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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN
THE DADS ROOM, ERB MEMORIAL UNION,
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

March 28, 1980

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the
Dads Room of the Erb Memorial Union, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 A.M. (P. S. T.), March 28, 1980, by
the President of the Board, Mr. Louis B. Perry, and on roll call the following
answered present:

Mr. Lester E. Anderson
Mr. Jonathan A. Ater
Mr. Alvin R. Batiste
Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter
Mrs. Edith Green
Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.

Mr. Robert C. Ingalls
Mr. William C. Thorp III
Ms. Elizabeth Warner-Yasuda
Mr. Loren L. Wyss
Mr. Louis B. Perry

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary Wilma L. Foster;
W. T. Lemman Jr., Vice Chancellor for Administration; J. I. Hunderup,
Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs; E. Rex Krueger, Vice Chancellor for Educational
Systems; Edward Branchfield, Assistant Attorney General; Richard S.
Perry, Director, Division of Management and Planning Services; Susan
Weeks, Assistant to Director, Division of Management and Planning Services;
Davis Quenzer, Assistant Budget Director; Ross Hall, Controller; Clarethel
Kahananui, Assistant in Curriculum Planning; Richard Zita, Director, Public
Services and Publications; Virginia Avery, Assistant Director, Public Services
and Publications; Francetta Carroll, Management Assistant; Karen McCumsey,
Secretary to Chancellor.

Oregon State University--President R. W. MacVicar; Clifford Smith, Vice
President for Administration; Sandra Suttie, Assistant to the President/
Curriculum Coordinator.

University of Oregon--President William B. Boyd; Ray Hawk, Vice President
for Finance and Administration.

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center--President Leonard Laster;
Ronald Parellus, Acting Vice President for Administration; Mary Ann
Lockwood, Acting Executive Assistant to the President; Janet E. Young,
Special Assistant to the President.

Portland State University--President Joseph Blume; James Todd, Vice
President of Finance and Administration; Kenneth Harris, Director of the
Budget; H. Erzurumlu, Head, Engineering & Applied Science.

Oregon College of Education--President Gerald Leinwand; James Beaird,
Provost; Ronald C. Coolbaugh, Dean of Arts & Letters.

Eastern Oregon State College--President Rodney A. Briggs; J. C. Lundy,
Business Manager.

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

Oregon Institute of Technology--President Kenneth F. Light; W. Douglass,
Dean of Administration; William W. Smith, Dean of Academic Affairs.
The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on January 25, 1980, and the special meeting held on February 19, 1980, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Green, Harms, Ingalls, Thorp, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

The Chancellor announced that the retirement of Dr. Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, had previously been reported to the Board. Dr. Romney now has received his assignment from the church and will be spending the next three years in Adelaide, Australia.

The Chancellor indicated that Mr. Donald F. Peer, Budget Analyst for the Executive Department would replace Mr. Bernie Saalfeld as budget analyst for the Department of Higher Education.

The Chancellor read the following statement pertaining to intercollegiate athletics and compliance with Title IX and Chapter 204:

**COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE IX AND CHAPTER 204**

In my report to you at the January, 1980, meeting of the Board, I commented on intercollegiate athletics and stated that we plan to pursue internal investigations to determine the extent to which the academic integrity of the System, conference regulations, and fiscal requirements had been compromised by the actions of coaches, students, and others. Those investigations are underway.

I also said I would be recommending to you changes in the Board's policy dealing with intercollegiate athletics. Unfortunately, each time I prepare a draft of recommendations, some new disclosure causes my draft to be out-dated.

Thus, I am not now prepared to propose the policy changes. It is necessary, nonetheless, that we deal with the immediate realities of budgeting for the 1980-81 year.

First a brief review of Title IX and Chapter 204, Oregon Laws 1975, and their implications for the 1980-81 budget.

Title IX requires that institutions receiving federal funds provide equitable treatment of men and women who participate in intercollegiate athletics. Failure to provide that equitable treatment may result in withholding of the federal funds.

Chapter 204, Oregon Laws 1975, prohibits, among other things, unreasonably differentiated treatment of men and women in intercollegiate athletics. The Board's Administrative Rules specify that the regulations issued in support of Title IX shall be the principal basis for judging compliance with Chapter 204.

Chapter 204 states that "Any public institution of higher education determined by the Chancellor of the State Board of Higher Education to be in noncompliance with provisions of this Act shall be subject to appropriate sanctions, which may include withholding of all or part of state funding, as established by rule of the State Board of Higher Education."

AR 580-15-155(1) authorizes the Chancellor to impose a monetary sanction. Sub-section (2) of the same rule limits such a sanction to a maximum of $10,000 without approval of the Board.
The Title IX date for compliance was set by H.E.W. to be July 21, 1978. I took the position, in the U of O Aiken case, initiated early in the 1977-78 academic year, that, in view of the fact instant compliance did not appear to be a realistic expectation, the Title IX timetable should be used to establish a timetable for compliance with Chapter 204. The Court of Appeals did not agree and returned my Order in the Aiken case for appropriate revision. The revised Order has not yet been issued.

Any reasonable interpretation, however, of either Title IX or Chapter 204 suggests that the deadline for compliance has passed.

What does all this mean?

It means to me the 1980-81 budgets for intercollegiate athletics should be prepared to reflect compliance with Title IX and Chapter 204.

I have instructed the institutions to submit budgets which accomplish that objective.

If the budgets submitted by the institutions allocate funds to men's and women's intercollegiate athletics in proportion to the participation rates of men and women, the institutions initially will be judged to be in compliance.

If the budgets do not display this proportional distribution, the institutions will be asked to defend the different distribution on grounds reflecting non-sex-related criteria.

Parenthetically, it should be noted that, during 1980-81, the Board's Compliance Officer will be examining the programs for intercollegiate athletics to determine whether the programs, as well as the budgets, comply with Title IX and Chapter 204.

In the event any one of the 1980-81 budgets for intercollegiate athletics fail to achieve compliance with Chapter 204, it is my intent to impose a monetary sanction on the offending institution and to instruct the institution to revise its budget to bring it into compliance. If the subsequent examination of programs reveals non-compliance, another sanction will be imposed.

The range of sanctions which I have in mind is from $1,000 to $25,000, the specific sanction depending upon the size of the budget and the degree of non-compliance. As noted earlier, any sanction in excess of $10,000 must have Board approval.

This is submitted in the form of a report and is not intended necessarily to elicit action on your part. If, however, you are uncomfortable with my report, you may wish to discuss it and possibly instruct me to take a different course of action.

In responding to questions concerning funding and the amount required for the institutions to be in compliance, the Chancellor stated that it was apparent that no institution would be submitting a budget that would reflect the kind of equity that would be construed to be in compliance. This is due to the fact that non-sex-related criteria preclude a budget in which the funds are allocated in proportion to the participation rate. The law specifies a reduction in state funds for non-compliance. The Chancellor indicated that he was interpreting state funds to include incidental fee and auxiliary enterprise funds as well as educational and general fund money. Therefore, the sanctions would be imposed, if necessary, against the athletic activities budget. He said there is some state money in the programs at each of the institutions, but it is very difficult to expand state participation to introduce greater degrees of equity without taking money from instructional departments. The Chancellor said it was probable that it would be necessary to seek interpretations of the regulations from time to time.
There was some discussion of compliance with the guidelines with respect to group and intramural sports. Ms. Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer for the State System, said all of the group sports were underfunded and for that reason the major effort would be toward compliance in intercollegiate athletics where there was a greater variation between men's and women's programs.

The Chancellor reported that the Commission on Public Broadcasting had terminated the appointment of Dr. Donald Bryant as Director of the Oregon Educational Public Broadcasting Service, effective June 30, 1981, thereby providing a one-year timely notice beginning July 1, 1980. The Chancellor informed the Board that he had received a mailgram from Dr. Bryant which requested that in accordance with the veto policy adopted by the Board, that the Board consider a veto of the Commission's action. The mailgram stated, "My request arises from my deep concern that I was asked on March 4, 1980, by the Chairman of the Commission and the Chairman of the Commission's Committee on Administration to accept temporary part-time employment and to relinquish my role as Executive Director but my request for reasons was unanswered except for an ambiguous charge that I was politically unsuited for the position."

The Chancellor indicated he had not received the minutes of the meeting of the Commission on Public Broadcasting and planned to make no recommendation to the Board at the present time. The Chancellor indicated he would advise the Board further after the minutes had been received. Mr. Perry stated that he had received one call concerning the termination and had explained the process but had not commented on the action.

President Perry invited Board members to identify any matters of interest for discussion or which would require the assembling of added information for presentation at a later time. They included the following:

1. Mr. Ater inquired whether the Commission on Public Broadcasting would be submitting a budget directly to the Executive Department or whether the budget would be reviewed and submitted through the Board of Higher Education. The Chancellor said it was his understanding that both the operating and capital construction budget requests would be submitted by the Commission directly to the Executive Department and the Legislature.

2. Mrs. Carpenter expressed interest in receiving a report on computer use among students to include the number and percentage of students who have an opportunity to use computers in instructional programs; the cost per student; the national standards; the number and variety of uses in instruction, research, and administration; the extent to which accounting procedures are available to measure accurately the cost and utilization of computers; the criteria to request funds for computer use; and the criteria used to establish standards and desirable levels of computer use. In summary, Mrs. Carpenter asked that the Board be advised of where the State System is and where it should be in the number of students using computers. It was agreed that Vice Chancellor Krueger would prepare the report, probably for presentation at the May Board meeting.

3. Mr. Wyss referred to the Arizona experiment in which students receiving WICHE assistance from that state were required to spend a period of practice time in that state equal to the length of their educational assistance or to return one-half of the cost of education paid by the State of Arizona to WICHE. He said he would be interested in receiving a report on this and similar programs and whether they have been successful. It was indicated that some studies were presently available and could be supplemented.

4. As a supplement to that report, Mr. Ingalls raised the broader question of WICHE involvement. However, it was pointed out that the decision to participate in WICHE programs is made by the Legislature rather than by the Board.
5. Mr. Batiste asked about the possibility of participating in very well equipped and outstanding engineering schools, including outstanding graduate programs.

6. Board members said they had received the headcount enrollment figures but expressed an interest in receiving an estimated FTE figure before the final figures are available.

Purchase of Raynes Property, SOSC

Summary and Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to purchase the property at 647 Indiana Street, Ashland, from Lincoln F. and Beth M. Raynes at the option price of $49,000. This property is located within the approved projected campus boundaries for Southern Oregon State College, near the southeast corner of the campus, and is expected to be utilized at some future time for the development of a perimeter road. The purchase would be financed from state fund resources authorized in 1975 and 1979 for land acquisition related to the educational and general plant.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

On February 22, 1980, Lincoln F. and Beth M. Raynes executed a 60-day option for the sale of the residential property located at 647 Indiana Street, Ashland, to the Board in the amount of $49,000. 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 includes Lot 27 and the northerly 10 feet of Lot 28 in Block "D", Meikle and Payne Addition to the City of Ashland. It measures 60 feet by 130 feet, thus containing approximately 7,800 square feet, or 0.179 acres, improved with a wood-frame residence which is about 50 years old. The structure has an area of approximately 2,000 square feet. On the main floor, there is a combination living-dining room, kitchen, three bedrooms, bath and laundry, and upstairs there is an apartment with a living room, kitchen, bedroom and bath. There is no garage or carport. The property is adjacent to other parcels south of Madrone Street previously acquired by the Board for general campus development, including the proposed rim road.

Funds required for the purchase of the property would be provided from the balance remaining from the legislative authorization in Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975, supplemented by state fund resources appropriated by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979.

Summary

In order to undertake simultaneously with the major Gilbert Hall Remodel project at Oregon State University some of the deferred maintenance and rehabilitation work needed within that building, and in view of the decision by the State Fire Marshal that occupancy of the 4th floor of Waldo Hall will not be permitted, it is proposed that the allocation of $75,000 which the Board approved on September 14, 1979, from its reserve for physical plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay for repairs within Waldo Hall be transferred to the Gilbert Hall job.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the allocation of $75,000 which the Board made on September 14, 1979, from its 1979-80 reserve for physical plant rehabilitation...
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and minor capital outlay for the "repair and rehabilitation of walls, ceilings, floor and fixtures on the 4th floor of Waldo Hall (partial)" at Oregon State University be cancelled and that in lieu thereof, the Board allocate this amount for deferred maintenance and other rehabilitation work within the chemistry building, Gilbert Hall. These repair items would be undertaken at the same time that the major capital construction project, Gilbert Hall Remodel, is accomplished.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Inasmuch as the National Science Foundation is making $195,750 available to Oregon State University for facility improvements at the H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest near Blue River, Oregon, it was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to review and approve the plans for such work, solicit bids and award construction contracts within the limitation of the grant funds.

Board Discussion and Action

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

On October 13, 1978, pursuant to the provisions of ORS 291.375, the State Emergency Board authorized the Department of Higher Education to submit an application with the National Science Foundation of the federal government for grant assistance in the amount of $195,750 to cover the total estimated expenditure requirements for proposed facility improvements at the H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest. It was indicated that this national field research laboratory, located near Blue River, Oregon, contains about 15,000 acres of land, a majority of which is in virgin old growth timber. The area was included within the Analysis of Ecosystems Program sponsored by the National Science Foundation, and a large number of scientists and technicians were engaged in the Coniferous Forest Biome project there recently. Under the direction of members of the faculty of the School of Forestry and the College of Science at Oregon State University, continued grant support for research is provided by the National Science Foundation.

The grant funds of $195,750 are to be used for facility improvements such as trailer pads, water, sewer and electrical system improvements, and related site development costs. Some of the trailer units are already available and others may be acquired as surplus property from the Environmental Protection Agency. A storage shed and climatic station already are located on the site. In connection with the proposed improvements, it is expected that the staff of the U. S. Forest Service will obtain the necessary Forestry and Environmental approvals, sell timber from the site, prepare detailed drawings and specifications for the proposed improvements, assist the Department of Higher Education personnel in contract preparation and award and furnish necessary job inspection services. Tentatively, the project schedule anticipates the completion of plans by April 15 so that bids can be solicited, a contract award can be made and the work can be substantially completed by November 1980. The facilities would then be available for use by research personnel during the peak summer season in 1981.

As indicated to the Emergency Board when the grant application was reviewed and approved, there is no commitment on behalf of the Department of Higher Education to maintain the facilities at the H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest. If federal funds are not available for the operation of the program, Oregon State University's involvement with the site will terminate.

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, February 22, 1980; present--Carpenter, Anderson, Harms, Warner-Yasuda, and Wyss.)

Oregon College of Education requests authorization to offer an undergraduate 33-credit-hour minor program of study in dance. The request appears in the document entitled, Request Of Oregon College Of Education For Authorization To Offer An Undergraduate Minor In Dance, which is on file in the Board's Office.

Summary

Under procedures of the Board, minor programs of study, made up of course work regularly offered as part of an institution's general education and major programs of study, are approved by the Chancellor. The minor program in dance proposed by Oregon College of Education is being brought to the Board for its consideration for two reasons: (1) much of the course work required in the program will be new to Oregon College of Education, and (2) the dance minor will be offered as a program in Oregon College of Education's newly organized creative arts department, where it will complement existing instruction in art, music, and theater. Dance instruction heretofore in the State System has been offered in schools or departments of physical education.
The proposed minor is designed to provide students preparing to become teachers or therapists, or to work in art-related fields, opportunity to acquire an area of competence which may be helpful in their careers; to enable students interested in the performing arts to obtain experience in this art form; and to offer an organized program of instruction for students who wish to use dance as an avocation or as part of a personal fitness program.

