have expanded the opportunities for service. Physical plant maintenance funds are at a low level and must be used primarily for remedial rather than preventive efforts. President Laster concluded by saying that the 2% proposal might be realistic from some points of view, but would present a real dilemma to the institutions.

Mr. Ingalls commented that the situation is not unique at the Health Sciences Center, as President Laster had pointed out. He said a percentage system, with a realistic figure in mind, appears to be the only feasible process unless an entirely different budget process is developed.

Mr. Holmer said the percentage could be increased but this would involve a substantial amount of documentation for the proposed range of priorities. This results in profound disillusionment when the allocations are minimal.

Mr. Keith Jackson said it was not intended to establish a 2% maximum. The 2% is described only as a dollar magnitude for guidance in assessing what a percentage figure might cost. The Committee could alter that to any chosen percentage. Academic salaries are another factor. A 5% improvement in the existing salary base, plus the associated other payroll expense, together with the 2% program improvement for Education and General Services, amounts to approximately $20 million in total program improvement. This may be as much as can be expected. He suggested that it would be advisable to determine whether academic salaries are to be incorporated.

Mr. Batiste said it had been his understanding this would be the year in which the issue of System-wide maintenance would be addressed. He said he was referring to major maintenance in the capital construction budget and the possibility of a moratorium on all new construction. He said the Board should look at the 1980's and be bold enough to speculate on some new approaches to the budget process. A differentiation between quality improvements and program improvements would be desirable with a determination of costs which could be presented to the Legislature.

President Boyd concurred with the statements of President Laster and advocated the occasional construction of a budget that is not predesigned by formula but grows out of a description of what each institution believes are its unmet needs. It is true that such an approach brings false expectations if it is done too often. It creates frustration and erodes confidence in the process. But unless an honest budget that reflects the best judgment of the campus personnel about institutional requirements is prepared occasionally, neither the Board nor the Legislature really has a way of gauging how close the formula approximates the true situation. If the Legislatures provides an approximation of the requests, but they have been limited in the first place, then the Legislature really is not addressing the actual needs. President Boyd said the bitter irony is to hear the education budget referred to in the final days of the Legislature in terms of the mediocrity of higher education in Oregon at a time when the budget constraints that were imposed at the very beginning of the process dampen aspirations.

Mr. Holmer said that in addition to the work schedule proposed for the budget preparation, it is assumed that there will be estimated resources for the 1981-1983 budget in about the same distribution of general cash funds and other income as there is in the present budget. It is further assumed tuition will be determined in accordance with the percentages. Mr. Holmer said the Committee might with to encourage the presentation of institutional aspirations as advocated by Presidents Laster and Boyd. Finally, the staff should be advised on whether academic salaries should be treated as program improvement or separated in the traditional manner.

Mr. Batiste said the time schedule was too restrictive and there would be no opportunity for discussion of philosophical issues. He said he wanted to see some evidence of new philosophy and new thinking in the budget preparation process.
Mr. Ingalls said he would like the budgets from the institutions to be constructed so that the Board could get a full idea of what is really needed. He said he would favor letting the Legislature make the political decisions on the basis of the presentation.

Mr. Thorp said the budget should be realistic. However, there are genuine needs and improvements in quality that should be presented regardless of the political implications.

Mr. Ater said the needs should be documented but he was concerned about removing any kind of limitation. The requirements for budget documentation are a significant burden, and if the background material is prepared with little or no prospect of receiving any attention by the Legislature, it might not be the best use of institutional resources. Mr. Ater said he was reluctant to raise false expectations, given the present Legislative and political climate.

The Chancellor said the September 1 deadline is a requirement from which other dates in the budget process are determined, so the schedule presented must be followed substantially in order to meet the September 1, 1980, deadline specified by the Executive Department for presentation of the budget. The innovations being urged should be considered and built into the budget presentation to the extent possible, but the State System must still present a budget in accordance with the instructions received from the Executive Department.

Mr. Batiste expressed disappointment that the time element would again preclude any opportunity to do what he considered to be a compelling obligation of the Board.

The Chancellor said there could be more frequent meetings of the Board's Committee so that the accomplishment of a set of goals might prove to be realistic under the schedule, but there is little flexibility in the schedule itself.

Mr. Ater said additional meetings had been held in the spring of 1978 and would be particularly necessary in 1980 if the 2% limitation on program improvement requests were removed.

After some discussion of the workload involved, it was agreed that the institutions would submit a statement indicating the nature of the things which the institutions would like to have under optimum conditions. It was understood that the requests would be on an order of magnitude basis without the details of costs and without a percentage limitation. They would not be presented in the required Legislative form but in a less formal statement listed in order of importance. Presentation of the material is scheduled for the February Committee meeting.

President Boyd cautioned against the suggestion that capital construction money be diverted to provide funds for these unmet needs. He said the state is more than a decade behind in meeting the capital construction requirements already identified for higher education. Quality will not be achieved by eliminating capital construction.

Dr. James Tattersall, State President of the Oregon Association of Faculties, said the position of that organization is to encourage the Board to convey its salary improvement request to the Executive Department at the same time as the regular higher education budget. He reviewed previous presentations with respect to the erosion of academic salaries and the effect on academic quality. He expressed appreciation for statements recognizing the salary problem.

Dr. Tattersall said special attention in high priority to salary improvements requires early submission of the Board's recommendations so that they will receive full consideration. Otherwise, salary improvements will be deferred.
until later in the session, received cursory discussion, and will, in effect, be limited to the result of bargaining with organizations representing classified employees.

Mr. Ater commented that the Board was clearly on record as believing that academic salary improvement is a desirable goal. It will take substantial effort and cooperation to achieve the goal. It was agreed that academic salary improvement be presented in the Board's biennial budget.

It was agreed also that tuition in the next biennium will be based on the same percentages of cost of instruction as used in the current budget, although it was noted that tuition levels might be high enough that additional consideration would need to be given to the matter.

Mr. Ingalls requested that Board members receive exactly the same budget document as that received by the Ways and Means Committee.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations, together with the understandings expressed during the Committee discussion.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Lemman explained Item 4 in the staff report under the base budget. The target for 1981 is an 80%-20% split, with 80% being financed by tuition and 20% from the General Fund. The split is presently 75%-25% and is expected to go to 75%-25% or 77%-23% by the end of the first year of the biennium, with the 80%-20% beginning in 1981.

Mr. Wyss mentioned the earlier discussion requesting the presidents to bring forward informally a number of concerns, noting that it had not been decided whether the Board would determine priorities or present the entire list to the Legislature.

Mr. Ingalls said it was the Committee's thinking that the staff and the Board would review the total list and perhaps reduce it to some extent but that the Legislature should be educated relative to the needs of the institutions to make them quality institutions. It would be expected that the Legislature would then make the difficult decisions.

Mr. Wyss said he disagreed with that philosophy. The Board should make the hard decisions.

Mr. Ingalls said he did not believe the legislators really knew what the institutions needed and if the Board reduces the list from the institutions before it reaches the legislators, then they never will be aware of the actual requirements for quality education.

Mrs. Carpenter suggested that if the proposals were submitted, after careful consideration and an indication of priorities, that would fulfill the Board's obligation.

Mr. Wyss said perhaps more of the process should be displayed to the Legislature by showing the legislators the total list and the Board's priorities.

Mr. Ingalls said this was an idealistic approach but a member of the Ways and Means Committee would ignore the items which were discarded. If everything is in the proposal, at least a decision would have to be made on each proposal.

Mrs. Green suggested the possibility of two budgets—one to include the things necessary to provide quality education and the other to include those which are absolutely essential if money is the prime concern.
Mr. Harms said it should be possible to devise a system which would make the Legislature aware of the situation in the institutions and at the same time would not abandon the Board’s responsibility to make choices or to indicate an order of importance.

Mr. Lemman said that it had been his understanding that the primary aim of the Committee had been to remove the arbitrary 2% limitation on the program improvement requests. It was not understood that everything the institutions brought back as a result of this effort was going to be passed on to the Legislature without review or without comment or judgment on the part of the Board. Mr. Lemman said it would be possible to do all of the things that had been discussed. It is expected the institutions will develop a large list with order of magnitude costs and brief justifications for each item. Presumably, the Committee or the Board would make preliminary judgments indicating support or disapproval. Once these tentative decisions are made, Mr. Lemman said he would anticipate that the institutions would create specific budget requests with appropriate documentation for consideration by the Committee or the Board at the April meeting. The institutions would suggest a priority for the items within their own lists. Mr. Lemman also commented that some improvement requests might be common to most or all of the institutions and could be consolidated into a System request. There might be a combination of a System-wide request and institutional requests.

The Chancellor commented that if efforts to communicate the magnitude of the needs to key people in the Legislature until the beginning of the session, it would be very difficult to get a hearing. In the last biennium, the Executive Department was informed early and the results were beneficial. Communicating this information at an early date to legislators is essential, even though the process may not fit neatly into a budget schedule and an election schedule.

Mr. Batiste commented that in the visitation to the University of Oregon it was apparent that in many instances a small investment could make an immense difference in quality. He said this had been the spirit behind the action of the Committee. He said he hoped discussion of the A and B budgets would not diminish that effort. He said he would like the institutions to present to the Board the kinds of improvements that should be made, together with the justification in terms of quality and efficiency and the cost benefit of the improvement. Mrs. Green commented that there were advantages to an A and B budget. If the institutions were permitted to submit to the Ways and Means Committee their aspiration budgets as well as the other budgets, they would do a better job of setting their own priorities and being able to persuade the Legislature or the Ways and Means Committee that these were the things that were absolutely essential to improve quality.

Mr. Ingalls said an automatic cutoff, such as 2%, limited the Board’s knowledge of what the institutions actually need.

Mr. Wyss said Board members gain a knowledge of the priorities for the institutions throughout the year. He said salaries and maintenance of capital equipment are very high. However, if the Board in frustration decides that funding is a political process beyond the Board’s willingness to control, then the Board becomes only an advocate for the System and does not represent the people whom it is supposed to represent. That would be the end of the Board as an effective body to control the System, defending it at some times and criticizing it at other times. Mr. Wyss supported the concept of an A and B budget so that the Board could review the total aspirations, but the process should not end there. The Board must make some decisions with respect to the requests.

President Laster said the goal at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center was to make sure that regardless of what is done with the information, the institution would have the opportunity to impart to the Board a clear sense of the range of opportunities where small investments would turn an
activity toward excellence. In other cases, there are gaping holes which are under-served. The presentation will include a traditional statement of program improvement requests, together with a statement from the dean of each school setting the requests in a context of the problems, needs, and opportunities, not just for the 1981-1983 biennium; but also, if the requests are submitted, the Board will determine what happens to them, but the process will create a very different feeling than the 2% cutoff which gives a feeling of futility because the needs will never be understood. The result may be the same, but at least the Board will know what it is buying and what it is not buying.

The Board discussed whether the lists should be prioritized at the institutions.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the understanding that general priorities would be indicated by the institutions with respect to program improvement requests. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Green, Harms, Ingalls, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

The Board's staff has begun planning toward development of the 1981-1983 Biennial Budget Request. Toward this end, the staff report has been structured to apprise the Committee of tentative staff proposals and to obtain direction for preparation of more detailed planning guidelines to be submitted for Board review early in 1980.

Format Planning

The Office of Administration has met with Executive Department and Legislative Fiscal Office budget analysts to develop and improve budget format and presentation. While relatively minor change is expected in the kinds of information submitted, there is general agreement that two documents will be provided. One would contain detailed workpapers of use primarily to the analyst. The other would contain summary information for legislative review. Specific format design is still under consideration.

The Executive Department has indicated that the Higher Education request is not to be submitted in the Alternative Program Levels System (APLS), the Oregon approach to zero-based budgeting, for 1981-1983. It is expected that APLS be utilized by all state agencies in 1983-1985.

Response to Budget Notes

The Budget Notes contained in the 1979-1981 Budget Report require attention to special submissions for 1981-1983. The Health Sciences Center is to submit a comprehensive five-year plan that includes:

1. The role of the Center in influencing the number, geographic distribution, and specialty coverage of physicians in Oregon.
2. The potential role of the Center in affecting the scope and delivery of health care services in Oregon.
3. The range of tertiary care services the Center should be expected to provide.
4. The extent and nature of the resources needed by the Center to support its services to the state.

The legislative concern for improvement in the quality of rural health care was evidenced also by a request for a report to the 1981 Legislature by the Health Sciences Center of appropriate and feasible means of modifying the Center's programs to support such improvement. Possible areas of modification include the Center's primary care training programs, continuing education of health professionals, and community education.
The Cooperative Extension Service was directed to explore alternative methods for identifying and presenting program priorities within the base budget for 1981-1983. This planning is under way in work sessions with the Divisions, Executive Department, and Board’s Budget Division. The project has been expanded to include the Agricultural Experiment Station and Forest Research Laboratory. This effort will have relevance to the conversion to the APLS format for 1983-1985.

Base Budget Presentation

Current plans call for utilization of the 1980-81 annual budgets as a base line for calculating the 1981-1983 base request. The 1980-81 budget represents the legislatively-authorized expenditure plan adjusted for subsequent Emergency Board revisions and salary adjustment funding.

Calculation of the 1981-1983 base budget will require adjustments for:

1. Salary levels consistent with the 1979-1981 end-of-biennium rates applicable to staff as the result of the series of mid-biennium increases built into the current salary increase agreements.

   It is assumed that the calculations will be built on the maximum rates applicable in settlements affected by increases in the Consumer Price Index, since budget preparation will occur before actual rates of inflation are known. Such calculations will be subject to review and revision if actual rates fall below the maximum.

2. Inflation allowances on services and supplies, capital outlay, library books, and energy items at percentage rates to be determined. Such allowances should be designed to maintain the purchasing power of currently authorized expenditure levels.

3. Enrollment changes for each institution, based upon the variable cost of instruction and constrained by the program stabilization and enrollment ceiling policies currently in effect.

4. Summer session expenditure levels which are 80% supported from tuition (20% state General Fund). This guideline results from implementation of actions by the 1979 Legislature to move toward that fund split in 1980-81 and require its full utilization in 1981-1983.

Workload Increase

It is proposed that institutions and divisions be given the opportunity to submit workload increase requests for Board review. If such a procedure is followed, guidelines will be established as a framework for preparation of such requests. The staff will provide recommended guidelines for review by the Board in January 1980. Subsequently, institutions would provide workload requests for Board review. Should this procedure be acceptable to the Committee, advice to the staff on guidelines and constraints would be helpful. One traditional constraint has been that workload increase requests may not apply to enrollment increases (which are provided for through formula funding). In recent biennia, workload increases have generally been changes in work effort required by new state or federal regulations.

