STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN  
THE WEST BALLROOM, MEMORIAL UNION,  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, CORVALLIS, OREGON  

October 24, 1980  

Meeting #469  
A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the West Ballroom, Memorial Union, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.  

ROLL CALL  
The meeting was called to order at 8:30 A.M. (P.D.T.), October 24, 1980, by the President of the Board, Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr., and on roll call the following answered present:  

Mr. Lester E. Anderson  
Mr. Alvin R. Batiste  
Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter  
Mr. John A. Elorriaga  
Mrs. Edith Green  
Mr. Robert C. Ingalls  

Mr. David Lomnicki  
Mr. James C. Petersen  
Ms. Elizabeth Warner-Yasuda  
Mr. Loren L. Wyss  
Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.  

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; Mrs. Clarethel Kahananui, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; E. Rex Krueger, Vice Chancellor for Educational Systems; Edward Branchfield, Assistant Attorney General; Arthur Mancl, Director of Campus and Building Planning; Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer, Richard Zita, Director, Public Services and Publications; Francetta Carroll, Management Assistant.  

Oregon State University--President R. W. MacVicar; Clifford V. Smith, Vice President for Administration; Sandra J. Suttie, Curriculum Coordinator and Assistant to the President; David Nicodemus, Dean of Faculty.  

University of Oregon--Acting President Paul Olum; Ray Hawk, Vice President for Administration and Finance.  

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center--President Leonard Laster; James T. McGill, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Mary Anne Lockwood, Executive Assistant to the President.  

Portland State University--President Joseph C. Blumel; James Todd, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Orcilia Forbes, Vice President for Student Affairs.  

Oregon College of Education--President Gerald Leinwand; James H. Beard, Provost; Maxine Warnath, Chairman, Department of Psychology and Special Education.  

Eastern Oregon State College--David Gilbert, Dean of Academic Affairs.  

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

Oregon Institute of Technology--W. M. Douglass, Dean of Administration; William W. Smith, Dean of Academic Affairs.  

Others--Dr. Pat Wells, Oregon State University Representative, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate; Fred M. Shideler, Oregon State University, retired; Jeff Mengis, President, Associated Students of Oregon State University.
The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the special meeting held on August 25, 1980, and the regular meeting of September 12, 1980, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

The Chancellor recommended that the Board designate Miss Francetta Carroll and Mrs. Pat Wignes as Assistant Board Secretaries. In the absence of the Board Secretary, Miss Carroll would be responsible primarily for matters pertaining to the Board meetings and the necessary arrangements for those meetings. Mrs. Wignes would have responsibility for signing official papers.

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

The Chancellor said it was anticipated the recommendations of the budget analysts would be available shortly and it was probable that there would be a meeting on October 30 with Governor Atiyeh to discuss the recommendations of the analysts. The Chancellor indicated that he had detected nothing in the state's economy that would appear to brighten the budgetary prospects.

The Chancellor reported that authorization had been requested from the Emergency Board to spend up to $1,376,000 at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center for the purpose of altering and relocating some of the facilities in the pediatrics and obstetrics/gynecology clinics. The funds would come from Article XI-F(1) bonds. The request was approved by the Emergency Board.

A second request for authorization to submit to the U.S. Department of Energy a grant request for $70,000 for the purpose of conducting research on refuse-driven fuel also was approved together with a request for authorization to spend the money if the grant is received.

The Emergency Board was asked to allocate $1 million to the Education and General Services budget of the Department of Higher Education to permit restoration of a number of class sections eliminated as a consequence of the major budget reduction. The request was approved.

An increase in the expenditure limitation for the Agricultural Experiment Station was sought from service fees, gifts and grants, and indirect cost recoveries. The Emergency Board authorized only the amount of $288,500 related to gifts and grants. It was stipulated that the balance of the sales and services fees and the indirect cost recoveries, provided the estimates proved to be realistic, would be available to help fund the budget in the next biennium. A similar situation occurred with the request for an increase of $870,000 in the expenditure limitation for the Medical School, to be funded from income greater than the original estimate from the Medical Education Improvement Fund. Only $535,000 was approved for expenditure this year, with the balance to be held for assistance in funding the budget requirements in the next biennium.

The Chancellor indicated also that it is anticipated that authorization would be requested from the Emergency Board at a later time to spend tuition income at those institutions where the budgeted enrollments have exceeded the budgeted level. The Chancellor stated that all of the institutions have enrolled a larger number of headcount students than were built into the budget and it is possible the enrollment on an FTE basis will exceed the estimates by 1.5%.
The Chancellor announced that the annual meeting of the Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education, and the Educational Coordinating Commission will be held on December 4, 1980.

The chairman of the Board of Education will preside this year, and the meeting will be a dinner meeting in Salem. Mr. Harms has appointed Mrs. Green as the Board's representative on the agenda committee for the meeting.