Oregon College of Education presently employs two dance specialists, at 1.33 FTE, who are professionally and academically competent to inaugurate the dance minor program. Studio and office space for the program is available. Necessary allotments of funds for strengthening the dance library, supplies and materials, and addition of .67 staff FTE over the first years of the program's operation, as shown on p. 13a of the full report, will be within the creative arts departmental budget.

Present enrollments in dance technique courses offered as part of Oregon College of Education's physical education activities program, and other evidence of student interest, described in the Oregon College of Education presentation, pp. 7a, 14a of the full report, leads Oregon College of Education to estimate that 60-70 students will be enrolled each year in the dance minor.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's Office recommended that the Committee forward the Oregon College of Education request for authorization to offer a minor program in dance to the Board with recommendation for approval.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Wyss commented that the demonstrated need and interest in this program was certainly convincing, but he questioned whether the problem of lack of funding and personnel would be alleviated by making it a certificate program. Mrs. Kahananui responded that it was her impression that Oregon College of Education was interested in serving its students and planned to transfer a reasonable amount of staff positions to the program.

Dr. Ronald C. Coolbaugh, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Oregon College of Education, described the development of the increased enrollment in the dance program. At the same time, there has been a sharp decline in student enrollment in music courses. This has made possible a shift in staffing to the dance program. Offering the new courses this year on a temporary basis has resulted in an opportunity to assess the student interest in upper division courses in theory and history. However, it is not expected that offering the minor will cause enrollments to increase more rapidly than they are at present. In addition, added enrollments in the history and theory courses will reduce the cost per student credit hour. As enrollments in minor programs grow, the faculty FTE associated with the program does not grow progressively.

Mr. Wyss referred to the courses which were of interest to students as indicated by a student survey and commented that they appeared to be of recreational nature more appropriate to a community college.

Dr. Coolbaugh said the survey was done approximately two years ago and these interests may have changed as a result of offering courses on a temporary basis. Disco dancing has never been offered, but it is offered by the community college. Jazz dancing is an integral part of any dance program.

Mrs. Carpenter said she had been impressed with the integration of these courses with the elementary and secondary education degree programs.

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

In response to a question, Dr. Ronald C. Coolbaugh, Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Oregon College of Education, indicated that students conceivably could complete the 33 hours required for the dance program in two years. However, in actual practice, these hours probably would be spread over the entire four years.

Mr. Perry asked whether there was a net overall faculty increase at Oregon College of Education because of the minor in dance. Dr. James Beaird, Provost, stated there was no net increase in the total faculty either within the department or as a reallocation. There are faculty vacancies in the fields of music and art which are within the combined creative arts department. This permits the institution to allocate additional FTE to the dance program. Mr. Perry explained his concern that in a time of stable or declining enrollments, the Board will be expected to justify any increases in faculty, large or small.

Mr. Thorp asked whether it would be possible also to reallocate faculty between departments and, if so, should the available faculty FTE perhaps be allocated to another department. Mrs. Carpenter responded that the Board has always encouraged flexibility within the institutions and that these decisions have always been delegated to the presidents of the institutions.

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

Staff Report to the Committee

Instruction in dance is offered by almost all liberal arts colleges and universities and the community colleges in Oregon. The Board's Office mailed copies of the Oregon College of Education proposal to these institutions and the response was uniformly supportive.

Oregon College of Education states that it is not considering requesting a major program in dance, and, indeed, there is no evidence that there is need for additional major programs of study in this area in Oregon. Oregon has one major program of study in dance, leading to baccalaureate and master's degrees, located at the University of Oregon.

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, February 22, 1980; present--Carpenter, Anderson, Harms, Warner-Yasuda, and Wyss.)

Summary

This is a reprise of an item that the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, and the Board dealt with in June and July 1979, respectively, which resulted in the Board's authorization to the University of Oregon and Portland State University of the following programs in gerontology.

| University of Oregon: Baccalaureate and certificate programs in gerontology. The Board's Office did not recommend approval of, and the Board did not approve, a University of Oregon request for Board authorization to offer a master's program in gerontology. |
| Portland State University: A graduate certificate program in gerontology. |

These programs, having been acted on by the Board at its July meeting, then became subject to review by the Educational Coordinating Commission.
After having the programs under review for more than four months, the Commission, on December 7, 1979, took the following action with respect to them:

- Took favorable action to the University of Oregon baccalaureate program in gerontology.
- Took favorable action on the Portland State University graduate certificate program in gerontology.
- Deferred action on the University of Oregon certificate program in gerontology, pending the Board's comments on "three policy issues" relating to the program.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's Office recommended that the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs:

1. Review the policy issues seen by the Commission as being involved in the University of Oregon certificate program in gerontology.
2. Consider and endorse—in their present or modified form—the positions set forth by the Board's Office vis-a-vis these policy issues.
3. Recommend to the Board adoption of the positions endorsed by the Board's Committee on Instruction vis-a-vis these policy issues.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Romney reviewed the Board's Office report on the certificate program in gerontology at the University of Oregon, discussing the policy issues raised by the Coordinating Commission, as described in the Board's Office report.

He noted, among other things:

1. That the program is an upper-division and graduate program open (a) to matriculated upper-division and graduate students and (b) on a space available basis, to nonmatriculated students employed in a professional capacity in a human service activity who can present evidence of academic and professional preparation or training indicative of the ability to profit from upper-division and graduate instruction in gerontology (e.g., present evidence that they are upper-division or graduate students or have equivalent training).

It is anticipated that the nonmatriculated students who seek this certificate will be persons living within commuting distance of the University who are employed as professionals in a human service activity (nurses, dental hygienists, social workers, teachers, health care administrators, ministers), and with few exceptions would be possessors of a baccalaureate degree.

2. That after numerous exchanges, orally and in writing, with State Department of Education and community college personnel, an understanding had been achieved with the Department and the colleges concerning the upper-division and graduate status of the program; that the State Department of Education, after discussions with community college personnel, had recommended that "approval" of the certificate program "ought not to be held up pending resolution of this larger question" [certificate programs for nonmatriculated students].

3. That Lane Community College, which stood to be most affected were the University's certificate program to have an adverse impact on community colleges, had never once raised any question about the University's proposed program in gerontology, notwithstanding the fact
that Lane Community College had importuned by some of the other community colleges to object to the University's program. The State Department of Education, after canvassing the matter with Lane Community College, concluded that "Lane Community College and the University of Oregon are in full agreement over the University's plans for the gerontology program."

Dr. Romney stated that the concerns expressed by some community colleges had not been discussed with the Board because the Board's Office had discussed with community college representatives the nature of the University's program in gerontology that distinguished it from community college programs and felt that the matter had been fully and adequately clarified.

Mrs. Carpenter asked why the Coordinating Commission had asked the question as to whether the proposed certificate program is "occupational supplementary"? Dr. Romney said he presumed that the Commission staff assumed that occupational supplementary programs are the domain of the community colleges. However, he noted that such an assumption would seem to be open to question, for "occupational supplementary" is defined by the State Department of Education as "curriculums...designed for individuals who have already entered an occupation" and who need either "retraining or improvement of occupational skills and knowledge to achieve job stability or advancement." The Board's Office has assumed that the community colleges would offer "occupational supplementary" programs for individuals in positions for which the usual initial entry level training is not in excess of an associate degree. That conversely, the State System institutions in offering "in-service" training, offer programs designed primarily for persons in positions for which the baccalaureate or a graduate degree is required.

Mr. Wyss said that in the earlier discussions of the gerontology programs the Board had not explicitly considered the fact that the certificate program in gerontology for nonmatriculated students was the first such program in the State System. It seemed to him, he said, that this ran the danger of putting the State System in competition with the community colleges. He said the case had been well made that most of the nonmatriculated students who would be served by the certificate program would be upper-division and graduate students. But, he said, the certificate program for nonmatriculated persons is a new kind of program for the State System and might introduce an element of competition with the community colleges.

Mrs. Carpenter asked whether, in offering the certificate program to qualified nonmatriculated students, the University of Oregon could be said to be serving the nontraditional needs of students, or meeting the needs of nontraditional students. Do the community colleges offer courses or programs for upper-division and graduate students as the University's certificate program would? Dr. Romney responded that by some definitions, this program could be thought of as serving nontraditional needs. The community colleges do number among their students some upper-division and post-baccalaureate students, he said.

Dr. Olson, Director of the Coordinating Commission, then referred to the three issues raised by the Commission concerning the certificate program. The first is the nature and objectives of Board-approved certificates. He said that the Board's and University's earlier discussions of the certificate program did not specifically include consideration of the fact that offering a certificate program to nonmatriculated students would be a new departure in certificate programs. Normally such an exception to common practice would not get a great deal of attention, but these are times of extraordinary sensitivity between segments and among the public, he said. If the University and the Board wish to make this exception to existing practice, the rationale therefor ought to be stated before the Commission reviews the program. There is concern about role and mission, of precedent and competition, or the appearance of competition, for students.
A second concern, Dr. Olson said, is the funding of the certificate programs for nonmatriculated students. To the extent the University advertises and promotes the certificate program, it is likely to attract additional students and increase the public dollars required to fund the program.

A third concern, he said, was the program review process through which the certificate program was considered by the Board. When the proposed program was circulated among the institutions of the state for their comments, some of the community colleges expressed concern [Lane Community College was not one of these]. When the proposal was brought before the Board there was no discussion of the concerns expressed by the community colleges, because the Board's Office felt that their concerns had been spoken to and misunderstandings clarified. The discussions between the community colleges (Mt. Hood and Clackamas) and the State Department of Higher Education that took place did not result in written comments from the Board's Office until July, the month in which the Board acted on the proposal. Dr. Olson said that the clarifications by the Board's Office were satisfactory to the community colleges but in their written form they came later than was desirable. He said that he was not sure that the practical import of this was as much of a difficulty as was the perception that the Board's Office was not as responsive as the community college people would have liked.

He said that he did not envision the Commission having problems with the upper-division/lower-division issues as they relate to the University of Oregon certificate program, for these have been spelled out clearly by the Board's Office and are agreed to by the community colleges. But the broader issue of the offering of certificates to nonmatriculated students still remains.

Mrs. Kahananui and Dr. Romney asserted that before the July letter was written to the community colleges there had been a variety of discussions with community college representatives, clarifying the distinctions between the certificate program in gerontology and certificate programs offered by the community colleges. These were merely confirmed in the July letter.

Mrs. Carpenter asked Dr. Boyd to comment on the University's interest in offering a certificate to nonmatriculated students.

Dr. Boyd responded that the amount of time that has gone into the discussion of this issue is out of all proportion to its importance. The University of Oregon hadn't considered the matter of sufficient importance to discuss. The University focused on the substantive issues of what should be the content of the certificate. Consequently, this matter was not debated by the faculty and it was not debated by the Board. It still seems trifling, he said. The resources are there, the program is being offered. There are a few people who fall into the unique category which has caused all the flak. Offering the certificate program to nonmatriculated students would not take more resources. There is some need for the service, and the University can meet that need, but on the other hand, he said, if the Board were to decide that it didn't wish to take on another issue right now, the University would not have hurt feelings.

Mr. Wyss asked if the number of nonmatriculated students involved in the program would be small and whether there is any way of knowing how large the program might grow in the future. President Boyd responded that what is needed in answering that question is a little experience with the program, but on the other hand, experience is difficult to get under the rule that institutions should do nothing for the first time.

Mrs. Carpenter said that she felt that while the Board needs to plan prudently and carefully, it is not possible to see every possible implication, but that where a program would serve students, as this program would, we should go forward with it and work with it. If experience demonstrates the need for a change in the program, the change can and will be made. She suggested that the program proceed as an experimental program, if necessary,
with a review to be made a year or two years hence, with the clear understanding that alterations in the program will be made then if experience demonstrates the need therefor.

Chancellor Lieuallen noted that in the normal review process, the Commission, having made its review and having passed on to the Board any concerns that it has, the Board, having examined the Commission's concerns, is then free to act as the Board shall decide, unless the Commission makes a finding that the proposed program would have a significant adverse impact on some other segment. He said that he was anxious that this certificate program not continue to be a source of agitation that requires an investment of time and energy not warranted by the results. His preference under those circumstances would be to drop the certificate program for nonmatriculated students. President Boyd said that it was not very important to the University but in the end it's the student who's the victim and he regretted the students being the victim of bureaucratic issues.

Mr. Wyss said he'd been against the certificate program from the beginning but that since the Board had approved a certificate program, he would move that to get the program underway, the Board withdraw authorization for the certificate for nonmatriculated students, leaving the University a certificate program for matriculated upper-division and graduate students. The motion was defeated 3 to 2—Mr. Wyss and Mr. Harms voting aye; Mrs. Carpenter, Mrs. Warner-Yasuda, and Mr. Anderson voting no.

Mrs. Carpenter said that she felt the needs to be served by the certificate program are legitimate needs; that one should start with the best and highest good to be served as a base for decision making; that a further rationale is really unnecessary.

Mr. Harms asserted that he felt with President Boyd that an inordinate amount of time had been spent on this matter; that it is a minor matter, and that if the proposal is going to cost more time and effort he would prefer to drop the matter.

Mr. Anderson moved that the Board resubmit the certificate program to the Commission for their review, together with a summary of the dialogue the Board's Committee has had. The motion was approved with the following voting in favor: Directors Carpenter, Anderson, Harms, and Warner-Yasuda. Those voting no: Director Wyss.

Following the February 22 meeting of the Board's Committee, President Boyd asked that the issue of the University's offering to nonmatriculated students access to a certificate program in gerontology not be further pursued in order to avoid expenditure of additional time and effort on a matter that has already consumed much more time and effort than is warranted.

Accordingly a meeting by telephone conference call was held on Tuesday afternoon, March 11, 1980, at 4:00 P.M. Participating in the meeting were the following Board members: Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter, Mrs. Edith Green, Mrs. Elizabeth Warner-Yasuda, Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr., and Mr. Loren L. Wyss. The sixth member of the Committee, Mr. Lester Anderson, was not in the city. A motion to the following effect was adopted unanimously by the Committee.

It is moved that the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs recommend to the Board that the certificate program in gerontology authorized the University of Oregon by the Board in July 1979, be offered to matriculated upper-division and graduate students only.
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Wyss said the Educational Coordinating Commission was fulfilling its responsibility in examining the long-term implications of the proposed program. He said if the Board intended to start a new kind of educational offering of a program to non-matriculated students for certificates, this had not been done previously. Therefore, it was an important issue. Mr. Wyss said this was an issue which was not discussed fully, partly because the question of gerontology as an academic discipline had been raised.

Mr. Harms said there had been some reservations about the designation of gerontology as a separate discipline. However, the fact that the proposal represents some exception from past Board policy really was adequately explained.

Mrs. Carpenter said the program is intended for professional people. The rationale for recommending the offerings of courses to non-matriculated individuals was to serve a small group of professional people already in the field and eliminate the necessity for added building and student fees when they were taking an occasional course. The purpose was to enable these students to upgrade their skills and the action represents a minor departure from previous policy.

The Board, or they as a profession, could make necessary changes in the event the certificate program was misused or mishandled.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as revised in the telephone conference call on March 11, 1980, to offer the gerontology program to upper division and graduate students only. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Green, Harms, Ingalls, Thorp, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

The Commission's Three Policy Issues

The Commission's statement of the three policy issues is as follows:

1. **Uniqueness of a Sub-baccalaureate Certificate.** Unlike other undergraduate certificate programs in the State System, it is not limited to persons receiving a baccalaureate in another field, and is viewed as a significant, perhaps precedent-setting, change in the role of those schools. What is the purpose of a freestanding upper-division certificate? Is it occupational supplementary? Is it liberal arts? Is this the first of what might be several certificates designed specifically for employed nondegree students in this or other fields? Should the admissions standard allow or encourage persons with vocational certificates or no prior college work to enroll in upper-division and graduate numbered courses?

   Discussions have taken place and there has been an understanding between the two Board Offices at the staff level that the admission standards would be for either matriculated students, graduate or undergraduate, or persons employed in a health-related field who have had at least two years of lower-division work, or a professional-level certificate requiring at least two years of training which would enable them to take upper-division courses as proposed in this certificate.

2. **Matriculation to the Institution.** As proposed, the program allows students to take the entire 24-credit program and be awarded the University certificate without being admitted to the institution--an exception to University policy. The community college deans proposed that students apply for admission to the University as well as the program before completion.
of nine hours. The Board's Office has declined to agree to this proposal, primarily because of a desire not to force on part-time students the additional fee costs (health, building, etc.) required after admission to the University. This fee policy, however, is unique at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University and is not uniform among State System institutions. This raises the question of whether it would be better for the University of Oregon to change its fee policy rather than have the State System introduce a certificate program catering to nonmatriculated students on the grounds of that different fee schedule.

3. Fee Costs. Under Board of Higher Education policy, the policy on part-time students (six or less credit hours) is that residency and admission requirements may be waived by all State System institutions except the University of Oregon and Oregon State University where the part-time policy will apply only to nondegree students. This policy has been questioned in the past by the Commission, most recently in the Commission reports on Graduate Education, October 1978 and March 1979.

In the absence of a clear discussion by the Board at the time of its review of the proposal, the Commission has no basis for making a judgment of whether this is a significant shift in terms of nature of the role and mission of State System institutions, how it might affect community colleges, or financial impact the programs might have. The program would generate substantial General Fund dollars.

**Board's Office Analysis**

From the outset of the discussions of the University of Oregon gerontology programs it has been the position of the University and the Board's Office:

1. That the University of Oregon certificate program is different in level and kind from programs offered by community colleges, and in particular, different from the programs in gerontology presently being offered in Oregon community colleges (i.e., the Clackamas Community College certificate and associate degree programs).

   The University of Oregon program is an upper-division program in contrast to lower-division certificate and associate degree programs offered at Clackamas Community College or which community colleges may subsequently offer.

   The University of Oregon certificate program does not offer students beginning-level skills that an occupational preparatory certificate program offered by a community college would. Students wanting to develop beginning-level skills will be directed by the University to a community college.

2. That the students admitted to the University of Oregon certificate program will be, by reason of their education and/or occupational experience, upper-division and graduate students, or persons who are fully competent to undertake upper-division work as a result of their occupational experience; that nonmatriculated students will be admitted only on a "space-available" basis.

Seeking to explain and clarify the Board's Office position on these matters, the Board's Office has had protracted exchanges in writing and orally with (1) selected community colleges, (2) the community college division of the State Department of Education, and (3) the Coordinating Commission staff and Issues Committee.
At issue in the discussion of the University of Oregon certificate program was whether it constituted an infringement on the certificate and associate degree programs being offered at Clackamas Community College, and whether it would likely infringe on programs in gerontology that might subsequently be mounted by other community colleges.

It is to be noted that Lane Community College was not among the community colleges submitting letters to the Board's Office or the Coordinating Commission alleging that the University of Oregon certificate program would have an adverse effect on the colleges. Perhaps this is explained by the statement made by the community college division of the State Department of Education in its November 29 letter (see item 1, near the middle of page 7 of the full report) to the effect that "Lane Community College and the University of Oregon are in full agreement over the University's plans for the gerontology program."

During the course of the October 5, 1979, meeting of the Educational Coordinating Commission Issues Committee the Board's Office agreed that it would provide the Committee a more detailed written statement of the admissions requirements for the certificate program than was contained in the University of Oregon proposal.

This the Board's Office did on October 10. The Issues Committee submitted the statement to the community colleges and the community college division of the State Department of Education for comment.

The State Department responded with two counter-proposals, one dated November 20, the other November 29. The November 29 counter-proposal as to admissions requirements for the University of Oregon certificate program was, in essence, the same as that submitted to the Issues Committee by the Board's Office on October 10.

It was the congruence of this second counter-proposal from the community college division of the State Department of Education with the October 10 statement from the Board's Office that led the Coordinating Commission to assert, as it did in the second paragraph of item #1 on p. 2 of the full report, that there has been an understanding reached between the Board's Office and the community college division of the State Department of Education with respect to this matter of admissions as it relates to the University of Oregon certificate program.

Board's Office statement of admissions requirements. The Board's Office October 10 statement of the admissions requirements for the University of Oregon certificate program in gerontology was as follow:

Admissions Requirements
Proposed UO Certificate Program in Gerontology

1. Students seeking admission to the certificate program must apply for admission on or before the completion of 9 credit hours of work applicable to the certificate.

2. Those admissible to the program include:
   a. Matriculated upper-division and graduate students.
   b. On a space available basis, nonmatriculated students employed in a professional capacity in a human service activity who can present evidence of academic and professional preparation or training indicative of the ability to profit from upper-division and graduate level instruction in gerontology.
Evidence supportive of this ability shall include one or a combination of the following:

(1) A minimum of two years of college and/or professional or hospital school work completed (as evidenced by transcripts).

(2) An employment record reflecting appropriate professional experience, as evidenced by job description (e.g., requires a baccalaureate degree and/or professional certification for job entry position).

(3) Professional-level certification (e.g., as for nurses, dental hygienists, the ministry, teachers) or job classification.

The second counter-proposal (November 29) from the community college division of the State Department of Education. The community college division of the State Department of Education addressed a letter on November 29 to the Executive Director of the Educational Coordinating Commission asserting that the community college division wished to amend the language it had proposed in its November 20 letter covering admissions requirements for the University of Oregon certificate program in gerontology.

Referring to the November 20 recommendation of the community college division of the State Department of Education, as cited above, the letter continued:

Since that time I have had the opportunity to discuss the issue with Dr. Romney and a number of concerned community college people. I now would limit my recommendation to the following:

Admission to the program will be limited to:

a. Matriculated upper-division and graduate students.

or

b. Students employed in a professional capacity in a human services activity who can present evidence of (1) at least two full years of academic preparation or (2) professional-level certificate requiring at least two years of training.

In addition, the University of Oregon should refuse admission to nonmatriculated students coming from a community where a program is offered by a community college unless there is an agreement between the institutions.

Several items came to light in my conversation with Dr. Romney which have led me to this revised recommendation.

1. Lane Community College and the University of Oregon are in full agreement over the university's plans for the gerontology program.

2. There are no similar circumstances involving a certificate program in any of the other State System institutions.

3. It is anticipated that the number of students who will seek admission as nonmatriculated students will not be large.
4. The purpose of matriculation is traditionally for entrance into a degree program. The students admitted under provision (b) above will not have a degree as their goal, therefore it would be unfortunate to force on them the additional fee costs (health and incidental) required on admission to the University.

Terry, there is a larger policy question which to be debated, namely, should there be a nonmatriculate element of a certificate program offered by a four-year institution. I encourage you to arrange that debate and involve the community college people. However, I believe the circumstances surrounding the gerontology program are such that approval allowed ought not to be held up pending resolution of this larger question.

The Board's Office view was that the foregoing letter (November 29) from the State Department effectively established the fact that with respect to admissions requirements for the University of Oregon certificate program in gerontology, there was a meeting of minds as between the State Department of Education and the Board's Office, with the exception of the suggestion made by the State Department of Education that the University of Oregon not admit to the certificate program nonmatriculated individuals coming from a community in which a community college is offering a program. The University of Oregon could not legally follow that suggestion. The Board's Office concurred fully with the suggestion in the foregoing letter to the effect that "the circumstances surrounding the gerontology program are such that approval allowed ought not to be held up pending resolution of this larger question [relating to the 'nonmatriculate element of a certificate program offered by a four-year institution']."

With the foregoing background, we now turn to a consideration of the policy issues cited by the Coordinating Commission.

Issue #1: Uniqueness of a sub-baccalaureate certificate.

The specific questions asked by the Coordinating Commission, and the Board's Office response thereto are as follows:

1. What is the purpose of a free-standing upper-division certificate?

The University of Oregon desires to serve through its certificate program the following types of persons:

a. Matriculated upper-division and graduate students who desire to earn a certificate in gerontology. Some of these students will do so while completing requirements for the baccalaureate or master's degree in some other field or discipline; others already possessing a baccalaureate degree will take the program as a free-standing program (24 credit hours of work).

b. On a "space-available" basis, nonmatriculated persons employed in a professional capacity in a human service activity who can present evidence of academic and professional preparation or training indicative of the ability to profit from upper-division and graduate level instruction in gerontology.

The University anticipates that the nonmatriculated students who seek this certificate will be persons living within commuting distance of the University who are (1) employed as professionals in human service fields of work, and (2) with few exceptions, possessors of a baccalaureate degree.

In its report to the Board and to the Coordinating Commission, and in discussions with the Issues Committee and the community college and state department representatives, the Board's Office cited the following evidence as to the kinds of persons likely to seek the University of Oregon certificate.
Data from 1977-78 and 1978-79 fall terms would suggest that if these enrollments are indicative, there need be little concern about the nonmatriculated students being students with less than upper-division preparation.

Of the 153 students enrolled in gerontology courses fall term 1977-78, 127 (83.0%) were matriculated--fully-admitted students. Of the 26 who were not matriculated, 17 (65.4%) were graduate students.

Fall term 1978-79, of the 177 students enrolled in gerontology courses, 162 (91.5%) were matriculated students. Of the 15 students who are not matriculated, 14 were graduate students.

Summer term enrollments differ somewhat from academic year enrollments in terms of the number of students who are employed full-time. A 1977 study revealed that employed students numbered 111 in the summer of 1977, distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Employment</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Faculty</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service - Delivery</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service - Administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Is the program occupational supplementary? Is it liberal arts?

The Commission does not define "occupational supplementary." But in Oregon, it is a term used in conjunction with a companion term "occupational preparatory" in connection with the definition of the community college function, as follows:

"Occupational preparatory" offerings are defined by the State Department of Education as "curriculums . . . designed to prepare individuals for employment."

"Occupational supplementary" curricula are defined by the State Department of Education as "curriculums . . . designed for individuals who have already entered an occupation" and who need either "retraining or improvement of occupational skills and knowledge to achieve job stability or advancement."

It is the Board's Office presumption that in offering "occupational supplementary" programs, the community colleges would offer programs for individuals in positions for which the usual initial entry level training is not in excess of an associate degree. Conversely, the State System institutions, in offering "in-service" training, offer programs designed for persons in positions for which the baccalaureate or a graduate degree is required.

Coming specifically, then, to the question raised by the Commission, the University of Oregon certificate program is an interdisciplinary program involving some professional courses which might be termed "occupational supplementary" as defined above, and some liberal arts courses, as well.

3. Is this the first of what might be several certificates designed specifically for employed nondegree students in this or other fields?

The University has no present plans for other free-standing certificate programs. If, subsequently, there appeared to be a need therefor, the Board would consider the proposals on their merits.
4. Should the admissions standard allow or encourage persons with vocational certificates or no prior college work to enroll in upper-division and graduate numbered courses?

It is not the intent of the University of Oregon to allow or to encourage persons with "vocational" certification or with no prior college work to enroll in upper-division and graduate courses, as the question implies. A reading of the admissions requirements makes quite clear that the program is open to matriculated upper-division and graduate students, and on a space available basis, to persons in professional employment with the equivalent of a minimum of two years of college work. The University has indicated that it has in mind, nurses, dental hygienists, social workers, health care administrators, the ministry, teachers, and the like.

Issue #2 - Matriculation in the University

The issue being raised by the Coordinating Commission is as to whether the University of Oregon should permit students to earn a certificate without having first matriculated with the University, that is to say, without the student's having first applied formally for admission to the University and having been formally admitted.

It continues to be the Board's Office view that, given the nature of the nonmatriculated students to be served in the University of Oregon and Portland State University programs, both institutions are warranted in offering nonmatriculated students access to their certificate programs. [Since approval of the program, Portland State University has decided that all students admitted to its certificate program will be required to matriculate.]

Issue #3 - Fee Costs

The precise nature of the Commission's concerns relative to fee costs as they relate to the University of Oregon certificate program in gerontology are not entirely clear to the Board's Office. The University of Oregon—like Oregon State University—does have different fee arrangements for part-time admitted or matriculated students than for part-time nonadmitted (nonmatriculated) students.

One of these differences is that the part-time admitted (matriculated) student is classified according to resident status and nonresidents pay a nonresident fee. Part-time nonadmitted (nonmatriculated) students are not classified as to resident status and all pay the same fee for any given number of credit hours.

Part-time admitted (matriculated) students pay fees according to the level of the student (i.e., undergraduate, graduate), irrespective of the level of the courses taken, while part-time nonadmitted students pay fees according to course level in which enrolled (i.e., they pay less for undergraduate courses then they do for graduate courses).

The student credit hour instructional fees paid (as distinguished from the building, incidental and health service fees) are the same for resident admitted students as for nonadmitted (nonmatriculated) students.

The University has felt that the nonmatriculated students who seek the certificate in gerontology should be permitted to earn and to receive the certificate, in accordance with the fee schedules established for the University by the Board.

It is the University's view, shared by the Board's Office, that the certificate program will be of principal interest to those nonmatriculated students who are employed in human service activity types of employment in the general commuting area of the University.
Meeting #464

March 28, 1980

Request for Authorization
To Offer BS Degree Program
in Civil Engineering,
PSU

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, February 22, 1980; present--Carpenter, Anderson, Harms, Warner-Yasuda, and Wyss.)

Summary

Portland State University requests authorization to offer a program of study leading to the degree of bachelor of science in civil engineering, effective as soon as the process for approval of new programs has been completed. The program is an extension of Portland State University's accredited bachelor of science degree program in structural engineering, and will provide an option for students presently enrolled in structural engineering who prefer the broader civil engineering curriculum. The request is presented in the document entitled, Request of Portland State University for Authorization To Offer a Bachelor of Science Degree Program in Civil Engineering, which is on file in the Board's Office.

With approval of the BS degree program in civil engineering, Portland State University's curricula in engineering and applied science will consist of:

- Baccalaureate degree programs in:
  - Applied Science
  - Electrical and Electronics Engineering
  - Structural Engineering
  - Mechanical Engineering (with emphasis in design)
  - Civil Engineering

- Master's degree programs in Applied Science.

The Portland State University request for authorization of a bachelor of science degree program in civil engineering is a part of the continuing process by which Portland State University, in its efforts to meet the needs of the Portland metropolitan area at the baccalaureate level, is moving from an emphasis on applied science to an emphasis on the well-recognized and traditional engineering fields.

