaureate courses without reference to a graduate degree.

It is anticipated that at the doctoral level, Portland State University will offer a limited number of carefully selected programs which are not unnecessarily duplicative and which are relevant to the needs of the Portland metropolitan area.

3. That with reference to the Board policies included in the draft statement, to which President Blumel referred (see p. 8 of the draft guidelines), if they are approved by the Board for inclusion in the Portland State University guidelines, they will be included in the guidelines of other State System institutions as they are reviewed and updated.

There was no intent on the part of the Board's Office to single out Portland State University as the only institution to which these general Board policies apply. But the Board's Office did feel that it was important to include them in these and all subsequent institutional guidelines.

4. That with reference to the Portland State University interpretation that the preliminary draft of the guidelines does not adequately emphasize Portland State University's role as a university, the draft statement says quite clearly (p. 7 of the draft statement):

As PSU marshalls its resources to fulfill the mission assigned it by the Board, it will do so in the realization that as a university it shares with universities everywhere dedication to three basic commitments:

- Instruction.

- The generation and dissemination of knowledge.

- Public service.

Mrs. Carpenter drew attention to the fact that a guidelines document must speak to many publics in Oregon, in addition to the University itself, and that the draft guidelines should be read with that in mind.

Mrs. Feves said that perhaps the reference in the draft document to Portland State University's role as an urban university might be taken by some to imply that somehow the admissions standards were lower than in other types of universities, or that in some other ways urban universities are at a lower level than traditional universities. Is this one of the concerns that Portland State University faculty feel? Do they believe that an emphasis on Portland State University as an urban university assigns to Portland State University a second-class status?

Professor Grubb affirmed that he was somewhat concerned lest the guidelines emphasize too much the service role and insufficiently the other fundamental areas of interest of a university.

Mrs. Feves said that she felt that Portland State University ought to be vitally concerned with serving the needs of the metropolitan area, but that she would hope that one would not infer therefrom that the Board intended that Portland State University should be an inferior or second-class university.
Vice President Richelle affirmed his view that universities situated in urban areas are not, for that reason, second-class universities. He cited the origin of universities in the cities, and the fact that many great universities are situated in urban areas of the nation, Columbia University being an example.

President Blumel acknowledged that the statement concerning the role of Portland State University as a university (cited by Dr. Romney) is set forth in the document but said that he felt that it is not given the visibility and prominence in the guidelines that it had in the faculty statement of mission and goals. He said that he also felt that the Planning Assumptions (pp. 8-9 of the document) include ideas that need expression, but that the sequence in which they are expressed appears to him to give a negative cast to the assumptions. It is, in a measure, the location of the statements—their juxtaposition—that leads to some concerns on his part, President Blumel said.

Dr. Romney said that he foresaw no real problems in modifying the sequence of items considered in the guidelines or in the modification of some aspects of the terminology; that these are matters that can be and will be modified wherever necessary to accord with the Board's desires.

Mrs. Carpenter said that she felt that there is in the urban university concept a kind of glowing mission that is exciting to contemplate. Seen in that light, Portland State University's future should be both challenging and satisfying.

Professor Grubb responded that he felt that the development of the Portland State University guidelines offers the Board the opportunity of making a statement to the effect that it views its three universities as equals, and that the Board is committed to making each of them outstanding universities. The Portland State University faculty is particularly sensitive, he said, to the relationship of Portland State University to the University of Oregon and Oregon State University, and does not wish to have Portland State University thought of as a lesser institution than the University of Oregon or Oregon State University.

Dr. Romney suggested that in several places the preliminary draft of Portland State University's guidelines, reference is made to Portland State University's need to pursue excellence, and that in the first paragraph of p. 9 of the document, there is very specific emphasis on the need for Portland State University to "aspire to national leadership—to becoming one of the best institutions of its kind in the nation..."

Professor Grubb acknowledged that the draft statement does so state, but suggested that such statement, and others like it in the document, need to be placed in a more prominent position than they now occupy.

Mr. Anderson asserted that there is a difference between a goals document and a guidelines document. A guidelines document in many instances must be restrictive. He said that it appeared that President Blumel was interested more in a goals document—a document that would speak to what it is that is the end result of all Portland State University's activities and how these activities should be directed to a very definite objective. Should the Board establish a restrictive document that sets the parameters within which Portland State University shall operate? Or, alternatively, should the Board set up specific objectives toward which the Board intends Portland State University shall work?