Program Improvements

The decisions about budget requests for program improvement begin with the identification of needs either for program additions (new services) or for qualitative improvement in the provision of existing services. Although some recommended program improvements may be unique to one institution, program improvements that benefit all institutions (e.g., library enhancements, building rehabilitation, equipment replacement) appear to have been preferred by the Board and the legislature. Consideration of Systemwide program improvements priorities in the Education and General Services portion of the budget focuses on significant policy issues and does not
require interinstitutional priority decisions. The program improvements for the Statewide Public Service Divisions have been (and should probably continue to be) submitted as separately prioritized lists.

It was the staff recommendation that Systemwide program improvements be established for the Education and General Services Program and that individual items be presented by Statewide Public Service Divisions, within an overall dollar limit.

If the Committee wishes to pursue this approach, the staff will confer with institution presidents and propose for Board consideration a prioritized list of Systemwide improvements for Education and General Services. Statewide Public Service Divisions will consult with their respective advisory boards and present requests in priority order. Dollar limits, if desired by the Committee, may be established as a percent of the 1979-1981 authorized expenditure level. Two percent of the 1979-1981 program authorization, before salary adjustments, provides a dollar magnitude of the requests to guide the Committee in recommending an improvement limit.

### 1979-1981 Program Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>% Improvement 1981-1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and General Services</td>
<td>$395,058,388</td>
<td>$7,901,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>121,245,155</td>
<td>2,424,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled Children's Division</td>
<td>12,550,992</td>
<td>251,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Clinics</td>
<td>1,967,552</td>
<td>39,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>23,777,758</td>
<td>475,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>28,536,554</td>
<td>570,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Research Laboratory</td>
<td>5,432,988</td>
<td>108,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEPBS</td>
<td>3,750,635</td>
<td>75,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Instruction</td>
<td>20,128,132</td>
<td>142,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDSL/Health Professions Student Loans</td>
<td>7,114,821</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic Salary Adjustments**

In previous discussions, the Board has indicated an intention to make a special effort to secure general improvement in the scale of academic salaries. Although salary adjustment is not a "program improvement" item, salary adequacy is clearly a factor in the quality of academic programs. The Committee may wish to consider whether to submit its academic salary recommendation as a part of the initial budget submission, rather than holding it for later presentation, as has been traditional. Placing such a request in the initial budget document would, of course, place salary adjustment in more direct competition with requests for "program improvement."

**Resource Estimates**

It was the recommendation of the Board's staff that the 1981-1983 request continue the State General Fund/Other Fund mix of resources at approximately the percentages currently authorized for the operating programs. Some deviation from this general objective may be necessary, particularly in the Statewide Public Service Divisions, if federal resources and other fund resource capability do not keep pace with program expenditures or requests are for General Fund supported program improvements.

For the Education and General Services Program, this resource policy would require that tuition be set at currently established percentages of the cost of instruction.

**Other Issues**

As the budget cycle proceeds, additional policy issues will be identified and brought to the Board. Reciprocity with Washington (resident tuition rates),
continuation of the phase down of international student fee remissions, funding of third and fourth year program levels for Veterinary Medicine, are examples.

Scheduling

The Biennial Budget process is intended to deliver a Board-approved request to the Executive Department by September 1, 1980. Interim presentations to the Board will be designed to produce Board policies and guidelines for preparation of the documents and Board review of the budgetary impact of those decisions. Tentative schedule provides for Board review of:

- Workload Increase and Program Improvement policies
- 1980-81 Annual Budget (establishes biennial base line)
- Workload Increase and Program Improvement approvals
- Base Budget review and approvals
- Final Board policy approvals of Biennial Request
- Staff preparation of documents for delivery to Executive Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workload Increase and Program Improvement</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies</td>
<td>February-March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81 Annual Budget (establishes biennial</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base line)</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload Increase and Program Improvement</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approvals</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Budget review and approvals</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Board policy approvals of Biennial</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff preparation of documents for delivery</td>
<td>1980-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Executive Department</td>
<td>July-August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review of Graduate Programs

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, December 14, 1979; present--Carpenter, Anderson, Harms, and Wyss.)

The Board of Higher Education has instituted regular and systematic reviews of graduate programs under its jurisdiction.

The 1978-79 review, covering graduate programs in political science, sociology, economics, urban studies, and geography has been completed. This review is the second phase of a three-phase review of graduate programs offered at more than one of the State System institutions in the same discipline.

The following is a listing of the specific programs reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Master's Programs</th>
<th>Doctoral Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the results of the review follows:

1. All the programs are of sound basic quality.

While recommendations were made for improving the quality of some of the programs reviewed, most particularly in respect to computer services, teaching assistants, and improvement of research and publications records of faculties, it is clear the consultants found graduate education in the social sciences in Oregon of sound quality.
The programs are in good position to make the adjustments needed to continue to serve the people of Oregon in graduate education in the social sciences in the 1980's.

The only disagreement with this conclusion was made on philosophical grounds by two of the six consultants reviewing the interdisciplinary Ph.D. program in urban studies at Portland State University.

The economics consultants found the urban studies faculty "generally of high caliber," and the students intelligent and enthusiastic. However, these consultants went on to express their grave personal reservations about development of interdisciplinary Ph.D. programs in general, and about development of these programs at institutions which do not offer Ph.D. programs in the component disciplines in particular, because, they said, without doctoral level training in a discipline, students are unable to "undertake research that will be recognized as such by scholars." This bias in respect to interdisciplinary programs, common in the academic world, was reinforced for the economics consultants by the fact that there was no senior urban economist faculty representative available with whom they could consult concerning the PSU program. Of the six pairs of consultants reviewing PSU's doctoral interdisciplinary programs (three pairs reviewing environmental sciences and resources in 1977-78, and three pairs reviewing urban studies in 1978-79), this is the only instance in which consultants have questioned the level of scholarship which can be achieved in these programs, and it is the only instance consultants were not able to review research underway with faculty from their own discipline. In fact, economics is not a strong component of the PSU urban studies program, a situation PSU is moving to rectify.

2. The programs are making valuable contributions to the state and the nation in research and in providing needed manpower at an advanced level for colleges and universities, business, industry, government, and non-profit organizations.

Placement of graduates is good; the majority have been placed in positions directly related to their area of specialization.

Enrollments are being adjusted to reflect decreased societal needs during the next ten years for college and university teachers.

In only a single program, the master's degree program in geography at Portland State University, is production at or expected to approach a level which would subject the program to Board review as a low production program. Portland State is addressing this problem.

3. The programs are not duplicatory at the doctoral level. Duplication at the master's level is limited.

The doctoral degree programs in political science, sociology, and economics at the University of Oregon are the only doctoral degree programs in these fields in the state.

The doctoral program in urban studies at Portland State University, while drawing to a considerable degree on political science, sociology, and economics for its content, is interdisciplinary and has its own unique emphasis and characteristics.

In geography, both the University of Oregon and Oregon State University have doctoral programs. However, in the view of the consultants, "There may be no two graduate geography programs in the United States more unlike than those at Corvallis and Eugene." The University of Oregon program is largely unstructured with a humanistic-cultural emphasis aimed mainly at producing scholars; the Oregon State University program is highly structured, with a strong applied orientation designed to train practitioners with high-level skills in resource and physical geography.
Five of the 10 master's programs are not duplicatory: urban studies, sociology programs at the University of Oregon and Portland State University, and the geography programs at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. Programs in economics, political science, and geography at Portland State University duplicate to some extent opportunities in these fields at the University of Oregon in that the University of Oregon admits some students to these programs who do not plan to continue their studies beyond the master's degree. However, the primary function of the master's degree programs in these fields at the University is to prepare students for the doctoral program. The master's programs at Portland State University focus more heavily on the needs of students who are vocationally-oriented and for whom the master's program is a terminal degree.

4. Academic computer facilities and services at the three state universities are being upgraded.

Without exception, the consultants pointed out the critical need for improved computer facilities at the University of Oregon and Portland State University.

The need for sophisticated computer facilities for research in the "hard" sciences has long been recognized. Much of the research that is emerging in the social sciences also requires highly sophisticated computer capabilities involving the manipulation of large data sets, e.g. census, voting records.

Steps are being taken to improve academic computer facilities in the State System. A new computer (Honeywell 6620) has been installed at Portland State University (fall 1979). The University of Oregon is seeking an interim replacement for its PDP 10, and a long-term replacement of the capability of the PDP 10 and its present IBM 360/50 in the next two years. It is planned to replace the CDC 3300 at Oregon State University this year (1979-80).

5. Faculties and administrators of the programs at the respective institutions are reviewing actions needed to respond to recommendations of the consultants (1) to correct weaknesses identified in the programs, and (2) to strengthen the programs' abilities to maintain educational quality and fiscal responsibility during a decade of stable or reduced enrollment.

The consultants strongly emphasized the need for additional state support, even if modest, for faculty research activities and student assistantships. The consultants reviewing the graduate programs in science in 1977-78 made a similar recommendation, resulting in approval by the Board of Higher Education of a program improvement request for the 1979-1981 biennium for one million dollars to support non-sponsored research in the Oregon colleges and universities, which was not funded.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that the Board:

1. Accept the report of the review of graduate programs in political science, sociology, economics, urban studies, and geography.

2. Authorize continuation of the programs by the respective institutions.

3. Continue to seek a modest but critical improvement in state support for these programs, and for graduate programs generally, to provide:
a. Increased support for the initial research activities of faculty members.

The total amount budgeted for research grants and contracts in 1978-79 in the six departments with doctoral programs involved in the review was slightly more than one million dollars. The urban studies program at Portland State University accounted for $617,000 of that total, with amounts ranging from $27,000 to $118,000 in the other programs.

State support would provide critical assistance to faculty members to enable them, during an initial or interim period, to demonstrate the ability to produce research of a quality which can command external support. In that sense, it is "seed money" which has a multiplicative effect.

b. More support for research and teaching assistantships.

Additional funds should be provided for assistantships, with a few of these being funded at a level high enough to attract truly outstanding students.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Romney summarized progress of the Board in its review of existing programs, the procedures followed in the current series of review of graduate programs offered in more than one institution, and the results of the review of graduate programs in economics, geography, political science, sociology, and urban studies.

Mrs. Carpenter noted that presenting the results of comprehensive reviews in summary form is very difficult. She suggested that issues and considerations the Committee would like to address in its discussion were needs of the programs in respect to (1) academic computing, (2) funding of faculty research, (3) graduate assistants, and (4) travel.

University of Oregon Programs. Dr. Olum introduced Dr. Henry Goldstein, head of the department of economics; Dr. Al Urquhart, geography; Dr. Ben Johnson, sociology; and Dr. Harmon Zeigler, representing Dr. Larry Pierce, head of the department of political science.

Dr. Zeigler reported that the department of political science reacted favorably to the recommendations of the consultants. The department is moving ahead to implement a more structured program and to provide students with a uniform package of courses and information that will give a sense guarantee that they will receive an education which will enable them to be placed into institutions that are comparable in status with the University of Oregon or higher. He said the department has been quite successful in obtaining non-state research funds, which has enabled the department to maintain a critical mass of graduate students, all of whom are receiving some support.

Obtaining outside grant funds is very difficult for the younger faculty members of the department, however, because they do not have the funds or released time to establish themselves in the research field.

Dr. Goldstein, reporting for the department of economics, said the overriding problem for the department was securing adequate funds for student support to attract the really good American doctoral student. In order to compete for the best students with institutions like the University of Washington, the department needs to be able to offer first-year awards at about $4,000-$5,000, he said. The result is that although the department gets a considerable number of applications from good U. S. students, only a few with strong regional preference enroll. In response to this situation, the department has been constrained to accept an unusually large percentage of its students from abroad, and while some of these students are very good, their language abilities are limited, making it difficult to utilize their services
in the classroom. The department's failure to be as vigorous as it might be in seeking non-state research funds reflects in part the problems resulting from its inability to enroll as many good American doctoral students as it would like.

Dr. Olum indicated that competition for graduate students varies among academic fields. He said the $5,000 figure mentioned by Dr. Goldstein is higher than is customary at the University of Oregon, but would place the University in a competitive position nationally in economics. He noted that the University of Oregon does not fund a set number of graduate assistant-ships for a department, but rather allocates the department a set fund, which it may split up as it chooses. The standard award is for .30 FTE he said. This is expected to become .40 FTE in 1980-81. If the department of economics wants to make $5,000 awards to top students it can do so, he observed, but it would have practically nothing then to give to other students.

Dr. Johnson reported that the department of sociology makes all of its teaching assistant awards at .15 FTE. In this way it can fund twice as many students as if it awarded .30 FTE assignments. As a result 90% of the department's 45-47 students are funded with stipends of approximately $2,000 each.

Dr. Zeigler said the regionalization of graduate programs at the University of Oregon is a serious problem and is the direct result of the inability of the University to offer top-notch students from the mid-west and east competitive fellowships. He said the department of political science is not competitive in attracting good students from outside the region insofar as stipends are concerned. However, quality of faculty is also important and some good students come to the department because of its nationally and internationally known scholars.

Dr. Johnson said the department of sociology had not suffered regionalization to the extent reported by political science, but it does lose some attractive applicants because it does not offer competitive stipends. Graduate enrollments have declined since the 1960's, but overall the students are of higher caliber and serious motivation. The department has a good reputation in some areas of sociology not present in all institutions, and has critical masses of faculty doing research in several important areas. The most pressing need of the department, he said, is strengthening of the senior staff, which has suffered serious attrition. Fortunately, the department will be able to hire one and possibly two new persons over the next two years.

Seed money to assist junior faculty in getting started in research, travel money, and money with which the department may bring in outside speakers are all inadequate. He noted that bringing in speakers who can spend a few days on the campus enables students and faculty to exchange ideas with well-known people in the field at comparatively little cost. The department is in the process of negotiating a faculty exchange with an eastern state university, which may result in some very beneficial cross-fertilization without costing the institutions any money.

Dr. Urquhart reported that the situation in geography parallels that in other departments. The master's program has remained at approximately the same level as in the past, but the student body has become much more regional in character. The Ph.D. program has declined somewhat in numbers and will continue to decline, because of the decline in the academic job market; but even with a smaller number it is drawing on a national market which is becoming increasingly competitive. Most of the students who come to the University of Oregon program are highly motivated because of the distinctive characteristics of the program, but some are lost during the second year because the department is unable to provide the support needed. The department is reluctant to offer one or two good stipends when most of the students are getting .20 FTE, about $3,200.
The department, which is one of the smallest in the University, would benefit greatly, he said, by being able to bring in outside specialists for a week or two at a time to interact with the students and faculty. He said this was probably the most important need of the department.

Mr. Anderson asked if the decline in enrollment in the University of Oregon program might be due to its rather unstructured nature as compared with the Oregon State University program, which provide rigorous training in job skills. Dr. Urquhart said the University of Oregon was aware of the changing job market for its graduates and was modifying the program to provide more skills for nonacademic employment.