Development of high quality, accredited baccalaureate level programs in civil-structural, electrical-electronics, and mechanical engineering programs at Portland State University has been a major objective of the Portland Advisory Committee for Engineering Education. With accreditation of baccalaureate degree programs in electrical and electronics engineering, mechanical engineering, and the new program in civil engineering, the objective identified by the Advisory Council will have been met.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's Office recommended that the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs endorse the Portland State University request and recommend approval thereof by the Board.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Romney reviewed briefly the history of engineering programs at Portland State University. He noted that initially (1960) Portland State University asserted it felt was preferable to a program in traditional engineering. The baccalaureate program in applied science was authorized Portland State University in 1960; the master's program in 1965.

Following the visitation from a team of engineering consultants employed by the Board's Office (former Dean of Engineering at Stanford University, the Dean of Engineering at the University of Houston, and the Dean of Engineering at Washington State University), the Board authorized Portland State University to offer baccalaureate programs in (1) structural engineering and (2) electrical and electronics engineering, effective 1973-74.
The consultants had advised the Board's Office that it was their view that Oregon would be wise to provide in the Portland area access to undergraduate programs in structural engineering, electrical and electronics engineering, and eventually in selected aspects of mechanical engineering. It was their view that Portland State University ought to be authorized programs in the basic engineering areas, namely, electrical and electronics, mechanical, and civil engineering. It was the consultants' view that it would require time and additional effort on Portland State University's part--perhaps more than Portland State University realized--to bring engineering programs in structural and electrical and electronics engineering up to an acceptable level for accreditation.

Accordingly, the Board, on the recommendation of the Board's Office, has authorized Portland State University to offer baccalaureate degree programs in the following engineering fields, as of the date shown.

- Structural engineering (1973-74)
- Electrical and electronics engineering (1973-74)
- Mechanical engineering (1979-80)

Structural engineering was accredited by the national accrediting body for engineering (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) effective 1975-76.

Electrical and electronics engineering, true to the prediction of the consultants, has had difficulty in qualifying for accreditation. In 1975, it was found by the accreditation team to be deficient in equipment and computer resources. These were corrected, Portland State University felt. In 1978, faculty turnover had created an instability that militated against accreditation, so that Portland State University withdrew its request for accreditation following the visit of the accreditation team. Of the seven positions in electrical and electronics engineering, two are yet to be filled by permanent faculty members. These two positions are presently being filled by a faculty member on a fixed term contract, and the second by part-time instructors from Tektronix. These positions are to be filled with permanent appointments by fall term 1980, according to Portland State University, and it is their plan to seek accreditation in the fall of 1982.

Mechanical engineering (with an emphasis in design) has been authorized Portland State University effective 1979-80. Accreditation will be sought fall term 1981--some 13 months hence.

Portland State University now requests authorization to offer a civil engineering program leading to the baccalaureate degree. In one significant aspect of civil engineering--structural engineering--Portland State University has already been accredited by the national accrediting body (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology--ABET). Authorization of the civil engineering program would offer students an option of taking their degree in this broader, more inclusive field which, in addition to the elements of structural engineering, would include work in transportation engineering and environmental (sanitary) engineering.

The courses requisite to the offering of the civil engineering degree program are presently being offered by Portland State University under the authorizations in engineering and applied science that it already has.

Portland State University expects to put additional funding into library acquisitions for its civil engineering program. It has already built up its library resources in support of structural engineering, in which program it has had national accreditation for half a decade. Portland State University expects to apply for accreditation of the civil engineering program in 1981-82, if the program is authorized Portland State University by the Board.

There are two other baccalaureate programs in civil engineering available in Oregon: one at Oregon State University, accredited by ABET; one unaccredited program at the University of Portland.
There are seven faculty in civil engineering—six full-time faculty now, the seventh to be added as the new head of engineering at Portland State University.

President Blumel said that he wanted the Board members to be aware that he had submitted a program improvement request for the 1981-1983 biennium essentially designed to bring the programs in the basic engineering fields (electrical and electronics, structural/civil, and mechanical engineering) not only to, but somewhat beyond, the minimum requirements for accreditation, because Portland State University believes that it will be important to increase in the Portland area the post-baccalaureate courses offered in engineering. That need derives, he said, from the number of electronics firms settling in the Portland metropolitan area.

Asked by Mrs. Carpenter if he were talking about degree programs, he said that Portland State University already has a master's degree program authorization in applied science, but without specific degree designation in an area of specialization. At some point in the future—none the near future, he said—Portland State University would probably request authorization to offer a master's program in electric and electronics engineering.

Responding to a question from Dr. Romney, President Blumel said that the program improvement funds for engineering which he is requesting are not necessary to Portland State University's attaining national accreditation of its programs in electrical and electronics, civil, and mechanical engineering, in none of which fields it presently has accreditation.

Mr. Wyss asserted that the case is clearly made that there should be a program in civil engineering in Portland. The concern is, he said, that some Oregon State University faculty and students feel that the civil engineering program at Oregon State University is seriously underfunded, and overcrowded, and they question the wisdom of authorizing another civil engineering program which will likely also be underfunded. Is this a wise approach to the discipline?

President Blumel said that Portland State University has to make choices in seeking to serve educational needs in Portland. Civil engineering is identified as being clearly an unmet need, and one that Portland State University should fill. The resources in the area of structural/civil engineering are adequate to meet accreditation standards in the judgment of the Portland State University staff, he said.

Mr. Wyss said that his principal concern is to assure that if the program is offered, it be a program of reasonable quality so that students are not disadvantaged in the quality of their education or in their ability to compete for employment in their chosen field.

Professor Erzurumlu explained that the tie between structural engineering (in which Portland State University has had national accreditation since 1975) and civil engineering is a close one and that the students served in the two fields are essentially the same students. He is confident, he said, that the resources Portland State University has in civil/structural engineering, together with what else Portland State University can add in the way of library resources, will provide the base for a good quality engineering education program. He feels sure that the Portland State University equipment and laboratory facilities are more than adequate to meet accreditation standards in civil engineering. What is needed, he said, is to provide students with an additional option in engineering education.

Mrs. Carpenter asked whether the student/teacher ratio in engineering is a reasonable one. President Blumel asserted that, so far as he could recall, the ratio in engineering is 17 to 1 which he'd like ultimately to reduce to 15 to 1. This can be accomplished either by shifting staff internally into engineering, or by restricting enrollments in engineering, or by some combination of the two.
Mr. Harms said that he saw no way that Oregon State University's program in civil engineering would be benefited by the Board's denial of a civil engineering program for Portland State University. Failure to authorize Portland State University the civil engineering program it requests will not add anything in the way of fiscal support to Oregon State University's civil engineering program. Likewise, approval of Portland State University's requested program will not detract from the level of support for Oregon State University's program.

Mr. Wyss said that he was primarily concerned that if the Portland State University program is authorized it be a good quality program, which may mean taking resources from some other Portland State University program in order to provide the necessary support in engineering, or it may mean making the decision not to try and offer some other programs for which it may also be said there is demand in the Portland area.

Mr. Anderson said that as he understood it, students presently in structural engineering, which is accredited, would have the option of a broader program in civil engineering.

Professor Erzurumlu said that he estimated that as many as half the students in structural engineering would wish to shift to the civil engineering option.

Mr. Anderson asked if Portland State University saw any other engineering fields in which they might wish to seek a baccalaureate degree authorization, such as aerospace engineering, or would the civil engineering authorization essentially complete the Portland State University baccalaureate programs in engineering. President Blumel said that Portland State University had no other aspirations for engineering authorizations at the baccalaureate level. Their commitment has been to develop baccalaureate programs in the three basic fields of electrical and electronics engineering, mechanical engineering, civil engineering. That will have been accomplished if the Board authorizes the requested program in civil engineering. He said that Portland State University did feel that it ought, in the next few years, to seek to offer more post-baccalaureate courses in the Portland area, principally in electrical and electronics engineering. Portland State University has a master's program in applied science.

Mrs. Carpenter asked whether Portland State University believes that it can get accreditation soon for its baccalaureate electrical and electronics engineering program, which it has had for some years. President Blumel responded that Portland State University hoped to ask again for accreditation in the fall of 1982--two and one-half years hence.

Responding to a question from Mrs. Carpenter, Professor Erzurumlu asserted that his estimate is that approximately one-third of the students in engineering are less than full-time students. Approximately one-half the engineering courses at Portland State University are offered after four o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Harms moved that the Committee recommend to the Board approval of the staff recommendation that Portland State University be authorized the proposed program in civil engineering. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Perry asked Mr. Wyss whether he was satisfied with respect to the questions of quality he had raised during the Committee discussions. Mr. Wyss indicated that after additional information and study he was. He said in both engineering and business it is difficult to hire quality faculty members because salaries are not competitive. He said it will be very expensive to upgrade the quality and expressed the desire to protect the business and engineering faculty as a high priority in this biennium and the next.
President Blumel explained that the plan for meeting the needs in engineering education in the Portland area involved first developing the three basic disciplines of electrical/electronics, mechanical, and civil engineering. The present request is the last stage of that development and the resources are essentially in place. The next stage anticipated by the institution is the expansion on a planned and deliberate basis of offerings at the post-baccalaureate level, particularly in electrical and electronics engineering. It is understood that the Oregon Graduate Center plans to offer master's level work in engineering and doctoral level work in selected specialties, particularly computer engineering and computer science.

Mr. Batiste said there were serious implications in undertaking a civil engineering course at Portland State University when at the same time Oregon State University is being forced to limit enrollment due to lack of facilities and staff. When the status of engineering in Oregon is considered, the Board must make a decision on whether it is going to continue to duplicate university programs at more than one university. The Board has expressed strong support for quality of education and excellence in its programs. Mr. Batiste said the Board, at this point, should vote in a manner that would express its intent to have quality engineering education and to indicate that a university is not the kind of institution that should be duplicated in this state. He said the universities are unique and that uniqueness must be protected. Portland State University is an urban university with urban problems. Because of the location of the electronics industry in the Portland area and the emphasis on power in the State of Oregon, certainly electrical engineering is very well chosen. However, Mr. Batiste said he could not favor the continuing development of non-electrical engineering courses at Portland State University as being in the interest either of the state or the University. The diversities between the universities should be maintained and funded. The proposed program is not inconsistent with maintaining that diversity and funding.

Mr. Wyss indicated he had expressed similar concerns to the Committee. Mr. Harms had pointed out that denial of the program to Portland State University would not necessarily be to the advantage of Oregon State University by transferring funds for the improvement of that program. Therefore, Mr. Wyss said, the choice seems to be not between having two programs that are not excellent but between offering enough engineering courses to people who want them in the state to help supply the needs of the community. Mr. Wyss said he found that argument persuasive.

Mr. Batiste said his concern was not the transfer of funds, but he was suggesting that in terms of program improvements the Board analyze whether program improvements are necessary at Oregon State University to maintain it as the one large engineering university in the state.

Dr. Romney said a committee of three distinguished engineering professors had been brought to Oregon in 1973 to review the situation with respect to engineering and to make recommendations. At the conclusion of their study, they recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to designate its program in civil engineering with the title of structural engineering and to continue the title of electrical engineering for that program. It was further recommended that accreditation be sought for these two areas and that the institution then extend activities to the mechanical areas, perhaps with a design emphasis. Subsequently, Portland State University has been authorized baccalaureate programs in electrical, structural, and mechanical engineering. The institution now requests authorization to offer a broader program with added offerings comprising the program in civil engineering. The accreditation process is underway for each of the three programs. The institution has proceeded in accordance with the recommendations of the consultants and the present request is also consistent with those recommendations.
Mr. Ingalls said he intended to vote against the proposal because the Board's limited resources require the expertise in the various fields to be used in a concentrated way. If there is to be excellence in any field, the Board must make the most of its opportunities and concentrate in the areas where the programs are already existing.

Mr. Harms said philosophically he agreed with Mr. Ingalls but the issue did not involve a great expenditure and would improve the existing engineering program at Portland State University.

The first and foremost responsibility of Portland State University is to meet the educational needs of the Portland metropolitan area, President Blume stated. Engineering education is a very significant element in those needs, now and in the foreseeable future, and it should not be ignored. It impacts the economic base of the area and addresses the educational needs and wishes of students who do not, for whatever reason, have available the opportunity to pursue education elsewhere. President Blume said he was not arguing that every educational need should be served, but there are some which are of great significance to potential students and to the welfare of the area served by Portland State University, and these should be addressed seriously. Engineering is in this context, and Portland State University should offer baccalaureate work in civil, mechanical and electrical engineering. Further, President Blume said there should be expanded post-baccalaureate offerings to meet the needs of practicing engineers and the urgent recommendations made by existing firms in the Portland metropolitan area and those contemplating locations there.

Mr. Batiste said he would agree that the electrical engineering program was of great importance and he could support it but that offering could be accomplished without the civil engineering course. Approval of the proposed program would represent, on a piecemeal basis, a move in the direction of having two major engineering universities in the State of Oregon.

President Blume said he was not proposing the development of two full-scale engineering schools in Oregon in the foreseeable future nor expanding the number of engineering courses beyond those three basics and the offering of advanced graduate courses. The matter of duplication is one of duplication of selected elements.

Mr. Ater said that the mandate to the Board has been to prevent unnecessary duplication but that duplication in itself was not bad. In fact, it is often a useful thing. He commented that nothing in the materials presented on this program suggested that operating baccalaureate programs at two locations would necessarily impair the quality of either. In addition to a concern about duplication, the Board must consider service to the different areas and regions of the state. Mr. Ater said, in his opinion, approval of the modest request for this program would not create unnecessary duplication or the replication of two full-blown engineering schools.

President Perry said the discussion had been useful because the Board increasingly will be faced with difficult decisions with respect to the priority for a community need as contrasted with improvements to existing programs.

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

Staff Report to the Board

The Portland State University request is presented on pp. 1a-15a of the full report.

This present proposal is part of the planned development of engineering education in the State System of Higher Education, as approved by the Board. The status of engineering education in Oregon was reviewed for
the Board's Committee on Instruction April 27, 1979, in connection with the
Portland State University request for authorization to offer a bachelor of
science degree program in mechanical engineering. Since that date the only
significant change in the status of engineering education has been the
announcement by Oregon State University that effective fall term 1981,
admission to the professional engineering program will be at the junior level
and will be limited to the number of students the school of engineering is
able to serve with resources available to it. The reorganized curriculum
and competitive admissions policies are designed to control soaring enrollments
which were making it increasingly difficult to maintain the programs at an
acceptable level of quality. Inauguration of the program in civil engineering
at Portland State University will relieve enrollment pressure in this major
area of engineering study.

The program at Portland State University can be inaugurated without addi­
tional courses or staff, and within existing physical facilities. With the
exception of some needed strengthening of the civil engineering library
collection, all resources to offer the program are substantially in place.
The library strengthening is a part of the department's planned develop­
ment, which has seen approximately 70% of the department library budget
devoted to selective strengthening of the electrical-electronics engineering
collection. This strengthening has been largely accomplished, and the
department is turning its attention to library needs in support of the mechani­
cal and civil engineering programs.

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant,
February 22, 1980; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Wyss.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Committee approve guidelines for proposed fee
rates and summer room and board rates to be set forth in the Summer
Session Fee Book for the 1980 Summer Session and that a public hearing be
scheduled to set 1980 summer session fees at the March 1980 Board meeting.