If the Board is interested in establishing a goals statement, it should set forth the goals for Portland State University and the policies the Portland State University administration and the Board should follow in attaining those goals, then, perhaps, the way in which the policies are to be implemented in the light of the goals.
He said he felt there are many areas in the preliminary draft of the guidelines on which there is agreement. He said that if the Board decides to maintain the format of the preliminary statement of guidelines, then it would be helpful if President Blumel and his staff would point out those things concerning which they have questions, rather than referring to general matters.

President Blumel said that he felt the matter of format is important. He said that he also felt that the "tone" of the document was not to his liking. He would be willing to go through the document section-by-section, identifying the areas concerning which he had question, but, he said, he had insufficient time to explore his faculty's views on the preliminary document and that he felt it essential to do so before engaging in a section-by-section discussion of the document.

Mr. Wyss expressed regret that the discussion had opened on such a negative note. In the earlier sessions, in which the Board had considered matters relating to Portland State University's guidelines, the University had presented to the Board its overall history, showing how innovative it's been and how various challenges have arisen along the way. The way in which Portland State University has reacted to change in societal needs is quite remarkable, he said. At some point, he said, he would like to see incorporated in the document the concept of Portland State University as a change agent, responding to new societal and educational needs perhaps to a greater extent than the more traditional universities are able to because of greater flexibility.

He said that the Board, by its very nature, can more easily be restrictive, looking to Portland State University to suggest the alternatives and choices that ought to be considered.

It must be recognized, he said, that no institution ought to be expected to be exclusive, rather than inclusive, in setting goals and mission statements.

The Board has, in its discussions, been attempting to determine in what areas Portland State University might specialize, while Portland State University has been feeling that it doesn't wish to specialize. One might have concluded, therefore, that Portland State University wants to be all things to all people, intruding on traditional universities that have already staked out the territories into which Portland State University wishes to move.

What should be done, he said, is to seek to discern what the future might hold, rather than what traditional university roles have already been staked out by other universities.

If one looks back to the history of Portland State University and the State System it seems apparent that it would not have paid to be exclusive in defining mission and role. Had Portland State University been asked in the early 1950's what kind of institution it was to become, and had been asked to be exclusive in its definition of mission and role, it would have found itself committed to becoming a quite different kind of institution than it has become—and perhaps a less useful one, too, Mr. Wyss said.

If we look then at the whole of the State System, and ask what its future is going to be, the major thrust and growth, we can't tell with any great accuracy. Therefore, he said, what Portland State University is saying is that the Board oughtn't to tie it down to a specific role which is going to keep Portland State University from responding to changing needs in the society of the future. If everyone can get that thought in mind, all will feel less argumentative and less threatened and will understand that we are all aiming at the same goal.
Mr. Wyss said that he felt the reader should not emphasize what the document says about the need for Portland State University to serve the metropolitan Portland needs, to the exclusion of what else the document says. There are a number of other phrases in the document referring to "emerging needs," "changing societal values," "non-traditional programs" which speak to the innovative history of Portland State University on which more emphasis might be placed by the reader. He did not know, he said, whether Portland State University's mission could be defined as one of flexibility and innovation, but he felt, that Portland State University, because of its location and the timing of its development, should have a special commitment to these qualities.

President Blumel said that he would find it difficult to tie the Portland State University mission statement to those terms, but he did acknowledge that force of circumstances had obliged Portland State University to do many of the things it has done over the past decade or so.

Mrs. Carpenter said that she recognized that there is in the document an effort to control the development of the institution, but that she felt that all of the positive aspirations are there in the document, too, as is evidence of the high value the Board places on Portland State University, its accomplishments, and its future. Perhaps, she said, a reorganization of some portions of the document might highlight some of these things.

Mr. Wyss said that he felt that it would be unwise to go through the preliminary guidelines section-by-section now, since President Blumel was unprepared to do so. The document sets forth a proposal for the Portland State University guidelines. Portland State University should now indicate what more it would like to have included or what it would like to have changed in the document.