Doctors Zeigler and Johnson reported that enrollments in their graduate programs had also declined, primarily in response to the academic job market. Graduates in all four departments are finding jobs, but these jobs more often than in the past are in nonacademic settings, and academic placement, more often than formerly, is at less prestigious institutions.

Mr. Wyss said the testimony of the department heads appeared to lead to several conclusions:

1. The decision as to whether to spread teaching assistant funds broadly over as many graduate students as possible or to concentrate the funds in a few good awards is a decision made by the individual department.

2. The ability of a department to attract high quality students depends in part on the extent of interest in the area and the perception of the departmental quality.

He said the Board needs to separate out these issues in order to determine how it might be of the most assistance to the institutions in improving the quality of their graduate programs.

Dr. Urquhart said the departments had to balance the need for a critical mass of students with the quality of student. The geography department, for example, feels it needs about 10 new students a year to provide sufficient student interaction to offer a good program. Mr. Harms noted that a department could not spend all its money to obtain one good graduate student if it thereby was unable to maintain the critical mass necessary to offer the program.

Mrs. Carpenter inquired as to the relationship of allotments of graduate teaching fellow funds to the instructional mission. Dr. Olum said the allotment of funds is based on instructional needs, not program needs.

Portland State University Programs. President Blumel noted that graduate programs reviewed at Portland State University have been in existence less than a decade. In view of this, he said he generally was pleased with the reviews, although he thought a different review format for Portland State University might have been helpful. Questions in respect to interdisciplinary programs, he said, are legitimate, and have been discussed in various contexts throughout the development of the programs. He said he felt the perception of the economists might have been influenced by the fact that Portland State University does not have sufficient staffing in urban regional economics, a deficiency that is being corrected.

Dean Nohad Toulan said he, too, was not surprised at the report of the economics consultants. Graduate urban studies, he said, is a field that is only about 12-13 years old. The only programs which resemble that of Portland State University are at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Carnegie-Mellon, the University of Delaware, and the University of Southern California, and, of these, only that of the University of Delaware is closely similar. The Portland State University program does not emphasize urban economics as such and 80% of the enrollment and a large number of the
faculty are specializing in urban social patterns, criminal justice, and policy analysis. Thus the consultants did not find much in the program they could recognize. He said he did recognize the legitimacy of their comments, but this is an argument that will not be decided at Portland State University. The school does plan to strengthen the economics aspects of its program, but the emphasis will be in spatial economics, combining economics and geography, rather than in the more traditional urban economics.

Dean Toulan continued that the most pressing problem of the urban studies and planning programs at Portland State University is not the need for funds for graduate assistantships, travel, or seed money for research, although these are serious, but the problem of space. The school's present housing, Francis Manor, does not provide space for the Ph.D. students, either in the library or in offices. As a result, half of the candidates are writing their dissertations at home.

In respect to placement of graduates, some Ph.D. graduates are employed at first-class institutions such as Yale, Johns Hopkins, the University of Florida, and the Minnesota state system. Master's students are more generally employed in the Portland area and Oregon in general.

Dr. Kenneth Dueker, assistant dean of urban studies, observed that research experience is essential for students in an interdisciplinary research degree. The two research units set up within the school, the Center for Urban Studies and the Institute on Aging, are designed to provide this research experience. Federal funding for research has become more difficult to obtain, he said, although the centers are bringing in a level of funding appropriate to the institutional investment.

Mr. Wyss said it appeared that the consultants were concerned that the interdisciplinary approach to research was not apt to be as scholarly as they would expect in a Ph.D. program. He said the research projects described by Dean Deuker appeared to more professional than scholarly in nature.

Dean Toulan responded that there was no doubt that the emphasis and funding of social science research during the last ten years has shifted from pure to more applied research. Nonetheless, he said, the education Portland State University's doctoral students are getting in methodology and theory will make them equal to any graduate in the academic disciplines.

Dr. Charles Bolton, head of the department of sociology, reported that the interdisciplinary program in urban studies has been very valuable from the standpoint of the sociology department. He noted that the Ph.D. program enables faculty from the department to participate in doctoral level instruction and research through joint appointments and service on graduate committees.

Dr. Bolton said the lack of graduate assistantships has been a serious handicap to the department's master's degree program in sociology, limiting the department for the most part to part-time, local students. This makes it difficult to retain the size of the student body needed to offer 500-level courses necessary to a good quality program. A second priority, he said, is to find some way to bring some new blood into the faculty. Travel funds are a third priority and faculty research money fourth.

Mr. Wyss said it would seem that sociology would be one of the areas which would be particularly successful in attracting regional projects and grants, particularly through the Institute on Aging. He said there did not appear to be any new grants received in the field during the past two years.

Dr. Bolton said it was his impression that during a period of significant change in the Administration on Aging in Washington, Portland State University proposals for funding "fell between a lot of cracks." He said he was confident that the new director of the Institute was gradually turning the Institute toward a better quality basic research, which would result in increased funding in the future.
Dr. Toulan said the Institute still has considerable research in progress under continuing grants. He said several new grant proposals had received favorable review and he believed the present difficulty was a passing crisis.

Dr. Thomas McClean, head of the department of economics, reported that the department graduates 10-12 master's degree students each year and placement is excellent. With some teaching assistant funds, the department could increase its nucleus of very good students. Research support and travel money is needed badly, he said, remarking that the department has seven papers scheduled for presentation this year and the five faculty involved must share a travel fund of $600. Seed money for research would be very helpful, he said. The new computer facilities have been very helpful and the staff is working with the computer center to acquire some of the software packages they feel they need.

Dr. Ladis Kristof, department of political science, said he was very comfortable with the interdisciplinary approach of the urban studies program. In terms of needs, he spoke eloquently concerning the problems of adequate maintenance of university libraries. Another high priority, and one that was more attainable in his view, was at least minimally adequate funds for faculty travel.

Dr. D. Richard Lycan, department of geography, said the department had been fortunate in being able to take advantage of the curricular offerings of the urban studies program and to cooperate in providing specialized course work for their two student bodies. In fact, he said, the master's program has become dependent to a considerable degree on graduate offerings provided by the school of urban affairs.

Dr. Lycan said the primary problem facing the department is the need for supplementary funds for part-time faculty during the next three to four years to teach needed graduate courses until such a time as the faculty can be reshaped through retirements.

Mr. Wyss said he understood that the department had a good cartographic center. He asked if this had been recently acquired. Dr. Lycan said the center has been improved significantly over the past five years and provides an important teaching tool which enables the department to place students in a circumstance much like cartography as it would be done in public agencies and private firms.

Mr. Anderson inquired about the small number of master's degree students. Dr. Lycan said the present enrollment was smaller than it should be, primarily because the department had been through a very difficult period during which it chose to rebuild portions of the undergraduate curriculum rather than put resources into its graduate program. The department feels it is now in a position to begin rebuilding in a slightly different mode of its graduate program. The faculty is very supportive of this rebuilding effort, and some are beginning to see ways they can remodel their own teaching efforts so portions of the program can be redirected.

Mrs. Carpenter thanked those who had testified. She said she felt the Committee's knowledge of the diversity of problems and highly individual planning required in management of departments had been greatly increased.

Oregon State University Programs. President MacVicar remarked that he regretted that his colleagues from the University had had to return to the University. However, he said, Dr. Byrne, acting dean of the graduate school, and Dr. Highsmith, department of geography, had expressed the belief that the review was a valuable one.

President MacVicar said he wished first to report to the Committee that the department of geography at Oregon State University was adequately housed in an excellent facility of relatively recent vintage. He said the department was committed to the areas of resource and physical geography, without apology. However the department head, Dr. Highsmith had asked him to
mention the fact that he believes that if the consultants had had opportunity to look in depth at the instruction in cultural geography in the program, they might have concluded that the humanistic element was not totally absent but was handled in a somewhat different way and adequately dealt with. In summary, while the department would like additional resources in the areas mentioned earlier to the Committee, it is proud of its achievements and is convinced it is serving a regional and national need.

Dr. MacVicar said he felt constrained to point out to the Committee that the formula used to generate resources in the state of Oregon simply is not adequate with respect to the highest levels of instruction. The Ph.D. programs simply are not given the kind of weight in this formula that the programs deserve. The point he wished to make to the Committee, he said, was that despite the underfunding of graduate education in Oregon, which is simply a matter of fact, Oregon institutions are offering graduate programs which are credible and in some cases have national distinction. He said he felt concerns one hears about graduate education in Oregon can be answered clearly and directly by saying that Oregon is getting in terms of the programs being reviewed by the Board, and the graduate degrees in general, a high quality product for a relatively modest input.

Mr. Wyss observed that one of the consultants, commenting on the lack of funds for faculty travel, said, "this insularity may be more detrimental to Oregon than to OSU", and that placement of Ph.D. graduates in prestigious institutions can be strongly related to the national visibility and acquaintance of individual faculty. He said this gives argument for the importance for travel for faculty to meetings, and perhaps a few thousand dollars in travel funds could pay off a great deal in public and national perception of the quality of educational facilities we have.

Mr. Harms said he thought it should not go without comment on the part of the Board that we have had consultants look at nine programs in this particular phase of the Board's review, and in three of these programs the consultants state that the programs are at least among the best anywhere. And in regard to Portland State University, the consensus seems to be that the status of those programs is remarkable considering the age of the institution.

The consultants' statements are particularly interesting in the area of geography, he continued, where the statement is made with regard to both programs at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon, namely, that each is one of the best if not the best of its kind in the country, and then continues to say that there is nothing about these programs that would represent duplication.

Mr. Harms said this recognition of the excellence of the programs of Oregon's universities is not publicly shared in every case, and is therefore worthy of comment, particularly since it follows similar results from the reviews of chemistry, physics, and biology. Certainly, he said, there are shortcomings in all of the programs, that is what evaluations are for, but he said the Committee digressed somewhat in discussing all of the possible problems of the departments. He said he did not argue that hearing these things was not useful, but the discussion of all the difficulties of financing of higher education had detracted in some way from what are really the remarkable results of the studies.

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

Board Discussion and Action

In concluding the presentation to the Committee discussion, Mr. Harms commented that it was encouraging to receive this kind of evidence of quality. In the seven or eight programs reviewed at the three universities, all have been described consistently as being of high or outstanding quality. The failure of Portland State University to achieve the preeminence listed at the other two universities, is due only to the much shorter period of existence of these programs at that institution. All were described as excellent.
Mrs. Carpenter said that extensive direct testimony from many of the people in these departments indicated three areas of particular concern— inadequate libraries, lack of funds for younger staff members to begin research, and inadequate computer facilities to meet the needs.

It was indicated by Vice Chancellor Krueger and others that the lack of computer services was being improved in the present biennium.

President Laster mentioned the necessity for specialized capabilities in some instances and indicated that there would be a thorough analysis of the computer requirements at the Health Sciences Center in preparation for future study of the issues.

There was some discussion of policies with respect to doing administrative computing in Corvallis. However, this would not prevent use of any excess computer capacity for academic computing. The situation is particularly pertinent to the sharing of computer capacity at Portland State University with the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center.

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

Board members asked that the public and the Legislature be made aware of the evaluations set forth in the report.

Staff Report to the Board

Following is a summary of the consultants’ reports and a brief resume, in each case, of institutional responses. The complete report entitled 1978-79 Review of Graduate Programs in Political Science, Sociology, Economics, Urban Studies, and Geography in Oregon’s Three State-Supported Universities, December 14, 1979, is filed in the Board’s Office.

Summary of Results of Review
Graduate Programs in Political Science

Quality of the Programs

The following were the major conclusions drawn by the consultants concerning the quality of the master’s and doctoral programs in political science at the University of Oregon:

The University of Oregon has a small but high quality research faculty in political science which is superior to that found in all but a few states. It has a few researchers of international prominence and others whose reputations extend beyond the local community.

The curriculum is general, rather than specialized, and unstructured. It is effective in preparing its graduates for positions in teaching and research in colleges and universities and in business, industry, and governmental agencies. However, with a relatively small faculty it is somewhat difficult to cover adequately a broad range of specialties, and the lack of structure in the program creates problems in aggregating the shrinking number of students into graduate courses with sufficient enrollments to be economically defensible.

The master’s program serves either as the basis for doctoral work or as a terminal degree providing training for non-academic careers in the public sector. The consultants felt that the present master’s program is somewhat inadequate to serve the needs of persons with non-academic career goals.

Office and instructional space and library facilities are adequate. Computing facilities fall well short of the department’s minimum needs.
The following are some observations by the consultants concerning the quality of the master's program in political science at Portland State University:

- The faculty in political science at Portland State University is well-qualified and capable.

Political science is one of the basic disciplines supporting the new interdisciplinary graduate programs in urban studies and public administration. While these burgeoning programs provide additional opportunities in instruction and research for faculty in supporting disciplines such as political science, the programs also tend to create their own faculties and their own curricula, thus undercutting the traditional academic disciplines in which they are rooted. To help alleviate this problem, the University is attempting to establish a strong network of relationships and communication among the social science departments and between the social science departments and the School of Urban Affairs.

- The curriculum is fairly standard for political science departments across the country. The consultants would encourage somewhat more attention to methodological training. Also the number of exclusively graduate courses offered seems large compared to the modest (and shrinking) size of the graduate student body.

- Library facilities are barely adequate. Computer facilities are grossly inadequate.

Duplication of Programs

Since the Ph.D. degree in political science is offered only at the University of Oregon, any duplication of programs that might exist would be at the master's level. However, there is little overlap in the master's programs in political science at the two universities. Both programs are relatively unstructured and highly adaptable to diverse student needs and interests.

The students in the two master's programs are very different. The University of Oregon draws its students from all parts of the country; the students at Portland State University are primarily from the Portland metropolitan area. The vast majority of the master's degree graduates at the University of Oregon continue studies in graduate or professional education; whereas the majority of the master's degree graduates at Portland State University take positions in the schools and in business, industry, and government. [For the three-year period 1975-76 through 1977-78, 79% (11 of 14) of the master's degree graduates at the UO, and 27% (7 of 26) of the master's degree graduates at PSU continued in graduate studies.]

Need for the Programs

The consultants concluded that opportunities to obtain good postgraduate training in political science in Oregon are superior, although there are problems and there is room for improvement. Present programs, i.e., the master's and doctoral programs at the UO and the master's program at PSU, are not duplicatory or overlapping and should be continued.

The number of graduates produced in the programs at both the master's and doctoral levels is relatively small, but adequate to meet Oregon's needs. Over the past five years, the University of Oregon has been producing an average of 6 master's and 6 doctoral degrees per year, and Portland State University has graduated an average of 9 master's students per year.