It was further recommended that following public hearing at the March 28,
1980, Board meeting, OAR 580-40-035, Summer Session Fee Book, be amended
as follows:

Summer Session Fee Book

580-40-035 The published document entitled, "Department of Higher
Education Summer Session Fee Book, dated March 31, 1980 [1979], is
hereby adopted by reference as a permanent rule. All prior adoptions
of summer session fee documents are hereby repealed, except as to
rights and obligations previously acquired or incurred thereunder.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Perry declared that the time set for the public hearing on the proposed
amendment of OAR 580-40-035, Summer Session Fee Book, had arrived and
asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed amendment.
There being no response to his request, Mr. Perry declared the public
hearing closed on this item.

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented and adopted the
proposed amendment on roll call vote with the following voting in favor:
Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Green, Harms, Ingalls,
 Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None. Mr. Thorp
was absent at the time of the roll call vote. The President of the Board
declared the amendment duly adopted.
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Staff Report to the Committee

Tuition and Fees

The Board annually establishes summer session fees under an Administrative Rule which distinguishes summer rates from those applicable during the terms of the academic year. Policies currently used to establish summer session fee rates have been in effect since January 1975. The significant policy guidelines are:

1. No residency determination is required for summer session students.
2. The instruction fee for undergraduate students is 15% greater than the instruction fee for the preceding academic term.
3. The instruction fee for graduate students is 10% greater than the instruction fee for the preceding academic term.
4. Incidental and health service fees recommended by the institutions cannot exceed the amount approved by the Board for full-time students in the preceding academic term.
5. The building fee for full-time students is established at a rate less than that for an academic term.
6. Fees which are not specifically described in the Summer Session Fee Book but which are applicable throughout the fiscal year are to be administered under policies and at rates applicable in the 1979-80 Academic Year Fee Book.

It is proposed that the summer policy guidelines be continued with one major modification. The 1979 Legislature required that 1980 summer session fee support be increased, and that State General Fund support be decreased, to move part-way toward a 1981-1983 goal that summer session be 80% fee supported. As requested, the 1980 session would have been about 73% fee supported. The part-way movement required by the Legislature is intended to move to about 76% fee support.

The legislative action affects only the instruction fee component of the tuition charge. Building, incidental and health service fees continue under existing policies. The impact of the legislative change can be illustrated for full-time student instruction fees as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1979 Session</th>
<th>1980 Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Policy</td>
<td>Legis. Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>$223</td>
<td>$243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>$366</td>
<td>$392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is intended that the full-time student rates presented for Committee review be utilized to develop part-time rates and that the full display of fee schedules in the fee book be submitted for Board review in March 1980.
Meeting #464
 Residence Hall and Food Service Charges, 1980-81

Tuition and fee recommendations for full-time students, 1980 Summer Session, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instruction Fee</th>
<th>Building Fee</th>
<th>Incidental Fee</th>
<th>Health Service Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Fee</td>
<td>Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$401.00</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>401.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>401.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>237.00</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>237.00</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>221.00</td>
<td>389.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* OIT provides no health service during summer session.

Room and Board Rates

The 1980 Summer Session room and board rates recommendations are shown on the attached exhibits. If approved, these schedules will become a part of the 1980 Summer Session Fee Book.

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

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Board:

1. Approve institution and Board staff recommended 1980-81 academic year residence hall room and board rates for Oregon State University, University of Oregon, Southern Oregon State College, Oregon College of Education, Oregon Institute of Technology, and University of Oregon Health Sciences Center as presented in Figure 1.

2. Accept Eastern Oregon State College recommended 1980-81 room and board rates, but postpone approval pending review and approval of a detailed institution budget and management plan designed to eliminate the projected debt service overdraft.

3. Require that institutions state in all publications which include residence hall and food service charges that the Board has the authority to modify charges during the year if the costs substantially exceed estimates on which the charges are based.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Ingalls said questions raised earlier had been resolved and there is a general feeling that students will be moving back into residence halls. It is anticipated all of the institutions, including Eastern Oregon State College, will have an improved financial situation as a result of increased occupancy.
Mr. Ater said the Committee had agreed tentatively to accept the rates for Eastern Oregon State College but to postpone approval pending study of a management plan for reducing the deficit. He asked whether there would be a public hearing on the rates for Eastern Oregon State College as part of the residence hall rates for the State System, or whether it would occur at a later time after the management plan had been considered.

Dr. Richard Perry, Director of the Management and Planning Services Division of the Office of Administration, said the Internal Management Directives require an institution which projects a deficit to bring to the Board a plan which would enable the institution to break even within a reasonable time. Eastern Oregon State College is in the process of preparing such a plan, and it is anticipated it will be presented to the Finance Committee in April.

Dr. Perry said he expects to receive a proposal which could be recommended to the Board. The present recommendation includes approval of the rates for Eastern Oregon State College so that the institution will be in a position to disseminate information on its room and board rates for next year.

Mr. Lemman recommended that the Board approve the rates, with the understanding that if any necessary change were recommended for Eastern Oregon State College, there would be a public hearing.

In that event, Mr. Ater said the Board would be having a public hearing on the rates for Eastern Oregon State College and interested individuals should be aware of that fact so that they could comment. The motion would be for approval of the rates at all of the institutions, with the understanding that if the budget plan presented by Eastern Oregon State College required a change, there would be a public hearing on any modifications.

Mr. Thorp inquired whether board and room rates could remain the same or be reduced if all of the residence halls were operating at full capacity. Mr. Lemman responded that full occupancy would help to lower the amount of the increase, but it would not be possible to retain the present rates or have a reduction.

Mr. Perry said that the time set for the public hearing on the proposed residence hall and food service charges for 1980-81 had arrived and indicated that Mr. Scott Bassett, President of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, and Mr. Donald Chalmers, Director of the Office of Student Advocacy at the University of Oregon, had requested an opportunity to present statements.

Mr. Bassett expressed appreciation to the Board for its decision to return the interest generated on housing deposits to the students for their allocation. He stated that this action had increased significantly student activity and involvement in dormitory governance. After reviewing the attractiveness of dormitory living and the projected occupancy rate, Mr. Bassett requested the Board to consider these factors to determine whether it would be possible to reduce the rate of increase in the room and board charges.

Mr. Chalmers called attention to the 1978-79 and 1979-80 excess earnings which primarily have been placed in excess sinking fund reserve accounts for improvements to the facilities. Some of this money has been spent for this purpose, but the remainder of approximately $500,000 has not been projected for a particular use and generates interest. He questioned whether excess sinking fund reserves are appropriate in the present economic situation. The projected amount for 1980-81 is $26,262 and it was recognized that this amount would be a slim margin of earnings in view of the size of the residence hall and food service operations. Another issue raised by Mr. Chalmers was the effect on dormitory rates of purchasing property from excess housing dollars and the question of reimbursement if the properties were used for purposes other than housing.

A third factor which is of importance in residence hall rates is the designed-rated capacity. As occupancy approaches designed-rated capacity more closely, the amount of increase required becomes less.
It was suggested that the net earnings projected for 1980-81 were inordinately low. Mr. Ingalls asked whether this was an effort to reduce the accumulation in the excess building fund reserves. Vice President Ray Hawk said this was part of the reason but it was also an effort to offer students the lowest possible figure in view of the inflationary spiral. He cited inflationary factors in food and fuel as special problems in costs for student housing. Dr. Hawk commented that the occupancy rate had been changed from the designed capacity because the rooms had proved to be too small to be attractive to students other than freshmen. In an effort to strike a balance of lower division, upper division, and graduate students in the residence halls, the full design-rated capacity is not achieved. With respect to property purchases from residence hall earnings, Dr. Hawk said the Silva property specifically mentioned by Mr. Chalmers is under study and no final decision has been made concerning its use. Ultimately, financial transactions required because of its use will be made.

Mr. Wyss asked if there were any policies against using any excess income for purchasing land. Dr. Hawk responded that he was not aware of any. He mentioned acquisitions in the East Campus area and stated that any surplus land may be needed for future housing and it would not be prudent to divert it to other activities.

Mr. Wyss pointed out that students now very well may be paying into a fund that is used for investment for the benefit of future students, just as past students paid into a fund that benefits present students. Dr. Hawk concurred and stated that the properties acquired are currently occupied by students with rare exceptions, such as transitional housing for new faculty families.

Mr. Lemman referred to marketable capacity as contrasted with design capacity. At the University of Oregon the design capacity is 3,354, of which 356 have been converted from double occupancy to single occupancy accommodations. The marketable capacity is lower than design capacity, and the University of Oregon is at or above full marketable capacity.

Mr. Wyss inquired of Mr. Chalmers or Mr. Bassett what they would consider a fair rate of increase. Mr. Chalmers said the added expenses might not represent a 10% upward adjustment and suggested that increases in the board and room rates should be something less than 10%.

Mr. Perry asked if anyone else wished to be heard on the matter of the residence hall and food service charges for 1980-81. There being no response, he declared the public hearing closed on this item.

Mr. Ater commented that the State System is presently in a situation in which new housing cannot be constructed. If there are pressures for on-campus housing, the Board should instruct the institution to look carefully at the resources available and make the best possible use of those facilities.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented and on roll call vote the following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Green, Harms, Ingalls, Thorp, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: Director Warner-Yasuda. The rates will be incorporated in the academic year fee book for 1980-81.

Staff Report to the Committee

In recommending residence hall room and board charges for 1980-81, each institution estimated residence hall occupancy in relation to enrollment projections and present occupancy, used:

- expense figures which project salary and wage increases in accordance with the appropriate collective bargaining agreements;
a 12% average increase in the cost of services and supplies (excluding utility costs) and in food costs;

utility cost increases ranging from 15%-45%.

The range in utility costs is caused by differences among institutions in both utilization and cost allocation procedures. Debt service requirements were calculated using the recently adopted five-year average occupancy method as described in IMD 6.315 (see Figures 3 and 4).

Recommended increases in 1980-81 room and board rates, as shown in Figure 1, indicate that the standard multiple occupancy rate ranges from $1,740 at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University to $1,835 at Eastern Oregon State College. These rates would result in increases over 1979-80 rates ranging from 10.1% at the University of Oregon to 12% at Oregon Institute of Technology.

Actual and projected earnings from operations for the years 1978-79 and 1979-80 are presented in Figure 2. Projected earnings at each institution for 1980-81, based on anticipated occupancy and the recommended rates, are also presented in Figure 2.

Projected budget plans presented by Southern Oregon State College, Oregon College of Education, and Oregon Institute of Technology indicate that each institution will generate sufficient earnings after debt service during 1979-80 and 1980-81, either to establish the additional fully-funded one-quarter year earnings emergency debt service reserve as required by IMD 6.310(1), or to contribute at least 20% annually for the next five years toward that required emergency reserve.

The University of Oregon and Oregon State University have adequate funds in their institutional sinking fund reserves to establish this additional emergency reserve on June 30, 1980.

Inasmuch as officials at Eastern Oregon State College project a net loss after debt service for 1980-81 of $38,999, the Vice Chancellor for Administration, in accordance with IMD 6.320(1), has requested that President Briggs or his designee present to the Board a detailed budget and management plan designed to eliminate the projected debt service overdraft by June 30, 1985. Because the plan was not received and therefore reviewed prior to the mailing of the Committee agenda, the Board's staff is recommending postponement of Board approval of Eastern Oregon State College's recommended 1980-81 room and board rates.

Price standards established by the federal Council on Wage and Price Stability are continued in 1980-81. Recommended room and board charges conform with these standards in that estimated 1980-81 net earnings for all campuses are either less than the base year standard or represent the modest turn around of prior year deficits. Two measures of compliance are allowed: a price deceleration standard and an operating margin (net income) standard. Because of the multiplicity of rates and variety of housing services and programs, it was determined that the operating margin standard would provide a more appropriate measure of compliance.
## Figure 1

**OREGON DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

Proposed Residence Hall Room and Board Rates 1980-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Proposed Rates 1980-81</th>
<th>Actual Rates 1979-80</th>
<th>Percent of Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UO Standard--20M/7 Days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,740</td>
<td>$1,580</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Inn--20M/7 Days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$2,262</td>
<td>$2,054</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excludes Social Fee required of all resident students--$9/year, $3/term.  
2 Includes linen, excludes telephone service in room.  
3 Includes linen, maid service, and telephone service in room.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OSU Standard--19M/7 Days</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snell, Cauthorn (men), Cauthorn (women), West, Hawley, McNary, Wilson, Finley, Poling, Buxton, and Callahan</td>
<td>$1,740</td>
<td>$1,565</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>2,262</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Single</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Weatherford</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,640</td>
<td>$1,465</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Single</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sackett</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,770</td>
<td>$1,595</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Single</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bloss</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Single</td>
<td>2,065</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Board Only--19M/7 Days</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Triple</td>
<td>$1,733</td>
<td>$1,576</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Double</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Design Single</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Double</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Design Single</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large, w/Shared Bath</td>
<td>2,201</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>1,823</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A 15-meal plan (Monday through Friday only) option is available at a cost of $60 less than the applicable 19-meal rate.  
2 A 15-meal plan/5 days option is available at a cost of $45 less than the applicable 20-meal plan rate.  
3 Excludes Social Fee required of all resident students.  
4 Includes linen; excludes telephone service in room.  
5 Includes linen; excludes cost for telephone service provided in room.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Proposed Rates 1980-81</th>
<th>Actual Rates 1979-80</th>
<th>Percent of Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Inn—20M/7 Days 1, 2, 4—Equal Payment Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Triple</td>
<td>$1,796</td>
<td>$1,667</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Triple</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Double</td>
<td>1,976</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Double</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Design Single</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Design Single</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, w/Shared Bath</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1A 15-meal plan (Monday through Friday only) option is available at a cost of $60 less than the applicable 19-meal plan rate.
2A 15-meal plan/5 days option is available at a cost of $45 less than the applicable 20-meal plan rate.
3Excludes Social Fee required of all resident students.
4Includes linen; excludes telephone service in room.
5Includes linen; excludes cost for telephone service provided in room.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Proposed Rates 1980-81</th>
<th>Actual Rates 1979-80</th>
<th>Percent of Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOSC Standard-Cascade—Equivalent to 19 M/7 Days 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,783</td>
<td>$1,630</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes, Green Springs 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,805</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupon Meal Program 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,683</td>
<td>$1,530</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homes, Green Springs 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,705</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siskiyou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple (NYACC Negotiated Contract)</td>
<td>$3,530</td>
<td>$3,304</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Excludes Social Fee required of all resident students—$10/year, $7 winter only, $4 spring only.
2Excludes linen and cost of telephone service provided in student rooms in the following halls—Green Springs, Forest, Glasier, Ivy, Hawthorne, and Emerald. Excludes linen and telephone service (optional) in the following halls—Aspen, Baker, Cedar, Diamond, and Homes.
340% of meals, unlimited choices and seconds; or 60% of meals with limited portions and no seconds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Proposed Rates 1980-81</th>
<th>Actual Rates 1979-80</th>
<th>Percent of Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCE Standard—19 M/7 Days 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,795</td>
<td>$1,640</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Occupants</td>
<td>$1,965</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Occupants</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Occupant</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Excludes Social Fee required of all resident students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Proposed Rates 1980-81</th>
<th>Actual Rates 1979-80</th>
<th>Percent of Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard-19 M/7 Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>$1,826</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deluxe Multiple</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Only</td>
<td>$1,065</td>
<td>$930</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Excludes linen and cost of telephone service provided in room.