Chancellor Lieuallen asserted that one of the facts to be borne in mind in considering guidelines statements is that institutional guidelines must be developed within the context of the overall State System mission. The Board is obliged to provide for Oregon a comprehensive program in post-secondary education, with each institution playing a differentiated role within an integrated system. It is almost inevitable, therefore, he said, that some restrictive terminology should be included in institutional guidelines as the Board attempts to define what share of the total mission for the State System each institution must play, building within the several guidelines statements the kind of overlap that inevitably must occur because of geographical and access considerations. It would obviously be difficult, he noted, for the Board to make a case for each of its six multipurpose institutions to carve out a comprehensive mission as inclusive as the mission of the State System as a whole. Each institution has a mission and role, some portions of which are unique to the institution, but with the institutional missions--in the aggregate--constituting a whole, which will permit the Board to offer a comprehensive, cost-effective program of postsecondary education for Oregon.

Dr. Romney stated that the Board's Office had presented the Board with the preliminary draft of the guidelines statement with expectation that the Board would indicate, through its discussion of the draft statement, in what ways the Board would like the draft modified to bring it into line with the Board's desires. He had gathered from the discussion, he said, that the Board's Committee would like some reorganization of the document so as to set forth goals for Portland State University with some suggestions as to how the goals might be attained. He said that it seemed apparent that the Portland State University representatives felt that the current document is more restrictive than they'd like. But, he said, eventually, one must come to the point of setting some parameters in connection with institutional
mission if a system of curricular allocations and institutional differentiation of function is to be maintained. He said that the Board's Office would be pleased to proceed with a re-draft, bearing in mind the Board's discussion of the preliminary draft, hoping that the re-draft will accord with the desires of the Board members.

Mr. Anderson suggested that the re-draft include a very short statement of goals and then go on to establish certain policies to be followed in meeting those goals.

Mr. Harms said he concurred with Mr. Anderson's views. Some modification in format may be helpful. He said he understood full well, the point Dr. Romney was seeking to make, namely, that in pointing to the principal role of Portland State University in serving an urban function, the document is not diminishing the importance of the fact that Portland State University is a university and as such, has a commitment to the functions that are essential aspects of all universities, namely, instruction, research, and service.

Mrs. Carpenter asked that President Blumel remind his staff and faculty that guidelines of necessity must speak to the interests and concerns of many publics.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Staff Report to the Committee

Each year, the Board's staff provides the Board with a two-year comparative report of income received from gifts, grants, and contracts, and a two-year comparative report of the income and expenditures of the corporate affiliates which provide support for various institution programs and functions. Although all of the income received for gift, grant, and contract activities represents money which has come to the institution and will be expended through institution accounts, not all of the income received by the corporate affiliates is transferred to and expended through institution accounts. The statutes governing activities of corporate affiliates do not require such an accounting and expenditure process. Further, some donors prefer that their gifts be expended directly by the corporate affiliate. Nevertheless, the affiliates were organized as not-for-profit corporations and their activities reflect the significant support they provide for institution education, research, and auxiliary activities.

To be certain, however, that the Board is made aware of the direct support such affiliates provide, the institutions are asked by the Board's staff to report annually the amount of money expended by the affiliates for all purposes as well as the amount spent specifically for institution programs and functions. In most instances, the money spent for institution purposes represents the amount transferred to the institution and expended through institution accounts.

Prior to May 31, 1977, the reporting period for gift, grant, and contract income was June 1 through May 31. The two-year comparative report presented in Table I covers that fiscal period. Beginning with the 1976-77 fiscal year, the annual comparative report will cover the July 1 through June 30 fiscal year.

At its January 28, 1977, meeting, the Board approved simplified reporting procedures for gift, grant, and contract income. These procedures have significantly reduced institutional costs of collecting and reporting the data.

Gift, Grant, and Contract Income 1976-77 and 1977-78

Total income from gift, grant, contract sources during 1977-78 amounted to $83,502,216, an increase of .6% over 1976-77, as shown in Table I below. The slight increase is misleading, however, because total income from federal sources actually decreased $3,905,666. The difference is offset, as stated later, by an increase in income from non-federal sources. The decrease in income from federal sources was the result of a general drop in funding for sponsored research, training grants, and fellowships. Such a decrease always has some impact on instruction and related research services funded from the General Fund and tuition. During this same period the cost of instruction increased approximately 7.1%.

An examination of selected restricted accounts for sponsored research, instruction and department research, and student services at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center revealed decreases in the funding for instruction and research amounting to $745,499 at Oregon State University and $573,544 at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center. The funds in these accounts are generally used to finance fellowships and other training which usually tends to improve the overall instructional program.
Income placed only in restricted sponsored research accounts, as required by the grantor, dropped $1,127,799 at the University of Oregon and $2,370,800 at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center. Contributing substantially to the Center's decrease in funding for sponsored research was the loss of the $600,000/year grant for cardiovascular research which the Center had received for the past 13 years.