Placement of the Ph.D. graduates in political science at the UO and of the master's graduates at the UO and PSU not continuing advanced studies has been good. Over the past three years, 75% (6 of 9) of the UO Ph.D. graduates in political science have obtained academic appointments at a four-year college or university. The remainder of the Ph.D. graduates were employed in government, business, and industry. The few master's graduates at the UO and the larger number of master's graduates at PSU
not continuing graduate studies were employed as teachers in the public schools and community colleges or in research and non-research positions in government, business, and industry.

Consultant Recommendations

University of Oregon. The political science department should give careful consideration to the following:

- Rethinking how it wishes to respond to changing student interests, perceived community needs, and available resources.
- Designing a more structured Ph.D. program in which central control over content and quality is retained, while providing some flexibility and opportunity for students to pursue individual and special interests. The current Ph.D. program is, in the judgment of the consultants, too unstructured to permit the most efficient planning and administration.
- Concentrating the Ph.D. program in one or two areas of special strength.
- In addition to the present master's program, developing a more vocationally-oriented master's program that would be terminal rather than preparatory for doctoral studies.

Institutional Response. The political science department will seriously consider offering a more specialized and structured Ph.D. program building upon a few existing areas of strength, and developing a more vocationally-oriented master's program. A graduate program committee within the department has been set up to review the graduate program in political science and to present its conclusions and recommendations to the department by the end of the fall term 1979. Every effort will be made to complete the review of the graduate programs so that any changes can be communicated to potential applicants for the 1980-81 entering graduate class.

Portland State University. The following are the recommendations with respect to the master's program in political science at PSU:

- The PSU administration needs to give continued attention to the problems of supporting the rapidly-growing new programs in urban studies and public administration without undercutting the strength of the political science department. These new interdisciplinary programs cannot be much better than the disciplinary departments from which many of their faculty and students come.
- Faculty capability to conduct research and engage in productive scholarship needs to be enhanced. To do this, the present heavy teaching loads need to be reduced, particularly for the younger, more recently trained faculty, and at least some teaching and research assistantships provided.

Institutional Response. The threat posed by the new interdisciplinary programs in urban studies and public administration to the strength of the traditional academic departments supporting these programs is recognized by the PSU administration and cooperating departments. There is concurrence with the consultants' statement that interdisciplinary programs, especially at the postgraduate level, cannot do much better than the departments from which their faculty and students come. Serious attention will be given in present and future planning to maintaining and strengthening the political science department as well as-and as a part of-sustaining and further developing the programs in urban studies and public administration.

The consultants make reference to the large number of "exclusively graduate courses" in political science. In reality the department offers very few exclusively graduate courses. It is likely the consultants were misled by the list of political science courses offered in 1975-77 and 1977-78. These lists included the master's of public administration course offerings, most of
them exclusively graduate courses, which have been carrying the political science (PS) designation, giving the consultants the erroneous impression that these courses were all political science courses. As of 1978-79, courses in public administration have their own designation (PA).

Summary of Results of Review
Graduate Programs in Sociology

Quality of the Programs

On the basis of the consultant evaluations, the following conclusions can be drawn concerning the quality of the master's and doctoral programs in sociology at the University of Oregon:

- Over the years, the department of sociology at the University of Oregon has earned an excellent reputation, reflected not only in its ability to place its graduates in teaching positions at other universities, but also in terms of the professional contribution of its faculty members. Faculty and former graduates have gained national recognition through their publications and research.

- The instructional program is particularly strong in areas such as women's studies and the family, organizational behavior, sociology of work, social stratification, and political sociology.

- The morale of the students is high. Students expressed concern about the lack of adequate funds to support teaching fellows.

- Classroom and laboratory facilities and library holdings are adequate. There is a desperate need to replace outmoded computers and increase the amount of computer time available to faculty and students.

The following are consultant observations concerning the quality of the master's program in sociology at Portland State University:

- The department of sociology at PSU has an exceptionally strong faculty for a master's program. There are nationally known persons in the department, and the senior faculty members continue to be productive in research and scholarly activities.

- The program, designed to serve both traditional and non-traditional students, is sensitive to the changing scene in higher education.

- Classroom and laboratory facilities are minimally adequate; library holdings need to be upgraded. Computer facilities and services are grossly inadequate.

Duplication of Programs

While both the University of Oregon and Portland State University offer master's programs in sociology, there is no unnecessary duplication. The master's program at the UO is an integral part of the doctoral program; for some years the department has not admitted students into its graduate program who do not plan to complete a Ph.D. degree. The master's program at PSU serves students who wish to go on to the doctorate in sociology and also those who seek the master's as a terminal degree (about half of the graduates over the past three years continued graduate studies). For individuals who seek a terminal master's degree in sociology, the only program in Oregon that will accommodate them is the master's program at PSU.
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Need for the Programs

The University of Oregon has conferred an average of 5 master's and 5 doctoral degrees in sociology per year over the past five years; Portland State University has averaged 5 master's degrees per year for the same period.

The vast majority (81%) of the Ph.D. graduates in sociology (13 of 16) for the past three years were placed in academic positions in two- or four-year colleges or universities; the remaining Ph.D. graduates were employed in research positions in other agencies and organizations.

For the same period, 81% (13 of 16) of the UO master's graduates in sociology, and 47% (7 of 15) of the PSU master's graduates continued advanced studies. Of the master's graduates not continuing graduate studies, a few were teaching in community colleges, and all others were employed in research and non-research positions in business, industry, and government.

The master's and doctoral programs in sociology at the University of Oregon are fulfilling their role of preparing individuals for teaching and research positions in higher education institutions and in other agencies and organizations in Oregon and elsewhere, and contributing to the advancement of knowledge.

The master's program in sociology at Portland State University, by serving both traditional and non-traditional students, is performing a distinct and useful function to the Portland metropolitan area and the state.

Consultant Recommendations

University of Oregon. The following are consultant recommendations with respect to the master's and doctoral programs in sociology at the University of Oregon:

- With the majority of the faculty presently holding the lower academic ranks and the expectation that this imbalance will increase with the impending retirement of a number of senior faculty, the department is encouraged to make faculty appointments in the more immediate future at the senior level as much as possible. Persons with established reputations may well bring with them outside research grants which would help in providing increased financial support help for graduate students. Faculty members who have an established reputation in a given field also tend to attract highly-qualified students.

- In planning staff needs for the future, the department should seek to strengthen some specialties which are not or will not be covered adequately because the department does not have enough staff currently or will be short of staff because of impending retirements in these specialties, i.e., social psychology, population, and quantitative methods (including statistics).

- The department has the potential of becoming a major center of research and training in some selected areas, i.e., environmental sociology, family and sex roles. Maintaining and possibly augmenting the expertise in environmental sociology and an additional appointment in the area of family and sex roles might help to develop a critical mass that would result in the department becoming a major center of research and training in these areas. This might be done through an addition to the department of sociology, or adding a relevant specialist in a related discipline, such as psychology or economics.

- The department is in need of more outside funding for research. Support for some additional research assistants is particularly crucial. Some "seed money" for faculty research and funds to support even a small number of assistantships would help considerably to strengthen the departmental research activities.
Facilities are adequate except for computer facilities and services, which desperately need improvement.

Institutional Response. The department considers three of the needs mentioned by the consultants particularly pressing: (1) greater strength in the areas of social psychology, population, and quantitative methods; (2) improved computer facilities; and (3) more senior faculty.

The department has recently voted to fill its next faculty vacancies with persons having specialties in the areas listed under (1). The University has already committed itself to meeting the general need for better computer facilities. As for (3), the department will make every effort to appoint faculty in the more immediate future at the senior level as much as possible. In the final event, achieving this objective will depend on the availability of University funds.

Portland State University. The consultants made the following summary statement concerning the master's program in sociology at PSU: "We are impressed with the master's program. The Portland metropolitan area and the state will be well served by its continued existence and modest expansion."

A special effort should be made to fund several graduate fellowships or assistantships on a continuing basis and to create a few "applied" internships for selected students within the Portland metropolitan area or Salem. The availability of additional assistantships on a continuing basis would help to attract highly-qualified students, and providing internships would strengthen the applied aspects of the program and enhance future employment opportunities for some students.

Some steps are being taken to provide support for the research work of junior faculty. Such efforts should be continued and strengthened, if possible.

Although the department has made real strides in accommodating to the non-traditional student, even greater emphasis might be given to the strengthening of the applied areas in the program.

Institutional Response. The department fully concurs with the consultant recommendation that efforts be made to facilitate, if possible, research development and scholarly activity through increased institutional support in such areas as computer and library services and the funding of some additional graduate assistantships.

With respect to the graduate assistantships, the department has provided some support for graduate students over the past several years by employing them as teaching assistants or lecturers on a "wage" basis. The budgetary arrangements have generally not been predictable enough to permit the use of even this relatively small level of support for recruiting students or assuring financial assistance to high-quality continuing students. Establishment of several line-item, budgeted graduate assistantships would help alleviate this problem.

Appropriate departmental committees will make a curricular review and explore the possibility of setting up "applied" internships, as suggested by the review team.

Summary of Results of Review
Graduate Programs in Economics

Quality of the Programs

The following were the main points made by the consultants in their evaluation of the quality of the master's and doctoral programs in economics at the University of Oregon:

The UO economics department has a strong faculty. Among the senior faculty, about half have a continuous and commendable research
output. Junior (non-tenured) faculty, though small in number (four people), have added strength to the faculty. Very appropriately, the department, in recent years, has hired economists with mathematical-quantitative training to help nurture some of the newer emphases in economics programs.

The Ph.D. program is sound and has no serious shortcomings. Although it is clearly not among the top 25% of Ph.D. programs across the country, it is considerably better than average. It provides good training, pitched at a fairly applied level (rather than focusing on high levels of theory and abstraction) that permits its graduates to function well as economists. Placement of Ph.D. graduates has been good.

The master's program is "in trouble." The morale of the master's students is low. They see themselves as little more than fifth-year undergraduates. They feel that they do not have enough access to the faculty and that there is a lack of communication of the faculty with the students.

To some extent the problems with the master's programs in economics at the UO reflect the position of master's degree programs in the economics profession. Master's students generally do not have a sufficiently strong undergraduate background to become professional economists in the one year or so that it takes to get a master's degree. The Ph.D. is considered to be the only professional degree in economics. Master's graduates are often hired by government agencies or business firms which then train them in a specific specialty, or they are employed by community colleges.

The following were the points made with respect to the quality of the master's program in economics at Portland State University:

The faculty is well-trained, competent, and qualified for its mission. Morale is good. Overall, the research performance of the faculty is "adequate."

Several faculty members, and one in particular, have achieved a very high level of scholarly productivity. Some of the faculty have done and are doing contract research for local governments. Since many of the graduates are likely to take research jobs with local governments, getting involved in this type of research helps faculty members to enliven their teaching in a way relevant to many of the students.

The students are reasonably satisfied with the quality and quantity of course offerings in the program.

Duplication of Programs

There is no overlap of programs at the doctoral level, since only the University of Oregon offers the Ph.D. degree in economics. For the master's programs in economics at the UO and PSU, where duplication might occur, there is little overlap particularly in terms of the student clientele served and the major program emphasis. The PSU program draws its students primarily from the Portland metropolitan area whereas the UO program draws its students from all parts of the country. Also, the PSU master's program is more vocationally-oriented and places greater emphasis on the practical application of economics than does the UO master's program.

Need for the Programs

Over the past five years, the University of Oregon has averaged 10 master's and 8 doctoral degrees in economics per year, and Portland State University has averaged 8 master's degrees per year.
The University of Oregon reports that demand for persons with a graduate degree in economics is strong; consequently there has been no falling off in the number of applicants to the graduate programs in economics at the University.

Portland State University also reports that the employment situation for graduates of the master's program in economics is good. Graduates have found positions in government, industry, banking, and with private research firms not only in Oregon, but in other states. The number of applicants for admission to the program is growing. Many of the applicants are already employed and wish to strengthen their qualifications and skills and to enhance their chances for promotion in their current positions.

Consultant Recommendations

University of Oregon. The following are the consultant recommendations with respect to the master's and doctoral programs in economics at the University of Oregon:

- The University and the department, when replacing or adding faculty, should be alert for opportunities to appoint one or two well-known scholars. The University should inform the department that if and when such an opportunity occurs, funds would be provided to make such an outstanding appointment possible.

- If possible, additional funds for seminar speakers and faculty travel should be provided to help overcome the difficulty of assuring adequate opportunities for the faculty members of a relatively small department to contact and interact with colleagues in the same specialty.

- To strengthen the department's capability of competing for top-level students, more funds should be provided for assistantships, with a few of these being funded at a level high enough to attract truly outstanding students.

- Since the department is admitting some students to the Ph.D. program with relatively low GPA's, the department should make a study of the performance of these students.

- The department should try to raise the proportion of its faculty that is engaged in extensive research.

- An attempt should be made to stimulate students to be more creative by having more faculty seminars, and by distributing working papers to the students.

- The department should designate a member of the faculty as placement officer.

- The master's program should be strengthened. Ways to achieve this goal include the following:
  - Appointing one faculty member to serve as an adviser to the students in the program and as general supervisor of the program.
  - Giving the program a more formal structure.
  - Placing more emphasis on practical applications of economics.
  - Giving the master's students a more definite identity and integrating them more effectively into the graduate program of the department.
Institutional Response. The economics department concurs with the recommendations of the consultants, some of which have been and are being implemented.

The department has already taken steps to "bring students into closer contact with faculty research." In particular, a regular weekly seminar series has been initiated in 1979-80 which graduate students and faculty are expected to attend.

The consultants' recommendation to appoint a head adviser for all master's students has been implemented. Steps have been taken to do a better job of providing information about the departmental program and procedure to new master's students (a brochure has been prepared for distribution), to provide a better orientation experience, and to encourage greater social and intellectual interaction between faculty and master's students as well as among the students themselves.

The department's ability to attract strong graduate students has suffered because of the need for more support for graduate assistantships in the department. The lack of assistantships has also had a negative impact on the department's undergraduate instructional program.

Portland State University. The following are the consultant recommendations with respect to the master's program in economics at Portland State University:

The University should be prepared to support a senior appointment to the faculty should the opportunity present itself. Since Portland is an attractive place to live, it might well be possible to attract an unusually qualified economist to the University.

Funds should be made available for some additional teaching assistantships (presently only a few are available). Such assistantships would provide help to the faculty in handling large classes and would constitute an important tool in recruiting good students.

Additional funds should be made available for bringing in visitors to offer seminars. This would help tie the faculty closer to the profession in general. More interaction with economists at OSU and the UO would provide additional stimulation of faculty productivity.

Computer use should be integrated more effectively with course work. The possibility of an additional graduate course in economic planning, particularly to serve the needs of the rather large contingent of foreign students from third world countries, should be considered.

The department should assign a member of the faculty and a secretary to provide placement services and serve as a clearinghouse of job listings.

Institutional Response. By and large, the economics department at PSU concurs with the consultant recommendations. A few of them need some further comment.