| EOSC | Standard-14M/7 Days (No Breakfast) | | |
| Multiple | $1,775 | $1,590 | 11.6 |
| Single | 2,285 | 2,105 | 8.6 |
| Deluxe Single | 2,430 | 2,270 | 7.0 |
| Standard-15M/M-F | | | |
| Multiple | $1,790 | $1,600 | 11.9 |
| Single | 2,300 | 2,110 | 9.0 |
| Deluxe Single | 2,445 | 2,280 | 7.2 |
| Standard-19M/7 Days | | | |
| Multiple | $1,835 | $1,640 | 11.9 |
| Single | 2,345 | 2,150 | 9.1 |
| Deluxe Single | 2,490 | 2,330 | 7.3 |
| Board Only | | | |
| 14 Meals/No Breakfast, 7 Days | $1,155 | $1,034 | 11.7 |
| 15 Meals/M-F | 1,165 | 1,040 | 12.0 |
| 19 Meals/7 Days | 1,195 | 1,066 | 12.1 |

2Excludes linen and telephone service provided in room.

| UOHSC | Room Only | | |
| 4-Term | | | |
| Multiple | $1,056 | $943 | 12.0 |
| Single | 1,408 | 1,260 | 11.8 |
| 3-Term | | | |
| Multiple | $850.20 | $759 | 12.0 |
| Single | 1,130.10 | 1,009 | 12.0 |
| 1-Term | | | |
| Multiple | $329.25 | $294 | 12.0 |
| Single | 427.25 | 381.50 | 12.0 |
| Monthly | | | |
| Multiple | $120 | $109 | 10.1 |
| Single | 158.45 | 141.50 | 12.0 |
| Weekly | | | |
| Multiple | $30.50 | $27.50 | 10.9 |
| Single | 39.75 | 35.50 | 12.0 |
| Nightly/Apartment | | | |
| Per Person | $8.50 | $7.50 | 13.3 |
| Per Person-3 Nights | | | |
| Minimum | $6.25 | -- | N.A. |

1All rates include initial issue of linen. Students are responsible for laundering. Rates exclude telephone service.
Figure 2

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Actual and Estimated Earnings From Residence Hall Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Oregon</th>
<th>Actual 1978-79</th>
<th>Estimated 1979-80</th>
<th>Budget 1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-Term Average Occupancy</td>
<td>2,857</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>2,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$5,443,035</td>
<td>$6,235,700</td>
<td>$6,606,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$1,624,662</td>
<td>$1,936,331</td>
<td>$2,116,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>1,541,578</td>
<td>1,820,237</td>
<td>2,188,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>1,283,055</td>
<td>1,525,000</td>
<td>1,675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>548,385</td>
<td>613,098</td>
<td>650,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$4,987,680</td>
<td>$5,894,666</td>
<td>$6,580,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Earnings (Loss)</td>
<td>$ 455,355</td>
<td>$ 341,034</td>
<td>$ 26,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design rated capacity 3,354.
Excludes additional one-quarter year earnings emergency debt service reserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oregon State University</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-Term Average Occupancy</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>4,369</td>
<td>4,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$6,424,099</td>
<td>$7,291,887</td>
<td>$8,001,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$2,504,615</td>
<td>$2,785,700</td>
<td>$3,293,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>1,370,544</td>
<td>1,420,952</td>
<td>1,707,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>1,660,058</td>
<td>1,830,734</td>
<td>1,948,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>741,318</td>
<td>994,844</td>
<td>991,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$6,277,035</td>
<td>$7,032,230</td>
<td>$7,940,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Earnings (Loss)</td>
<td>$ 147,064</td>
<td>$ 259,657</td>
<td>$ 60,546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design rated capacity 4,720.
1978-79 and 1979-80 income and expenses exclude income and expenses associated with the contract with Professional Food Management, Inc., to operate and manage the College Inn.
Includes income and expenses associated with the PFM contract.
Excludes additional one-quarter year earnings emergency debt service reserve.
Excludes debt service for College Inn.
### Southern Oregon State College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1978-79</th>
<th>Estimated 1979-80</th>
<th>Budget 1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-Term Average Occupancy</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$2,089,095</td>
<td>$2,341,521</td>
<td>$2,647,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$701,269</td>
<td>$841,075</td>
<td>$983,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>566,923</td>
<td>707,580</td>
<td>795,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>432,431</td>
<td>463,808</td>
<td>556,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>292,122</td>
<td>291,952</td>
<td>275,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$1,992,745</td>
<td>$2,304,415</td>
<td>$2,612,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Earnings (Loss)</td>
<td>$96,350</td>
<td>$37,106</td>
<td>$35,637</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oregon College of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1978-79</th>
<th>Estimated 1979-80</th>
<th>Budget 1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-Term Average Occupancy</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$1,158,236</td>
<td>$1,310,474</td>
<td>$1,462,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$406,457</td>
<td>$493,930</td>
<td>$543,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>226,554</td>
<td>318,935</td>
<td>397,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>279,277</td>
<td>313,224</td>
<td>363,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>158,019</td>
<td>179,661</td>
<td>158,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$1,070,307</td>
<td>$1,305,750</td>
<td>$1,462,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Earnings (Loss)</td>
<td>$87,929</td>
<td>$4,724</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Oregon Institute of Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1978-79</th>
<th>Estimated 1979-80</th>
<th>Budget 1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-Term Average Occupancy</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$983,979</td>
<td>$1,060,213</td>
<td>$1,215,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$382,110</td>
<td>$353,242</td>
<td>$421,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>191,341</td>
<td>286,000</td>
<td>343,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>273,076</td>
<td>287,500</td>
<td>319,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>115,793</td>
<td>132,501</td>
<td>120,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$962,320</td>
<td>$1,059,243</td>
<td>$1,204,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Earnings (Loss)</td>
<td>$21,659</td>
<td>$970</td>
<td>$10,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Design rated capacity 1,463. Average occupancy excludes 100 non-student contracted residents of the NYACC program.
2. Excludes additional one-quarter year earnings emergency debt service reserve.
3. Design rated capacity 919. Average occupancy excludes 95 non-student contracted residents of the Oregon Police Academy program.
4. Design rated capacity 552.
### Eastern Oregon State College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1978-79</th>
<th>Estimated 1979-80</th>
<th>Budget 1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-Term Average Occupancy&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$759,763</td>
<td>$805,687</td>
<td>$953,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$347,703</td>
<td>$356,504</td>
<td>$370,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>217,945</td>
<td>248,658</td>
<td>270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>222,648</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>258,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>113,181</td>
<td>128,009</td>
<td>93,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$901,477</td>
<td>$983,171</td>
<td>$992,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Earnings (Loss)</td>
<td>$(141,714)</td>
<td>$(177,484)</td>
<td>$(38,999)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### University of Oregon Health Sciences Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 1978-79</th>
<th>Estimated 1979-80</th>
<th>Budget 1980-81</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three-Term Average Occupancy&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$115,258</td>
<td>$138,000</td>
<td>$155,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$55,822</td>
<td>$58,800</td>
<td>$67,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>57,746</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>70,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>62,010</td>
<td>62,969</td>
<td>63,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$175,578</td>
<td>$200,769</td>
<td>$200,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Earnings (Loss)</td>
<td>$(60,320)</td>
<td>$(62,769)</td>
<td>$(45,254)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> Design rated capacity 627.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes additional one-quarter year earnings emergency debt service reserve.

<sup>3</sup> Design rated capacity 170.
**Figure 3**

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Calculation of Residence Hall Five-Year Academic Year Average Occupancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>2,621</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td>2,857</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>2,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>4,293</td>
<td>4,297</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>4,369</td>
<td>4,327</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>4,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>100³</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>95⁴</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Five-year average academic year occupancy will be recalculated using actual occupancy for Spring Term 1980 when data is available.
2. Assumes a four-year average occupancy in Snell Hall of 224.
3. Residents in NYACC program.
4. Residents in Oregon Police Academy Program.
### Analysis of Residence Hall Debt Service and Earnings Requirements
#### For Fiscal Year 1980-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Hall Five-Year Average Occupancy</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>HOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,672</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>4,327</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Debt Service Requirement in Fiscal Year 1980-81 for 1982-83**: $3,020,567

**Deduct:**
- Interest on Consolidated Sinking Fund Reserve: $470,000
- Debt Service Grants From College Housing Program: 83,852
- Maaske Hall, OCE Debt Service Paid by Current General Fund: 17,961
- Total System Credits: $571,813

**1980-81 Gross Earnings Required to Meet 1982-83 Debt Service**: $2,448,754

**Deduct:**
- Interest on Excess Institutional Sinking Fund Reserves: $152,928
- Real Property Rental Earnings: 25,000
- Total Institutional Credits: $177,928

**1980-81 Net Earnings Required to Meet 1982-83 Debt Service**: $2,270,826

**Emergency Debt Service Reserve -- One-Fourth Year Additional Earnings Based on 1980-81 Debt Service**: $753,152

---

1. Includes spaces occupied by resident assistants. Three-term average occupancy for years 1975-76 through 1979-80.
2. Assumes a four-year average occupancy (1976-77 through 1979-80) in Snell Hall of 224.
3. Includes 100 non-student contracted residents of the NYACC program.
4. Includes 95 non-student contracted residents of the Oregon Police Academy program.
5. Distribution of debt service among the six institutions will be recalculated to reflect actual Spring Term 1980 occupancy data. Estimated debt service per average occupancy is $253.18 for each institution.
Amendment of OAR 580-21-045, Conditions of Employment on Gift, Grant and Contract Funds

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 22, 1980; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Wyss.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

For the purpose of clarification, it was recommended that OAR 580-21-045, Conditions of Employment on Gift, Grant, and Contract Funds, be amended as follows:

Conditions of Employment on Gift, Grant and Contract Funds

OAR 580-21-045 (1) The President of each institution shall determine whether unclassified personnel [employed in federal or foreign governmental contract programs] whose employment is financed primarily by gifts, grants or contracts, which have qualification or tenure requirements substantially different than those for regular academic staff, shall be subject to Administrative Rule provisions regarding vacations, sick leave, tenure, and promotion, sabbatical leave, and timely notice of nonrenewal or termination of employment.

(2) For those employees which the President determines shall not be subject to the above-mentioned provisions, applicable employment conditions shall be stipulated in their notice of employment, unless stated in Board Administrative Rules.

(2) Administrative Rules which do not apply to a particular employee, and any substitute provisions, shall be specifically identified in the notice of appointment.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Perry announced that the time set for the public hearing on the amendment of OAR 580-21-045, Conditions of Employment on Gift, Grant and Contract Funds, had arrived, and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed amendment. There being no response to his request, he declared the public hearing closed on this item. The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented and adopted the proposed amendment on roll call vote, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Green, Harms, Ingalls, Thorp, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None. President Perry declared the amendment duly adopted.

Adoption of AR 580-01-020, Availability of Public Records

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 22, 1980; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Wyss.)

Summary

State agencies are permitted to establish reasonable charges for providing copies of public documents to interested individuals. A statement indicating where the documents may be examined and designating any charges made for copies should be included in the Administrative Rules of the agency.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the following Administrative Rule be adopted by the Board following public hearing at its March meeting:

OAR 580-01-020 Availability of Public Records

The public may review all Board documents that are designated public records. These documents are on file in the Board’s Office during regular working hours.
Copies of public records are available to the public upon request. The following charges will be made, payable in advance or when the materials are received:

**Administrative Rules of the Board of Higher Education--current notebook and revisions for a two-year period**

$5.00

**Copies of documents:**

- 1-10 copies: 20¢ per page
- 11 or more: 15¢ per page

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

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

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Perry announced that the time set for the public hearing on the adoption of OAR 580-01-020, Availability of Public Records, had arrived and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed rule. There being no response to his request, Mr. Perry declared the public hearing closed.

The Board adopted the proposed rule as recommended, and on roll call vote the following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Green, Harms, Ingalls, Thorp, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None. The President of the Board declared OAR 580-01-020, Availability of Public Records, duly adopted.

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, February 22, 1980; present--Ingalls, Ater, Batiste, and Thorp.)

**Summary**

In connection with the Conditional Use Permit for the construction of the Addition to Parking Structure III at Portland State University, the Hearings Officer for the City of Portland imposed a requirement that officials of the institution seek authorization from the Board to lease for commercial retail or housing development that portion of Block S 1/2 B which is south of the new parking structure. In order to proceed with the necessary actions to comply with that requirement, it is recommended that requests for proposals be solicited from prospective developers. If an acceptable response is received, the principal lease provisions would be reviewed with the Board before a final commitment is made.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

It was recommended that an invitation be extended through the publication of an advertisement in the Portland Daily Journal of Commerce for proposals to develop the 0.251 acres within Block S 1/2 B south of Parking Structure III Addition for commercial retail and/or housing purposes, subject to all applicable codes and regulations, in accordance with the provisions of the Conditional Use Permit which the City of Portland granted for the construction of the addition to the parking facilities. Tentatively, it is expected that the initial term of the lease would be not less than 20 years nor more than 30 years.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

In presenting the report, Mr. Hunderup stated that there was a footnote in the capital construction authorization by the 1979 Legislature to the effect that it was the understanding of the Ways and Means Capital Construction Subcommittee that all construction projects are subject to applicable city, county, and state approval for planning, zoning and construction. It was further requested that presentation of each project for approval by the
Emergency Board, as required by law prior to the commencement of the construction, clearly demonstrate that such approvals have been obtained. In the presentation of the Parking Structure III Addition project to the Emergency Board, it was indicated that there would be compliance with all of the City of Portland requirements. One of those requirements was the recommendation to make the adjacent site available for commercial retail or housing development. The recommendation is to invite proposals from developers who might be interested in constructing and operating retail stores or housing, or a combination of both of them, in close proximity to the other facilities of Portland State University.

Mr. Hunderup said the policy implications extended beyond Portland State University because other institutions have inquired in the past about the potential for allowing some of the campus land to be used on an interim basis for commercial or housing development. The determination on the present proposal might be interpreted as either permitting or denying similar activities for other campuses. Mr. Hunderup also emphasized that the requirement was for a recommendation to the Board, but the Board was not obligated to approve the recommendation and approval or denial would not affect the construction of Parking Structure III Addition.

Mr. Ater said it would be difficult to make a policy decision until the proposals were received. He said he would favor approving the staff recommendation, reserving judgment with respect to approval until the proposals for commercial enterprises have been made.

Mr. Batiste said any proposal approved should enhance the program of the University and be compatible with it and the services provided to students. He asked whether it was intended that the invitation for proposals would indicate in some priority manner the kinds of development that would be compatible. Mr. Hunderup indicated that this was not anticipated because it would be perhaps more restrictive than would be desirable.

Dr. James Todd, Vice President for Finance and Administration at Portland State University, said that without the requirement imposed upon the institution, the potential activities for the site would not have been pursued. Any approved proposal would have to be something compatible with the environment of the University and serve some important needs. Since the site is not a high traffic area, any commercial retail outlet would be dependent upon the University population for business.

Mr. Hunderup commented that in seeking background material, no comparable situation for a long-term development had been found. The Department of Transportation has leased surplus land for a short term, usually for agricultural purposes pending expansion of state parks. Mr. Hunderup said it would be reasonable to include in the request for proposals language specifying an activity compatible with the purposes of Portland State University. If a satisfactory proposal is not received, it is anticipated that recycling activities would be returned to the site and the property would be landscaped.