Lastly, there was a $585,939 decrease in the total funding of restricted student services accounts funded from federal sources. All institutions within the Department were effected. The majority of the decrease occurred in the college work-study programs. Again, the loss of income decreases the amount of student assistance which can be provided all departments at the institutions.

Fortunately, income from other than federal sources (e.g., state and private) increased $4,423,983 during this same period. Increased income from non-federal sources were reported as follows: UOHSC $4,400,000; PSU $390,000; SOSC $185,000; OIT $350,000; and DCE $10,000. Decreases in these sources of income were reported at OSU, UO, OCE, EOSC, OEPBS, and Teaching Research.

Affiliated Organizations Income and Expenditures 1976-77 and 1977-78

Total income of all affiliated organizations for 1977-78, as presented in Table II below, was $11,651,653, an increase of $2,135,710 or 22% over the previous year. University of Oregon, Portland State University, Oregon College of Education, Southern Oregon State College, and Eastern Oregon State College affiliates reported increased income in the range of 25% to 199%.

Total expenditures for the institutions (representing for the most part expenditures through institution accounts) increased from $2,921,292 in 1976-77 to $3,849,122 in 1977-78, or 32%. Of the expenditures for the institutions, 39% of the money was used for student support, 36% for instruction and research, and 22% for general institutional support.

Presented below is a more detailed examination of the comparative two-year summary of income and expenditures of corporate affiliates, as shown in Table III.

University of Oregon Foundation

The University of Oregon Foundation reported an 87% increase in income amounting to $1,413,368. Expenditures for the institution increased by $354,625 or 44%. The major increases in expenditures over 1976-77 occurred in the following areas: endowed chairs, +$50,507; instruction and research programs, +$29,672; athletic aid and support, +$109,134; student loans and wages, +$38,374; related instruction, athletic or recreation facilities, +$33,365; college and university relations, +$48,558; and miscellaneous furniture and equipment, +$102,544.

The difference between the total amount expended in 1977-78 by the University of Oregon Foundation and the amount spent for institution purposes amounts to $189,817. Of this amount, $140,000 was used to cover operating expenses of the Foundation including wages and salaries of personnel, and approximately $49,000 was paid to beneficiaries of funds given in trust to the Foundation. Expenditures in the college and university relations area were as follows: $111,000 for support of Friends of the Museum, University Music Society, and other University-related groups; $36,000 to help defray the cost of publishing Old Oregon and Northwest Review; $9,000 to support the offices of alumni and university relations; and $17,000 for the offices of the University President and Vice Provost for promotion, including fundraising in connection with an endowed chair for Wayne Morris.
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Oregon State University Agricultural Research Foundation and Oregon State University Agricultural Engineering Research Foundation

The Oregon State University Agricultural Research Foundation reported a 6% decrease in total income and a corresponding 6% decrease in expenditures for the institution. All $258,123 expended during 1977-78 was used to support institution programs and functions.

The Oregon State University Agricultural Engineering Research Foundation reported a 3% increase in income during 1977-78. Expenditures totaling 77% of the total 1977-78 income, or $6,000, supported University instruction and research programs.

Oregon State University Foundation

All reported expenditures for the institution pertain to money expended by the Oregon State University Foundation through University accounts.

Total income for 1977-78 amounted to $6,064,100, an increase of 2.4% over 1976-77. Expenditures for the University increased 20.2%; however, total expenditures of the Foundation increased 55.1%. The largest increases in expenditures through institution accounts occurred in the areas of instruction and research, +$138,022; athletic aid and support, +$100,527; shared wages and salaries for general administrative employees who serve as information specialists, +$61,570; and student financial need scholarships, +$27,287.

Offsetting decreases in expenditures through institution accounts occurred in the areas of instruction and research facilities and equipment, ($96,460); and faculty travel and moving, ($10,037).

The $213,371 expended through institution accounts for general administration and miscellaneous support—shared wages and salaries—is accounted for as follows: $158,909 was spent to support OSU Foundation employees such as 20% of the Director's salary (80% is paid by institution education and general funds), a business manager, four clerical and secretarial employees, three development specialists, and a park manager for the 4H Center. $54,462 was spent through Department of Intercollegiate Athletics accounts to pay the salary of the Executive Director of the OSU Beaver Club and two secretaries. The $85,006 spent for college and university relations was channeled through University accounts to support the Alumni Office.