A lack of student assistants must be attributed in large part to the severe financial retrenchment resulting from falling enrollments in the social sciences. With the upsurge in enrollment in economics over the past several years, the department and the University administration hope to repair this deficiency, at least to some degree.

With its current allocation of faculty, the department would be hard pressed to release a faculty person's time for service as a placement director. The department cooperates with the University placement service and the department head's office serves as a clearinghouse for potential job openings. These are not only posted but brought to the attention of students who are felt by the faculty to be well-qualified for particular openings. The department, however, will make a greater effort to inform the business community about its graduates.
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Summary of Results of Review
Graduate Programs in Urban Studies

Since the master's and doctoral programs in urban studies at Portland State University are interdisciplinary and draw heavily on the basic disciplines of political science, sociology, and economics, they were reviewed by the consultants in all three of these disciplines.

Quality of the Programs

The following are some observations made by the consultants concerning the quality of the master's and doctoral programs in urban studies at PSU:

The faculty in the urban studies program at PSU is generally of high caliber. Faculty members appear to be well-qualified. Because of the newness of the program, the faculty has, as yet, not established a national reputation.

All consultants were impressed with the quality of the students and their enthusiasm for the urban studies program. The program has a natural asset in its capacity to draw from a large pool of potential students in its immediate vicinity. It appeals both to students who wish to pursue full-time academic work prior to launching a professional career, and to professionals currently employed in business or government wishing to obtain advanced degrees on a part-time basis while employed full time.

The morale of the students in the program is high. One of the most important aspects of a good graduate program is developing a structure in which graduate students effectively educate one another. The fact that students must take a series of core courses with other students who enter the program in the same year, creates a cohesive group, with a great deal of interaction and coeducation taking place.

The assessment of the curriculum in urban studies at PSU by the consultants in political science and sociology differs somewhat from the assessment made by the consultants in economics.

The political science and sociology consultants felt that the curriculum in urban studies is well-conceived; that considerable thought has been given to the purposes the program should serve at both the master's and doctoral levels. The curriculum is designed to provide a general foundation of training in the social sciences. Students become familiar with a variety of analytic and empirical approaches to the study of urban phenomena. Students will tend not to have in-depth training in any one discipline. However, a very strong market has developed for students trained in this fashion. Few programs in the country exist where a student can gain this kind of training at the doctoral level. Given the complexity of urban phenomena, it may be that students with genuine interdisciplinary training in urban studies may be able to address important research and public policy questions more effectively than students with a strong disciplinary training.

The consultants in economics, on the other hand, questioned the advisability of offering a Ph.D. degree in urban studies at Portland State University, as indicated by the following quote from their report:

Interdisciplinary Ph.D. programs are difficult to evaluate. As economists, we have grave doubts about an interdisciplinary Ph.D. program in a university that has few Ph.D. programs in component disciplines. Urbanology is not a recognized scholarly specialty; it has no coherent group of scholar members, no literature, no journals, no research techniques, and almost no academic recognition. What is at
issue is not whether urban processes and problems are important and worth scholarly research. They are. What is at issue is whether important scholarship is likely to be done by those with firm groundings in traditional disciplines or by those with interdisciplinary training. During the last couple of decades, important research on urban issues has been done by scholars with training in political science, economics, sociology, etc. But a corps of urbanologists has not yet arisen. Our prediction is that high quality future research will continue to be based on traditional disciplines. Students in an interdisciplinary program are simply unable to get to the frontiers of research in any discipline so that they can undertake research that will be recognized as such by scholars.

Duplication of Programs

There are relatively few graduate urban studies programs in the United States with only five doctoral and about 30 master's degree programs in the entire country. Since urban studies is interdisciplinary it overlaps and is integrated with a number of other fields such as planning, the policy sciences, public administration, sociology, and urban ecology.

Need for the Programs

Since the inception of the Ph.D. program in urban studies in 1969, and the master's program in 1974, a total of 14 Ph.D. and 25 master's degrees have been awarded.

Enrollments are projected to increase; in 1981-82 it is projected that 15 master's and 10 Ph.D. degrees will be awarded.

During the last four years since the first student graduated from the urban studies program, not one graduate has failed to obtain a job within one month following graduation. Some of the doctoral students face a problem in that they are recruited by various agencies and find it difficult to finish the dissertation.

Consultant Recommendations

The following are the recommendations with respect to the master's and doctoral programs in urban studies at Portland State University:

All consultants feel that the research capability and productivity of the faculty should be strengthened; and that one way to achieve this goal would be to increase, even if modestly, state support for faculty and student research in the program.

The political science and sociology consultants feel that the present thrust of both the master's and doctoral programs in urban studies is sound and well-conceived. They recommend that both programs be continued.

The economics consultants, while fully supporting the focus and direction of the master's program, question the advisability of offering a Ph.D. degree in urban studies at Portland State. As economists, they have grave doubts about an interdisciplinary Ph.D. program in a university that does not have Ph.D. programs in the component disciplines. While not recommending any particular alternative, they suggest three possible alternatives: (1) abolish the Ph.D. program in urban studies; (2) move the Ph.D. program to Eugene where the Ph.D. is offered in the supporting disciplines; and (3) require the Ph.D. students in urban studies at PSU to take some of their work in the disciplines at the UO.
The sociology consultants recommended several specific steps to strengthen the program:

- One or two senior professors, e.g., a political scientist or economist with a specialty in the area of aging, should be added to the faculty. Such an arrangement would have immediate as well as long-range benefits.

- A few internships should be established for selected individuals with appropriate agencies in the Portland metropolitan area and in Salem.

- The desirability of expanding the core program without undermining the flexibility and multidisciplinary emphasis of the program should be considered.

The economics consultants recommended that a placement office be set up in the School of Urban Affairs and a faculty placement officer and placement secretary be appointed. The office would serve as a clearinghouse for job announcements, arranging interviews, and giving placement assistance.

The consultants, generally, emphasized the need for present widely-dispersed physical facilities and housing for the School of Urban Affairs to be consolidated to permit better space and working arrangements. General support facilities such as map room and analysis laboratories need to be upgraded. Library resources, particularly for the Ph.D. program, also need to be upgraded.

Institutional Response. The School of Urban Affairs at Portland State University is appreciative of the helpful suggestions made by the review teams, and will attempt to implement as many of the suggestions as possible. The following are examples of activities that have been or will be undertaken:

- Core offerings are being reviewed with an eye to expanding and structuring these offerings to assure a more systematic exposure to the crucial multidisciplinary components of the program.

- A distinguished visiting professor in urban economics has been brought in for 1979-80 and an urban economist is being recruited for 1980-81 to be appointed at a senior level.

- It is planned to institute a few internships for students who intend to pursue applied careers.

- A faculty placement officer and a placement secretary will be appointed.

- Plans for future development call for the bringing together of the various urban studies programs in a common facility.

The School recognizes the need to strengthen its research production and capability. In 1978-79, prior to the consultant visits, new directors with outstanding research records were hired for the Urban Studies Institute and the Institute on Aging. (One of them was not yet in residence when the consultants were on the PSU campus.) Two other faculty positions in the School will be filled in 1978-80; the research potential of the candidates will have top priority in making the selections.

The School takes issue with some of the comments made by the consultants in economics concerning the advisability of offering a Ph.D. degree in urban studies at Portland State University, and makes the following statement:

Whether urbanology (urban studies) is a recognized scholarly specialty depends in part on definition. As an emerging field, urban studies overlaps and is integrated with a number of other fields such as planning, the policy sciences, public
administration, sociology, and urban ecology. However, there are now five doctoral programs in urban studies in the United States, including programs at M.I.T. and Carnegie-Mellon University, and over 30 master's degree programs. There is a rapidly growing literature of publications and research articles in the field. Most of the writing so far has been and is being done by persons who received their advanced degrees in the traditional disciplines. But in the early stages of any newly emerging field, the writing is done by persons who are trained in other areas. Certainly an increasing number of publishing academicians identify themselves as urbanologists.

As to whether urban studies has any research techniques and methodology distinctly its own; it has, in fact, the broadest set of research techniques of any of the fields in social science, drawing on and combining relevant research techniques from fields such as economics, political science, urban geography, sociology, and environmental psychology. Increasingly, all of the social sciences are coming to share common methodologies, especially in statistical data analysis. The master's and doctoral students in urban studies at PSU receive training in the same data gathering and data analysis techniques as that generally provided for graduate students in the various social science areas. The students are required to take at least five and more often take six or seven graduate courses in research methodology.

It is not correct to perceive the urban studies program at PSU simply as a professional or applied program. The school attempts to maintain a balance between professional preparation and preparation of students for academic and "pure" research. About half of the doctoral graduates are employed in teaching or research positions in higher education. Most of the faculty retain a central commitment to theoretically relevant scholarship. Fully half of the courses in the program are focused upon theoretical or methodological questions rather than upon applied matters. Thus faculty and students are constantly in contact with the theoretical and methodological work in urban phenomenon done both by urbanologists and by people in the traditional disciplines.

It is unfortunate that the review took place at a time when the program was weak in the area of urban economics. The principal full-time economist in the program did not attain tenure and was in his last year when the review occurred. He did not choose to participate in the review procedure.

Summary of Results of Review
Graduate Programs in Geography

Quality of the Programs

The following is a summary of consultant comments concerning the quality of the master's and doctoral programs in geography at the University of Oregon:

1. The UO program is aimed principally at the production of Ph.D. graduates broadly qualified for teaching and research positions.

2. The programs are strong in humanistic-cultural geography with some strength also in physical geography. Cartography is the principal "tool" taught. The program is academically rigorous. Each student's course work and research is tailored to his or her abilities and proclivities. Seminars tend to be true seminars and not lecture courses. A clear strength of the program is the emphasis on real-world processes and problems, involving both faculty and students in community and regional land-use planning and mapping projects, as well as in individual research.
The department follows the unusual practice of not grading students in graduate courses or seminars. The practice was devised to establish critical but mutually supportive dialogue among students and faculty. Criticism flows in all directions, but is devoid of the rancor that a competitive environment often produces. This rather radical approach would not work in a much larger department, but here it seems to function without visible loss of scholarly rigor.

Faculty members in the department are highly capable; the senior members have national recognition. With the exception of one faculty member, their recent published productivity has not been high, although a number of faculty publications have been reprinted and cited widely. In the last few years, virtually the entire departmental staff has been involved in the production of an excellent Atlas of Oregon. Students in the program consistently comment on the excellence and expertise of the faculty. The faculty maintains an open-door policy and there is a "family" atmosphere among faculty, students, and former students.

Classroom facilities appeared to be adequate. Facilities for map work are good; the campus map library adjacent to the library is a notable asset. The consultants did not have an opportunity to evaluate the library facilities. Both faculty and students pointed out the need for more adequate secretarial services.

The consultants feel that the UO graduate program in geography is "certainly one of the best, if not the best, of its kind in the country."

The following statement by the consultants points out the uniqueness of the University of Oregon graduate program in geography and the distinctive contribution the program is making to the state and to the nation:

Since its aims involve a strong element of knowledge for knowledge's sake and the production of thoughtful and critical scholars, the program at the University of Oregon must be judged against national rather than regional standards. It merits appreciation on those grounds. It is perhaps the center where the so-called Berkeley School of Geography, maintained at Berkeley for several decades under the leadership of Carl Sauer, survives in its more coherent form and as such is a national asset. The staff is fully aware that these hard times for the would-be ivory tower academic. They and their students are becoming more involved in local and state-wide problems of environmental management policy, and students are often finding employment in those areas.

It is to be hoped that they do not find it necessary to give up such concerns as the origin of agriculture and the persistence of unusual crops or the relation of architectural character and town design to the quality of life in small communities. Such studies may not lead to immediate administrative actions or new laws, but they may prove vitally informative in directing the development of our civilization over the next several decades.

Summary of consultant comments concerning the quality of the master's and doctoral programs in geography at Oregon State University:

The OSU program is concentrated in resource and physical geography, with strong support from economic geography. There is little cultural geography.
The consultants know of no graduate program in geography in the country that is so overtly dedicated to the application of geographic skills and understandings to the solution of immediate social and environmental problems as the program at Oregon State University. Utilizing both the departmental and extra-departmental resources of the University, students are being equipped to serve as planners, researchers on environmental problems, and environmental managers at the community, county, state, and federal levels.

The departmental faculty is well-spread in age, rank, and length of service at Oregon State University. Faculty members are bright, alert, and extremely hard working. Generally, they are younger than the geography faculty at the University of Oregon; so they have had less opportunity to develop national reputations.

The students are strongly motivated and goal-oriented, the goal being to acquire the background and skills for employment in agencies, particularly public, involved in planning, land-use management, environmental protection, and other similar activities. They work hard at a demanding curriculum which includes courses in a number of other departments as well as the geography department.

The consultants feel the Oregon State University master's program in geography is one of the best, if not the best, of its kind in the country. Its strength lies in its structured nature, a rigorous training in useful skills, the application of systems analysis to geographic questions, and linkages to real-world, contemporary geographic problems. Its main weakness (more relevant at the doctoral level) lies in a lack of formal exposure to the cultural, political, and value questions that underlie all resource decision-making as well as the art and science of geography itself.

The Ph.D. program has many of the strengths of the master's program. However, one of the geography consultants particularly felt that the Ph.D. program is too much an extension of the master's program; the students broaden the range of their skills and write a dissertation, but may not become scholars in the sense of deepening their knowledge of geographic value problems.

Both students and faculty feel that they are very short of space and regret that their facilities are scattered widely over campus. Specialized equipment is adequate. The facilities for map work are good. The consultants did not have the opportunity to evaluate library resources and facilities. Secretarial and other support services are inadequate.

Summary of consultant's comments concerning the quality of the master's program in geography at Portland State University:

The geography faculty at Portland State University is capable; several faculty members are well-known nationally. The competencies of the faculty range widely across the various "systematic" and "regional" fields of geography, rather than clustering in two or three areas. The number of geography majors enrolled in the master's program is small. The undergraduate program and service to other departments in the University command the bulk of the department's attention.

The curriculum offerings are appropriate for the purpose of the program. A major value of the program lies in exposing graduate students in other disciplines to modern geographic thought and techniques and in offering a few advanced courses to persons in the area who are already established in careers.

Dr. Aschman made the review of the master's program in geography at Portland State University. Dr. Cook, the other geography consultant, was unable to clear his schedule for the time needed to visit all three of the university campuses.
The graduate program in geography relates well to other programs on the campus.

Available space and facilities are adequate; cartographic facilities are excellent. The Cartographic Center is an asset to the entire campus.

Duplication of Programs

In terms of program structure, aims, and even the orientation of the students, it would be hard to find graduate programs in geography more diverse or even disparate than those at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. The more limited program at Portland State University, leading only to the master's degree, is less distinctive and focuses somewhere between the other two programs, perhaps closer to the program at the University of Oregon than to the program at Oregon State University.