The Chancellor stated that it is expected that after the meeting with Governor Atiyeh on the biennial budget requests and recommendations, it will be necessary for the Board to hold a special meeting for the purpose of developing responses to the budget recommendations. The dates of November 14 and 21 were suggested on the assumption that the budget recommendations would not meet the full requests submitted by the Board in its biennial budget requests.

It was agreed that the meeting, if necessary, would be held at 1:30 P.M. November 21, 1980, in Salem, Oregon. (This meeting subsequently was changed to December 11, 1980, at 1:30 P.M. in Eugene.)

During the introduction of items by individual Board members, Mr. Petersen expressed his appreciation to President MacVicar and his staff for an outstanding visitation. He said the visitation served to crystallize thoughts which he had been developing over the past few weeks. Dedicated, enthusiastic faculty members presented a story which the public should know and understand. Mr. Petersen said he would propose that the Board evaluate and perhaps develop a new approach to presenting the Board's budget to the Legislature. A budget represents a goal statement or mission statement of an organization. Mr. Petersen said the issue of the 1980's will be economics and the Board must determine how to sell its budget to legislators and constituents. The Board has a choice, Mr. Petersen said, of taking the asset built up over the years by many people into a well-articulated and well-organized higher education system and continue to nurture that asset or let it disintegrate. Mr. Petersen said he did not particularly care to preside over the dismantling of higher education. He said the Board needed to become more politically active and to mobilize some help. Other people lobby, and lobbying represents an educational exercise to inform the Legislature of the Board's programs so that the legislators can make informed choices. The formal approach is important, Mr. Petersen stated, but the Board should go beyond the formal approach and explain the educational programs, the impact of budget cuts, and the State System's unique place in Oregon as an educational, social and economic asset. Mr. Petersen said he would like the Board to provide leadership in this effort.

Mr. Harms expressed concurrence. He noted that the Board has been active in this process, especially during the last two legislative sessions. The necessity for such efforts is even more apparent with the present economic situation. He suggested discussion of appropriate steps might occur in the meeting to discuss budget recommendations on the Board's budget request.

Mr. Petersen urged that the presidents of the alumni associations be invited to that meeting because time is drawing short to develop an effective educational program.

Mr. Harms suggested that the December Board meeting might be a more appropriate time since the meeting on November 21 would be a work session.

Mr. Petersen and the Chancellor expressed the view that the November discussion would be beneficial. The Chancellor said the impact on the public of having representatives of the advocacy groups present to hear the discussion of these matters might very well be a significant event in pursuit of the Board's goals.

Mr. Anderson proposed including other constituencies in addition to alumni and having the educational efforts coordinated in a central location.
Mr. Harms commented that interest groups have supported the Board in past legislative sessions but very frequently they were single-issue interest groups.

Mr. Batiste indicated he favored the approach suggested but questioned the advisability of having outside groups at the November meeting prior to discussion by the Board itself.

Mrs. Green said she was in favor of an advocacy role for the Board but believed it would be very helpful for the chairman to call and preside over a meeting with alumni from all of the institutions in an attempt to reach a consensus on the greatest priorities and which programs should be funded.

Mrs. Carpenter said she agreed that a Board work session should precede the public information session. She stated that informed groups were presently available as a result of the activities of many of the presidents.

Mr. Wyss said the process of finding the proper budget designations and support was certainly a political one. He expressed concern about politicizing the process too early before the Board had reached its own decisions. Further, he said he was not certain the Board should slip so quickly into being almost exclusively an advocacy Board for higher education. The historical purpose of the Legislature in establishing the Board of Higher Education was that it would stand between the various parts of society that deal with higher education, including the citizens, taxpayers, institutions, and the Legislature. The Board may lose part of its objectivity by determining that the Board should represent the institutions and the part of the budget which should go to higher education alone.

Mr. Wyss commented that the Board has a deep responsibility to make certain that money is spent properly for appropriate programs. The Board loses a great deal of its credibility if it becomes, or is viewed by legislators, as only an advocate of higher education rather than as a body which determines which programs are most appropriate at the time. He suggested that the Taxpayers Union should perhaps be among the groups invited to see where higher education fits into the spectrum of interest about how much money should be spent on higher education. The Board should not become strictly an advocacy Board, Mr. Wyss said. A sound budget could be supported, but the proposals made by Mr. Petersen would be another step in politicizing the Board into a lobbying group.

Mr. Petersen responded that he recognized the concerns expressed by Mr. Wyss but viewed lobbying as an educational process. Presumably the adopted budget represented the majority viewpoint of the Board as to the programs and funding needed for higher education. The Board must do a better job of demonstrating what those dollars will provide.

Mr. Wyss said the difficulty is in carrying any credibility because the decision-makers have already decided that the Board is an advocacy board and no longer is concerned with the best interests of the citizens. Board actions demonstrating tough, tight decisions might serve better to counteract this impression.

Mrs. Carpenter said the Board does stand on the budget it presented. