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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN  
ROOM 328-329, MICHAEL J. SMITH MEMORIAL CENTER  
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, PORTLAND, OREGON  

March 30, 1979

Meeting #455  
A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Room 328-329, Michael J. Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

ROLL CALL  
The meeting was called to order at 8:30 A.M. (P.S.T.), March 30, 1979, by the President of the Board, Mr. Louis B. Perry, and on roll call the following answered present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lester Anderson</td>
<td>Mr. Robert C. Ingalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jonathan A. Ater</td>
<td>Mr. Gregory G. Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alvin R. Batiste</td>
<td>Mr. William C. Thorp III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter</td>
<td>Mr. Loren L. Wyss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Betty Ferves</td>
<td>Mr. Louis B. Perry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHERS PRESENT  
Centralized Activities--Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary Wilma L. Foster; J. J. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; E. Rex Krueger, Vice Chancellor for Educational Systems; W. T. Lemman, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration; Edward Branchfield, Assistant Attorney General; Richard S. Perry, Director, Division of Management and Planning Services; Keith Jackson, Assistant Budget Director; Richard Zita, Director, Public Services and Publications; Diane Marsh, Assistant Director, Public Services and Publications; Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer; Francetta Carroll, Administrative Assistant; Jan Lindsay, Administrative Assistant.

Oregon State University--President R. W. MacVicar; Sandra Suttie, Assistant to the President/Curriculum Coordinator.

University of Oregon--President William B. Boyd.

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center--President Leonard Laster; M. R. Parelius, Acting Vice President for Administration and Finance; Richard Jones, Special Consultant to the President; Mary Anne Lockwood, Assistant to the President for University Relations; Lloyd C. Peterson, Acting Business Manager; Gary F. Stevens, Assistant Director for Fiscal Services, University Hospital.

Portland State University--President Joseph Blumel; James Todd, Vice President of Finance and Administration; Kenneth Harris, Budget Director; Margaret J. Dobson, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs; W. C. Neland, Director, Physical Plant; Stanley E. Rauch, Dean of Graduate Studies.

Oregon College of Education--President Gerald Leinwand; Ronald Chatham, Assistant to the President.

Eastern Oregon State College--President Rodney A. Briggs.

Southern Oregon State College--President Natale Sicuro; D. E. Lewis, Dean of Administration; Ernest E. Ettlich, Dean of Academic Affairs.

Oregon Institute of Technology--President Kenneth F. Light; W. M. Douglass, Dean of Administration.
The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the regular meeting held on January 26, 1979, and approved them as previously distributed.

The Chancellor reported that a committee had been reviewing affirmative action developments at the University of Oregon and had completed a report on its findings. He requested President Boyd to present the report and recommendations to the Board.

The University of Oregon Affirmative Action Compliance Committee began an examination of affirmative action on the campus of the University of Oregon in 1977-78. President Boyd said the committee found that mere compliance was not moving the University rapidly enough toward goals which the committee thought were appropriate to an environment that reflects social justice as the best kind of environment for teaching and learning.

The report concluded with a set of recommendations which reached almost every aspect of the University community and placed particular emphasis on the need for the faculty itself to become involved more actively in affirmative action since most of the vacancies exist in the faculty and appointments are made through it. President Boyd emphasized that no individual group was a special target of the attention of the committee and its recommendations.

President Boyd then read the second recommendation contained in the committee report in which President Boyd was asked to submit the report to the Board with a request that the Board affirm its priorities concerning affirmative action and that it direct the Chancellor to offer greater evidence of leadership in implementing federal and state mandates concerning affirmative action. This statement read in isolation, President Boyd said, could be interpreted as a criticism for non-action. However, in the total context, it states that more must be done in every way if the goals in affirmative action are to be achieved. Thus, each part of the University, and now the State System, is being encouraged, not admonished, to become more active. He noted that the report has been in preparation for some time and has been subjected to the usual processes in the Senate and Legislative Assembly of the University. He indicated that during that time the Chancellor's Office had been increasingly active in the area of affirmative action and of substantial assistance to the University of Oregon in dealing with special difficulties on that campus.

President Boyd recommended that the Board add its acceptance and endorsement in an effort to assist the System, and the University of Oregon in particular, to achieve success in affirmative action.

The Chancellor suggested that the Board might wish to request the staff to review the affirmative action policy with the Board or the Committee to determine whether any modifications were necessary.

Mr. Batiste asked for further clarification of the request being presented to the Board. President Boyd said the Affirmative Action Compliance Committee on the University of Oregon campus had completed a year-long study of the state of affirmative action on that campus. It was the opinion of the committee that even though compliance was being achieved, goals were not being met. Therefore, more effort was needed from every possible source to move the campus more rapidly toward those goals. Each portion of the University community has been admonished by the committee to increase its
attention to affirmative action and give it higher priority. The Board was also asked to affirm its priority for affirmative action and help provide the leadership that would assist the campus to meet these goals.

It was agreed that a report would be made to the Board after further review and consultation.

A report of Kasonic & Associates, Inc., entitled, "Requirements Analysis of Physician Manpower and Training in the State of Oregon," recently has been mentioned frequently in the Ways and Means Subcommittee. The Chancellor said the study resulted from a $25,000 appropriation made earlier by the Emergency Board to the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission for the purpose of contracting with a management firm to prepare a report on medical education in Oregon. Dr. T. K. Olson, Executive Director of the Educational Coordinating Commission, has reported to the Ways and Means Subcommittee on the document. The Chancellor then asked President Laster to indicate his perception of the report and the probable consequences.

President Laster said it appeared that the basis for the inception of the study was the concern that some fundamental decisions would have to be made about the funding of the budget of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center. In addition, the Legislature was not sufficiently informed about the basic issues related to the interplay of the Health Sciences Center and the delivery of health care in the state and the need for the various types of personnel that emerge from the Health Sciences Center. The study was commissioned in order to help the members of the Legislature understand better the dynamics and ecology of the system.

The findings in the report show that the state is expected to have sufficient physicians now through the year 2000 for the projected population, but the problem is mal-distribution around the state, particularly in remote areas. This is true in Oregon and nationally as well. In fact, the nation may be over-producing physicians. On the basis of physician-population ratios, Oregon is thirteenth from the top in supply of physicians. However, President Laster said there are areas of the state that are in need. He said the issue is not necessarily physicians, but health care. In some parts of the state, health care may mean nurse practitioners, physician assistants, a system of care, but not necessarily a physician in place. President Laster said he made this point because much of the public policy has been directed toward determining mechanisms of economic or political coercion to place a physician into a community as a means of solving the problem.

A second imbalance in the state is between two categories of physicians. There are not enough people in family practice, general practice, internal medicine, pediatrics, obstetrics, and gynecology. There is an oversupply of specialists in surgery areas, pathology, and psychiatry. Again this is true nationally, and there are efforts to correct this imbalance.

A third finding is that a large in-migration of physicians into Oregon accounts for much of the current and future supply, so that a reduction in the number of physicians trained in this state has relatively little impact on the total supply. President Laster said 115 physicians were produced each year at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center. If this number were cut in half, it would not alter in any significant way the projection that by the year 2000 there would be an oversupply of physicians. In fact, Oregon could have an adequate supply of physicians state-wide in the future without training any physicians in Oregon. A significant consideration in continuing the program, however, is providing access to undergraduate medical education for Oregonians. Dr. Laster said. The state has approximately 1.1% of the population of the country and produces about 1.1% of the physicians in the nation. If medical education were eliminated entirely, Oregon young people would find it difficult to obtain entry in other parts of the country to the medical education process.
Graduate medical education in the residency programs is important in the training of physicians. Many resident physicians from other states stay in Oregon to practice, and Oregon attracts back a higher-than-average share of Oregonians who have taken their residency programs in other states.

President Laster stated that the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center funds less than half of the residency programs in the state. This is an important fact to remember in efforts to alter the number and distribution of physician supply because the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center does not control the supply to any significant extent. He indicated that the residency programs are accredited by a National Liaison Committee on Graduate Medical Education, and access to programs is controlled through the National Resident Matching Program based on student preferences.

There are requirements for these activities that are set nationally, and that is important in terms of considering any manipulation of the system for local purposes. The University Hospital's service role to the state, the patient care role of the residents, and the resident and medical student teaching relationship in cooperative programs with other nearby states should be considered in proposals for adoption of resident production. Along with incentives for physician redistribution, Oregon should pursue alternatives such as mobile teams, transportation of patients to regional medical centers, and training of nurse practitioners and physicians' assistants and others to serve in rural areas.

President Laster summarized the following staff recommendations from the Educational Coordinating Commission:

1. There is a need for statutory clarification of the responsibility to undertake comprehensive health employment planning, and it is recommended that the Legislature assign this responsibility by statute. It is further recommended that the responsibility be placed in the State Health Planning and Development Agency and that plans should be adopted by the State Health Coordinating Council with reports to, and consultation with, various agencies, including the Health Sciences Center, the Board, and the Educational Coordinating Commission.

2. The Legislature should review the role it has specified for the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center. In doing so, the Legislature should consider the fact that the hospital has been designated by planning agencies as the state's extraordinary tertiary care center. The implications of this designation should be reviewed, together with a possible need to determine whether the role of the Center should be changed and whether the law should be amended to serve as a basis of a five-year plan for the Health Sciences Center.

3. With respect to physician specialty and geographic distribution, there are a number of alternative approaches and proposed legislation to provide economic incentives to physicians who settle in areas of shortage. There is a recommendation that family practice resident trainees be required to spend three to six months working with a physician in a rural area.

4. A modification of the size of the graduate programs is recommended, with an increase in the number of family practice residents by diminishing other programs.

At the conclusion of the report, Mr. Moore requested that a copy of the material presented by President Laster be made available to Board members.

Defense Costs in Connection with Legal Action Concerning Divestiture

The Chancellor reported that negotiations had been unsuccessful to remove the Board as a defendant in a legal action to permit the Board to divest itself of its investment holdings in southern African countries. The Attorney General also is reluctant to permit the employment of outside counsel. The Chancellor said it now seemed advisable to pay a share of the expense costs despite the fact that the Board did not particularly wish to be defended in this instance.
Mr. Ater expressed concern as to whether the Attorney General adequately represents the Board's interests in view of his opinions which were contrary to those of a majority of the Board. He said the Board should be advised of developments in the case and if there are continuing doubts about the representation of the Board's interests, the question of outside counsel should be raised again.

Mr. Branchfield indicated that he would keep the Board informed periodically with respect to progress of the case.

The Chancellor recommended that Dr. James Beaird, Acting Provost at Oregon College of Education, be appointed as Provost, effective July 1, 1979, at an annual salary rate of $38,997.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wysa, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

The Chancellor reported that Legislative consideration of the State System budget had reached the work session stage. The matter of tuition has been under discussion recently in these budget reviews. The Chancellor indicated that the Governor's original budget recommended that the tuition for undergraduate resident students be set at 25% of the cost of instruction; tuition for nonresident undergraduate students at 100% of the cost; tuition for resident graduate students reduced from 25% to 27% of the cost; and tuition increased from 35% to 50% of the cost for nonresident graduate students. When the full implications of these recommendations became evident, following the identification of the impact of the future or 1979-1981 salary adjustments, plus the impact of the fact that several cost items were not fully funded in the current biennium but were included in the base budget for the next biennium, it was apparent that the percentage increase for undergraduate resident students would be approximately 19% the first year of the biennium due to this policy.

As a result of conversations between student representatives and the Governor, the Governor directed Mr. Saalfeld, his budget analyst, to propose some modifications designed to reduce the percentage of cost for undergraduate resident students from 25% to 23%. For each percentage point of adjustment, there is a requirement of approximately $2,2 million for the biennium. Therefore, the proposed 2% reduction would require a change of approximately $4.3 million in the budget. The Governor recommended that this be accomplished through a readjustment within the original budget rather than through the infusion of external funds. The Chancellor then presented the additional resources identified by the Governor to produce $4.5 million to offset the change in tuition rates. These amounts are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savings from changes in enrollment projections</td>
<td>$1,519,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recission of Small Business Center proposal</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase application fee from $10 to $20</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase transcript fee from $2 to $3</td>
<td>167,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Foreign Graduate Instruction Fee</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Foreign Student Fee Remission program</td>
<td>-362,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase professional school tuition to 17.5 percent of WICHE rate</td>
<td>478,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending balance from teaching hospital revised budget</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,552,427</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chancellor said the Governor's revised recommendation had been discussed with the presidents of the institutions and he was prepared to recommend modifications which would accomplish the goal, but in some instances would rely upon a different set of resources to achieve the necessary funds. The logic of doubling the application fee and at the same time only increasing the transcript fee from $2 to $3 was unclear. The impact of doubling the application fee was of concern to the presidents because many
students apply to more than one institution. The increase could result in substantial costs to those individuals. The Chancellor proposed that the application fee, in general, be increased from $10 to $15, rather than from $10 to $20. At the same time, it was recognized that the effort in processing applications for specialized programs was greater than for more routine admissions. The Chancellor recommended that the basic application fee be increased from $10 to $15. The additional resources needed to achieve the $800,000 included from the application fee in the Governor's revised budget would be obtained by identifying larger amounts for certain programs which call for more extensive processing in determining acceptance into the program. The proposed schedule will be brought back to the Board.

It was proposed that there be no change in the foreign graduate student instruction fee from the Governor's original budget and no change in the foreign student fee remission program. The net effect is to reduce the funds available by approximately $1 million which would come from two sources. In 1977, the Legislature authorized an income estimating reserve of $700,000 from carried-forward balances at the end of the biennium. If that practice were continued and $800,000 were generated in carried-forward balances at the end of this biennium and appropriated to an income-estimating reserve, it would be possible to increase the total income estimate by $500,000. If the income estimate proved to be inaccurate, the reserve would be available. The source of the remaining $500,000 would be generated as a consequence of capturing the reductions in the public service budgets already accomplished in a series of actions by the Ways and Means Subcommittee earlier in the session.

The Chancellor said it was his impression the Presidents were unanimous in joining him in this recommendation and asked the Board to authorize the presentation of these recommendations to the Subcommittee as representing the views of the State System. The remainder of the recommendations proposed in the Governor's budget would be carried forward without change. In response to a question, it was indicated that 1979-1981 resident undergraduate tuition would decrease from 25% to 23% of the cost of instruction. The Chancellor's revised proposal is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savings from changes in enrollment projections</td>
<td>$1,519,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recission of Small Business Center proposal</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase application fee from $10 to $15</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective increase in application fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase transcript fee from $2 to $3</td>
<td>167,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase income estimate</td>
<td>500,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget reductions already accomplished</td>
<td>681,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase professional school tuition to 17.5%</td>
<td>478,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent of WICHE rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending balance from teaching hospital revised budget</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $4,796,718

*Contingent upon establishment of income estimating reserve of $800,000

Miss Molly Smith, representing the Oregon Student Lobby, was recognized for the purpose of commenting on the tuition proposals. She said she was pleased with the recommendations made by the Chancellor and had been supportive of the efforts of the Governor. However, students were displeased to see in the Governor's revised recommendations that the resident undergraduate tuition would be reduced at the expense of other categories of students. She said the Governor's proposal was impractical in that the estimates were based on an attrition rate of 10% for foreign graduate students if tuition were raised to the proposed level. This is only an estimate, and the Oregon Student Lobby is of the opinion that more than 10% of the foreign graduate students would not return at the proposed tuition levels. Therefore, the projected revenue would not be available.

Miss Smith said that if medical school students must pay a tuition increase of 26%, it will be necessary for most of them to borrow more money. In
order to repay these loans, students will be more likely to locate in areas where their earnings will be greater in a shorter amount of time. This tendency will operate to the disadvantage of small towns and economically-depressed areas in terms of encouraging physicians and dentists to locate in those places.

In discussing foreign nonresident graduate education costs, it was indicated that the proposed rates would be higher than for nonresident graduate tuition. The fee remission program would be held at the level recommended in the Governor's budget so that in the first year of the biennium the dollar amount would remain the same. There is a percentage increase in the second year.

Mr. Batiste asked for an explanation of fee remission and how it is used. The Chancellor said several years ago the students proposed a fee remission program which would apply to foreign students. The amount available for that purpose was established in the statute as no more than 10% of the total estimated tuition income from all nonresident students. Normally the State System has utilized almost the maximum level, but in the 1979-1981 biennium, the recommendation was $400,000 below the maximum. The Governor's revised recommendation would decrease the unused authority by $350,000. The funds are used by the institutions as an offset against the tuition payments for needy foreign students. The determination is made at the institutions, each of which has a quota of the total amount for distribution. These fee remissions are paid from the General Fund.

The Chancellor pointed out that when the program was devised, the tuition represented a percentage of the total cost and was not broken down by categories of students. Since this was considered a reduction of income, the tuition levels were set a little higher than otherwise would have been necessary in order to generate that percentage of income. Consequently, students could legitimately claim that they were paying directly for the program. During the last two biennia, new policies have resulted in the fee remission program being a direct call upon the General Fund.

Mr. Keith Jackson, Assistant Budget Director, said the current level for the fee remission program is $1,203,000. This level is continued in the Governor's budget for 1979-80 and is increased by approximately 7% in 1980-81 to $1,289,000. The total for the next biennium would be approximately $2.4 million.

Mr. Ingalls asked whether the students still would prefer those funds be used for foreign student fee remissions rather than reducing tuition for students in general. Miss Smith responded that the Oregon Student Lobby officially supports the foreign student fee remission program.

Mr. Anderson referred to the recision of the Small Business Center proposal. He said a report to the Board on business education had indicated that increased emphasis should be placed on education for students who would like to become entrepreneurs in small business. He inquired as to the rationale which had led to the recommendation to eliminate the Small Business Center proposal.

The Chancellor said the recommendation was placed in Governor Straub's budget at the behest of the former director of the Economic Development Commission. The request was based on the assumption that some federal funding would enable Oregon to receive federal money for federal programs designed to deal with problems of small businesses. These programs did not involve the teaching of undergraduate students. If approved, the Center would be a public service program rather than an educational program. The impetus toward this program diminished with the departure of the director, and since there was no longer a program for the use of the recommended funds, it seemed appropriate to eliminate the funding for it.
Mr. Harms said he questioned the entire concept of fee remissions for foreign students, particularly to the extent of a $2.4 million subsidization from the General Fund. He said he was not inclined to modify the budget at this time but would like a complete report on the entire foreign student program at a later date.

There was some discussion of the application fee. The Chancellor explained that there would be no additional work involved in the change from $10 to $15. The increased workload would occur in connection with increases in the application fee for special programs. The proposed action, the Chancellor said, would authorize presenting the recommendations to the Ways and Means Subcommittee but would not set the actual fees. Ultimately, the Board would have to set fees which would generate the required income.

Mr. Wyss expressed concern that the utilization of the ending balance of $600,000 from the Teaching Hospital's revised budget would tend to remove some of the incentive to careful management.

The Chancellor said it was his conviction that those dollars would not be left in a reserve for the Teaching Hospital in any event. It would be preferable to retain them for higher education by utilizing them for this purpose rather than to have the money diverted to another state agency.

In commenting further on the tuition proposals, the Chancellor said the responsibility for raising tuition is a shared responsibility of the Governor, the Legislature, and the Board of Higher Education.

Mr. Ater suggested that President Laster should have an opportunity to testify in connection with the proposed increase in the professional application fee, the tuition increases, and the proposal to remove ending balances from the Teaching Hospital.

President Laster said the tuition increase is really a social and sociological one. He said it is difficult to argue against this modest amount when Georgetown University’s Medical School tuition is $14,000 a year. On the other hand, this small increment can be a major deterrent to an underprivileged person, even though it is possible to repay loans very quickly once the individual enters practice. With respect to the $600,000 excess, the amount ultimately may or may not be available because projecting a surplus or deficit is not an exact science. The Hospital budget is $52 million a year, of which 75% is earned from its own activities. For an enterprise of that magnitude, a $600,000 margin for error is not an unreasonable request. In addition, there has been a recommendation that the state consider funding a poison control center and the budget for that activity is identical to the projected ending balance. The institution would favor use of that amount for the poison control center instead of for some other purpose.

President MacVicar was asked to comment particularly with reference to the veterinary school. He said that he would hope that if the proposed changes were made, appropriate recognition might be given in the budget of the Scholarship Commission for offsetting scholarship assistance to those who are particularly needy. A small scholarship for perhaps a relatively small percentage of the students, perhaps 10%, might deal with the social issues rather effectively. President MacVicar said he had no objection to the recommendations of the Chancellor and believed that it would not impact the numbers of applicants significantly. He said there would be some impact on the WICHE program in that Oregon would have a substantially higher tuition level than would be true at Washington State University, but it is unlikely to deter WICHE students from the program.

The Board approved the Chancellor's recommendations for modifications to the Governor's revised tuition policy. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Battiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.
Mr. Harms then moved that the Chancellor's Office provide the Board with a report on the number and administration of the fee remission programs for foreign students. He asked that the report contain information on the impact on foreign student enrollment if a substantial cutback or elimination of the fee remission program should take place. The Board should also review the staff's viewpoint on the philosophy of offering this fee remission program and the benefits to the various institutions and the Board. Further, assuming this is a good policy, what is its priority in terms of other budgetary needs.

The Board approved the motion, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Earlier this year, several Board members asked the Board's Office to begin preparation of a series of reports concerning equal opportunity and affirmative action with respect to education and employment. The purpose of the 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 second of these special reports follows. It includes:

- A review of equal opportunity and affirmative action concerns relating to employment
- A review of intercollegiate athletics as it pertains to athletic equity between men and women

Summary and Recommendations to the Committee

The reports on affirmative action/equal opportunity have summarized the efforts of State System institutions in four areas:

- financial assistance
- special student programs
- employment
- intercollegiate athletics

The reports have included both the successes of the programs as well as the problems encountered. The Board, at its January 26 meeting, requested that the Board's Office staff make recommendations concerning the problems encountered by the programs. We cannot presume to present solutions to all the problems which beset programs such as those which deal with complexities whose roots and scope go far beyond postsecondary education. The following recommendations are offered concerning matters within our sphere of influence.

Financial Assistance. Data indicated that of full-time students, minority and female students received assistance in greater proportion than their representation in that group. However, minority, female, and handicapped students are often only able to attend as part-time students and as such are subject to requirements which act as obstacles to their participation in our educational programs.
Recommendations:

1. The Board's Office staff should meet with representatives of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Commission on the Blind to discuss coordination of our mutual efforts to assist handicapped students.

2. The Board's Office staff and the Interinstitutional Committee of Financial Aids Directors should investigate further the needs of handicapped, female, and minority part-time students and propose appropriate action based upon their findings.

3. The Board's Office staff recommends that the Interinstitutional Committee of Financial Aids Directors meet with representatives of the State Scholarship Commission to discuss concerns relating to providing financial assistance to women, minority, and handicapped part-time students.

Special Student Programs. Because of the wide variations in the nature and the goals of special student programs both within and among the institutions, no statewide action recommendations are proposed. The Board's Office staff intends to continue acting as a resource to the institutions and as a catalyst to coordinate institutional efforts through meetings of interinstitutional committees on Minority Education and Handicapped Service Coordinators as well as on an ongoing basis. We will pursue funding for handicapped accessibility and services through items included in the Governor's 1979-1981 biennial budget.

Recommendations:

The Board's Office staff recommended that the Board reaffirm its support for institutional efforts to provide special student programs to assist in the recruitment, admission and retention of special student groups.

Employment. Affirmative action staffs cited problems relating to data collection and analysis and to recruiting as primary needs.

Recommendations:

1. The Board's Office staff should accelerate efforts to establish computer capability to assist with data collection and analysis on a System-wide basis.

2. The Board's Office staff should work with the institutions to develop and maintain data on the available workforce which can be used on a System-wide basis.

3. The Board should reaffirm its commitment of the State System to a policy of affirmative action and its support for the programs of the institutions which seek actively to increase the number of women, minority, and handicapped employees.

Intercollegiate Athletics. The institutions are attempting to comply with state and federal regulations designed to provide athletic equity. The greatest obstacles are lack of funds and ambiguity in the interpretations of equal opportunity. The Board has included an item in the 1979-1981 biennial budget to meet the financial necessities of equity. Board's Office staff is currently preparing testimony in support of this item for the Legislature. New proposed interpretations by the federal government will assist in evaluating compliance efforts.
Recommendations:

1. Upon approval of proposed federal policy interpretations the Board's Office staff should meet with the institutional officials to assist them in evaluating their compliance efforts.

2. The Board's staff should continue their efforts to obtain recommended appropriations for Title IX activities.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

It was indicated that workshops and other activities are conducted at the institutions to increase the sensitivity of staff to affirmative action matters and to help increase the applicant pool by attracting more qualified women and minority applicants for positions. These training programs assist personnel at the institutions in avoiding litigation or complaints from improper actions. At the same time, they serve as an educational mechanism to increase the awareness of staff members to factors which may contribute to discrimination or limit opportunities for women and minorities.

Ms. Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer for the State System, reported that affirmative action programs have resulted in an increased awareness of the institutional affirmative action goals and procedures as evidenced by the gains of women on committees and in other types of positions in which they were previously under-represented. There has been success in the achievement of salary review and equity in many of the programs. Recruitment outreach was emphasized as a continuing concern that requires further attention.

Mrs. Carpenter asked whether there was any timetable for getting employment into balance. Ms. Grier responded that the institutions have timetables, although not always ones that will bring them into balance in a short period of time. She said that those institutions holding federal contracts are expected to have timetables that will bring them into balance. Even though the institutions may not meet their goals and timetables, there must be an annual review to evaluate programs. If they are not making the necessary progress to be in compliance within a certain amount of time, they should start developing new programs.

Mr. Lemman, Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration, commented that in constructing a timetable, one must take into account the probable vacancies in a particular area within the next five years, based on historical turnover. For example, if a department has ten professorial staff, with no expectations of retirement in the next five years, and an average turnover of one faculty member per year, the maximum opportunity would be an addition of one minority or female per year. Another factor in the timetable is the probability of locating a qualified female or minority in the particular discipline or area for which the timetable is being prepared. Mr. Lemman said the timetables must be done on an individual basis.

Mrs. Carpenter asked whether there was information on graduate students in under-represented professions which may have been stereotyped in the past. Ms. Grier responded that this data has been included in the affirmative action plan for the three universities and the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center. It would be possible now to assemble data on the number of graduate fellows in a given discipline compared with a previous year. Mrs. Carpenter also indicated that actual numbers would be more helpful than percentages in some of the statistical material.

The recent action increasing the mandatory retirement age from 65 to 70 will have an impact on opportunities for women and minorities, especially in the academic positions, because there will be fewer available openings as more people work beyond the present retirement age.
Mrs. Carpenter asked whether the advising staffs have been alerted to the issue of outlining to women and minorities the other kinds of job possibilities that might be open to them. Ms. Grier said they have been made aware of the need for such informational efforts but more could be done in this area. Mr. Lemmen stated that faculty in general are sensitive to the encouragement of women and minorities to attend graduate school. When faculty identify individuals with potential during their junior and senior years, they are encouraged to take advanced work.

Vice President Cecilia Forbes indicated that Portland State University has been collecting information on the patterns of attendance of women and the minority population and comparing this data with national statistics. The newly-developed student affirmative action plan at Portland State University states specifically that there is a responsibility for bringing minorities and women into certain fields where they have been under-represented. Other efforts are being made with projects that work either through grants or through institutional funding specifically to bring minorities or women into a field.

Mr. Wyss inquired whether Vice President Forbes could enlighten the Committee with respect to the reasons there had been unfavorable comments from various minority staff members when they had left the campuses. The complaints have been similar—that they have not been given the kind of support that they had expected, that they had not advanced as quickly as they had hoped, and that in general they had been treated badly.

All of the institutions are suffering in terms of the number of faculty members, minority faculty members in particular, that can be attracted to the institutions, Vice President Forbes replied. This creates some isolation among faculty members, especially in the teaching faculty. At the department or school level, it is sometimes difficult to resolve the principles of how much focus is placed on specific minority programs versus the rest of the programs. Consequently, minority faculty members do become frustrated. In addition, there is a problem in being able to recruit enough minority students, particularly in the graduate programs, so that there will be a community of scholars in that area that could support the students, and the students in turn could support the faculty members. An effort should be made to determine what other factors are causing the individuals to seek enrollment elsewhere. Vice President Forbes said it would be beneficial to attract more minority faculty members to form internal advocacy groups and gain the necessary support.

In explaining the situation with respect to compliance under Title IX to provide equal opportunity to men and women in athletics, Ms. Grier said this has not been interpreted to mean equal expenditures nor that identical programs must be offered for both men and women. The definition of equal opportunity is still to be resolved. Efforts have been made to integrate federal and state regulations so that there is only one set of guidelines. However, the federal guidelines are ambiguous. The practical problem of providing opportunities has been compounded by lack of definition, lack of funds, and by the differing rules of the men's and women's conferences, especially those related to recruitment and financial assistance. There is a desire to allow the women to develop programs suited to their interests and philosophies regarding the role of athletics in education and not to force them to model their programs on the men's programs. Ms. Grier then described the situation at the institutions. Although the programs are not funded on an equal basis, decisions regarding funding increasingly are being made using non-sexist criteria applied equally to the men's and women's teams. Recent interpretations of Title IX provide that when expenditures per capita are not equal in men's and women's programs, the use of non-sexist criteria applied equally to men's and women's programs will be considered a valid justification for such differences.
In response to a question concerning computer capability, Mr. Lenman stated that the recommendations on computer capability were related to employment. He explained that there are large amounts of data in the personnel data base residing in the data services center on a system-wide basis. However, not all of the elements needed for statistical analysis are there. The recommendation would propose adding to the data base elements which would be of assistance to affirmative action officers in performing statistical analyses. If the recommendation for computer capability proceeds according to plan, the new system would be in operation by July of 1980.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Batiste said he was pleased with the efforts of the Committee to review these matters and shared the concern expressed by President Boyd with respect to progress in affirmative action. He indicated he had been unable to find an Administrative Rule of the Board pertaining to affirmative action regarding employment.

Mr. Batiste cited statistics with respect to applicants, admissions, and enrollments of minorities at the Health Sciences Center during the past three years. There were 30 black applicants in 1976, 1977, and 1978, of which 2 were accepted and none enrolled. There were 53 Hispanic applicants, with no acceptances or enrollments. There were 21 Native American applicants, of which 2 were accepted and 1 enrolled. This data indicates under-representation was not a matter of recruitment but was a result of the applicants not being accepted.

In the case of the Dental School for the same period, 21 blacks applied, 6 were accepted, and 4 were enrolled; 30 Hispanics applied, 8 were accepted, and 7 enrolled; 6 Native Americans applied, 2 were accepted and 1 enrolled. This data indicates under-representation was not a matter of recruitment but was a result of the applicants not being accepted.

In the distribution of employment, Mr. Batiste said there is a gross under-representation of women and minorities at salaries of $20,000 and above. Mr. Batiste said the State System may have made a good faith effort, but there is more substantial effort required. Mr. Batiste stated that he would like the Board to pursue the equity issue with a more formal approach. He then referred to a report prepared for the 1978 Teacher Standards and Practices Commission entitled, "Discrimination and the Oregon Educator," and recommended the approach for the State System. This would require that everyone being considered for tenure know the rules pertaining to discrimination and pass an appropriate test. He said he would favor establishing an independent commission to study the total affirmative action program and report to the Board. He asked that the Chancellor review the discrimination document mentioned above and advise the Board whether it should move toward a more definite position, with more requirements for tenure involving an examination of individuals and including as part of the evaluation of presidents and deans an evaluation of them in the area of equal opportunity and affirmative action. Mr. Batiste said he had reviewed the materials carefully and supported the recommendations. He said his remarks particularly were in reference to the matter of reaffirmation of the affirmative action policy on employment. The reaffirmation should be made on the basis of a more detailed look, perhaps by an independent group.

Mr. Perry mentioned that the Board's Administrative Rule 580-22-050 states, "There shall be no prohibited employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, handicap, age, or sex in the Department." He asked whether Mr. Batiste had intended to suggest that goals be set with respect to specific numbers to be employed by department or division
in terms of members of minority groups. He asked further whether Mr. Batiste were interested in specifying certain numbers of women and members of minority groups at various supervisory and management levels by a certain time.

Mr. Batiste said he was not, although that might be included. He commented that AR 580-22-050 was a statement of law and he did not consider it an administrative rule, particularly when the Board's Administrative Rule on discrimination with respect to students has some 10 sections. He said he was interested in the Board's accepting its responsibility for enforcing equal opportunity as mandated by statute, but he did not consider a statement of a statute to be a policy.

It was agreed that Mr. Batiste's comments would be considered in relationship to those made by President Boyd earlier in the meeting, with the understanding that a response would be made at a later time. Further, his comments were to be made available to Board members.

Mr. Ater expressed appreciation to Mr. Batiste for his remarks, stating that even though individuals profess to support equal opportunity goals, their actions are often far short of the goals which they profess. He said Mr. Batiste had demonstrated areas which need attention and affirmation of the Board's commitments.

Mr. Batiste stated that the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center had been mentioned only because he had the data available, and it was not his intention to be critical of that institution in particular.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

Employment

Although "affirmative action" is a term usually associated with employment, it also may be applied to non-employment matters as well. The term is also frequently used carelessly to include virtually any matter related to discrimination.

Generally speaking, "affirmative action" relates to those activities aimed at increasing the number of qualified female and minority applicants--for jobs or educational programs. Affirmative action programs embrace the following:

1. Analyzing the workforce or student population by race, sex, handicap, etc.
2. Determining on a local, state, regional or national basis (as appropriate) the number of available qualified applicants (e.g., Ph.D.'s in chemistry, qualified accountants) in the population.
3. Comparing "availability" with workforce or student population to identify areas of "under-representation".
4. Developing goals and timetables to bring workforce or student population into balance with availability.
5. Developing programs of recruitment, training, promotion, etc., to achieve the goals.

"Equal opportunity" relates to hiring, training, promoting, paying, discharging employees or admission to educational programs on a non-discriminatory basis.
There are many aspects of these two concepts which overlap and interrelate, and there are many dimensions and sub-categories of plans and goals which are not discussed here. These explanations are intended as a concise overview.

The nature of the institutional efforts to assure equal opportunity and to take affirmative action in employment varies among the institutions. The universities and the Health Sciences Center, because of the size of their staffs, have affirmative action programs and budgets which are significantly larger than those at the colleges and Oregon Institute of Technology. State law requires all institutions to have affirmative action plans. The format for these plans is strictly defined for those institutions holding federal contracts. Federally required plans must include statistics by which to evaluate the annual progress an institution has made toward achieving a workforce that is representational of the available workforce by sex and racial/ethnic group. Plans to overcome under-representation of any group are also necessary.

In response to our queries, affirmative action office personnel mentioned recently completing the following activities relating to their affirmative action programs: updates, review and revisions of their plans, and reviews of the affirmative action structure within the institution. Specific concerns related to affirmative action plans included the need for reliable data concerning the availability of qualified women and minorities for various types of positions; the need to ensure that internal procedures provide accurate current data, and the need for computer capability to assist in statistical analysis.

A constant and recurring problem at almost every institution is the under-representation of women in academic, administrative and skilled craft positions and the under-representation of minorities throughout the workforce. Although gross statistics are not a valid measurement of adequate representation in the workforce, Table I gives some indication of the scope of the problem throughout the State System institutions. It is toward achieving their concern to carry out more effective recruitment of faculty and administrators; the lack of available candidates in certain fields, especially due to historical job stereotyping; difficulty in recruiting minority faculty and administrators to certain geographical areas; and the inability to retain minority employees once they have been successfully recruited. Recruitment of minority graduate students for graduate research and teaching positions and the recruitment of female graduate students into non-traditional areas are other goals for those institutions having a sizeable graduate student population. Such student recruitment programs should produce more qualified job applicants in the future. Affirmative action personnel also mention the need to identify veterans and handicapped individuals for affirmative efforts, the lack of handicapped applicants and the need to remove architectural and psychological barriers to increase the number of handicapped individuals hired.

Employment procedures are an important component of an affirmative action program. Many of the programs provide in-service training to personnel both through workshops and individual assistance. Workshops have focused on increasing the sensitivity of staff members to affirmative action/equal opportunity concerns, assisting staff in the implementation of related personnel procedures such as recruiting and interviewing techniques, and providing training to increase the upward mobility of under-represented groups. Affirmative action programs have also included salary analysis and equity adjustments, increased dissemination of affirmative action/equal opportunity policies both the the institutional community and the public and increased participation of women and minorities on institutional committees. Both Oregon State University and the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center have completed full scale compliance reviews prior to the awarding of large federal contracts within the past year.
The affirmative action programs have made progress both in the increased awareness of institutional affirmative action goals and procedures, which is evidenced on the campuses by the gains in numbers of women on committees and in certain types of positions in which they were previously underrepresented. The achievement of salary review and equity on an ongoing basis is another area in which many of the programs have demonstrated success. The institutions have increased their recruitment outreach in an attempt to increase the number of women and minority applicants, but express the concern that there is much left to be done. Future plans emphasize the need for more success in recruiting, to carry out additional reviews and evaluations and to continue acting as a campus resource for employment procedures and upward mobility of under-represented groups.

Intercollegiate Athletics

Under both Title IX of the 1972 Educational Amendments to the 1964 Civil Rights Bill and under Chapter 204, 1975 Oregon Laws (ORS 659.150 and 659.155) the institutions of the State System are required to provide equal opportunity to men and women in athletics. This has not been interpreted to mean equal expenditures for men and women nor to mean that identical programs must be offered for both men and women. The practical problems of providing equal opportunities for men and women are compounded by the lack of definition of what constitutes equal opportunity between the programs, lack of funds, the different rules of the men's and women's conference (especially those relating to recruiting and financial assistance), and the desire to allow women to develop programs which are suited to their interests and philosophies regarding the role of athletics in education.

Each of the institutions has taken various actions to assure that athletic programs meet the compliance requirements of the State and Federal regulations. As the institutions have attempted to expand the women's programs, they have had to rely primarily on stretching current resources to serve both programs. This has been accomplished both through merging men's and women's programs and through sharing of certain services, e.g., medical and training facilities and publicity.

At the colleges and Oregon Institute of Technology provision of an adequate number of coaches has been the most serious problem. Oregon Institute of Technology began its women's athletic program in 1975-76 in response to the need to provide equal athletic opportunity for women. Currently forty women participate in three sports. As with budgets throughout the institutions, physical education and athletic budgets are already inadequate, and coaches for newly added or upgraded women's teams are almost out of reach financially. At the institutions where special financial assistance is offered to male athletes, finding similar funds for women has been difficult. Each of the colleges and Oregon Institute of Technology has made efforts to maintain the men's program while bolstering the women's rather than reducing the men's program.

The universities, due to the nature and size of their men's programs, have had significant problems providing comparable levels of support for women's programs. Staff of women's programs are now involved in fundraising efforts and have started charging admission to selected events. It has been extremely difficult for the universities to assure that women have equal opportunities to receive financial assistance and to assure that comparable levels of recruitment are utilized by both men's and women's programs. Inequities in recruitment are largely a result of the differences in rules of the men's and women's athletic conferences. Currently, although the programs are not funded on an equal basis, an increasing number of the decisions regarding funding are made using non-sexist criteria applied equally to men's and women's teams. Interpretation of Title IX recently proposed by HEW provide that when expenditures per participant are not equal in men's and women's programs, the use of non-sexist criteria applied equally to men's and women's programs will be considered a valid justification for such differences.
The institutions are currently attempting to use revenues from income-producing sports to supplement institutional funds in order to maintain existing men's programs, improve women's programs and to modify facilities to meet increased demands. The colleges, universities and Oregon Institute of Technology are also hoping for the success of the request in the Board's 1979-1981 biennial budget for women's athletics to assist them in providing the kind of athletic programs which the women deserve. Although we believe institutions are now in compliance with Title IX and the state law as presently interpreted, the impact of this legislation has been to increase interest as well as opportunity in women's athletics at all educational levels. The need for continuing expansion of opportunities will thus continue for some time.

Authorization to Award DVM Degree, OSU

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, February 23, 1979; present—Carpenter, Feves, Thorp, and Wyss.)

Oregon State University requests (1) approval of an instructional program in veterinary medicine to be implemented on the Oregon State University campus fall term 1979-80 as Oregon's participation in the Washington-Oregon-Idaho regional veterinary medical program, and (2) authorization to award the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) degree to Oregon-sponsored students successfully completing the program.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board:

1. Approve the proposed instructional program in veterinary medical education as outlined in the Oregon State University request pp. 1-19 of the full document on file in the Board's Office.

2. Authorize Oregon State University to award the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) degree to Oregon-sponsored students successfully completing program requirements.

3. Authorize Oregon State University to implement the program with the first year of instruction 1979-80, provided funds to cover instructional costs of the program are appropriated by the 1979 Legislature.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mrs. Kahananui reviewed the history of the tri-state regional veterinary medical program. She noted that the present request was for approval of the outline of the curricula to be followed by Oregon-sponsored students and authority for Oregon State University to award the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degree. Washington and Idaho sponsored students will complete the Washington State University curriculum and receive their degrees from Washington State, she said.

President MacVicer observed that the tri-state regional program in veterinary medicine is a pioneering venture which has achieved national attention as a model for very high cost professional education programs, programs which require resources a small state has difficulty providing for itself. He said this model offers the advantage of Oregon-based instruction in veterinary medicine, benefits of which, to Oregon citizens and Oregon's animal agriculture, will be substantial. Not only will the program provide education for Oregon students wishing to pursue this profession, he explained, but the presence of animal practitioners and clinicians and basic bio-medical scientists in an expanded program in Corvallis will have significant benefit to animal health and, perhaps to a lesser extent, to human health. He said he felt it was a great compliment to the Board of Higher Education, the Board of Regents of Washington State University, and the Board of Education.
of the State of Idaho that the three states were able to develop a regional program in a field of this complexity. He noted that the federal government had sought to encourage the project by appropriating $10,000,000 for construction of specialized veterinary medical facilities in the three states.

Mr. Wyss said he realized that it was too late to reverse decisions already made in respect to development of the veterinary medical program, but said he had always been uncomfortable with the program because of its extremely high cost. He said that if one divides the cost of the program when all four classes are enrolled by the number of students, the out-of-pocket expense is $16,000 per year per student. This, he continued, is considerably more than the $9,000 per year it costs to send a student to Colorado State University under the WICHE contract, and more than the $10,000 per year it costs to send an Oregon student to Washington State University under the tri-state interim agreement. WICHE support for students enrolled in the Oregon-sponsored portion of the tri-state regional program will be $11,000, he said, but this is considerably less than per student costs as presented in the program budget. Even if WICHE payments are increased, he said, it would appear that participation in the tri-state program will be more expensive than would provision of veterinary medical education for students under WICHE contract.

Mr. Wyss said reports of veterinary medical students served under WICHE contracts in 1978-79 show that Utah has 40 students enrolled in the Colorado State University program, Montana has 35 at Colorado and 12 at Washington State, and Arizona has 46 at Colorado and 11 at Washington State. Oregon has 7 students at Colorado and 7 at Washington State under WICHE contracts, he continued, and another 24 at Washington State under the interim agreement. He said these figures raise a question as to whether Oregon has participated as strongly in the WICHE programs as some other western states. What appears to have happened, he continued, is that in the early 1970's, when pressure on admissions in veterinary medicine resulted in effort to expand the programs at Washington State and Colorado State Universities, Montana, Utah, Arizona, and Wyoming agreed to participate in an expanded Colorado program, while Oregon agreed to participate in what turned out to be the more expensive Washington-Oregon-Idaho program.

Mr. Wyss said he realized that the decisions leading to Oregon's participation in the Washington-Oregon-Idaho program were behind us, but what is not behind us, he continued, is the question of requiring graduates of the program to repay the state a fair portion of the cost of their education by making some commitment of service to the state. He said Arizona requires all Arizona-sponsored WICHE students to sign a contract promising either to practice in Arizona one year for each year they have been supported by WICHE payments or pay back the state one-half of that cost. The Idaho Legislature has before it this year a bill which would require similar repayment for Idaho-sponsored students enrolled in the tri-state regional veterinary medical program. The National Health Service demands that any student not repaying the federal government for support provided for medical training can be sued for three times the original cost to the government for this support.

Mr. Wyss said it was his conclusion that the Board should suggest to the Oregon Legislature that it consider requiring Oregon graduates of the tri-state veterinary medical program to make a commitment of service or repayment similar to that required by Arizona.

President MacVicar said he could not explain all the differences in cost between the Colorado and Washington programs. The figure of $16,000, he observed, is not the cost to Oregon taxpayers for each Oregon-sponsored student in the tri-state program, but is, rather, total per student cost of the program. Some of this cost is covered by student tuition, some by the federal government, and some is hospital income and fees for services.
Certainly students should not be expected to reimburse the state for costs covered by this income. He said he would not oppose a requirement of service to the state or repayment of a fair portion of the investment in the student's education to assure that the benefit of high cost professional education accrues to the state where the costs are incurred.

He noted that the Oregon portion of the tri-state program places strong emphasis on food animal medicine and it is this area in which rural Oregon is underserviced with veterinary professionals at the present time.

The Colorado State University program, he said, is a very different way of solving the problem of providing opportunity for veterinary medical education for a state's own residents. In this program, Colorado, Wyoming, Arizona, and Montana are locked into an inter-state relationship that has created a very large veterinary medical facility at Fort Collins, Colorado. This development will be of great benefit to Colorado and perhaps southern Wyoming, he said, but the benefit to Arizona and Montana, other than getting some of their own residents educated and returning as professional veterinarians, is minimal. In exchange for education of their students, Wyoming, Arizona, and Montana are going to be sending, on a continuing basis, many hundreds of thousands of dollars to Colorado State University. In contrast, Dr. MacVizir said, the Washington-Oregon-Idaho program will provide veterinary medical educational facilities in each of the three participating states. He said he did not know all the reasons why the cost of the Colorado program should be less than the cost of the Washington-Oregon-Idaho program, but one obvious reason was that it is a larger program—the divisor is bigger. Oregon would prefer, quite frankly, he said that the instruction at Washington State University were less expensive than it presently is, and perhaps it will become so. However, he continued, Oregon has made a most careful and critical examination of the costs of the Washington program and has found they are all proper, appropriate, and legitimate. He said Washington is not satisfied that the proposed WICHE payment of $11,000 per student fairly represents costs which should be supported by contracting states and this will be a matter of continued discussion.

Mrs. Carpenter said she felt a state could become provincial about trying to assure that its students remained in the state after graduation. She observed that veterinarians now practicing in Oregon must have received their professional training elsewhere, since Oregon has not offered veterinary medical training in the state. She said she felt it would be unfortunate and narrow to impose a commitment on graduates before Oregon has had experience with the program. The situation could be watched, she said, and if graduates seemed to be leaving the state to practice, a payback commitment could be instituted.

Mr. Wyse said that legislatures, representing society as a whole, had become much more resistant to funding very expensive professional education and he felt that governing boards should look at requiring a service or payback commitment of graduates of these programs. He noted that he was not singling out veterinary medicine, noting that there was a problem in getting physicians to practice in rural areas, and a service obligation would be a way of getting at this problem. He pointed out that the service academies have operated on the principle that its graduates were obligated to make a return to the nation in the form of service, with the result that the United States has developed excellent military leadership.

He concluded by saying that he would hope that the Board's staff could initiate a study of the question of requiring a service/payback commitment from graduates of veterinary medicine and other expensive health service programs so the Board might consider establishing policies on this matter before the veterinary medical program is implemented.
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Mr. Thorp said he tended to agree with Mr. Wyss. He said he was personally aware of the difficulty of obtaining large animal veterinary services in the rural areas of Oregon and Washington and some incentive such as a service/payback commitment might encourage veterinary medical graduates to look at this kind of practice. He asked how many veterinary medical students would be on the Oregon State campus when the program was in full operation.

Mrs. Kahananui responded that there would be 36 first-year students, 36 third-year students during the spring term of their third year, and 36 fourth-year students enrolled on the Corvallis campus or in clinical experiences under supervision of the Corvallis campus, for a total of 108 students being educated in Oregon.

Mr. Wyss said he did not feel he could continue to support development of veterinary medical education in Oregon until some fair system was worked out for getting a return of service.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations as presented with Directors Carpenter, Feves, and Thorp voting in favor and Director Wyss opposed.

Mrs. Kahananui and Dr. Romney assured the Committee that in view of the Committee discussion, information would be prepared concerning possible service/payback arrangements for discussion by the Committee at an early meeting so that students can be informed of the state's policies in this respect before beginning their studies.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Wyss indicated that he had previously expressed his concern about the high cost of this program and whether it confronted the problem of having sufficient practitioners in veterinary medicine to meet the needs of the state of Oregon. The major shortage in Oregon is for individuals trained in large animal or food animal medicine. The training at Oregon State University will concentrate on large animal medicine, but every veterinarian also receives training in small animal medicine. The graduates, therefore, have a choice. Mr. Wyss said it has seemed to him a very indirect approach to say that care in the selection process and providing training in large animal medicine would assure that the graduates of the program will go into rural areas and practice veterinary medicine on large animals. Mr. Wyss then reviewed briefly some of the Committee discussion related to Oregon's participation in veterinary medicine training programs and comparative costs.

As a result of investigations into other approaches which might be effective in assuring an adequate supply of veterinarians, Mr. Wyss received from the WICHE office a copy of an Arizona program. Copies were distributed to the Board. Mr. Wyss said that Arizona residents in the WICHE program agree that for each year in which they are supported by state taxpayers for education out-of-state in a WICHE school, they will practice one year of their profession with the State of Arizona. There are opportunities for deferring that service for graduate programs or military service, but if the graduates fail to fulfill the requirements to practice in the State of Arizona, they agree to repay one-half of the entire sum paid by the state on behalf of the student. Interest is charged at the rate of 4% annum from the time of disbursement of the funds to the time of repayment. Mr. Wyss said the program has been in effect for several years and it is believed to have increased the commitment to return of students who have elected to participate in the program.

Mr. Wyss said a similar law is being considered in the State of Idaho this year and is specifically written to include the tri-state veterinary medicine program.
Mr. Wyss commented that President MacVicar had been very supportive to Mr. Wyss in his questioning and had indicated that the suggestion was not an improper one nor was it an inappropriate study for the Board. Mr. Wyss said he did not vote against the matter because he felt that it needed at this point to include some sort of payback in either service or money. He said he was altogether uncomfortable with the request as it now stands and would vote against it. The matter of payback is a question that requires study in a far broader context than this single program because it raises as many questions as it solves. He indicated his intention to initiate with the Committee on Instruction a study of the implications of a payback program.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, and Perry. Those voting no: Directors Harms and Wyss.

Staff Report to the Committee

The Washington-Oregon-Idaho regional veterinary medical program to be implemented fall term 1979-80 on the Oregon State University and Washington State University campuses is the culmination of six years of work involving citizens committees, professional associations, the three institutions directly involved, the accrediting association, governing boards, other state agencies and review bodies, executive and legislative branches of the three state governments, and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Board first approved the general concept of the tri-state program May 21, 1974.

The 1975 Oregon Legislature authorized the Board of Higher Education to establish a School of Veterinary Medicine at Oregon State University as a first step in implementation of the planned tri-state program.

The 1977 Legislature authorized construction of a Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital-Clinic Facility on the Oregon State University campus to be financed by state and federal funds. The Board has approved the schematic design for this project and authorized completion of construction documents, solicitation of bids, and awarding of contracts within the project budget of $3,551,000. Bids for the project are to be opened February 13, 1979.

Funds to cover the first two years of the instructional costs of the program were included in the Board’s 1979-1981 biennium request, and appear, in the amount of $1,800,000, in the Governor's budget now under consideration by the 1979 Legislature.

Enrollments. The tri-state professional veterinary medical program is designed and budgeted to serve an entering class numbering 106 students each year (70 on the Washington State University campus and 36 at Oregon State University):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSU Campus</th>
<th>OSU Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 Washington residents</td>
<td>26 Oregon residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Idaho residents</td>
<td>8 WICHE students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 WICHE students</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course of Study. At least seven years are required to obtain the degree of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, a minimum of three years of pre-veterinary college studies and four years in a professional program. All the colleges and universities of the State System offer the pre-veterinary medicine program.
The professional program will be offered by the Washington-Oregon-Idaho regional program. The first portion of the professional program is designed to acquaint the student with the anatomy, physiology, and biochemistry of the normal animal. Oregon State University has considerable expertise in these areas and with additional faculty personnel to handle the actual instructional load is well qualified to offer this portion of the program for the 36 Oregon-sponsored students.

The second year of the program will be offered for the entire second-year class on the Washington State University campus. This work will cover causative factors of disease, the effect of disease in animals, and disease diagnosis.

The third year of study includes courses in medicine, surgery, obstetrics, and epidemiology designed to assist in the clinical diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of disease. Oregon will not duplicate specialized resources already available at Washington State University in small animal medicine and surgery. These courses, a course in public health, and introductory course work in large animal medicine will be completed during the first two-thirds of the third year of the program at Washington State University. Oregon-sponsored students will return to Oregon State University spring term of their third year for course work in the diagnosis and treatment of large animal diseases; large animal surgical techniques; diagnosis and treatment of reproductive disorders (theriogenology); and diagnosis, treatment, and management of special animals, including laboratory animals.

The fourth year of the professional program, students participate with veterinary clinicians in the treatment and care of animals. These experiences will be set up in four-week blocks, scheduled so as to make the best possible use of resources for clinical experiences available in the three states. Each institution will emphasize different areas of clinical specialization. Oregon State University will offer elective courses and clinical training in food animal and equine medicine, surgery, and reproduction. Washington State University will offer a general exposure to large animal medicine and surgery, with emphasis in its clinical programs on equine and swine medicine, as well as offering all work in small animal medicine and surgery. A referral teaching-hospital being constructed at Caldwell, Idaho, will provide clinical training related to food animal medicine and herd health.

In summary, Oregon-sponsored students will complete their first year on the Oregon State University campus, will go to Washington State University for the second and most of the third year of study, and will return to Oregon State University spring term of their third year. The fourth year Oregon-sponsored students will complete three required clinical blocks of instruction at Oregon State University and then will rotate through three elective clinical blocks and two externship blocks selected in accordance with career interest and space availability from specialized instructional offerings of Oregon State University, Washington State University, and the Caldwell Veterinary Medical Center, in Idaho.

Oregon-sponsored students will receive their Doctor of Veterinary Medicine degree from Oregon State University.

Resources to Offer Program. The present Oregon State University faculty involved in teaching, research, extension, and diagnostic service in veterinary medicine number 14. This number will be increased by 8 FTE faculty fall term 1979-80 to provide instructional staff for the first year of the new program. The instructional staff will be further increased to 9 FTE in 1980-81, 15 in 1981-82, and 17 in 1982-83, when the program is fully operational. Support personnel will increase from 5 in 1979-80 to 26 in 1982-83. The Kerr Library collection in veterinary medicine has been judged adequate by an accreditation team of the American Veterinary Medical Association to support the new program and no special expenditure is anticipated in this area. However, additional funds will be required in the 1981-1983 biennium for supplies and equipment purchases.
Budgetary Impact. The budget for the first four years of the program's operation, excluding the construction costs of the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital-Clinical Facility, is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>227,564</td>
<td>349,424</td>
<td>657,000</td>
<td>744,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Personnel</td>
<td>69,036</td>
<td>79,291</td>
<td>227,150</td>
<td>385,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to WSU for Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Contract Students</td>
<td>60,840</td>
<td>56,040</td>
<td>28,020</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>474,895</td>
<td>262,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable Equipment</td>
<td>76,160</td>
<td>145,465</td>
<td>406,595</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to WSU for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr of Oregon-Sponsored</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>490,180</td>
<td>857,822</td>
<td>942,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Renovation</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>1,258,400</td>
<td>2,696,185</td>
<td>3,405,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, State Funds</td>
<td>561,600</td>
<td>1,258,400</td>
<td>2,696,485</td>
<td>3,405,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs of the program will be offset in part by income to the State Board of Higher Education resulting from tuition payments of Oregon-sponsored students, WICHE receipts, and fees for clinical and hospital services.

Tuition and fees to be charged Oregon-sponsored students enrolled in the program have not yet been determined, but will be set in accordance with the same policies as govern the setting of fees for medical and dental education.

In detailed descriptions of the instructional program to be offered on the Oregon State University campus and supporting information concerning development of the program, resources available, and budgetary implications are included in the document entitled Request of Oregon State University for Approval of an Instructional Program in Veterinary Medicine Leading to the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine Degree, February 23, 1979, which is on file in the Board's Office.

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, February 23, 1979; present--Carpenter, Feves, Thorp, and Wyss.)

Mrs. Carpenter indicated that the Oregon Student Lobby had requested an opportunity to present a statement to the Committee concerning proposed legislation to further instructional improvement projects at the State System's colleges and universities.

Miss Cindy Willhite, representing the Oregon Student Lobby, distributed background information concerning the proposed legislation which has been introduced as SB 451. Miss Willhite said there is a deficiency of teaching skills on the part of college and university faculty members which is serious enough to warrant attention. She indicated that some of the language in the bill presently is being modified but the Oregon Student Lobby was seeking support of the concept from the Committee and the Board.

Miss Willhite then described the College and University Teaching Project which has been in operation for the past five years at Oregon State University and stated that it had been very successful in improving teaching strategies and teaching effectiveness. She cited some of the accomplishments of the program.

Since there is no state commitment for this or other projects of a similar nature, Miss Willhite indicated that students had taken the initiative to prepare SB 451. An appropriation of $800,000 for the 1979-1981 biennium is specified in the bill to be used for instructional developments in schools operated by the State Board of Higher Education.
President MacVicar said it was his conviction the Oregon State University Program was cost effective. He stated that the program really owed its origin to Representative Phil Lang who became convinced in the 1973 Legislative Session that if funds of this sort could be introduced into the educational process, there would be a positive result. He urged the Committee and the Board to lend their moral support to what he considered to be a very positive effort on the part of the student lobby.

It was stated the program, if approved by the Legislature, would be tailored to each individual campus. With respect to flexibility in the use of the funds, Miss Wible said it was intended that there would be sufficient rigidity in the legislation and in the rules to assure a quality instructional improvement project. At the same time, there is need for flexibility at the institutional level in order for the program to meet the particular needs at that institution.

The Committee recommended that the Board support the proposed legislation as something that is desirable and would aid the instructional process.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Perry indicated that Mr. Mel Ferguson, President of the Associated Students of Oregon State University, had requested an opportunity to make a statement concerning the proposed legislation for instructional improvement. Mr. Ferguson stated that he was speaking on behalf of the Oregon Student Lobby. He reported that on March 27, the Senate Education Committee had voted unanimously to send SB 451, the Instructional Improvement Bill, to Ways and Means with a "do pass" recommendation. Mr. Ferguson said the Instruction Committee's support of the Bill had improved its reception in the Senate Education Committee and the Oregon Student Lobby was asking now for the support of the full Board.

It was stated that instructors, unprepared or unassisted in meeting rigorous teaching responsibilities, severely hinder students' abilities to learn course material and thereby harm the quality of education students receive. Further, poor instructors serve to increase the cost to students for obtaining an education because of the reduced credit hour load that students carry due to the recurrent need to drop ineffective courses. Not all instructors are ineffective, Mr. Ferguson said, but the problem is serious enough to support a measure designed to provide financial resources for instructional improvement. The fault of poor instruction should not rest solely with the faculty members. It has resulted from a lack of financial commitment to improve instruction, and SB 451 was developed by students as an effort to improve the quality of their education through the appropriation of $800,000 to support instructional improvement projects. Mr. Ferguson then described the College and University Teaching Project and its results.

Mr. Ferguson said that it had been intended to ask that the money be appropriated for developing similar programs at each of the State System institutions. However, after further consultation and discussion, it has been decided that the concept of institutional flexibility has merit. He indicated that arrangements for cooperative efforts have been made in the event the allocations for the smaller schools are insufficient to develop a quality program.

In response to other questions during the discussion of the proposal, Mr. Ferguson indicated that neither the Faculty Senate nor the Faculty Lobby had taken a position on the measure but they were aware of the program and were not opposing it. The policy on course drops and withdrawals is currently under review at Oregon State University. He said it was difficult to determine the extent of the poor instruction but even very effective instructors could become more effective under this program.
Mr. Ferguson indicated that selection of the participants would be left to the institutions. At Oregon State University, it is an honor to be involved in the program. There is also some financial reward for faculty members who are involved. Another method of selection would be to review, over a period of time, how students have perceived a faculty member through the use of some kind of evaluative mechanism. The program at Oregon State University is voluntary, and approximately 30 faculty members participate in the program each year.

Mr. Anderson said it would seem that incentives would be very important to insure that the faculty members who needed the program were the ones who participated in it. Mr. Ferguson said the Oregon Student Lobby would be open to any suggestions with respect to incentives or determining participation but the important thing was to get the program established throughout the State System.

Mr. Perry asked whether the proposal was accompanied by any effort to assist the students in the learning process because effective education also depends on student effort and skill. Mr. Ferguson said a special part of the technique that is employed would provide faculty with examples of ways to attract student interest and facilitate their learning.

Mr. Thorp said the program was good but without some sort of stipulation, the instructors who needed this program probably would not be the ones who took advantage of it.

Mr. Anderson said he was certain everyone was in sympathy with the objectives of the program but he was somewhat troubled as to its implementation. The program needs to be reviewed carefully by the Board if the Board is to be charged with its implementation.

Mr. Moore said any time you can achieve better communication in the teacher-student relationship should receive substantial support. He said he understood the concerns about implementation but the presidents of the institutions should be able to resolve those issues.

The Chancellor said it would seem that the Board would be in a position to applaud the objectives of SB 451, with the understanding that in the event the Bill is passed and the appropriation made, the implementation would come back to the Board for review and consideration. It would be unwise to put that implementation in the Bill, but it should be a matter for Board consideration at a later time.

Mr. Ingalls moved that the Board vigorously applaud the intent of SB 451 and, if it is approved by the Legislature, that the various institutions bring the methods of implementation to the Chancellor's Office and the Board for approval.

The Chancellor said it was his interpretation that approval of the motion should not be construed as an official Board request to open the Governor's budget to add the $800,000, and further, that the request did not rank in higher priority than the priorities already established in the Board's program improvement requests presently before the Subcommittee.

After discussion concerning the priority which the Board placed on the proposal in SB 451, it was understood that the Board's priorities would remain unchanged. The Board would support the project identified in SB 451 as a very laudable and exciting program. The Board would eliminate any issue of priority and let the legislation stand as a high priority of the Oregon Student Lobby.

President MacVicar indicated that he supported the Committee recommendation and would favor an affirmative vote on the motion by Mr. Ingalls.
The Board approved the motion by Mr. Ingalls, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Oregon State University is requesting authorization (1) to suspend its baccalaureate degree program in Russian and (2) to discontinue its baccalaureate program in systems technology, effective 1979-80.

The Board's Office recommended that Oregon State University be authorized to take the actions requested.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations as presented.

The Board approved the staff recommendations as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

The Oregon State University's requests are found in the document entitled, Request of Oregon State University For Authorization To Suspend Temporarily the Baccalaureate Degree Program in Russian and To Discontinue the Baccalaureate Program in Systems Technology, which is on file in the Board's Office.

Briefly stated, Oregon State University believes enrollment in upper-division courses in Russian and in the system's technology curriculum are not sufficient to justify continued assignment or reassignment of resources to these programs.

It should be noted that the actions requested will not leave the state without major programs of study in these areas. The University of Oregon and Portland State University offer baccalaureate degree major programs in Russian and Oregon Institute of Technology offers a fully accredited program in computer systems engineering technology.

Oregon State University is requesting a suspension of the Russian program for two years in order to give the College of Liberal Arts time to assess prospects for increased student interest in the study of languages before making a final recommendation as to discontinuation of the program.

Experience with the program in systems technology over the past four years, and the need to assign additional staff to the program to meet accreditation standards if the program is continued, leads Oregon State University to recommend discontinuation of the program. Schedules of students presently enrolled in the program have been arranged so that the students will be able to graduate.

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to accept, on behalf of the Board, the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed Cultural and Conference Center which the Oregon State University Foundation expects to construct on the campus in Corvallis. These plans are now being completed by Architects Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Portland, in cooperation with Foundation and institutional officials and the contractor, H. A. Anderson. Preliminary sketches of the building and site plan were reviewed informally with the Board's Committee on Finance, Administration and Physical Plant on February 23, 1979.
As reported to the Board on January 26, 1979, when arrangements were made for the use of the site (on the east side of 26th Street, between Western Avenue and Stadium Drive), the Foundation will present the completed facility as a gift to the State for use by Oregon State University.

Board Discussion and Action

In presenting the Committee report, Mr. Ingalls stated that the Board would be responsible for all maintenance and janitorial service at a cost probably in the range of $68,000 to $80,000 per year.

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Therp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon understandings reached when the Board authorized a revision to the 1979-1981 capital construction program to substitute a smaller Cultural and Conference Center in lieu of the earlier proposed Performing Arts Center at Oregon State University, the OSU Foundation commissioned Architects Skidmore, Owings & Merrill to design and provide contract administration for the new facilities with the assistance of H. A. Anderson, the contractor selected for the construction work. The design concepts, now being refined into the schematic design phase of planning, reflect a gross area of approximately 45,000 square feet in a one-story structure which would have its principal entry from 26th Street and would include an auditorium/lecture hall seating about 1,200 persons, a smaller lecture room, several conference rooms, an office suite and related service areas such as a lobby, catering kitchen, mechanical spaces and restrooms.

On the basis of preliminary estimates, the direct construction costs are expected to be somewhat less than $4,000,000, and the total expenditure requirements likely would be limited to a sum not to exceed $4,500,000, including rededication of that portion of the site which had been acquired originally from auxiliary enterprise funds.

Tentatively, it is contemplated that the structure would have exterior brick walls and would have doubled-glazed windows. The utilities would be provided from central campus services. Institutional officials and Mr. Louis DeMonto, campus planning consultant, have reviewed and approved the proposal and have indicated that they do not anticipate any problems with the necessary fire, safety or handicapped access reviews.

Pending receipt of more precise data on areas and costs, and the review of the proposed agreement with the OSU Foundation for the use of the site for the construction of the facilities, the Board's staff does not recommend the formal acceptance of the schematic design phase of planning, but does request that authorization be given to the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning to acknowledge such acceptance when such data are available, if satisfactory.

N. Sicuro, Welcome as President, SOSC

Mr. Perry introduced Dr. Natale A. Sicuro, recently appointed as President of Southern Oregon State College, and welcomed him to the State System.

Proposed Construction of Biology Greenhouse Facility, SOSC

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 23, 1979; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Moore.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to proceed with the construction of a proposed Biology Greenhouse Facility east of the Science Building at Southern Oregon State College when all of the
funds required therefore are available from the National Science Foundation and/or the Southern Oregon College Foundation. Tentatively, it is estimated that the total cost of the project would be approximately $74,100.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

During the discussion, it was indicated that if grant funds did not become available, the Foundation would provide the funds necessary for this project in lieu of other items which might be undertaken.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry.

Staff Report to the Committee

For several years, officials of Southern Oregon State College have indicated the need for a greenhouse to serve the Department of Biology as a life sciences laboratory. Through the assistance of the S.O.C. Foundation, the schematic design of this project has been prepared and assurance has been provided by the Foundation that funds would be made available to cover at least one-third of the total estimated cost of $74,100. With the concurrence of the State Emergency Board on February 24, 1978, a grant application was submitted to the Division of Science Education Resources Improvement within the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., to cover two-thirds of the project costs. Although the initial request for grant funds was not approved, the application has been re-submitted for consideration this year and institutional officials believe that there is a reasonable opportunity for it to receive favorable action prior to June 30, 1979. Meanwhile, the S.O.C. Foundation has provided assurance that it will make sufficient resources available to assure the completion of the greenhouse even if the federal grant is not obtained.

It is expected that the greenhouse would be a prefabricated structure measuring approximately 40' by 40', with four compartments, and would be located directly east of the Science Building, northwest of the campus central utility plant. The Foundation intends to purchase the prefabricated unit from a manufacturer and give it to Southern Oregon State College for installation on the project site during the summer of 1979, or as soon as a determination is made concerning the federal grant. Plans and specifications for the base of the greenhouse and utility service connections are being prepared by a local engineering firm as a gift to the institution through the Foundation.

As explained to the Emergency Board when the federal grant application was authorized, the availability of a greenhouse would provide the proper environment for growing plant materials used in courses taught in the Biology Department of Southern Oregon State College and provide space for experiments which would give students an opportunity to observe and manipulate the growth of plants. Currently, courses such as Plants and Organisms, and Plant Physiology are hindered by the lack of such facilities. Other courses, such as Plant Ecology, Plant Morphology, Environmental Biology, etc., could be improved by the addition of greenhouse experiments.

In granting approval for the submission of the grant application, the Emergency Board indicated that it did so with the understanding that the remainder of the expenditure requirements would be financed from gift funds through the S.O.C. Foundation and that no request would be made for any increase
in the operating budget to cover the costs of maintenance and operation because the new facility would replace two small greenhouses with some saving in heating and maintenance costs.

Inasmuch as the estimated total cost of the project is less than $100,000, it would be identified as a capital improvement rather than as a capital construction item. Consequently, further legislative approval would not appear to be required.

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 23, 1979; present—Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Moore.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Planning Assumptions, Planning Objectives and Planning Principles that have been prepared by the staff of Southern Oregon State College with the assistance of The Amundson Associates, P.C., planning consultants, be approved as a basis for updating the Long-Range Development Plan for that institution.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

President Perry asked President Sicuro to comment on a broader planning process which he understood involved the Ashland community as well as the institution.

There is a unique opportunity at Southern Oregon State College in the preparation of the long-range development plan, President Sicuro said, because there has been initiated also a six-year review of the academic programming at Southern Oregon State College. There might also be a unique opportunity as a new president coming into the area to involve a broader segment of the constituency in the development of what has been termed the Southern Oregon Plan for the 80's. Any proposed changes in the guidelines would be based on broad support from both internal and external constituencies. President Sicuro said there had been remarkable response to invitations to participate in the review.

Minor modifications to Planning Principle 6 were suggested by Mr. Harms and have been incorporated in the minutes. They were intended to clarify the building height planned for the Southern Oregon State College campus.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Perry, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

At its October 28, 1968, meeting, the Board approved revisions to the long-range campus development plan for Southern Oregon State College which had been prepared with the assistance of Architect Vincent Oredson, Ashland. Subsequently, at its July 1970 and May 1971 meetings, the Board approved minor revisions to the campus boundaries identified in the plan. Within these revised projected campus boundaries, there is now a total of approximately 178.64 acres. Of this total, the Board owns 153.86 acres, about 10.26 acres are in streets and alleys not vacated, and the remaining 14.53 acres are still in private ownership.
Inasmuch as significant improvements, including the construction of the
Music Building, the Education-Psychology Building and the Stevenson College
Union, have been made during the interval since 1968, and inasmuch as
earlier expectations in enrollment patterns have not been realized, there is
a need for revising and updating the long-range master plan for the develop­
ment of the campus. As reported to the Board at its January 26, 1979
meeting, The Amundson Associates, P.C., Springfield, have been retained
to assist the administration, staff and students of Southern Oregon State
College in the review of the planning assumptions, objectives and principles
upon which the updating of the long-range development plan should be
based and also to assist in the revision of the plan.

The planning assumptions, objectives and principles now being recommended
have many similarities to the guidelines used for the 1968 plan update,
including a concern for the attractiveness of the physical environment,
functional relationships of the buildings to each other and to other physical
features such as walkways, parking and access to the campus.

There is also a reaffirmation of the institution's role as a regional multi-
purpose college consistent with the "Guidelines for the Regional State Colleges"
approved by the Board at its November 18, 1977, meeting. The guidelines
recognize undergraduate teaching as a primary role for the college but
include some graduate instruction in education, business administration,
general studies and interdisciplinary studies.

The most significant changes reflected in the proposed planning assumptions,
objectives and principles, when compared to the guidelines applicable
in 1968, are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1968 Plan Update</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td>4,000 Fall Term FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open-ended with increments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of 4,000, 6,000 and 8,000 FTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Residence Halls</td>
<td>provide diversity with existing housing (36.6%) on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodate 40% of students on campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building-to-Land Density within Central Campus</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>(existing about 13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed assumptions, objectives and principles, which follow, reflect
concerns for the needs and resources of the region, effective use of existing
facilities as well as recognition of the role of Southern Oregon State College
as an educational and cultural center for the region:

Planning Assumptions

1. The Long-Range Development Plan will reflect the Board-approved
enrollment limitation of 4,000 Fall Term FTE students. There is expected
to be a shift of undergraduate enrollment to the upper division.
Graduate enrollments are expected to remain relatively constant comprising
about 5% of the FTE enrollment or about 10% of the headcount.

2. Southern Oregon State College is the only four-year liberal arts bache-
laureate degree-granting college in Southern Oregon. As such, it
should continue to serve the southern region and the state as a four-
year college with some less-than-baccalaureate programs appropriate to
its resources and the needs of the region it serves, and with some
graduate level programs.

Southern Oregon State College will serve as a regional educational and
cultural center for southern Oregon and will continue to work closely
with the Oregon Shakespearean Festival and the Britt Music Festival.
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3. In order to achieve an attractive learning environment there will be continued involvement of the publics which Southern Oregon State College serves, including students, faculty, alumni and community representatives in cooperation with the staff of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education and its Office of Facilities Planning.

4. The College and the community will continue to share healthy and harmonious development as long as the needs of each are satisfied commensurate with the needs of the other. In keeping with ORS 197.180 the College will (1) carry out the planning duties, powers and responsibilities and take actions that are authorized by law with respect to programs affecting land use in accordance with state-wide planning goals, and (2) submit a program for coordination to assure conformance with state-wide planning goals and compatibility with city and county comprehensive plans.

5. The natural environment of the campus is an irreplaceable asset and physical development of the campus must be in harmony with this environment and enhance it wherever possible.

6. Physical planning will be based on the Board's space standards.

7. Effective physical planning is dependent on the early and continuing involvement of the users of the campus. The users and those responsible for academic programs are expected to identify facility needs and their relationships needed to implement institutional programs.

8. Previously approved land acquisition within the approved campus boundaries will be completed. No additional land acquisition would then be required.

9. Housing of students is an important and relevant educational function. A diversity of essential, self-supporting and self-liquidating housing conducive to personal and social growth, will be provided by the College. Existing student housing will be improved so as to provide a more livable environment responsive to student needs.

10. Access for emergency and service vehicles, necessary roads, and parking on a self-supporting and self-liquidating basis will be provided and must be complementary to the natural environment of the campus.

11. Requirements for safety, care of the handicapped, operational and maintenance needs, and the efficient use of energy will be recognized.

Planning Objectives

The objectives of the Long-Range Development Plan for Southern Oregon State College are:

1. To foster the achievement of the mission and guidelines which were approved by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education for Southern Oregon State College.

2. To serve as a general guide to future physical development of the campus to accommodate the planned enrollment plus appropriate research and service activities.

3. To provide a sound and flexible frame of reference for intelligent and financially sound decision making on a continuing array of planning and design considerations.

4. To identify an optimum use or disposition of land and existing facilities.
5. To retain all buildings of special historical worth in as economically reasonable and useful manner as possible.

6. To achieve and maintain a human scale for the campus.

7. To preserve, during the course of development, the visual qualities and amenities of the campus, to conserve and improve its distinctive environment, and to demonstrate the institution's ability to live in harmony with the environment.

8. To promote a public consciousness of the unity and integrity of the campus and of the importance of design decisions to the total campus environment.

Planning Principles

1. The central campus area facilities within a ten-minute walking distance will accommodate the principal disciplines. The disciplines will be located in workable relationships to one another based on student crossover studies.

2. The central campus is defined generally by a ten-minute walking circle with a diameter of about 2,600 feet. The use of the central area for building sites recognizes the need to accommodate approximately 65 percent of the space required for classrooms, class laboratories, and other facilities related to instruction.

3. Activities which do not require central locations for academic reasons or because of non-intensive campus use will be located on peripheral sites.

4. The plan will accommodate incremental development of facilities or large complete units, as needs and availability of resources permit.

5. An open space quality of the central campus should be preserved. Inasmuch as the existing ground coverage on the portion of the campus south of Siskiyou Boulevard, including all buildings, is about 13 percent, it would appear that 15 percent is the desired maximum in order to preserve these qualities.

6. Buildings within any significant section or portion of the central campus area generally should not exceed a height of three stories, including basement, consistent with the planning for the Library and Taylor Hall. A few individual buildings with additions that have been planned within the central campus area would be limited to a maximum height of five stories above grade.

7. Permanent open spaces and areas of special landscape treatment will be identified to promote preservation and enhancement of the natural environment and visual character of the campus.

8. Pedestrian circulation will be served by a network of open walks, and will pass through buildings where practical.

9. Bicycle paths and conveniently located bicycle compounds, some covered, will recognize the growing use of bicycles and the need to avoid conflicts with pedestrians on walks and at building entrances.

10. Campus vehicular circulation will be on peripheral streets. Access for service or to parking will be through relatively short penetrations. Emergency vehicles and "peak" public events traffic can be served by controlled links connecting these penetrations.
11. Campus vehicular access will be coordinated with plans of the City of Ashland.

12. Campus parking will be provided primarily in landscaped surface lots dispersed about the campus to reflect demand pattern as closely as possible consistent with open space objectives.

13. Campus utilities will be located underground with the possible exception of remote areas.

14. Existing temporary and obsolescent buildings will be programmed for removal on a realistic basis. New short-term space must be confined to areas reserved for it.

Surface Drainage Improvements and Physical Education Fields Relocation, EOSC

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the feasibility analysis and preliminary design which Architects Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson and their consultants have prepared for the proposed Surface Drainage Improvements and Physical Education Fields Relocation project at Eastern Oregon State College be accepted with the understanding that further planning be deferred pending legislative authorization for construction.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The possibility of making the holding pond into a swimming pool was raised by Mr. Batiste.

Mr. Hunderup said this would be the choice of the President and others at Eastern Oregon State College. However, Mr. Hunderup said he could not recommend to the Board that it incur the legal liability that would result from an open landscaped pool area in the campus.

In response to a question concerning the need for two separate fields, it was stated that they would allow multiple simultaneous use of both areas.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

In July 1973, the professional services agreement with Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson, A.I.A., Architects, who had assisted in updating the long-range development plan for Eastern Oregon State College, was amended to provide further services and compensation relating to a feasibility analysis and the preliminary design for the proposed surface drainage improvements and physical education fields relocation project for which an expenditure limitation of $610,000 is being requested as part of the Board's capital construction program for 1979-1981. The primary objective of the project is to eliminate the flooding of buildings, such as the Hoke College Center, and to correct the present conditions of excessive dampness and unevenness which prevent the use of the track and football field for much of the school year.
The especially hard rains characteristic of Eastern Oregon drain off the mountain slopes southwest of La Grande from the Mill Creek and Deal Creek watersheds. Periodically, they overflow their channels and flood portions of the campus. Large underground drain lines, including a 60" diameter storm sewer, were installed by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers a number of years ago in an effort to contain the flow of these creeks through the campus. Normally, the drains are adequate to contain the intercepted flow of water. However, extensive development adjacent to the campus and extending up the nearby western slopes has increased the maximum runoff beyond the capacity of the drains. Further, the problem is aggravated occasionally by the partial plugging of drain intakes by flotsam. The combination of these factors periodically creates flood conditions damaging the Hoke College Center and causing problems in an underground utility tunnel and the campus central heating plant as well as making it virtually impossible to use the outdoor physical education teaching stations and recreation areas such as the running track and the football field (also used for other games and activities).

The design proposed by the Architects and their consultants addresses the problem of flooding by proposing to intercept the surface runoff water that is in excess of the capacity of the existing drains by using an open basin, or holding pond, which would be located on the site now utilized for the large parking lot between the Hoke College Center and Quinn Coliseum. Earth berms and raised street grades beginning in the blocks east of 6th Street and extending beyond the Classroom Building near 8th Street would be constructed to channel the water to this basin and prevent it from flowing in the paths that now lead to facility flooding. The basin would be attractively landscaped for use throughout the year but would be expected to contain the flood waters for short periods of time on those occasions, possibly once a year, when the capacities of the drains were exceeded, gradually releasing the water to the drains. An emergency overflow would be provided to direct the water away from the college's facilities toward Gekeler Slough in the event that the combined capacities of the drains and the basin were exceeded.

Parking displaced by the proposed basin would be provided, at least temporarily, by making use of former City streets within the campus boundaries as well as by a small gravel surface lot. By allowing only one-way traffic on these streets, angle parking would be possible.

The problem of the wet and uneven fields and track would be solved by relocating them on a site directly south of the Coliseum where the ground elevation is higher and where the proposed new outdoor facilities would be protected by earth berms and the water-flow course diversion. The existing track and games field would benefit from the water-flow diversion and become more useful as auxiliary fields during dry periods.

The planning for the project is consistent with the recently completed and approved long-range development plan for Eastern Oregon State College except that the Architects suggest now that service access to the Classroom Building would be from the south, off 8th Street, rather than from the west. Portions of the related campus development program, such as the construction of permanent parking lots, new tennis courts, the physical plant service building access road and other elements of the grounds landscape development, would be undertaken in subsequent phases as resources become available.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF PRELIMINARY DESIGN PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - EOSC Surface Drainage Improvements and Physical Education Fields Relocation

Architects - Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson, A.I.A., Portland
Board's priority - No. 13 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)
No. 8 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Estimated total project costs $ 610,000
Estimated direct construction costs:
Total, including $257,710 for landscaping, roads, walks and other sitework $ 522,710

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - October 1979
Completion - October 1980

Tentative financing plan:
General Fund appropriation $215,000
Article XI-C bond proceeds 215,000
Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises 180,000

Total $ 610,000

Amendment of AR 580-40-035, Summer Session Fee Book (Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 23, 1979; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Moore.)

It was recommended that AR 580-40-035, Summer Session Fee Book, be amended as follows:

Summer Session Fee Book

580-40-035 The published document entitled, "Department of Higher Education Summer Session Fee Book" (Fees and Charges) dated March 1979 (May 1978), is hereby adopted by reference as a permanent rule. All prior adoptions of summer session fee documents are (were) hereby repealed, except as to rights and obligations previously acquired or incurred thereunder.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented. (The March 1979 Summer Session Fee Book appears as Supplement A to these minutes.)

Board Discussion and Action

At the time set for the public hearing on the Summer Session Fee Book, Mr. Perry declared the public hearing open and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the amendment to AR 580-40-035, Summer Session Fee Book. There being no response to his request, he declared the public hearing closed.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor of adoption of the amendment: Directors Anderson, Afer, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

The proposed action is necessary in order to approve the fees and charges set forth in the Summer Session Fee Book for the 1979 Summer Session.
Tuition. The Board annually establishes summer session fees under a policy adopted on January 21, 1975. The significant policy differences from those of the academic year are:

1. No residency determination is required for summer session students.
2. The instruction fee for undergraduate students is 15% greater than the instruction fee for the preceding academic term.
3. The instruction fee for graduate students is 10% greater than the instruction fee for the preceding academic term.
4. Incidental and health service fees recommended by the institutions cannot exceed the amount approved by the Board for full-time students in the preceding academic term.
5. The building fee for full-time students is established at a rate less than that for an academic term.
6. Fees which are not specifically described in the Summer Session Fee Book but which are applicable throughout the fiscal year are to be administered under policies and at rates applicable in the 1978-79 Academic Year Fee Book.

It is proposed that these policies be continued in establishing fee schedules for the 1979 Summer Session.

Room and Board. Summer session consists primarily of eight- and eleven-week sessions; however, daily as well as weekly rates are provided. Most campuses provide for room only or board only in addition to the more normal room and board plans. Rates of charge are generally comparable to those for individual terms of the academic year.

Amendment of AR 580-22-075, Confidential Information Relating to Employed Faculty Not To Be Sought Nor Accepted

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 23, 1979; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Moore.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that AR 580-22-075, Confidential Information Relating to Employed Faculty Not To Be Sought Nor Accepted, be amended as indicated below:

Confidential Information Relating to Employed Faculty Not To Be Sought Nor Accepted

580-22-075 When evaluating employed faculty members, the Board, its institutions, schools, or departments shall not solicit nor accept letters, documents, or other materials, given orally or in written form from individuals or groups who wish their identity kept anonymous or the information they provide kept confidential, except for student evaluations made or received pursuant to AR 580-22-100(5).

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

During the discussion, it was indicated that if the anonymous report were of such a serious nature that an investigation seemed warranted, the institution would conduct an investigation. The results of the investigation, but not the anonymous report, could become a part of the file.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.
Board Discussion and Action

At the time set for the public hearing on the amendment to AR 580-22-075, Mr. Perry declared the public hearing open and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed amendment. President MacVicar conveyed a comment from the Dean of Faculties at Oregon State University that the statement "except for student evaluations" was not sufficiently precise. The intent appears to be to refer only to student survey evaluations of classroom and laboratory performance, as stated in AR 580-22-100(5). President MacVicar suggested the Board might wish to consider more precise language.

There being no further testimony, Mr. Perry declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Ater suggested that the proposed amendment "except for student evaluations" be expanded to read "except for student evaluations made or received pursuant to AR 580-22-100(5)." He then moved that the amendment, including the additional language be adopted.

The Board approved the motion by Mr. Ater, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

The proposed changes is recommended in order to clarify possible conflict between two existing Rules.

Amendment of AR 580-40-015, Hospital Charges

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 23, 1979; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Moore.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that AR 580-40-015, Hospital Charges, be amended as indicated below:

Hospital Charges

580-40-015 (1) Patient fee schedules shall be established and maintained by the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center and shall be adequate to meet costs of operating the Hospital and other commitments in accordance with the approved budget. The schedules must be approved by the Hospital Director and the President and filed with the Vice Chancellor for Administration.

(2) Charges may be established for:

(a) Room, board, and nursing services per patient day;
(b) Per diem ancillary services;
(c) Itemized ancillary services;
(d) Outpatient charges;
(e) Medication and medical supplies.

(3) Costs and charges shall be computed in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles for hospitals and the requirements of third party carriers.

(4) Charges for room, board, nursing services, ancillary services, and outpatient services must be [maintained for at least ninety days following adoption.] filed and maintained in accordance with the rules and procedures established by the Oregon State Health Planning and Development Agency under ORS 442.410.
(5) Inpatients shall pay or make arrangements for payment of services (at the time of discharge) on admission or as soon thereafter as is feasible. Outpatients shall pay or make arrangements to pay for services before completion of the last visit.

Statutory Authority: ORS 351.070
Hist: Filed and Eff. 6-5-78 as HEB 3-1978

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Modifications have been included in Sections 1 and 5 to reflect clarification of concerns expressed during the Committee discussion.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

At the time set for the public hearing on Hospital Charges, Mr. Perry declared the public hearing open and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the amendment of AR 580-40-015, Hospital Charges. There being no response to his request, he declared the public hearing closed.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor of adoption of the amendment: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

The 1977 Legislature created the State Health Planning and Development Agency (SHPDA) with amended Chapter 442 of the Oregon Statutes. ORS 442.410 provides that SHPDA shall issue rules on the filing of health care facilities rate increases. The statute stipulates that rates covered by the SHPDA rules cannot become effective for 30 days after filing. The proposed amendment to AR 580-40-015 reflects these statutory changes.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Board's staff be authorized to offer for sale 120 acres of unimproved property near Hood River, Oregon. The minimum acceptable bid price would be $260,225. If the advertised invitation to bid results in no acceptable bid, the staff would proceed to negotiate a sale for cash totaling not less than the advertised minimum bid price. These procedures are authorized by the Oregon statutes.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.
Staff Report to the Committee

In 1925, Oregon State University was the recipient of a major share of the Joan C. Palmer Tift estate. Subsequently, some of the assets were converted to cash and placed in an irreducible memorial fund for student loans, as required by Mrs. Tift's will. Interest earned on the interest-bearing student loans has been added to the student loan fund.

Since the 120 acres of partially wooded property are not used for scientific research or educational purposes, it has been recommended that the property be sold and the proceeds added to the Tift Memorial Loan Fund.

The Board's staff obtained the required appraisal and has received clearance from the Department of General Services to sell the property. The Division of State Lands released mineral rights but denied a request that the state relinquish geothermal rights to the property.

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 23, 1979; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Moore.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the building at 1385 Franklin Boulevard, Eugene, formerly a large residence but now being used for Graphic Design classes in the School of Architecture and Allied Arts at the University of Oregon, be named in honor of the late Professor Jack Wilkinson, the first head of the Department of Fine and Applied Arts.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Peves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

Officials of the University of Oregon have endorsed the recommendation of the faculty of the School of Architecture and Allied Arts to designate the old farm house located adjacent to the Physical Plant complex on the north side of Franklin Boulevard as the Wilkinson House in tribute to Jack Wilkinson, who is now deceased. Professor Wilkinson was a member of the faculty of the University from 1941 to 1968. Earlier, from 1932 to 1935, he had been a student on the campus before attending the California School of Fine Arts and studying painting in Paris at Academie Ranson and Atelier 17. During his 27 years of service at the University of Oregon, he progressed from the rank of instructor in painting to that of professor. He served as head of the Department of Fine and Applied Arts from 1963 until 1968 when he resigned to accept appointment as head of the Art Department at Louisiana State University.

Professor Wilkinson painted the major mural at the southeast entrance to Lawrence Hall, and shortly before his death two years ago, returned to the campus to give several lectures and to supervise the restoration of the mural.
Because he provided leadership and provocative stimulation as a teacher and artist throughout his career at the University of Oregon, the faculty has recommended that his name be used for the identification of the two-story wood-frame building at 1385 Franklin Boulevard which was purchased in 1950 and is now being used for sections of Graphic Design classes and other functions of the Department of Fine and Applied Arts. As noted, this recommendation has been endorsed by administrative officials of the institution and by the Board's staff.

Proposed Sale
of Steinberg
Estate Property,
UO HSC

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 23, 1979; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Moore.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Board's staff be authorized to offer for sale two unimproved lots located on North Overlook Terrace in Portland, Oregon. The minimum acceptable bid price for both lots would be $26,000. If sold on contract, the minimum acceptable terms would be 20% down, payable on closing, with the balance payable in equal installments over a period not to exceed 10 years. Payments would include principal and interest. The rate of interest would be comparable to the prime rate in effect at the time the property is advertised for bids. If the advertised invitation to bid results in no acceptable bid, the staff would proceed to negotiate a sale for cash or on contract for not less than the advertised minimum bid price. These procedures are authorized by ORS 273.201, 273.205, 273.211, and 273.216.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wiyas, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

In 1976, the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center received cash, securities and other residue of the estate of Rudolfine Steinberg. Among the residue were two unimproved, contiguous view lots located on the east side of North Overlook Terrace in Portland, Oregon. Each parcel is rectangular in shape and measures 70.5 feet by 333.63 feet; the total area approximates 1.1 acres.

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center executives recommend sale of the property because it cannot be used to carry out the mission of the institution.

The proceeds of the sale will be used in accordance with the will of the late Rudolfine Steinberg which states that the residue of the estate shall "...be invested, and the interest therefrom to be used for annual scholarships for needy students of...[the Physiology] Department."

In accordance with applicable Oregon statutes, appraisals were obtained, a clearance to sell has been requested of the Department of General Services, and a relinquishment of the state's mineral and geothermal rights has been requested of the Division of State Lands.
Proposed Sale of Hutsh Estate Property, UOHSC

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Board's staff be authorized to offer for sale an improved lot containing a single family residence located at 1911 N. E. Hancock, Portland. The minimum acceptable bid price would be $51,000. If sold on contract, the minimum acceptable terms would be 20% down, payable on closing, with the balance payable in equal installments over a period not to exceed 10 years. Payments would include principal and interest. The rate of interest would be comparable to the prime rate in effect at the time the property is advertised for bids. If the advertised invitation to bid results in no acceptable bids, the staff would proceed to negotiate a sale for cash or on contract for not less than the advertised minimum bid price. These procedures are authorized by ORS 273.201, 273.205, 273.211, and 273.216.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ander son, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center has received a partial distribution of the estate of Evelyn Treinies Harsh—two parcels of property, each containing a single family residence. Only one of the parcels is being recommended for sale at this time. The other parcel is not yet fully vacated but is expected to be recommended for sale in the near future. According to Health Sciences Center executives, the property cannot be used to carry out the institution's mission. Remaining assets consist of another improved property in Portland, cash, securities, and two unimproved lots near Long Beach, Washington.

In accordance with applicable Oregon statutes, appraisals were obtained. Clearance to sell has been requested of the Department of General Services, and a relinquishment of the state's mineral and geothermal rights has been requested of the Division of State Lands.

Up-Dated Long-Range Development Plan, PSU

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant February 23, 1979; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Moore.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the up-dated long-range development plan for Portland State University, which has been prepared by institutional officials with the assistance of Campbell Yost Grube Professional Corporation, Architects, and their consultants, be accepted for use as a guide in the future physical development of that campus.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

There was extensive discussion of the housing requirements for Portland State University students. President Blumel indicated that a committee had been appointed to review housing prospects over the next several years. However, the institution has been unable to build student housing at a cost
which students could afford in the vicinity of Portland State University. Housing alternatives in the area of Portland State University, and possibly in more remote locations will be studied.

The possibility of acquiring the Park and Ione Plaza apartments was raised by Mr. Batiste. He asked if the proposed plan would preclude acquiring those apartments in order to meet the needs of this large university in the Portland area. He suggested that perhaps more flexibility with respect to these properties could reduce the cost of development of the long-range plan and eliminate some of the alternative facilities included in the plan. It was stated that the staff would be receptive to the acquisition of the two buildings if it were economically feasible to do so. It was also pointed out that housing in more remote locations would require consideration of transportation in view of the limited parking spaces at Portland State University.

Since housing for an institution as large as Portland State University is an issue, Mr. Batiste said it might be desirable to consider high density developments on campus. This would involve multistory permanent facilities in that location.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hunderup said the development of additional areas for sports and recreation was anticipated and would involve a playing floor with adjacent seating capacity for about 4,000 persons in retractable seating. There is no intention to build a domed stadium as mentioned in a letter sent to Board members representing individuals living in the area.

President Blumel said the space would be an arena area which also could be used for purposes other than sports events. The institution presently has no public space to accommodate a commencement or performance event of reasonable size. The space is not a playing field or domed stadium, or anything which would remotely resemble that kind of operation.

In presenting the plans, Mr. Hunderup commented that contact was made early in the planning of the updated master plan with officials of the Portland Planning Commission. An opportunity has been requested to present the plans to the Planning Commission so that arrangements can be made for public hearings to provide citizens in the area an opportunity to comment on the plans.

Mr. William Neland, Director of the Physical Plant at Portland State University, reviewed the housing situation at the institution. There is a need for low-cost student housing. It is expected that the existing units within the major campus area will be retained and future additional investments recommended. There has been some modification in the downtown building codes which may make it possible to develop reasonable low-cost housing, particularly within the western area of the campus. Housing should be integrated with traffic patterns to minimize traffic and also noise problems for students who work at night and sleep during the day. Housing is required for single students which would offer facilities for preparing meals. The housing above the Student Center would be small scale and would utilize food service and recreational facilities in the building.

Mr. Neland indicated that economics may preclude the development of sufficient housing on campus and solutions to low-cost housing may need to be found elsewhere. This would create additional problems in terms of transportation and parking limitations. Mr. Neland said housing plans must be considered in the perspective of transportation, cost, and the impact on the physical development of the campus, community and city.

March 30, 1979
President Blumel said an agreement had been made with Portland Student Services, which operates student housing for Portland State University, that two student housing facilities on Market Street, between Park and Tenth, would be retained.

Mr. Hunderup indicated these buildings were retained on the drawings of the long-range development plan.

In response to a question concerning the number of units ultimately proposed, it was stated that the plan anticipated that the present 740 units would be increased to approximately 1,000.

In commenting on the projected cost, Mr. Neland said at the present time the units would be required to be of Type I construction because the campus is in Fire Zone I. Those specifications would result in costs in excess of $42,000 for a 600-700 square-foot, one-bedroom, unit. The housing units considered for Parking Structure III were estimated to have a direct construction cost of $48,000. Relaxation of building code requirements might result in a cost of about $30,000. Mr. Neland emphasized that any delay would only increase the expense.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Moore, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

As reported to the Board on January 27, 1978, when notice was provided that arrangements had been made with Campbell Yost Grube Professional Corporation, Portland, for professional services relating to the design and contract administration of Phase I (for Education) of the proposed Professional Schools Building, the Architects were also commissioned to assist in reviewing and updating the master plan which they helped to prepare in 1966 for the physical development of the Portland State University campus.

It was noted that consideration would be given to the future expansion of the Millar Library and the science complex as well as utility distribution systems, and that the Architects would be expected to make recommendations for the incremental development of the campus, including the interim use of land and temporary facilities until the full master plan is achieved.

A comprehensive outline setting forth the basic assumptions and planning objectives upon which the revised plan would be based was prepared by institutional officials and reviewed and approved by the Board's staff prior to the involvement of the Architects in the updating process. Among other matters, it acknowledged the substantial reduction in automotive parking spaces to be provided consistent with the planning of the City of Portland, the accommodation of student housing on the campus (both on an interim and permanent basis), and the potential future growth of the institution to an enrollment of 15,000 to 16,500 Fall Term FTE students. Incremental phasing to reflect the facility requirements for the recently approved ceiling of 10,500 Fall Term FTE students, and a later possible increase to meet the needs of approximately 12,200 students, has been reflected in the plan.

Some background information may be helpful to members of the Board.

In 1960-61, the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill was retained to prepare a development plan for the institution (then Portland State College) which would culminate in facilities for approximately 20,000 FTE undergraduate students. At the time of the study, about 5,000 students were enrolled, and the 1951 report projected facility needs in increments to accommodate 8,000, 8,000, 12,000, 15,000, and 20,000 FTE undergraduates.
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Many of the space factors applied by the Architects were derived from their planning for the Chicago Circle campus of the University of Illinois. For the 20,000 student body at Portland State, the 1961 plan predicted a requirement of 1,606,300 gross square feet of academic and related space, including such auxiliary enterprises as the Student Union. An additional area of 388,000 gross square feet was indicated for automotive parking, derived from the City of Portland code requirement of one off-street parking space for each 10 classroom seats.

The most significant feature and benefit of the 1961 plan was the expansion of the boundaries to embrace areas west of the Park Blocks. Previously, planning for the institution had been confined to the strip between S. W. Broadway and S. W. Park, and between S. W. Market and S. W. Jackson. The Architects evaluated the costs of providing space accommodations within high-rise facilities within those narrow boundaries and contrasted them with costs relating to expansion in new areas. The estimated costs of vertical transportation, such as elevators and escalators, as well as space inefficiencies and high maintenance costs, were primary factors in the decision to pursue westward expansion.

Out of the 1961 plan, sites were identified for the Science complex, the Millar Library and the Health and Physical Education building. A further outgrowth of that plan was the application for federal urban renewal funds to cover a major portion of the cost of acquiring the properties within the newly defined area of development. Later, to fulfill a requirement for the urban renewal project, the institution’s development plan had to be re-examined, and several major factors warranted change, such as revised criteria for parking, the effect of graduate programs on space needs and a determination that because of vibration problems from heavy traffic on S. W. Market Street, additional science facilities needed to be located differently than had been contemplated earlier.

Using space factors of 150 gross square feet for each undergraduate student and 200 gross square feet of building area for graduate students, both on an FTE basis, which fell within a median range for the planning of several urban institutions throughout the country, the 1966 plan which was developed with the assistance of Architects Campbell-Michael-Yost reflected the potential of approximately 3,200,000 gross square feet for academic and auxiliary functions (other than automotive parking) for an enrollment of 20,000 FTE students. Of this number, it was projected that 80% would be undergraduates and 20% would be graduate students. The parking requirements were increased to 6,700 spaces in order to conform to then-current standards of the City of Portland. One of the features of this plan revision was an elevated walkway system linking the east and west portions of the campus. It was expected that these links would be constructed over S. W. Montgomery and S. W. Harrison Street, and would intersect with the proposed Science Building II and the Millar Library. The purposes of the mid-level systems were to expedite student travel at class-break times, to relieve the demand on building elevators, and to reduce the wear and tear on the Park Blocks foreseen by thousands of daily crossings as the west area of the campus developed.

Although the Montgomery bridge element was included in the construction package for Science II, economic and other factors caused that portion of the project to be discarded (or at least delayed), and it has not emerged subsequently.

As an outgrowth of the 1966 plan, the University Services Building was sited, together with Parking Structure II, and two levels of understructure parking were included in the Science II project as the first of several proposed developments of underground parking facilities to reduce the unwanted prospect of seven or eight full-block parking structures ringing the campus. (Subsequently, the parking areas in the lower levels of Science II were converted to laboratory and office spaces leased to the Department of Environmental Quality and the State Health Division.)
After the construction of Science II, the University Services Building and the completion of Cramer Hall, no major new construction has taken place on the campus. As part of the urban renewal project, however, the south Park Blocks within the University boundaries were redeveloped, eliminating automotive traffic in much of the area and creating pedestrian pathways more attuned to crossing the Park Blocks, where existing pathways presumed pedestrian travel parallel to the Park Blocks.

Subsequent to the 1966 plan revision, several fundamental planning concepts of that era have undergone modification. The focus of environmental concerns and the identification of limitations on petroleum-based energy resources brought a total rethinking of transportation modes. Whereas the City was concerned in 1968 that one off-street space for each three FTE students might not be an adequate provision, it later adopted an ordinance which imposed a ceiling of 2,232 spaces on the University. The campus has been identified as a special parking district within the City’s downtown transportation strategy, and must work within this fixed limit.

Another change in the planning parameters is the acceptance by the University of a responsibility to provide housing for students, both to improve access for educational opportunity and to recognize a responsibility to the community with respect to housing. With the concurrence of the Board and the Legislature, nine residential buildings within the campus area have been retained and partially rehabilitated; and a large residential unit, the Ondine, has been acquired and incorporated into the campus boundaries.

A third factor has been the development of enrollment ceilings for the State’s public colleges and universities, which, together with general population trends, requires a re-evaluation of the ultimate size of the institution. In accordance with Board action on January 26, 1979, a ceiling of 10,500 Fall Term FTE students was established for Portland State University. For master planning, it seems appropriate to consider the potential of future growth to a maximum of approximately 15,000 or 15,500 Fall Term FTE students. If the institution is to achieve such an enrollment at some future time, it appears likely that there will be additional growth in the night program as well as a steady increase in graduate programs. Both would have a direct impact upon the physical facilities requirements.

A fourth item of concern in updating the plan is the reality of limited resources for capital construction, thus requiring phased increments for expansion and the need for the best possible sense of cohesion of the campus during a slower period of physical growth than that which occurred in the 1960’s.

Within the campus boundaries, there is a total land area of about 47 acres. Of this, nearly two acres are retained in private ownership (Ione Plaza, Park Plaza, and Koinonia House), and the City of Portland retains ownership of approximately 15 acres for the Park Blocks and non-vacated streets. The remaining area of about 30 acres is owned by the Board. It is buffered on the south and west by the Stadium Freeway, and on the north and east by major arterial streets. S. W. Broadway penetrates the campus in its east portion, and forms a portion of the boundary at the south end. The land to the east of the University is primarily in commercial use, with limited housing to the south between Broadway and S. W. Sixth Avenue. On the north, additional commercial development and additional housing exists. The campus itself is dominated substantially by the 200’ x 200’ grid of the downtown city, and requirements for access for fire fighting equipment and underground utility services will not yield much latitude from this grid, particularly on the east-west axis. One of the goals of the 1966 plan, which is being retained in the proposed current revision, limits the ground coverage to a maximum of 50% of the site area inclusive of the Park Blocks. Using the same space factors per student as those reflected in the earlier plan, as well as the same ratio of undergraduate to graduate enrollment, a total space requirement of about 2,100,000 gross square feet of building area for academic and related functions is produced. Upon the
completion of Phase I of the Professional Schools Building, which was authorized by the 1977 Legislature, the institution will have a total of approximately 1,672,983 square feet of building area exclusive of housing and parking structures. Of this amount, about 56,765 square feet is within structures expected to be razed. It appears reasonable to anticipate that the remaining requirements for as many as 15,500 Fall Term FTE students could be achieved through construction on land presently within the approved boundaries. (As noted in a subsequent section of this report, however, it may be necessary to modify the boundaries to include an additional area of 30,000 square feet if a fourth parking structure is to be constructed at the southeast edge of the campus.)

The present buildings on campus are almost equally divided among those which existed prior to 1952 and those acquired or built since that time. 740 units of student housing are distributed in ten residential buildings, and parking for 1,555 vehicles is located within three structures. Additional surface parking is provided for 555 vehicles. About 90% of the University's classrooms and most of its administrative units are distributed through several buildings bordering S. W. Broadway near the east edge of the campus. The classrooms are integrated among special purpose laboratories, research facilities, and faculty offices for the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences. Health and physical education facilities, science laboratories and offices and the School of Social Work all occur in buildings located in the west portion of the campus.

The campus planning consultants have commented that the existing campus is characterized by a lack of cohesion between east and west, most markedly as a consequence of the preponderance of surface parking and the lack of continuity in the treatment of landscaping, furnishings, and pedestrian walkways throughout the west campus. They suggest that the means by which to maintain and extend the continuity and integration of spaces and facilities appropriate to an urban university can be found in the concept of small plazas and pedestrian malls such as those they propose in the plan up-date. They state that "By redesigning vacated streets as major pedestrian networks and surfacing these walkways in a manner similar to existing finishes, two major objectives can be met: the movement of large numbers of people in brief time spans and the creation of the visual cohesion sorely needed between the east and west campus areas."

The updated plan reflects the proposed completion of the Professional Schools Building on the east side of S. W. Broadway, directly across from the Smith Memorial Center, to bring together the Schools of Education, Business Administration, Urban Affairs, and Social Work. The site of the proposed Science III unit, immediately south of Science II, will require the removal of one residential building and a temporary maintenance facility. A new maintenance unit would be constructed north of the west heating plant in a peripheral location. The first expansion of the Millar Library would occur on the east side of the building, allowing the collection to exceed 676,000 volumes. The proposed Recreation and Sports Facilities, for which legislative authorization is being requested as part of the Board's capital construction program for auxiliary enterprises in 1979-1981, would be located north of the existing Health and Physical Education Building. The completion of Parking Structure III, also in the 1979-1981 program requests, would permit the closure of nearly all surface parking west of the Park Blocks and offer the first real opportunity to develop the west portion of the campus in a manner architecturally related to the surface improvements existing in the east campus area. As this physical growth is achieved to accommodate the present ceiling of 15,500 Fall Term FTE students, some internal reorganization of space allocation will occur, but to a limited degree. The primary benefits will be the expansion of academic and related activities in the west campus, including an increase in classroom stations in that area, moving toward a more even balance of activity on either side of the Park Blocks.
To achieve the ultimate long-range capacity for as many as 15,500 students, on a Fall Term FTE basis, a series of additions to existing buildings and new construction would be required. One of the new units would be an Administrative Services Center across the Park Blocks from the Smith Memorial Center to allow the University to relocate all administrative services now distributed in various buildings, thus providing growth opportunities for those academic units which are now the primary occupants. The campus planners note that at this location, the public use of these services can be improved greatly because of the site's singular access to a non-arterial street and through the provision of short-term parking under the facility. The proposed Center's proximity to the Park Blocks, and its relatively small size, would provide an opportunity also to expand the park-like open space to the west.

Although some student housing existing in 1979 would be displaced, the long-range plan projects not only its replacement, but also an increase in the number of units. Within the west campus area bounded by Market and Harrison Streets, 11th and 12th Avenues, several low-rise one-bedroom apartment structures would be constructed for shared occupancy (family) housing. South of Shattuck Hall, a mid-rise building would be provided for single-student housing of a bachelor-type, featuring either individual or congregate kitchen facilities. If economics permit, a level of residential parking could be provided for this unit as well as in the west campus area housing complex. A third housing opportunity could be realized in a more traditional dormitory facility to be constructed as a vertical tower addition to the Smith Center, utilizing food service and recreational facilities already existing in that building. Once these plans are achieved, the housing inventory on campus would be increased from the present level of 740 units to approximately 1,000 units (40% allocated to shared-occupancy; 40% to self-contained single-student housing; and 20% to dormitory housing).

In anticipation of an improvement in the University's share of off-street parking in the downtown zone from 2,232 spaces to 3,600 spaces (exclusive of residential parking), the plan includes the potential for a fourth major parking structure. It would be located south of S. W. Hall Street between S. W. 6th Avenue and S. W. Broadway (immediately south of Parking Structure I and west of the Odine Residence Hall). Such a structure would require the expansion of the campus boundary at that location to include an additional 30,000 square feet of land, south and east of East Hall. The development of commercial and retail space opportunities at the grade level of such a structure would be given serious consideration, not only to replace those activities displaced through construction, but also to abide by the City of Portland's guidelines urging inclusion of such facilities in all parking structures within the downtown area. Pending a determination by the City that this additional allocation of parking spaces would be granted to Portland State University, a specific recommendation for the modification of the campus boundaries is not being presented for Committee or Board action.

A two-story addition to the maintenance facility west of the proposed Recreation and Sports Facilities is projected to provide office and activity space in support of instructional functions for Health and Physical Education.

The expansion of the Millar Library to 10 floor levels above grade would be required to meet the needs of the projected student enrollment and the expansion of the collection. Except for this particular facility, where special consideration would have to be requested, the proposed campus development would fall well within the planning guidelines for floor area and ground coverage established by the City of Portland. By providing some areas of open space at the edges of the campus, there would be protection against the adjacency of large building masses counterpointed along the major arterial boundary streets. As the campus planners have indicated, "This softening of the edges anticipates the emergence of larger structures north and east of the university, as the private sector continues to develop
residential and commercial facilities." They indicated further that a major
unifying theme of the campus plan would be achieved through the develop-
ment of pedestrian circulation and open areas, where the continuity of
materials, furnishings and landscaping would set off the campus as an
identifiable element. Plazas would occur within the Professional Building
complex, as a forecourt to the future Administrative Services Center, and
between Science III and the Recreation and Sports Facilities. Typically,
newly formed pedestrian walkways would be surfaced in a manner similar to
the existing finishes on the east campus. Other less active open spaces,
grassed and landscaped, would occur throughout the campus.

A major goal of the long-term plan would be to contain vehicular traffic
exclusively on those arterial streets peripheral to the campus proper. The
only exceptions would be the maintenance of public right-of-way loops
serving the Lone Plaza and the Park Plaza, the two privately-owned apart-
ment buildings on campus. The Lone Plaza loop would afford the University
an opportunity to provide public access to the proposed Administrative
Services Center. By continuing the process of establishing permanent
parking structures along the periphery of the campus, the need to introduce
vehicles into the academic area would be eliminated, or minimized, while
providing a most efficient way of intercepting automotive traffic from the
freeway system and returning that traffic with minimum travel on public
streets. A minimum of 26 feet of paved or hard-surfaced roadway would be
planned on all north-south and east-west pedestrian malls allowing emergency
and service vehicle access to all campus buildings.

Graphic interpretations of the up-dated master plan, as recommended for
approval, will be available for review at the meeting of the Committee when
this agenda item is presented.

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service
Programs, February 23, 1979; present--Carpenter, Feves, Thorp, Wyss.)

In view of the continued concern expressed in the state about the possible
excess production of teachers, the Board's staff, in cooperation with the
deans and directors of teacher education of the institutions, are reviewing
again teacher education programs in the State System to determine whether
certain programs leading to certification should be discontinued or admission
to existing programs restricted.

At its February 23, 1979, meeting, the Committee considered a report on
teacher education programs leading to the basic norm or certificate. The
review of programs leading to graduate certificates and endorsements will be
presented to the Board's Committee at its April 23, 1979, meeting.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

With respect to those teaching fields in which the number of teachers pro-
duced is significantly greater than the number of job openings in Oregon
for new beginning teachers, i.e., art, foreign languages, health and physical
education, and social studies, the Board's Office recommends the following:

1. That, although good progress has been made in reducing the production
   of art and social studies teachers, each institution must continue to
   exercise careful surveillance of its production and placement of teachers
   in these teaching fields, so that the ratio of production and demand
   will continue to improve.

2. That the institutions assure in a systematic, orderly way that students
   entering the teacher preparation program in foreign languages under-
   stand (a) the limited employment market for foreign language teachers,
   and (b) the desirability of completing a second teaching norm in an
   area in which employment is more readily available.