The University of Oregon program is unstructured with a humanistic-cultural emphasis aimed mainly at producing scholars. The Oregon State University program is highly structured, with a strong applied orientation designed to train practitioners with high-level skills in resource and physical geography. The PSU master's program attracts a varied clientele, primarily persons residing in the metropolitan area, some seeking a background that will enable them to pursue a doctoral program at another institution, others taking a few advanced courses that will be useful in their careers, and still others seeking employment in government agencies or private consulting firms in planning or environmental management and research. The program also serves to provide needed background in geography to graduate students in other disciplines, e.g., urban studies.

Need for the Programs

The University of Oregon has conferred an average of 5 master's and 4 Ph.D. degrees per year over the past five years; Oregon State University has awarded an average of 14 master's and 5 Ph.D. degrees per year; Portland State University has graduated an average of 2 master's per year for the same period.

The Ph.D. graduates at both the UO and OSU continue to be placed in university and college positions, although the opportunities are becoming more limited. Over the past three years, 7 of 12 (58%) of the Ph.D. graduates at the UO, and 11 of 15 (73%) of the Ph.D. graduates at OSU, were placed in academic positions at four-year colleges or universities. Jobs in government, business, and industry are readily available for both master's and doctoral graduates in geography.

The 11 master's graduates in geography at PSU since the program was initiated have all found professional employment in positions in management, research, or planning.

Recommendations

University of Oregon

The following are the consultants' recommendations with respect to the master's and doctoral programs in geography at the University of Oregon:

- Much of the strength and uniqueness of the programs can be attributed to their lack of structure; however, it would appear useful to give them a modicum of structure and to require more grounding in statistics and quantitative geographic methods.

- Although the senior faculty members in the department have substantial national recognition, scholarly productivity has been somewhat limited...
in the last several years. In order to maintain the basic strength and vitality of the programs, particularly the Ph.D. program, greater stress will need to be placed on faculty research and scholarly activities.

There should be more emphasis on knowledge of allied fields; e.g., anthropology, statistics, urban studies, political science.

Travel funds and secretarial and other support services are inadequate. The consultants understand that lack of travel funds is a problem for the entire University and not just the geography department. However, they emphasize the importance of adequate travel funds for a university, especially where the institution is somewhat distant geographically from the nexus of professional activities.

Institutional Response. The department finds the consultant report a good statement of the strengths and weaknesses of its graduate programs in geography. The department will attempt to continue to build on its strengths and improve areas of weakness.

The department feels that it does incorporate considerable emphasis on statistics and quantitative geographic methods in its instruction and research activities, but acknowledges the need for greater emphasis on those aspects of the program. One of the professors, when in residence, regularly teaches a course in statistics. He was out of the country on a scholar exchange program in 1978-79, but is back in 1979-80.

The department would make the case that, contrary to consultant comments that the publishing record of the faculty is somewhat deficient, particularly during the last few years, the record is reasonably good, as evidenced by the information included in the faculty vitae submitted to the consultants.

The department urgently needs additional secretarial staff.

Oregon State University

Consultant recommendations with respect to the master's and doctoral programs in geography at Oregon State University were as follows:

There is need, particularly in the Ph.D. program, to give students more exposure than is presently given to cultural geography, in addition to the exposure to resource, physical, and economic geography. There is not sufficient opportunity to explore the cultural and value issues of geography.

The department should consider bringing in one or two new faculty members qualified in the social-humanistic aspects of resource decision-making.

The department should make a strong effort to increase both the depth and flexibility of the Ph.D. program. OSU has an opportunity to innovate and build on the strength of its present program. As matters stand, American Ph.D. programs in geography are designed primarily to produce teachers; there are no geographic research laboratories where directors must have a Ph.D. degree. But there is a growing need for professional planners and managers whose education could start with the kind of master's program offered at Oregon State University, and then go on to a doctoral program that is professional, and yet truly doctoral-level, one designed to produce insightful and educated resource planners and managers rather than teacher-researchers. (Such a degree could be called, with all propriety, Doctor of Geography.)

The Ph.D. program has a heavy applied emphasis and a good share of the faculty publications appropriately consist of reports to agencies in the Pacific Northwest. The faculty publication record in refereed
journals and the research literature needs to be improved. Such faculty involvement in scholarly and research activities would serve to strengthen the Ph.D. program in geography at Oregon State University and give it more visibility and recognition. Since the faculty members carry heavy teaching loads, achieving this objective may require additional staff.

The graduate curriculum in geography at OSU is presently one of formal courses rather than exploratory seminars with individual informal faculty guidance. Offering some exploratory seminars would help to make the program more responsive to student interests and needs.

As in the review of the geography programs at the University of Oregon, the consultants stress the need for more adequate travel funds not only for the geography department but for the University as a whole.

Institutional Response. The consultants did an excellent job, particularly in view of the limited time spent on the Oregon State University campus. Their analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the master's and doctoral programs in geography at Oregon State University is insightful and helpful.

Members of the geography department perceive some implications in the consultant reports that applied geographic studies may be less scholarly than those which are non-applied. The department feels that this is not the case and that the studies and research being conducted in geography at Oregon State University are of high scholarly attainment, even though they are of an applied nature.

With respect to the lack of cultural geography in the programs, although it may be true that little is offered formally in cultural geography, cultural and social value issues are included in the course work and the studies conducted. Students are made aware of these values through direct contact with faculty, particularly in carrying out thesis research.

The University is pleased that the consultants recognize the significance and uniqueness of its graduate programs in geography nationally, and that these programs do not duplicate the programs in geography at the University of Oregon and Portland State University.

Portland State University

Dr. Aschmann made the following recommendations with respect to the master's program in geography at Portland State University:

Even though the master's program in geography is small and the number graduating with degrees is small; the program should be continued. It does serve the students in the metropolitan area with the need for advanced work in geography, whether wishing to qualify for entry to a doctoral program at another institution or for employment in government agencies and private consulting firms, or wishing to enroll in a few advanced courses to help in a job already held. The program also plays an important role in exposing graduate students in other disciplines to modern geographic thought and techniques.

A larger number of resident graduate students would certainly strengthen the program, but additional resources, particularly in the form of assistantships, would be required to build enrollments.

Institutional Response. Dr. Aschmann identifies the two key problem areas in the master's program in geography at Portland State as (1) smallness, and (2) lack of focus. The program was substantially larger in 1970 than it is now. The department had a number of graduate assistants; twice as many active students, many out-of-state; and considerably more courses. The enrollment declines of the mid-1970's resulted in a severe attrition of resources dedicated to the geography master's program, from which the
department is now beginning to emerge. During this same period, the department went through the process of adapting its graduate program in geography to the rapidly developing programs in urban studies and public administration.

The department is presently involved in the development of long-range plans for the entire program in geography—graduates and undergraduate. The division of resources between graduate and undergraduate programs and the issue of a broad versus a focused graduate program will be given careful consideration. When alternative courses of action are delineated, the department would like to seek the advice of the consultants.

The department wishes that both consultants could have reviewed the geography master's program at Portland State University, and that more time could have been allocated for the review.

President Perry announced that the next regular Committee meetings would be held on the campus of Portland State University on February 22, 1980. The March 28, 1980, Board meeting is scheduled at the University of Oregon.

The Committee meetings on April 25, 1980, will be held at Portland State University and will be preceded by a visitation to the institution, beginning about 2:00 P.M. April 23, and continuing through April 24.

President Perry also announced that Mrs. Elizabeth Warner-Yasuda was absent on her physician's orders due to illness.

After a brief discussion, it was agreed that the consideration of quality of education would be deferred to a Committee of the Whole meeting on February 22, 1980, to be scheduled from 11:00 A.M. to 12:00 Noon.

The Chancellor announced that a special meeting of the Board would be held by conference telephone connection at 12:00 Noon, February 19, 1980, for the purpose of considering bids received for two bond issues.

It was recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to purchase the property at 1038 Henry Street, Ashland, from Ardell R. Forney and Bonnie J. Forney at the option price of $52,700. This property is located within the approved projected campus boundaries for Southern Oregon State College, near the west edge of the south portion of the campus, and is expected to be utilized at some future time for parking or other auxiliary enterprise purposes. The purchase would be financed from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds or other balances available for auxiliary enterprises within the expenditure limitation for land purchases authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

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

On December 12, 1979, Ardell R. Forney and Bonnie J. Forney executed a 60-day option for the sale of the residential property located at 1038 Henry Street, Ashland, to the Board in the amount of $52,700. The option price is equal to the average of two independent appraisals recently obtained by the institution—one from Kent L. Puckett and the other from Joseph E. Riegel.
The property measures 71 feet by 88.6 feet, thus containing approximately 6,290 square feet or 0.144 acres, and is improved with a one-story wood-frame residence which is about 33 years old. It includes a living room, dining room, kitchen, three bedrooms and a bath, all within a total of about 1,520 square feet. It is located near other properties acquired for student and staff parking.

Funds required for the purchase of the property would be provided from the balance remaining from the 1977 legislative authorization for land purchases financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

Summary and Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to purchase the property at 2751 N. W. Orchard Street, Corvallis, from W. Joan McDougald at the option price of $48,500. This property is located within the approved projected campus boundaries for Oregon State University, on the north side of Orchard Street and northeast of Withycombe Hall, within an area expected to be utilized for parking. The purchase would be financed from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds or other balances available for auxiliary enterprises, such as excess sinking fund reserves from parking operations, and would be charged against the expenditure limitation for land purchases authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

On December 31, 1979, W. Joan McDougald executed a 60-day option for the sale of the residential property located at 2751 N. W. Orchard Street, Corvallis, to the Board in the amount of $48,500. The option price is equal to the average of two independent appraisals recently obtained by the institution—-one from Robert N. Rondeau and the other from Steven S. Swedberg.

The property measures 50 feet by 110 feet, thus containing approximately 5,500 square feet or 0.126 acres, and is improved with a one and one-half story old wood-frame residence which has a living room, dining room, kitchen, three bedrooms and a bath on the main floor and an apartment upstairs, all within a total of about 1,820 square feet. There is a partial cellar-type basement. It is located adjacent to other properties acquired over the past several years for student and staff parking.

Funds required for the purchase of the property would be provided from the balance remaining from the 1977 legislative authorization for land purchases financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to seek concurrence of the Joint Legislative Committee for Data Processing and the Emergency Board to upgrade the CYBER computer at Oregon State University to meet an increasing workload, in accordance with the plan presented in the following staff report.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Oregon State University officials request approval to upgrade its CYBER computer for the purchase cost of $575,165. This proposed acquisition is the lower cost of two alternatives to meet an increasing workload. It will be financed on a lease/purchase contract and funded through existing Computing Center revenues.

Oregon State University has upgraded its CYBER computer several times since acquisition in 1975. Central memory and disk- and magnetic-tape drives have been acquired to meet an increasing workload in both instruction and research. An additional upgrade in processing power and memory is contemplated for the current biennium. This need was documented in a prior staff report to the Board on July 27, 1979.

The University has described the growing workload on the computer as predominantly research oriented. The research computing workload on the CYBER, primarily a batch computer with limited timesharing capacity, continues to grow at an annual rate greater than 10%. The total computing workload at the University is split between the CYBER (65%) and the 3300 computer (35%). The latter is to be decommissioned in 1980, and a new timeshared computer is to be installed in August 1980 for use by instructional users. The University is currently involved in the Request for Proposals (RFP) process to acquire this machine. The instructional computing workload is expected to double following introduction of this machine, which partly will be funded by program improvement funds.

The augmentation of the CYBER is (1) to bring back some research computing which currently must be acquired off-campus because the CYBER does not have sufficient memory to meet project requirements, and (2) to meet increasing resource needs primarily in support of large mathematical modeling projects. The former is typified by applications processed by the Chemistry Department, the Climatic Research Institute, and the Radiation Center. A typical example of the latter is the forest economic research conducted by the Department of Forest Management. This research is oriented toward testing the effect of alternative forest policy strategies on forest resources sustainability and supply and future income and employment levels. The computer modeling system currently in use will be enhanced to accommodate much larger data bases. The current computer's memory and processing power impose restraints which must be removed for the research project to meet project objectives.

Other research projects in the fields of Chemistry, Physics, Nuclear Engineering, and Atmospheric Sciences also often are constrained by the limitation of the current CYBER configuration.

ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES

Two strategies to upgrade the CYBER are possible:

1. Add central memory and peripheral processors to the existing CYBER 73.
2. Replace existing CYBER 73 with a new model CYBER 720 (which has additional memory and peripheral processing power).

The University's long-range computing plan contemplated the first alternative of adding central memory and peripheral processors to the current configuration to meet the necessary workload.

The second alternative is a vendor proposal to achieve the needed capacity at lower cost than Alternative 1. It is based on recently announced new technology equipment totally compatible with the existing computer. The University has done performance measurements and confirmed that the desired capacity improvement can be achieved. The total six-year costs of the two alternatives (see Tables I and II respectively) show a cost savings of $285,528 if the second alternative is implemented. This alternative is proposed. It should be noted that in the event of any additional augmentations, which is probable during the anticipated six-year lifetime, additional savings are achieved through implementation of Alternative 2. This is a consequence of the lower cost of the new technology.
These are the only alternatives considered feasible by the University because of the existing investment in peripheral equipment which would be retained ($750,000 replacement value), the investment in existing applications software, and the overall cost of a formal RFP process to the State and to vendors. To affirm this, the Board's staff has advertised in a national computer publication for competitive proposals. It has also carried on discussions with major vendors. The Board's staff is prepared to report on the outcome of this process.

### TABLE I

**Original Long-Range Plan Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present CYBER Configuration</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,249</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Software License</strong></td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEMS (Software Maintenance)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPU Upgrade (Peripheral Processors)</strong></td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memory Upgrade</strong></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Six-Year Cost**: $1,601,040

1 Lease/purchase is presently priced in excess of $8,000/monthly Control Data Corporation. However, since the CYBER 73 is out of production, it is reasonable to expect a sharp reduction in cost by 1982, the planned date of acquisition.

### TABLE II

**1980-1986 Cost for Proposed Strategy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Expenses</th>
<th>No. Mos.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retained CYBER Components</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New CYBER Components</strong></td>
<td>10,352</td>
<td>2,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Software License</strong></td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEMS (Software Maintenance)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Six-Year Cost**: $1,315,512

2 Lease/purchase of the following equipment estimated on the basis of third-party financing at 3% interest.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Purchase</th>
<th>Monthly Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170-720 Central Processor</td>
<td>$460,950</td>
<td>$1,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10501-702 32K Memory</td>
<td>63,435</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10513-725 25KVA Motor Generator</td>
<td>17,380</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7155-1 Data Storage Controller</td>
<td>59,990</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>885-12 Field Upgrade 885-11 Disk</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>625,165</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,087</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Trade-in</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Total Purchase Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>575,165</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Data Corporation has extended an offer of $50,000 trade-in for the CYBER components and any 3300 devices that are of no value to Oregon State University.