The difference between the total expenditures of the affiliate, $4,691,651, and the total expenditures for the institution through institution accounts, $1,553,808, amounts to $3,137,843. These dollars were expended for the following purposes: Oregon 4H Foundation, $276,000; Construction Engineering and Research Foundation, $158,000; fundraising in connection with the Great Hall, $123,000; payments to beneficiaries of various trusts for which the Foundation acts as trustee, $1,132,000; operation of the Harris Ranch, $34,000; administrative and promotional expenses of the Foundation, $258,000; student aid, general administration, and faculty support for the University, $500,000; and miscellaneous outside agency activities, $285,000.

Portland State University Foundation

Total income of the Portland State University Foundation amounting to $326,439 represented an increase of 7.5% over 1976-77 income. Expenditures by the Foundation for the institution increased by $61,861 or 43% over the previous year. However, the expenditures for the institution expressed as a percentage of total income decreased from 82% in 1976-77 to 63% in 1977-78. The major portion of the percentage differential can be accounted for by the fact that the Foundation received two substantial gifts during 1977-78; however, only the income from the invested funds can be used to support institution or Foundation activities.

The largest increases in expenditures during 1977-78 occurred in the areas of instruction and research, +$22,312; athletic aid and support, +$19,884;
and college and university relations, +$12,995. All money for scholarships, athletic grants-in-aid and fellowships are transferred by the Foundation to the University and expended through institution accounts.

The difference between the total expenditures of the Foundation and the total expended for the institution amounts to $4,862. Most of this money was spent for promotion and fundraising in connection with intercollegiate athletics. However, the source of the money expended was charges made to persons who attended the no-host meetings.

The $18,879 spent in 1977-78 for college and university relations supported promotion programs and entertainment associated with the Foundation. It occurred shortly after a new director was employed, which is the time to increase the visibility of the Foundation and its goals. Again, the source of the expenditure was charges made to persons who attended the dinners and other events.

Southern Oregon State College, Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon College of Education, and Oregon Institute of Technology

Of the affiliates at the four smaller institutions, the OIT Development Fund experienced the largest percentage increase in income over 1976-77, whereas the EOSC Foundation reported the largest amount of income, $35,766. The SOSC Foundation and the EOSC Foundation continued to spend the major portion of their income, 73% and 94%, respectively, for institution activities.

Oregon Foundation for Dental Research and Development

This Foundation increased its 1977-78 expenditures for UOHSC activities by 174%; $176,000 or 96% of the money was used to purchase instruction and research facilities and equipment.

On October 21, 1977, the Foundation transferred its remaining net assets of $75,616 to the UOHSC Foundation, and the State of Oregon Department of Commerce issued a Certificate of Dissolution on November 15, 1977. The decision by the Board of Directors was based on its conclusion that the non-profit corporation had ceased to do the business for which it was formed and that it appeared to be in the best interest of the public and the field of dentistry that it be dissolved.

A limited number of functions formerly performed by the Oregon Foundation for Dental Research and Development will be handled by the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center Foundation.

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center Foundation

The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center Foundation continued a pattern of spending about 25% of its annual income for UOHSC activities. However, the overall income of the Foundation increased 40% over 1976-77. Increased income permitted an increase in expenditures during 1977-78 for instruction and research programs, +$124,585, and for instruction and research facilities and equipment, +$24,283.

Total expenditures for the institution through institution accounts amounted to $413,860.

In addition, the Foundation made direct payments to vendors for University of Oregon Health Sciences Center programs, supplies, and equipment during 1977-78, totaling $371,300. This amount was not recorded as expenditures for the institution because they were paid directly by the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center.
### Table I
Two-Year Summary Comparison
Gifts, Grants, and Contracts Income