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

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

On January 25, 1980, a report was made to the Board concerning the bids and contract award for the addition to Parking Structure III at Portland State University which had been authorized previously by the Board and
the 1979 Legislature. In order to obtain a Conditional Use Permit to construct these facilities, it was necessary to accept the requirement imposed by the Hearings Officer of the City of Portland that the University seek authorization of the Board to lease for commercial retail development or housing that portion of the state-owned property immediately south of the parking structure, as enlarged by the addition, which is bounded by S. W. 12th and 13th Avenues and S. W. Montgomery Street. This 65-foot-wide parcel contains approximately 10,920 square feet, or 0.251 acres. It has a frontage of 147 feet on Montgomery Street, but the northern edge (adjacent to the parking structure) is about 189 feet long. The west boundary is at an angle because of the Stadium Freeway right-of-way. Except for a small building at the southeast corner which had been used on a temporary basis as a collection station for recyclable materials but is currently being used as an office for the construction contractor, the land is unimproved.

Specifically, the October 24, 1979 "Report of Hearings Officer Decision" included the following condition:

A. Portland State University will propose to the Board of Higher Education that the property south of the parking structure be made available for lease to commercial retail or housing developers. Upon authorization from the Board and the Portland Development Commission, proposals for lease will be solicited and a lease negotiated, subject to the applicable codes and regulations. A copy of PSU's proposal to the Board shall be submitted to the Hearings Officer for inclusion in this case file.

Reference to the Portland Development Commission was made because that agency has jurisdiction over the Urban Renewal program under which much of the land within the campus boundaries of Portland State University, including part of this particular parcel, was acquired.

The Board's attorney has pointed out that the Board has authority under ORS 271.310 to lease property which the Board finds is "not needed for public use, or whenever the public interest may be furthered". He cited a 1969 opinion of the Attorney General relating to the leasing of housing units at Portland State University which affirmed the authority of the Board to lease property not needed for Higher Education purposes during the term of the lease even though the purpose of the use by the lessee is not related to Higher Education.

Inasmuch as there are many factors which might influence the decision to lease this particular parcel of land for commercial retail or housing development, including not only economic feasibility or attractiveness but also the type (or types) of activity to be accommodated and the compatibility thereof with University purposes, it appears most advisable to issue a request for proposals so that these can be reviewed and evaluated for further consideration by the staff and the Board before a determination is made to execute a lease. It is assumed that a developer would need a minimum term of 20 years to amortize an investment in improvements, but that the Board would not likely make a lease commitment which would extend more than 30 years--at least for the initial term. (The statutes permit leasing for a maximum period of 99 years.)

Various options, such as to exclude the site of the former recycling station and to require the demolition and removal of the improvements at the conclusion of the lease term so that the site can be restored to its present condition, may be included within the request for proposals.
Summary

The Board will recall that at the August 1978 joint meeting of the State Board of Higher Education, the State Board of Education, and the Coordinating Commission, it was agreed that the Commission should examine the issues relating to Project Advance-type courses in Oregon and should develop some alternative recommendations relating thereto, designed to resolve the differences in view as between the Board's Office and the State Department of Education on these issues.

It was further understood that the Commission should be assisted in its review of the issues by a six-member committee consisting of two representatives from each of the two Education Boards and two from the Coordinating Commission. Mrs. Green and Mr. Ater represented the State Board of Higher Education.

The Commission, on February 15, took action on a set of recommendations and has forwarded them to the two Education Boards for consideration. A copy of the Commission's conclusions and recommendations is included as Supplement A to these minutes.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's Office recommended that the State Board of Higher Education act favorably on the recommendations of the Commission.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Wyss summarized the report and stated the recommendations of the Educational Coordinating Commission with respect to Project Advance activities.

Mr. Ater pointed out that the recommendations do not grant the community colleges the right of first refusal on these projects. The high school has the primary responsibility for defining its program, soliciting proposals, and selecting the institution to offer the proposed program. The community college must have an opportunity, along with other institutions, to submit a proposal if there is a community college in the high school district.

Mrs. Green said there had been improvements in the present proposal. She said she agreed with the Chancellor's position that courses given in the high school in Project Advance are strictly high school courses and could in no way be considered a violation of the 1978 Joint Agreement. A critical need in education is for innovative and creative programs, and the Clackamas High School program in cooperation with Portland State University has been doing precisely that. It is a way of challenging the very bright students in the high school. Mrs. Green said the recommendations were unfortunate interference with the high schools and universities in making their own arrangements. Rules, regulations and limitations result in a very chilling effect on other high schools with respect to starting innovative programs. The wording should provide the high schools with the opportunity to make free decisions, Mrs. Green said. Further, government rules and regulations are inhibiting and create additional costs. The requirements set forth in the regulations will require additional paperwork at added expense.
Mr. Anderson expressed agreement with Mrs. Green's statements and suggested an addition to the Joint Agreement recognizing that there are problems which are to be worked out in much the same manner as the other conflicts which arise and are addressed in the Joint Agreement. This would avoid the bureaucratic approach of regulations.

In concurring with Mrs. Green, Mrs. Carpenter said subsequent minutes of the Educational Coordinating Commission would seem to supplant the original agreements by the Commission by saying that it was absolutely required that the community colleges be approached first. The minutes indicated that at least one Board of Education member felt very strongly that the Board should write regulations in a manner which would assure that perceived status of two-year and four-year institutions played no part whatsoever in Project Advance decisions. Mrs. Carpenter said she would think this would mean very severe regulations and would really deny the interests of students. Discussions from community colleges as to their function have seemed to indicate their students are for the most part somewhat different in their interests and their backgrounds from students who go to four-year institutions. Project Advance is attractive to students who do not have enough to challenge and occupy them in their last year of school. These students are much more likely to be going to a four-year institution, and it would seem logical to encourage them to do so.

The Chancellor said he certainly agreed with the statements by Mrs. Green. He noted that the major impact of the recommendation before the Board falls upon the Board of Education because the State System institutions would be agreeing to do things which they are either doing now or should be doing. He cited recommendations two and three. The first specifies offering basic survey classes in the high schools with other courses to be drawn from regular course offerings, thus prohibiting experimental classes. The second specifies that the high school must go to a community college at the same time or before it goes to a four-year institution. This would affect the high schools, and presumably the Board of Education has the power to impose this upon the high schools. Philosophically, the Chancellor said, he disagreed with that requirement, but it was not the Board of Higher Education's responsibility.

Mr. Ater said the Board was being asked to respond to three quite narrow recommendations: (1) that there be no more doublefunding, which has never affected the State System anyway; (2) that the classes be limited to catalog classes and not experimental ones; and (3) that there should be written contracts for the programs in existence. All of the other matters affect recommendations to the Board of Education, as do most of the other matters which have just been discussed. While Board members may have opinions on these subjects, there is little that can be done about those decisions. He said he would favor the acceptance of these three recommendations so that the Board would be in a position to respond to any high school that requests assistance from one of the State System institutions.

An explanation was requested by Mrs. Green of the advantages of the second recommendation which limits courses to those in the catalog and thereby prevents innovation to meet the needs of a particular group of students.

President Blumel said he agreed that the programs should not consist primarily of experimental courses but in special situations exceptions to the general practice should be permitted. If exceptions are permitted, President Blumel said the mechanisms are available to do this. He said he believed the recommendation as written was intended to preclude the use of omnibus numbers, which are the device used for experimental courses.

Mr. Ater said he believed there was still some room for negotiation within the language. He said he shared the basic feeling that this proposal is a very bureaucratic response to a simple problem, but it does represent progress from the situation last summer at the time of the joint meeting. The language in the recommendations provide room for negotiations and flexibility in working out arrangements for Project Advance programs.
Mr. Harms reiterated his earlier remarks with respect to an unjustified amount of effort being expended in terms of the importance of the problem.

Mr. Ater moved that the Board approve the Commission’s Recommendations 1, 2, and 3. Recommendation 4 is a contingent recommendation which does not affect the Board of Higher Education. Mrs. Green requested that the Board consider the matter further after lunch in order to provide an opportunity to consider the possibility of a substitute motion which would express the Board’s concern about the regulations. Following lunch, Mr. Ater stated that Mrs. Green had prepared substitute language and he withdrew his motion.

Mrs. Green moved that the following language be substituted for all of the recommendations included in the docket item: That the State Board of Higher Education commends those high schools which have taken the initiative to develop innovative, creative dual-credit programs for their talented seniors. The Board encourages all the institutions under its jurisdiction to work with interested high schools to develop such programs. No reimbursement will be sought for such courses from state funds. The Board suggests that any contracts which have been negotiated between said high school and any college or university be available to any interested parents or students.

Mrs. Carpenter suggested that the proposed statement might sound somewhat chauvinistic to the community colleges and asked if the statement could be modified slightly to indicate that the Board was not trying to preempt anything but simply trying to encourage brilliant, able students to enlarge their horizons.

Mrs. Green said the motion was silent on the matter of community colleges, which are not under the jurisdiction of the Board of Higher Education. It refers only to institutions under the Board’s jurisdiction, with the intent that those institutions be free of all rules and regulations in developing arrangements with the high schools. The proposed motion would not prevent a high school from making any desired arrangements with a community college.

Mr. Wyss said he agreed philosophically with the tenor of the discussion but wondered whether adoption of an alternative statement would not result in additional joint conferences.

There may be further meetings, Mrs. Green said, but in the absence of a statement such as the one proposed, there will be interminable meetings with high schools and colleges and the problem will not be resolved.

Mr. Ater said the effect of the revamped statement proposed by Mrs. Green is to eliminate a good deal of legislative history to which she is not willing to subscribe, but at the same time adopt the essence of the position expressed in the Commission recommendations.

Mr. Batiste inquired as to what would be the next step, were Mrs. Green’s motion approved. Mr. Ater said that it was his opinion that if the revised language were adopted, there might be no occasion for either the Board or the Commission to take any further action.

The Chancellor said that, if the motion were passed, it would probably be incumbent upon Dr. T. K. Olson, Executive Director of the Educational Coordinating Commission, to determine whether the Board’s language was in conflict with the Commission’s recommendations. The Chancellor said he did not perceive the motion to be in conflict in any significant way. If some conflict is seen, it might be necessary to return to the Board for further action.

The Board approved the revised motion as stated by Mrs. Green, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Ater, Batiste, Carpenter, Green, Harms, Ingalls, Thorp, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Perry. Those voting no: None.
Staff Report to the Committee

The Commission recommendations are based upon the premise espoused by the Board's Office, namely, that Project Advance courses are the responsibility of the high schools, that they are offered by the high schools, and thus, are not covered by the 1978 Joint Agreement.

The recommendations themselves are, in their essential elements, consistent with the positions espoused by the Board's Office, namely:

1. That students enrolled in high schools in Project Advance-type courses should be counted for reimbursement only by the local school district.

2. That preference should be given to offering basic survey classes in the high schools and that other courses offered in the high schools should be drawn from regularly offered courses described in institutional catalogs and bearing specific course numbers.

3. That the school districts and participating collegiate institutions should establish written contracts governing the details of their relationships, with such information to be available to participating staff, students, parents.

4. That high schools should be free to select from among the two- and four-year institutions proffering assistance, the institution with which the high school wishes to affiliate in Project Advance-type activities.

Recommendation #4 provides that the high schools wishing to participate in Project Advance-type activities should prepare a written statement setting forth the learning objectives to be achieved in the Project Advance-type courses, and that in the case of high schools situated in a community college district, "...the college must be provided an opportunity to submit a proposal to respond to the high school's needs." The high school may also solicit from other public or private institutions proposals to serve its needs. The decision as to which institution the high school is to affiliate with remains the high school's decision to be made consistent with the high school's stated objectives.

Summary

The report which follows is to provide the State Board of Higher Education with information concerning the progress made in the several regions of the State in the regional planning meetings called by the presidents of the State System Institutions, in accordance with the provisions of the 1978 Joint Agreement adopted by the State Board of Higher Education and the State Board of Education. Appendices were included in the full report on file in the Board's Office.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's Office recommended:

1. That the Board accept the present report.

2. That the Board commend the institutions, public and independent, for the progress they have made under the 1978 Joint Agreement to establish mechanisms and processes through which continuing cooperative planning may be carried on to assure effective, efficient use of educational resources in service of Oregon's educational needs.
3. That the Board request that the Board's Office keep the Board apprised through periodic reports of the anticipated further developments in these regional cooperative planning efforts.

4. That the Board authorize the transmission of this present report to the members of the State Board of Education and the Coordinating Commission as a matter of interest to them.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Romney summarized the report, and presented the staff recommendations for Committee action.

Mrs. Carpenter said that she had read with interest the memoranda of agreement in some of the regions. It seemed, she said, that some very complicated issues have, in some instances, been dealt with. Speaking of the publication of joint announcements of courses offered in a region, Mrs. Carpenter said that it would be difficult to do but that it is a worthwhile endeavor and the Board would watch with interest the kinds of mechanisms through which this and similar problems are resolved.

She said that with respect to the Eastern Oregon State College/Blue Mountain/Treasure Valley memorandum of agreement, she felt that the provisions of paragraph 3a, as they pertain to Eastern Oregon State College are much too restrictive. She said that inasmuch as Eastern Oregon State College, as an institution of the State System of Higher Education, has responsibility as to what upper-division and graduate courses are to be offered off-campus (as well as those to be offered on-campus) it seems an infringement on Eastern Oregon State College's prerogatives to require that they have prior consultation with the community colleges before offering upper-division and graduate courses off campus.

Dr. Romney said that he had noted the same thing at the time the memorandum of agreement was developed several months ago and had talked with President Briggs about it at the time, but that President Briggs felt that such a provision would cause him no difficulties and that it would facilitate coordination generally in the eastern region. Dr. Treadway of Eastern Oregon State College stated that the phrase to which Mrs. Carpenter objects was not intended to be read as meaning that the community colleges have approval authority over the upper-division and graduate courses that Eastern Oregon State College could offer off campus. Rather, it is merely a matter of facilitating coordination of offerings. He said that given the sparsity of population in eastern Oregon, Eastern Oregon State College would not wish to offer an upper-division course in personnel, for instance, in a community in which Blue Mountain or Treasure Valley Community Colleges were offering a workshop or lower-division course in the same community. Mrs. Carpenter noted that the language of the agreement does not convey that interpretation.

Responding to Mrs. Carpenter's question as to the effectiveness of regional coordination in the Upper-Willamette area, President Boyd asserted that the mechanism has not yet been put to a real test so one cannot be sure how it will work.

Mr. Wyss noted that the Upper-Willamette area memorandum of agreement contains the phrase "We strongly believe that interinstitutional affairs are best resolved by the institutions themselves and not by a central state agency." President Boyd, responding to Mr. Wyss' question, asserted that this is a widely held view.

Mr. Anderson moved that the Committee recommend Board approval of the staff recommendation. The motion was approved with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Carpenter, Harms, Warner-Yasuda, and Wyss.
Board Discussion and Action

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

Regional Coordination Under the 1978 Joint Agreement

The 1978 Joint Agreement (Appendix E, pp. 23-31 of the full report) provides for intersegmental regional coordination of off-campus credit and non-credit activities in the following terms:

Coordination

Respecting coordination of off-campus and non-credit activities, the joint Boards agree that:

- Planning can best be done by regions. For although there may be similarities in the categories and kinds of off-campus educational services needed in the several regions of the state there is variation in: (a) the nature of the agencies equipped to serve the continuing education needs of the several regions, and (b) their capacities to serve regional needs.