**Summary and Staff Recommendation**

It was recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to purchase the property at 717 S. W. 26th Street, Corvallis, from Edna E. Schlender at the option price of $39,500. This property is located within the approved projected campus boundaries for Oregon State University, on the east side of 26th Street between A Street and Stadium Drive, directly opposite from Parker Stadium. It is the last parcel to be acquired in this area of the campus. Inasmuch as it is expected to be utilized for parking, the purchase would be financed from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds or other balances available for auxiliary enterprises, such as excess sinking fund reserves from parking operations, and would be charged against the expenditure limitation for land purchases authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

**Board Discussion and Action**

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

**Staff Report to the Board**

On January 2, 1980, Edna E. Schlender executed a 60-day option for the sale of the residential property located at 717 S. W. 26th Street, Corvallis, to the Board in the amount of $39,500. The option price is equal to the average of two independent appraisals recently obtained by the institution—one from Robert N. Rondeau and the other from Steven S. Swedberg.

The property measures approximately 40 feet by 127 feet, containing about 0.113 acres, and is improved with a small, old house which has an area of 720 square feet on the main floor and a basement of the same size. It is located adjacent to other properties which the Board has acquired over the past several years in anticipation of future parking for students and staff.

Funds required for the purchase of the property would be provided from the balance remaining from the 1977 legislative authorization for land purchases financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

**Report of Bids and Contract Awards for Biology Greenhouse Facility, SOSC**

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Marquess & Associates, Inc., Medford, project engineers, for the foundation and erection of a biology greenhouse on the campus at Southern Oregon State College were accepted on behalf of the Board. The prefabricated green-
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house structure had been purchased by the SOC Foundation as a gift to the institution. Bids were received initially on July 31, 1979, but they exceeded the resources available, so they were rejected. Modifications were made in the construction documents and separate bids were solicited for the general, mechanical and electrical portions of the work. Provision was also made for an optional bid for a combination of the work within the three separate divisions. The bids received on November 8, 1979 may be tabulated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Item</th>
<th>Number of Bids</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>High Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$24,950</td>
<td>$28,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,580</td>
<td>19,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>8,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination bid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48,840</td>
<td>51,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inasmuch as the sum of the three lowest bids was lower than either of the combination bids, contract awards were made on that basis and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction:
- General work - J. B. Steel, Inc., Medford $24,950
- Mechanical work - Western Mechanical, Inc., Medford 15,580
- Electrical work - Jack Mathis General Contractor, Inc., Roseburg 7,700
- Prefabricated greenhouse 23,822
- Less-Allowance for materials expected to be donated (1,472)

Subtotal $70,580

Professional services fees (donated) -
Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs 2,120
Contingencies 500

Total $73,200

The general work contract includes all sitework; concrete slabs, walks and foundations; all storm drains and irrigation; the installation of the pre-fabricated metal greenhouse and its glazing. The mechanical work includes all heating, cooling and ventilating. The electrical work includes all power, lighting and control wiring.

The expenditures are being financed from a federal grant of $48,500 from the National Science Foundation and from gifts of $24,700 obtained through the SOC Foundation.

RECAPITULATION UPON THE RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARDS

Project - SOSC Biology Greenhouse Facility

Engineers - Marquess & Associates, Inc., Medford

Board's priority - Not applicable

Legislative authorization - Approval to file the federal grant application was given by the State Emergency Board on February 24, 1978. Because the expenditure requirements are less than $100,000, no further legislative approval is required.

Estimated total project costs $73,200
Estimated total direct construction costs
Average (per square foot) for gross area of 2,150 sq. ft. - $32.83
Scheduled completion - March 1980
Tentative financing plan:
National Science Foundation grant - $48,500
SOC Foundation gift funds - 24,700
Total $73,200

Board Discussion and Action
The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board
Report of Architectural Services for Hoke Hall Balconies Cover, EOSC
By means of a supplement to the professional services contract for up-dating the long-range development plan and for the design and contract administration of the proposed Surface Drainage Improvements and Physical Education Fields Relocation project at Eastern Oregon State College, arrangements have been made with Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson, AIA, for a feasibility analysis and research study, with recommendations for design solutions, for the correction of water leaks and the correction of heating and cooling problems at the Hoke College Center on the campus in LaGrande.

An expenditure limitation of $265,000 was approved by the Board and the 1979 Legislature for covering the balconies of the Hoke College Center to provide additional protection from adverse weather conditions. The feasibility of such a capital construction proposal needs to be reexamined and other alternatives need to be explored in an effort to achieve the most practical and aesthetically satisfactory solutions to the present problems.

For their professional services and those of consultants, including the firm which designed the building and provided contract administration during original construction, the architects are to be compensated on a time and materials basis not to exceed $8,000 without prior written approval of the Owner's Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning. The arrangements contemplate that if further design services for this project are authorized, credit against the total fee negotiated for such work shall be allowed for the amounts invoiced and paid for the feasibility analysis.

Funds required for the study are being provided from auxiliary enterprise resources.

Board Discussion and Action
The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board
Report of Acceptance of Design Development Phase of Planning for Surface Drainage Improvements and Physical Education Fields Relocation, EOSC
On March 30, 1979, the Board approved the feasibility analysis and preliminary design schematics for the proposed Surface Drainage Improvements and Physical Education Fields Relocation on the campus at Eastern Oregon State College, prepared with the assistance of Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson, project architects, Portland.

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials following the completion of the design development phase of planning, the architects were authorized to complete the construction documents phase so that bids may be received and a contract award made for the work. The description of the work
remains essentially as outlined in the March 30, 1979 Board minutes. It is anticipated that several major deductive alternates will need to be provided in the bid documents to assure reasonably the ability to proceed with a contract award within the resources available. One of these may be for surfacing the track, particularly if certain demolition, grading and other sitework is not accomplished through private donations.

Based upon the price level expected to prevail in March 1980, when bids may be solicited for the project following the completion of the construction documents, the architects estimate that the direct construction costs will be $460,375. These costs and the related expenditures for professional services fees, construction supervision and other project expenses, all of which total $610,000, are to be financed from a combination of Article XI-G bond proceeds, General Fund appropriation, and Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds or other resources available for auxiliary enterprises, as detailed within the final section of the following summary.

**RECAPITULATION UPON ACCEPTANCE OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF PLANNING**

Project - EOSC Surface Drainage Improvements and Physical Education Fields Relocation

Architect - Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson, Portland


Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs: $610,000

Estimated direct construction costs: $460,375

**Tentative schedule:**

Bidding - March 1980
Completion - November 1980

**Tentative financing plan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund appropriation</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-G bond proceeds</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or balances available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$610,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Morrison, Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., project engineers, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for the Physical Plant Services Building on the campus at Eastern Oregon State College was accepted as of October 15, 1979, subject to the completion of minor punchlist items. The work was inspected on behalf of the Board by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning, accompanied by President Briggs and Consulting Architect David Soderstrom.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board of November 17, 1978:
Meeting #461 January 25, 1980

Revised Original Increase or Budget Budget or 10/15/79 11/17/78 (Decrease)

Direct construction costs:
The Timber Co., Inc., Hermiston $474,435 $476,162 $(1,727) (1)
Reserved for cabinets and shelving to be installed by Physical Plant forces 14,147 - 14,147
Subtotal $488,582 $476,162 $12,420

Professional services fees 38,174 (2) 38,208 (34)
Furnishings and Equipment 4,000 - 4,000
Construction supervision, site clearance and other miscellaneous costs 6,482 8,583 (2,101)
Artwork (per Chapter 848, O. L. 1977) 4,762 4,762
Contingencies - 14,285 (14,285)

Total $542,000 $542,000 $-

(1) Includes reduction in cost for installing metal siding directly to wall sheathing without metal furring strips and for rebidding the painting work; extending sewer line east to next manhole (per City of LaGrande); modifying outlets for electrical and telephone; adding roof vents for shop areas; adding finish material to increase fire rating of separation wall at painting room to one-hour; changing automatic sprinkler system; revising selected items of finish hardware, revising routing of condensate piping and substituting manufacturer for condensate pumps; omitting insulation on steam condensate and pumped return lines in heated spaces and other minor modifications within six approved change orders.

(2) Includes $1,000 share of fees for campus master planning.

The work of the contract included the construction of two one-story shop and storage buildings separated by a courtyard which is enclosed by the building walls and wire security fencing. The westerly portion of this courtyard is covered with a roof connected to the existing Central Heating Plant. The wood framed buildings are finished with enameled metal siding. The south portion contains approximately 4,200 square feet of gross area and the other building (located about fifty feet to the north) contains approximately 2,560 square feet of gross area.

The financing of the project, involving resources for the correction of safety deficiencies as well as those appropriated separately for the Physical Plant Services Building, is outlined in detail within the final section of the recapitulation below:

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - EOSC Physical Plant Services Building

Engineers - Morrison, Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., Portland
(Architectural Consultants - Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson, Portland)

Board's priorities - Nos. 1 (part) and 13 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)
No. 5 in 1977-1979 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Meeting #461
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Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs: $542,000

Estimated gross areas:
- Buildings 6,760 sq. ft.
- Covered open-air (fenced) 3,280 sq. ft.
- Open-air (fenced) 4,610 sq. ft.
- Buildings plus one-half of covered yard 8,400 sq. ft.

Estimated total direct construction costs (excluding demolition of existing warehouse units) - Total $474,435
- Buildings and fixed equipment (excluding sitework) 438,935
- Average (per square foot), using 8,400 sq. ft. - $52.25

Financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation:
  - For Correction of safety deficiencies $66,000
  - Other 174,250

- Article XI-G bond borrowings:
  - For correction of safety deficiencies $66,000
  - Other 174,250

- Subtotal for Educational and General Plant $480,500
- Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises 61,500

- Total $542,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

On May 25, 1979, the Board approved the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed Library Building on the campus at Oregon Institute of Technology, prepared with the assistance of The Amundson Associates, P.C., project architects, Springfield.

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials following the completion of the design development phase of planning, the architects were authorized to complete the construction documents phase so that bids may be received and contract awards made for the work. The description of the project remains essentially as outlined in the May 25, 1979 Board minutes.

Based upon the price level expected to prevail in March 1980, when bids may be solicited for the project following the completion of the construction documents, the architects estimate that the direct construction costs will be approximately $3,569,761 inclusive of all site development costs. Outside utility extensions to this building are being provided under a separate project for which the acceptance of the design development phase of planning is reported separately.

Consistent with the expenditure limitation approved by the Board and the 1979 Legislature, the total project budget for the Library Building is $4,405,600. In addition to the direct construction costs, this amount includes professional services fees, construction supervision, furnishings and equipment, artwork and a contingency reserve. The project budget is funded in equal shares from a state appropriation and Article XI-G bond proceeds.

RECAPITULATION UPON ACCEPTANCE OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OIT Library Building
Architects - The Amundson Associates, P.C., Springfield
Board's priority - No. 4 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)

Estimated total project costs $4,405,000

Estimated gross area - 51,029 square feet

Estimated total direct construction costs:
- Total, including parking lot rebuilding, landscaping and other site development costs $3,569,761
- Building and fixed equipment only:
  - Total $3,517,722
  - Average (per square foot) - $68.94

Tentative schedule:
- Bidding - March 1980
- Completion - January 1982

Tentative financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $2,202,500
- Article XI-G bond borrowings 2,202,500

Total $4,405,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

On November 17, 1978, the Board approved an increase in the expenditure limitation in the amount of $300,000 for the Student Union Addition and Alterations project on the campus at Oregon Institute of Technology. This increase was used in 1977-1979 to cover expenditures for improvements to the campus utility system in order to provide adequate connections to the Student Union Building and Snell Hall. As a part of the study made preparatory to the recommendation for these improvements, The Amundson Associates, project architects, and their consultants, Gordon & Associates, had made an analysis of the entire utility system to determine potential directions for future extensions and improvements to the remainder of the utility system. The program shared with the Board and subsequently with the State Emergency Board included two alternative routes for constructing utility tunnels to serve the proposed new Library Building as well as the existing buildings on the campus. Authorization to proceed with a portion of this work was granted by the 1979 Legislature.

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials following the completion of planning equivalent to the design development phase, the architects were authorized to complete the construction documents for these utility improvements so that bids may be received and a contract award made for the work. Planned to be constructed similar in detail to the utility tunnel and piping installed for the Student Union Addition, the 6-ft. by 6-ft. concrete tunnel is expected to run from the Mechanical-Electrical Building north to the west side of the proposed Library Building. The portion of the tunnel routed through the Library Building (for future extension to the Physical Education Building) is included as part of the budget for the Library project.

Also included within the proposed utility improvements project is the addition of a chiller in the Mechanical-Electrical Building to increase the cooling capacity for service to various campus buildings, especially the Library Building.

Based upon the price level expected to prevail in February 1980, when bids may be solicited for the utility improvements following the completion of the construction documents, the architects estimate that the direct construction
costs will be approximately $395,000. These costs and the related expenditures for professional services fees, construction supervision and other project expenses, all of which total $480,000, are to be funded from the authorization included within Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979. The financing resources include $335,000 from equal shares of a state fund appropriation and Article XI-G bond borrowings and $145,000 from Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

RECAPITULATION UPON ACCEPTANCE OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OIT Utility Improvements

Architects - The Amundson Associates, P.C., Springfield (assisted by Gordon and Associates, consulting engineers, Corvallis)

Board's priority - No. 5 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)
No. 3 in 1979-1981 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs $480,000
Estimated total direct construction costs $395,000

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - February 1980
Completion - August 1980

Tentative financing plan:
General Fund appropriation $167,500
Article XI-G bond proceeds 167,500
Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds
and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises 145,000

Total $480,000

The Board received the report as presented.

A report was made to the Board on July 27, 1979 of the acceptance on behalf of the Board of the revised schematic design phase of planning for the remodeling and correction of safety deficiencies within Gilbert Hall on the campus at Oregon State University.

Based upon the recommendation of institutional officials following the completion of the design development phase of planning, prepared with the assistance of Zimmer/Gunsul/Frasca Partnership, project architects, Portland, the architects were authorized to complete the construction documents phase so that bids may be received and a contract award made for the work. The description of the project remains essentially as outlined in the July 27, 1979 Board minutes.

Based upon the price level expected to prevail in March 1980, when bids may be solicited for the project following the completion of the construction documents, the architects estimate that the direct construction costs will be approximately $2,521,800. The total project budget is $3,190,000, representing the sum of $2,750,000 authorized as part of the program for safety deficiency corrections, Phase III, and $440,000 separately authorized by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979, for other remodeling within the building. In addition to the direct construction costs, the budget includes amounts for the estimated expenditure requirements for professional services fees, construction supervision and miscellaneous costs, furnishings and equipment, and artwork.
The project costs are expected to be financed from state funds as detailed below.