1976-77 and 1977-78
(June 1 Through May 31)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Income</th>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>Total Percentage Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction and Department Research</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$8,308,678</td>
<td>$2,563,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$7,223,358</td>
<td>$3,228,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (or Decrease)</td>
<td>$(1,085,320)</td>
<td>$664,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organized Activities Related to Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$80,921</td>
<td>$111,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$1,125,843</td>
<td>$179,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (or Decrease)</td>
<td>$1,044,922</td>
<td>$68,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sponsored Research</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$36,258,641</td>
<td>$5,287,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$32,784,948</td>
<td>$7,736,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (or Decrease)</td>
<td>$(3,473,693)</td>
<td>$2,449,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension and Public Service</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$7,073,611</td>
<td>$5,356,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$7,343,367</td>
<td>$4,452,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (or Decrease)</td>
<td>$269,756</td>
<td>$(904,166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Support</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$189,297</td>
<td>$118,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$204,692</td>
<td>$469,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (or Decrease)</td>
<td>$15,395</td>
<td>$351,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Services</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$15,702,691</td>
<td>$1,180,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$15,116,752</td>
<td>$2,756,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (or Decrease)</td>
<td>$(585,939)</td>
<td>$1,575,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance and Operation of Physical Plant</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$4,968</td>
<td>$3,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$9,575</td>
<td>$14,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (or Decrease)</td>
<td>$4,607</td>
<td>$11,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Institutional Support</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$241,000</td>
<td>$508,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$145,245</td>
<td>$712,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (or Decrease)</td>
<td>$(95,755)</td>
<td>$203,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$67,854,839</td>
<td>$15,129,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>$63,949,173</td>
<td>$19,553,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase (or Decrease)</td>
<td>$(3,905,666)</td>
<td>$4,423,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II

**Two-Year Summary Comparison of Income and Expenditures of Corporate Affiliates 1977 and 1978**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Previous Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Current Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Income of Affiliates</td>
<td>$9,515,943</td>
<td>$11,651,653</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures of Affiliates</td>
<td>$5,258,775</td>
<td>$7,676,855</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures for Institutions</td>
<td>$2,921,292</td>
<td>$3,849,122</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Expenditures of Total Income for Institutions</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURES FOR INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Previous Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Current Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chairs</td>
<td>$34,466</td>
<td>$98,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants and Fellows</td>
<td>54,888</td>
<td>69,404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Research Programs</td>
<td>592,042</td>
<td>894,451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Travel and Moving Expenses</td>
<td>162,258</td>
<td>137,506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Recruiting and Related Expenses</td>
<td>35,720</td>
<td>41,570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Research Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>196,221</td>
<td>347,648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Furniture and Equipment</td>
<td>15,996</td>
<td>2,981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,091,591</td>
<td>$1,591,890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library—Instructional Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>$27,887</td>
<td>$31,635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Rare Book Acquisitions</td>
<td>$1,023</td>
<td>$31,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$28,910</td>
<td>$31,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Instruction, Athletic/Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$39,812</td>
<td>$83,189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Institutional Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$243,891</td>
<td>$272,728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and University Relations</td>
<td>231,701</td>
<td>284,267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Supplies and Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>$112,486</td>
<td>$96,845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$588,078</td>
<td>$653,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Scholarships</td>
<td>$116,192</td>
<td>$125,914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Need Scholarships</td>
<td>330,731</td>
<td>364,795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Aid and Support</td>
<td>718,376</td>
<td>949,924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Loans and Wages</td>
<td>7,602</td>
<td>47,898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,172,901</td>
<td>$1,488,531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Expenditures for Institutions                     | $2,921,292           | $3,849,122          | 32%                 |
### Summary Comparison of Corporate Affiliate Financial Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ending</th>
<th>UO Foundation</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>OSU Agricultural Engineering Research Foundation</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>OSU Agricultural Research Foundation</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>OSU Foundation</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/30/77</td>
<td>6/30/78</td>
<td>6/30/77</td>
<td>6/30/78</td>
<td>6/30/77</td>
<td>6/30/78</td>
<td>6/30/77</td>
<td>6/30/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income of Affiliates</td>
<td>$1,629,165</td>
<td>$3,042,533</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$10,158</td>
<td>$10,455</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$365,281</td>
<td>$344,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures of Affiliates</td>
<td>$1,026,550</td>
<td>$1,354,418</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,712</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$296,248</td>
<td>$258,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures for Institutions</td>
<td>$809,976</td>
<td>$1,164,601</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$296,248</td>
<td>$258,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Expenditures of Total Income for Institutions</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>UO Foundation</th>
<th>OSU Agricultural Engineering Research Foundation</th>
<th>OSU Agricultural Research Foundation</th>
<th>OSU Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chairs</td>
<td>$918</td>
<td>$51,425</td>
<td>$33,548</td>
<td>$46,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants and Fellows</td>
<td>26,530</td>
<td>19,972</td>
<td>23,358</td>
<td>43,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Research Programs</td>
<td>14,578</td>
<td>44,720</td>
<td>244,823</td>
<td>382,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Travel and Moving Expenses</td>
<td>69,925</td>
<td>55,947</td>
<td>38,845</td>
<td>20,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Recruiting and Related Expenses</td>
<td>24,430</td>
<td>35,231</td>
<td>104,923</td>
<td>7,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Research Facilities and Equipment</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>$444,979</td>
<td>$509,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Furniture and Equip.</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>$33,548</td>
<td>$46,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library—Instructional Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>$15,651</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Rare Book Acquisitions</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$151,801</td>
<td>$213,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$16,674</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Capital Outlay                        |               |                                               |                                      |                |
| Related Instruction, Athletic/Recreation Facilities | $5,821 | 39,189 | $151,801 | $213,371 |