- Planning regions will vary in size and in the constituency of the agencies involved.

- Some planning regions will include a community college and one or more other agencies (e.g., community schools park and recreation district, proprietary schools.) The Northwest region of Oregon, with Astoria as the focal point, is illustrative. Or, the Ontario area, with Treasure Valley Community College at the core, is another illustration.

- Other planning regions will consist of (a) one or more four-year colleges and/or universities, (b) the community colleges serving the same area, and (c) such other agencies as desire to participate in the coordinative effort.

It is in this latter type of planning unit that the coordinating interests of the two Boards converge, owing to the presence in the unit of the two- and four-year colleges and universities. Such planning units would include each of the public four-year institutions (UO, OSU, PSU, SOSC, OCE, EOSC, OIT, UOHSC,) the community colleges, and independent colleges and universities serving the area, and such other agencies as wish to participate in a coordinated effort.

Coordination of the off-campus credit and non-credit activities of the two- and four-year colleges within each of the several regions will be accomplished through the presidents of these institutions jointly discussing institutional plans for offering off-campus credit and non-credit activities.

The presidents of each of the public four-year colleges and universities will take the initiative in bringing together the presidents of the community colleges and independent colleges and universities serving the area, together with representatives of the principal other agencies offering educational services to the area, for the purpose of launching this coordinative effort. (The charge given the presidents of the public four-year colleges and universities is not intended
to preclude community college presidents from convening such coordinative meetings as to them seems desirable in coordinating educational efforts in their areas, as suggested in the illustrations given at the top of this page, relating to the Ontario and Astoria areas.)

- The plans should be sufficiently specific as to make clear in what ways the institution plans on using off-campus credit and non-credit courses and activities in the medium range future (i.e., What is the role of off-campus credit and non-credit activities in the institutional plans? Whom does the institution wish to serve through off-campus courses and programs? Through what kinds of courses and programs? In what areas of the state? In what ways does the institution plan on coordinating its planned off-campus activities with other institutions and agencies?)

- The plan should, at the same time, be sufficiently broad and future oriented as not to require frequent discussions among institutional presidents in the region as to the general structure of institutional plans. Once every several years should suffice.

Should these consultations among the presidents identify unnecessary duplication and overlap in the programs proposed in the institutional plans, the presidents of the affected institutions will seek to negotiate a resolution of the problems. If they are unsuccessful in so doing, they shall refer the matter to the State Department of Higher Education and the State Department of Education, for appropriate action in those instances in which public institutions are involved. The ultimate appeal in intersegmental disagreements in these matters is to the Educational Coordinating Commission.

Coordination at the operational level year-by-year or term-by-term is also encouraged by the joint Boards, when that seems desirable. But the joint Boards do not wish to mandate creation of regional coordinating committees in every corner of the state that would be required to meet regularly when, in the judgment of those closest to the scene, there is no necessity for such meetings.

The Boards anticipate that the presidential coordinative process will be sufficiently effective that only infrequent regional coordinative meetings will be necessary. Such intersegmental problems as may arise in the application of presidential agreements will be resolved by direct and open discussion between and among the agencies involved, or where necessary, by referral to the State Department of Higher Education and State Department of Education (where the public institutions are involved.)

One practice that the Boards would like to encourage is the joint publication of the listing of off-campus courses and programs to be offered by the several segments in the same geographic area. This will greatly assist potential students in planning their educational activities.

Regional Meetings to Develop Memoranda of Agreement

Consistent with the foregoing provisions of the 1978 Joint Agreement, the presidents of the State System institutions have duly called regional meetings involving presidents of other two- and four-year institutions, and, in some instances, representatives of other agencies offering educational opportunities to people of the region.
Some two- and four-year institutions have been represented at planning meetings in more than one region. But other institutions, including some with statewide interests, have elected initially to be involved in the coordinative sessions in but one region, namely, the region in which the institution's campus is situated. These latter institutions expect to become involved in the coordinative efforts in other regions of the state after this initial round of collaborative activities has been completed. Let us turn now to a brief description of the regional meetings through which coordination is presently being undertaken.

1. Upper Willamette Valley region: Meetings have been called by President Boyd of the University of Oregon and have included representatives of the University of Oregon; Linfield College; Northwest Christian College; Lane, Umpqua, Southwestern, and Central Oregon Community Colleges; and Eugene and Bethel school districts.

At the initial meeting of the regional group it was agreed that no particular issue was causing any serious friction among the institutions represented at the meeting. Among the topics discussed were: Project Advance, transfer of credits from one institution to another, the semester system, and general cooperation among the institutions present.

A subcommittee was appointed "to draft an agreement on the processes to be employed to deal with any difficulties that may occur among the institutions" in the region. A memorandum of agreement has been developed by the subcommittee and has been adopted by the participating colleges and universities. A copy of the memorandum is included as Appendix A, pp. 9-10 of the full report.

2. Mid-Willamette Valley region. President Leinwand of OCE has convened a number of meetings of the presidents of colleges and universities situated in the Mid-Willamette region, to share plans for off-campus educational activities, and to develop a memorandum of agreement providing for coordination of effort among the institutions.

Institutions whose presidents have participated or been invited to participate in the regional meetings include Oregon State University, Oregon College of Education, Willamette, Linfield, Chemeketa and Linn-Benton Community Colleges, Colegio Cesar Chavez, and Western Baptist College.

Counties encompassed within the region include: Benton, Linn, Polk, Marion, Yamhill, Lincoln, and Tillamook counties.

A subcommittee was appointed to develop a memorandum of agreement for consideration and adoption by the presidents. The memorandum is currently being circulated for signatures of the presidents. A copy of the memorandum is presented in Appendix B, pp. 11-14 of the full report.

3. Portland metropolitan area. Institutions represented (usually by the president) at the regional planning meeting convened by President Blumel of Portland State University included the following: Portland State University, University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, Lewis and Clark, Reed, Pacific University, Marylhurst, Warner Pacific, Judson Baptist College, George Fox College, Columbia Christian College, Linfield, Concordia, Multnomah School of the Bible, Museum Art School, Oregon Graduate Center, and Clackamas, Mt. Hood, and Portland Community Colleges.

It was agreed (a) that there is a need for the continuing exchange of information and sharing plans for development of new programs; (b) that the institutions should cooperate in (1) gathering information and data about education and educational needs in the Portland area, (2) conferring about the development of programs, (3) offering programs as they already are, (4) publicizing their offerings, in particular their off-campus offerings.
There was general agreement that coordination of non-credit offerings constitutes more of a problem than coordination of credit courses. It was further agreed that committees should be appointed (a) to develop a report as to the nature and extent of the non-credit issue, and to report back with alternative recommendations for dealing with the issues; and (b) to develop plans for a joint publication each term of off-campus continuing education-type courses or programs being offered in the Portland metropolitan area.

The two committees have been appointed and are presently at work.

4. Southern region: Meetings have been called by President Sicuro involving representatives of Southern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology, and Southwestern, Umpqua, and Rogue Community Colleges. The seven counties considered by the participants to be a part of this southern regional planning area include: Coos, Curry, Douglas, Jackson, Josephine, Klamath, and Lake Counties.

Out of these meetings of the presidents, and subsequent meetings of their staffs, has come a draft of a memorandum of agreement for consideration by the presidents, a copy of which we include here as Appendix C, pp. 15-17 of the full report. It is anticipated that the memorandum will be signed by the presidents on February 25.

In the course of the development of the memorandum of agreement, the five institutions involved discussed the memorandum and its possible implications with a number of public and private agencies in southern Oregon. Among these agencies were: Oregon College of Art, Jackson County Education Service District, officials of several public school systems, and from several municipal and county governments.

The guidelines and principles set forth in the memorandum of agreement appear to have general support from the region.

It was agreed at an early meeting of the group that during 1979-80 the institutions will explore the feasibility of:

a. Joint planning and funding of off-campus programs.

b. Cooperatively employing regional itinerant instructors.

c. Cooperatively advertising all off-campus instructional offerings.

5. Eastern region: Following a series of meetings, a memorandum of agreement has been drawn up and signed by the presidents of Eastern Oregon State College and Blue Mountain and Treasure Valley Community Colleges governing the relationships between Eastern Oregon State College and the two community colleges (See Appendix D, pp. 19-21 of the full report).

The memorandum also provides for consultation with Oregon State University and other institutions which, though their campus headquarters are situated outside eastern Oregon, offer educational services in the eastern region, for the purpose of developing a secondary memorandum of agreement covering the role and function of Oregon State University and other out-of-region institutions in serving the eastern region. A draft of this secondary memorandum of agreement is currently in preparation at Oregon State University for consideration by Eastern Oregon State College and the two community colleges referred to above.

Included in the eastern region are the following ten counties: Union, Umatilla, Baker, Malheur, Wallowa, Harney, Grant, Morrow, Wheeler, Gilliam.
Further Matters

A number of matters relating to the development of these regional coordinative efforts deserve further comment.

1. The steps thus far taken to achieve regional coordination under terms of the 1978 Joint Agreement have gone well. That is not to say that all or most of the issues and problems relating to coordination of institutional efforts across segmental lines have been resolved. Obviously they have not been, nor was it anticipated that they would be at this stage of development. Coordination is a continuing need.

But institutional will and the desire to achieve a state of effective regional coordination across segmental lines are there, and institutional attitudes are good, presaging continuing effective working relationships among the institutions.

2. In taking these initial steps in regional coordination, the colleges and universities within the several regions have, for the most part, elected to begin the coordinative process by involving only the colleges and universities whose campuses are located within the region. Deliberately omitted from these early coordinative efforts have generally been (a) representatives from colleges and universities whose campuses are not located in the region but which extend credit or non-credit courses into the region, and (b) representatives of agencies other than colleges and universities (e.g., park and recreation departments, public schools, private agencies such as YMCA) which offer educational activities in the region.

It is the intent of the colleges and universities in the regions first to establish effective procedures for achieving coordination among themselves before taking steps to involve in the formal coordinative process the colleges and universities located outside the region which are extending courses into the region, or the non-college agencies such as recreation departments and community schools, which offer educational activities within the region. In the judgment of the Board's Office, this is wisdom.

3. Some matters that are of importance to the regional coordinative process may warrant, or even require, both regional and statewide consideration. Illustrative is the issue as to the appropriate designation of course level (i.e., lower-division, upper-division).

As matters stand, community colleges have, on occasion, felt that some courses offered by State System institutions off-campus as upper-division courses have actually been lower-division courses. And some of the State System institutions have decried what they see as community college practice of assigning lower-division numbers to courses that have traditionally been upper-division courses, thus making transfer of credits and their application toward departmental requirements a difficult problem in which the transferring student is sometimes the victim.

Steps are currently being taken at the state level to get at this problem. The State Department of Higher Education, and the State Department of Education and community colleges combined, have agreed that as soon as the State Department of Education and the community colleges can develop a computerized list of community college course offerings similar to the list of State System course offerings maintained by the Board's office, the Board's Office and the State Department officials will go over the two lists and seek to identify those instances in which it appears one or the other of the two segments may have classified a course inappropriately as to its level (i.e., lower-division, upper-division), and will initiate corrective action.
Incidental Fee Guidelines, SOSC

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The document entitled "Guidelines and Procedures for Allocation of Incidental Fee," submitted by Southern Oregon State College, was provided for Committee review and was recommended for approval. (See Supplement B.)

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

The incidental fee process at Southern Oregon State College was examined during July 1979, at the time of Board review and approval of 1979-80 fees. Questions raised about the meaning and intent of existing guidelines resulted in a recommendation that revised guidelines be submitted for Board approval.

The proposed guidelines have been prepared during the past six months by a committee composed of faculty and students. They have been reviewed by the Southern Oregon State College Student Senate and by Mr. Branchfield. The institution is prepared to conduct the public hearing to proceed with adoption under the Administrative Procedure Act.

Emergency Board Request--Crippled Children's Division, UOHSC

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the staff be authorized to submit a request on behalf of the Crippled Children's Division to the Emergency Board (1) to increase the expenditure limitation for gifts, grants, and contracts in the amount of $225,687; (2) to request a General Fund appropriation in the amount of $1,100,000 to cover a projected deficit in federal formula funds and patient fees; and (3) to request an increase in the expenditure limitation and an accompanying General Fund appropriation of $130,306 to improve the Division's accounting and information retrieval systems.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

President Laster said it was his understanding when the Crippled Children's Division was begun initially it was intended that to the degree possible the state would provide to those families whose incomes could not enable them to give to their children with crippling diseases the necessary medical care the mechanism to obtain such care. The problem is where to draw the line for including and excluding patients. The first part of the request is to avoid eroding the current level of services. This reduction in services would result if funds no longer came from federal grants or other sources and were not replaced. There are presently an estimated 255 children who need medical care and whose family income is just below the level to qualify for medical care assistance. The needed services either will not be obtained or will be delayed, and in many instances, delay contributes to the permanency of the condition.
Another part of the recommendation is intended to maximize the opportunities for payment for medical services from sources other than the General Fund through mechanisms, accounting procedures, and analytical capability to do the most effective job.

Mr. Lemman commented that the Crippled Children's Division is one of the few activities for which there is an expenditure limitation for gifts, grants and contracts. This is an unusual request for that reason.

Dr. Victor Menashe, Director of the Crippled Children's Division, reviewed the projections for federal grant and patient fee revenue and distributed additional background information. Alternatives to the request had been considered, he said. An increase of 10% in the clinic fee will be effective April 1, 1980. An increase in patients to the clinic was considered but this action would increase the demand for purchased services and potentially could increase the shortfall of revenue. A third alternative to decrease services was not considered desirable.

Dr. Menashe pointed out that the ability to make projections of workloads and funding needs would be improved through approval of the third part of the request for the accounting and information retrieval system.

In response to a question, it was stated that the request involves 1.5 FTE and $130,000. It was indicated that the accounting and information retrieval system represented a program improvement and was justified as a separate request from other program improvements because it would pay for itself while the others would not.

Mr. Ater said the increase in the expenditure limitation for gifts, grants, and contracts, and the request related to federal funds should be approved. The salary increases were part of the regular salary package for the biennium and were underfunded.

Concerns were expressed about recommending approval of the program improvement request. President Laster said managerial systems which were adequate in the past are no longer adequate to compete in the complex world of fiscal management. The deficiencies are reflected in the discrepancies of fiscal projections and actual experience and in the limitation on information available for planning. Without data, the ability to recover costs is reduced.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve staff recommendations 1 and 2. By a tie vote the motion to recommend approval of the staff recommendation to improve the accounting and information retrieval systems was defeated. It was explained that the program improvement request was recognized as important but it should be considered in connection with other improvement requests for all other institutions.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Lemman reported that the Emergency Board had approved the expenditure limitation increase for gifts, grants, and contracts.

There were two components to the second request, one related to the possible shortfall in federal formula grant revenues and another related to the shortfall in patient fee income. The possibility of a shortfall in the estimate of federal formula grant revenue was acknowledged by the Emergency Board as was the duty to replace the estimated federal funds with state funds. However, action on the request was postponed because it was too early to determine the amount of money which will be received in 1980-81. The Emergency Board stated that the agency should continue to make budget plans on the basis of the full amount of money being available from state or federal funds.