**RECAPITULATION UPON ACCEPTANCE OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF PLANNING**

**Project** - OSU Gilbert Hall Remodel

**Architects** - Zimmer/Gunsul/Frasca Partnership, Portland

**Board's priority** - Part of No. 1 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant) and No. 3 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)

**Legislative authorization** - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

**Estimated total project cost** $3,190,000

**Estimated total direct construction costs** $2,521,800

**Tentative schedule:**
- **Bidding** - March 1980
- **Completion** - March 1981

**Tentative financing plan:**
- General Fund appropriation $1,595,000
- Article XI-G bond proceeds 1,595,000

**Total** $3,190,000

The Board received the report as presented.

**Staff Report to the Board**

On July 27, 1979, the Board approved the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed third phase of remodeling within the Memorial Union Building at Oregon State University, prepared with the assistance of Jeppsen, Miller & Tobias, project architects, Corvallis.

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials following the completion of the design development phase of planning, the architects were authorized to complete the construction documents phase so that bids may be received and a contract award made for the work. The description of the project remains essentially as outlined in the July 27, 1979 Board minutes, with the exception that the renovation of exterior brick and stone has been omitted from the scope of work to be accomplished within the basic bid. It may be included in the bid documents as an alternate.

Based upon the price level expected to prevail in February 1980, when bids may be solicited for the project following the completion of the construction documents, the architects estimate that the direct construction costs will be approximately $488,062. These costs and the related expenditures for professional services fees, construction supervision and other project expenses, all of which total $506,000, are to be financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available for auxiliary enterprises, as authorized by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979.

**RECAPITULATION UPON ACCEPTANCE OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF PLANNING**

**Project** - OSU Memorial Union Remodeling, Phase III

**Architects** - Jeppsen, Miller & Tobias, Corvallis
Meeting #461

January 25, 1980

Board's priority - No. 14 in 1979-1981 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs $605,000

Estimated total direct construction costs 488,062

Tentative schedule:
- Bidding - February 1980
- Completion - September 1980

Tentative financing plan:
- General obligation bond borrowings under Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $605,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Gordon and Associates, Inc., project engineers, Corvallis, the work of the prime contractor for revisions to handrails throughout Batcheller, Bexell, Covell, Kidder, Oceanography I, Rogers, Shepard and Wilkinson Halls on the campus of Oregon State University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of October 1, 1979.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board of January 26, 1979:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/1/79</td>
<td>1/26/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Ramsay Construction Co., Corvallis</td>
<td>$120,112</td>
<td>$118,942</td>
<td>$1,170 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>10,810</td>
<td>10,705</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>6,728</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>3,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$137,650</td>
<td>$137,650</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes modifying gutter and area drains at one building entry; installing additional handrails; deleting breaking out and replacing stair abutments at Shepard Hall; revising asphalt paving area at Shepard Hall; and other minor modifications within five approved change orders.

The work of the contract included installing new handrails and making modifications to existing handrails to provide safe use of stairways and exitways within eight buildings.

Expenditure requirements for the project were charged against resources of $584,500 allocated for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, at Oregon State University, as part of the program authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Batcheller, Bexell, Covell, Kidder, Oceanography I, Rogers, Shepard and Wilkinson Halls Handrail Revisions)
Meeting #461

January 25, 1980

Engineers - Gordon and Associates, Inc., Corvallis

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

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

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) 120,112

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

Total $137,650

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.


On July 27, 1979, the Board approved the schematic design phase of planning for Phases I and II of the proposed Crop Science Building at Oregon State University and authorized the project architects to include the fourth and fifth floor levels of the office and laboratory portion of the building in the design development phase of planning for the initial construction inasmuch as the 1979 Legislature had anticipated that gift and grant funds might be available to make it possible to include this portion with Phase I in 1979-1981.

On August 14, 1979, in response to a budget note on House Bill 5032 (the Board's capital construction appropriation bill for 1979-1981), a progress report was submitted to the State Emergency Board, through the Executive Department, indicating that notice had been received from the Max C. Fleischmann Foundation that a grant of $885,000 is being made for the construction of the fourth floor of the proposed new building and that the trustees still have under consideration the request for the additional sum of $595,000 for the fifth floor. It was noted that a site visit would be made by one of the trustees to determine whether funds may be allocated for this final floor of the tower section of the building. (To date, this site visit has not been made.)

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials following the completion of the design development phase of planning, the architects were authorized to complete the construction documents phase so that bids may be received and a contract award made for the work. The description of the project remains essentially as outlined in the July 27, 1979 minutes. If they can be constructed with the initial unit, the fourth and fifth floor levels would provide office and laboratory space for weeds and forages, special crops, a weather station, and the International Plant Protection Center.

In providing authorization to the architects for the completion of the working drawings and specifications, it was indicated that the construction of the fifth floor (involving a gross area of about 11,096 square feet) would need to be identified in the bid documents as an alternate so that if funds do not become available for it, it can be omitted from the initial contract awards.

Based upon the price level expected to prevail in March 1980, when bids may be solicited for the project following the completion of the construction documents, the architects estimate that the direct construction costs of the building, including the fourth and fifth floor levels, will be $3,533,740. These costs and the related expenditures for professional services fees, furnishings and equipment, construction supervision, artwork and other project expenses, all of which total $4,280,000, are to be financed from equal shares of state funds and Article XI-G bond borrowings in the amount of $2,800,000 and gift and grant funds in the amount of $1,480,000, as authorized by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979 and the State Emergency Board on August 17, 1979.
RECAPITULATION UPON ACCEPTANCE OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OSU Crop Science Building

Architects - Martin, Schultz and Geyer, Eugene

Board's priorities - No. 6 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant), Phase I
No. 27 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant), Phase II

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979 (for Phase I with an option for portions of Phase II, if gift and grant funds became available)

Estimated total project cost $4,280,000

Estimated gross area - 57,766 square feet (including 22,192 sq. ft. on the fourth and fifth floor levels)

Estimated total direct construction costs
Building and fixed equipment only $3,533,740
Average (per square foot) - $59.04

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - March 1980
Completion - November 1981

Tentative financing plan:
General Fund appropriation $1,400,000
Article XI-G bond borrowings 1,400,000
Subtotal $2,800,000
Gifts and Grants $1,480,000
Total $4,280,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Morrison, Funatake, Incuye, Andrews, Inc., project engineers, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for revisions to handrails throughout Agriculture, Milne, Gilmore, Administrative Services Building, Kerr Library, Oceanography, Weigand, Benton and Milam Halls on the campus at Oregon State University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of November 2, 1979.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on January 26, 1979:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/2/79</td>
<td>1/26/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Ramsay Construction Co., Corvallis</td>
<td>$104,470</td>
<td>$106,200</td>
<td>$(1,730) (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>9,402</td>
<td>9,558</td>
<td>(156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>2,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>(2,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$116,800</td>
<td>$119,800</td>
<td>$(3,000) (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes deleting all handrail work at Benton Hall and substituting handrail extensions, revising handrails at Milne Computer
Center, revising and adding handrail work in Agriculture and Milam Halls, adding a guardrail at a window on stairway No. 1 in Milam Hall and other minor modifications included within three approved change orders.

(2) Net "savings" will be applied to other portions of the program for the correction of safety deficiencies.

The work of the contract included installing new handrails and making modifications to existing handrails to provide safe use of stairways and exitways within nine buildings.

Expenditure requirements for the project were charged against the resources of $584,500 allocated for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, at Oregon State University, as part of the program authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

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

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

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $116,800

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $104,470

Tentative financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $58,400
- Article XI-G bond proceeds $58,400

Total $116,800

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of Oregon State University officials, the work of the two prime contractors for the remodeling of two buildings at Adair Village suitable for storage of library materials was accepted on behalf of the Board. The work in the Base Exchange Building was accepted as of June 6, 1979 and that in the NCO Building as of October 1, 1979.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budgets reported separately on May 25 and June 22, 1979 when contract awards were made or proposed:
Meeting #461

January 25, 1980

Revised Original
Budget 5/25/79 6/22/79 Increase or
10/1/79 Budget (Decrease)

Direct construction costs:
Base Exchange Building - $25,701 $25,491 $ 210 (1)
Robert R. Egan Contractor,
Albany
NCO Building - Dale Ramsay $36,064 35,336 728 (2)
Construction Co., Corvallis
Subtotal $61,765 $60,827 $ 938

Professional services fees 3,970 3,970 - (3)
Construction supervision and
miscellaneous costs 6,497 6,497 -
Contingencies - 3,706 $(3,706)
Total $72,232 $75,000 $(2,768)

(1) Includes revision in specifications for plywood covering for win­
dows and removing water cooling piping within two approved
change orders.

(2) Includes revision in specifications for plywood for covering win­
dows, deleting hardware for three doors, deleting demolition of
bathroom walls, providing eleven additional light fixtures, instal­
ling an electric meter base and providing lock guards at the
astragals of three doors and other minor modifications all included
within four approved change orders.

(3) Engineering by the Physical Plant Department of Oregon State
University for both buildings based upon measured drawings
prepared by Architect Richard Massie, Corvallis.

The work included the removal of existing partitions, the enclosure of
windows and abandoned doors, selected re-roofing and roof patching,
applying exterior waterproofing, installing security locking hardware, and
reactivating electrical service and air-handling equipment.

On July 28, 1978, the Board authorized the execution of arrangements with
the Oregon-Southwest Washington Laborer’s Training Trust Fund for use of
space within buildings at the former Camp Adair for the storage of library
materials for several institutions. Funds for the alterations were provided
from the Board’s reserve for physical plant rehabilitation and minor capital
outlay.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OSU Library Storage Facilities (Adair Village)

Board’s priority - Not applicable
Legislative authorization - Not required

Total project costs (two buildings) $72,232
Total direct construction costs (two buildings) $61,765

Financing plan:
Board’s reserve for physical plant rehabilitation
and minor capital outlay $72,232

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Meeting #461

Report of Appointment of Architects for Student Union Facilities Rehabilitation, UO

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendations of officials of the University of Oregon, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 580-50-020 (formerly AR 70.146), arrangements were made with Sheldon, Eggleston, Reddick Associates, P.C., Architects, Portland, for professional services relating to an analysis of the building program prepared by the staff of the University of Oregon for the Erb Memorial Union Fishbowl Renovation project, which is part of the Student Union Facilities Rehabilitation authorized by the 1979 Oregon Legislature, and to the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed work.

Compensation to the architects is being provided on a time and materials basis not to exceed a maximum of $3,500. Upon the completion and acceptance of the schematic design phase of planning for the work, if mutually satisfactory arrangements can be made, the scope of the architects' services may be extended to include the complete design and contract administration of the Erb Memorial Union Fishbowl Renovation project.

Funds required for this initial planning are being provided from self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Lawrence Hall/North Site Arts Building), UO

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Marquess Engineering Co., project engineers, Springfield, for the correction of safety deficiencies within Lawrence Hall and the North Site Arts Building on the campus at the University of Oregon were accepted on behalf of the Board. This work was bid on June 28, 1979, but inasmuch as the only bid received at that time was greatly in excess of the engineers' estimate, it was rejected. Some minor modifications were made to the construction documents and the work was rebid on December 18, 1979. Four bids were received on that date, ranging from a low of $59,060 to a high of $112,700. Inasmuch as the low bid was within the engineers' estimate and resources were available, a contract award was made and the following budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey &amp; Price, Co., Eugene</td>
<td>$59,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>5,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>17,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>5,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the contract includes the addition and extension of automatic fire sprinkler systems within the two buildings.

The expenditure requirements for this project are being charged against the funds allocated to the University of Oregon for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, authorized by the Legislature within Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - UO Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Lawrence Hall/North Site Arts Building) (Automatic fire sprinkler work only)
Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $88,000
Estimated direct construction costs (this portion only) $59,060

Scheduled completion - July 1980

Tentative financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $44,000
- Article XI-G bond proceeds 44,000
  Total $88,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications for the maintenance facility at the University of Oregon's Institute of Marine Biology at Charleston, Oregon, were accepted on behalf of the Board. They had been prepared by the staff of the institution's Physical Plant Department with the assistance of students from the School of Architecture and Allied Arts.

Eight bids were received for the project on October 16, 1979, ranging from a low of $58,523 to a high of $81,000. Inasmuch as the resources were available for the work, as described hereinafter, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct construction costs:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Brown Construction Co., North Bend</td>
<td>$58,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>7,795 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>4,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes amounts reserved for shelving, work benches and other direct purchase or force account fabricated items of fixed equipment omitted from the construction contract.

The work includes the construction of a one-story wood-frame building containing a gross area of approximately 1,681 square feet, including an office, shop, storage room and an interior loading area suitable for use as a garage for a small truck. The exterior is to be finished with cedar beveled siding and an asphalt shingle roof. Windows are to be double-hung wood sash. Electric unit radiant heaters are to be included and the lighting is to be provided by industrial-type fluorescent fixtures.

The project expenditures are to be financed from a combination of capital outlay building use credits ($32,300) and other restricted funds available to the University ($38,700), principally from proceeds from the sale of timber blown down on the Charleston property.
Board's priority - Not applicable
Legislative authorization - Not required
Estimated total project costs $71,000
Estimated total gross area - 1,681 square feet
Estimated direct construction costs - Total Average (per square foot) = $34.81
Tentative completion date - March 1980
Tentative financing plan:
Capital outlay building use credits - $32,300
Other restricted funds - 38,700
Total $71,000

Board Discussion and Action
The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board
Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the work of the prime contractors for the correction of safety deficiencies within the Main Science Building and Science Building, 2nd Addition, at the University of Oregon was accepted on behalf of the Board. The mechanical work contract was accepted as of September 24, 1979, and the electrical work as of October 4, 1979.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on May 25, 1979:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget 10/4/79</th>
<th>Original Budget 5/25/79</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work - L &amp; M Sheetmetal, Inc., Eugene</td>
<td>$93,498</td>
<td>$90,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work - McPheeters Electric Co., Eugene</td>
<td>32,230</td>
<td>29,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$125,728</td>
<td>$120,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>10,718</td>
<td>10,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>12,554</td>
<td>11,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
<td>$149,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes rerouting ductwork at penthouse, substituting masonry for gypsum board in elevator pit, sawing new opening and installing lintel at heat of new access door, and other minor modifications included with two approved change orders.

(2) Includes replacing certain ballasts to accommodate emergency lighting, installing one additional 500-watt inverter and a battery pack, installing a manual motor interlock at three fume hoods, installing a relay at new inverter for emergency lights and other minor modifications included within four approved change orders.

The work of the contracts included the correction of ventilation deficiencies within Science Building, 2nd Addition, and one room of Main Science, East Wing; installing four new fume hoods in Science Building, 2nd Addition;