| General Institutional Support         |               |                                               |                                      |                |
| Shared Wages and Salaries             | $123,419 | 171,977 | $151,801 | $213,371 |
| College and University Relations      |               |                                               |                                      |                |
| Operating Supplies and Miscellaneous Expenses | $337 | $98,139 | $69,716 | $32,500 | 44,000 |
| Total                                 | $123,419 | 172,314 | $236,801 | 298,371 |

| Student Services                      |               |                                               |                                      |                |
| Academic Scholarships                 | $41,025 | 44,766 | $65,836 | $65,427 |
| Financial Need Scholarships           | 39,913 | 36,254 | 272,003 | 300,090 |
| Athletic Aid and Support              | 441,777 | 550,911 | 239,200 | 335,727 |
| Student Loans and Wages               | 1,816 | 40,992 | 4,500 | 637 |
| Total                                 | $524,533 | 672,023 | $378,339 | 701,881 |

| Total Expenditures for Institutions   | $809,976 | $1,164,601 | $296,248 | $258,123 |
|                                      | $1,292,537 | $1,533,808 | $1,292,537 | $1,533,808 |
### Summary of Expenditures for Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ending</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>Development Fund</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>SGSC</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>EDSG</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/30/77</td>
<td>6/30/78</td>
<td>6/30/78</td>
<td>12/31/76</td>
<td>12/30/77</td>
<td>12/31/77</td>
<td>12/31/77</td>
<td>1/1/77</td>
<td>12/31/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income of Affiliates</td>
<td>$186,632</td>
<td>$326,439</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$456</td>
<td>$1,164</td>
<td>155%</td>
<td>$24,546</td>
<td>$31,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure of Affiliates</td>
<td>$177,845</td>
<td>$221,947</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$22,972</td>
<td>$24,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure for Institutions</td>
<td>$145,224</td>
<td>$207,085</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$22,972</td>
<td>$24,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Expenditure of Total Income for Institutions</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instruction and Research

- **Endowed Chairs**
  - Graduate Assistants and Fellows: $5,000, $6,297
  - Instruction and Research Programs: $29,403, $31,715
  - Faculty Travel and Moving Expenses: $6,463, $3,501
  - Faculty Recruiting and Related Expenses: $11,044, $5,928
  - Instruction and Research Facilities and Equipment: $24,345, $11,621
  - Miscellaneous Furniture and Equipment: $1,043, $930

### Academic Support

- **Library—Instructional Materials and Supplies**
  - Total: $77,298, $79,992

### Capital Outlay

- **Related Instruction, Athletic/Recreation Facilities**
  - Total: $1,491

### General Institutional Support

- **Shared Wages and Salaries**
  - Total: $9,200
- **College and University Relations**
  - Total: $5,984, $18,879
- **Operating Supplies and Miscellaneous Expenses**
  - Total: $3,324, $8,700

### Student Services

- **Academic Scholarships**
  - Total: $17,019, $26,431
- **Financial Need Scholarships**
  - Total: $17,019, $26,431
- **Athletic Aid and Support**
  - Total: $41,399, $61,283
- **Student Loans and Wages**
  - Total: $2,600

### Total Expenditures for Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>6/30/77</th>
<th>12/31/76</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>12/30/77</th>
<th>12/31/77</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>1/1/77</th>
<th>12/31/77</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSII</td>
<td>$145,224</td>
<td>$207,085</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$22,972</td>
<td>$24,868</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>$24,546</td>
<td>$31,438</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$22,972</td>
<td>$24,868</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGSC</td>
<td>$31,438</td>
<td>$38,037</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$22,972</td>
<td>$24,868</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSG</td>
<td>$26,703</td>
<td>$35,766</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$22,972</td>
<td>$24,868</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Ending</td>
<td>OIT Development Foundation</td>
<td>Oregon Foundation for Dental Research and Development</td>
<td>UOHSF Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/31/76</td>
<td>12/31/77</td>
<td>Percentage Increase</td>
<td>10/31/76</td>
<td>10/31/77</td>
<td>Percentage Increase</td>
<td>6/30/77</td>
<td>6/30/78</td>
<td>Percentage Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income of Affiliates</td>
<td>$3,743</td>
<td>$11,182</td>
<td>199%</td>
<td>$147,177</td>
<td>$105,211</td>
<td>(29%)</td>
<td>$1,147,437</td>
<td>$1,612,818*</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures of Affiliates</td>
<td>$4,490</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>(73%)</td>
<td>$21,125</td>
<td>$288,183</td>
<td>304%</td>
<td>$529,447</td>
<td>$794,661</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures for Institutions</td>
<td>$4,490</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>(73%)</td>
<td>$29,484</td>
<td>$183,388</td>
<td>522%</td>
<td>$279,816</td>
<td>$413,860</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Expenditures of Total Income for Institutions</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>174%</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Expenditures for Institutions**

- Instruction and Research
  - Endowed Chairs
  - Graduate Assistants and Fellows
  - Instruction and Research Programs
  - Faculty Travel and Moving Expenses
  - Faculty Recruiting and Related Expenses
  - Instruction and Research Facilities and Equipment
  - Miscellaneous Furniture and Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$3,075</th>
<th>$411</th>
<th>101%</th>
<th>$529,447</th>
<th>$794,661</th>
<th>34%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$2,829</td>
<td>$411</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$22,097</td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library—Instructional Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>$96,245</td>
<td>$61,857</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and Rare Book Acquisitions</td>
<td>$2,933</td>
<td>$3,669</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$25,394</td>
<td>$331,514</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay Related Instruction, Athletic/Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>$2,072</td>
<td>$3,497</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$89,168</td>
<td>$45,910</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Institutional Support Shared Wages and Salaries</td>
<td>$1,405</td>
<td>$913</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$2,072</td>
<td>$3,497</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Supplies and Miscellaneous Expenses</td>
<td>$1,451</td>
<td>$818</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$1,759</td>
<td>$2,222</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,451</td>
<td>$818</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$3,831</td>
<td>$3,719</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Academic Scholarships</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Need Scholarships</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Aid and Support</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Loans and Wages</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$259</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures for Institutions</td>
<td>$4,490</td>
<td>$1,229</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>$29,484</td>
<td>$183,388</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $114,984 from dissolution of Oregon Foundation for Dental Research and Development.*
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Batiste asked about the direct relationship between the presidents of the institutions and the foundations. It was indicated that the presidents generally were members of the boards of directors and participated in the meetings. The audit function for the financial records of the affiliated organizations is performed both by independent firms and, to some extent, by the Office of the Secretary of State in connection with the biennial audit of the Department of Higher Education. There has been some resistance to allowing the state auditor to examine the books of an independent organization. Mr. Holmer said copies of all of the audit reports of the affiliated organizations were on file in the Office of Administration. With respect to potential competition between foundations affiliated with public and private institutions, the Chancellor said the earlier conflict had abated as a result of interest on the part of the private institutions in obtaining funds from public sources. Now both public and private institutions are seeking support from public and private resources.

During the discussion, the Committee requested that future reports include a report on the net worth of each corporate affiliate. As a response to that request, the Board's staff has included in this 1978 report a beginning and ending balance sheet for each corporate affiliate, except the Oregon Foundation for Dental Research and Development which was dissolved on October 28, 1977. Its assets, liabilities, and fund balances were transferred to the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center Foundation. Each balance sheet is patterned after Form CT-12, Part II, Page 5, of the Annual Report--Charitable Organizations--State of Oregon, Department of Justice. The net worth of each corporate affiliate as of the most recently completed fiscal year was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Affiliate</th>
<th>Net Worth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Foundation</td>
<td>$6,043,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Agricultural Engineering Research Foundation</td>
<td>11,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Agricultural Research Foundation</td>
<td>318,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Foundation</td>
<td>10,546,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University Foundation</td>
<td>472,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education Development Fund</td>
<td>5,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College Foundation</td>
<td>34,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College Foundation</td>
<td>176,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology Development Foundation</td>
<td>14,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Health Sciences Center Foundation</td>
<td>3,275,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>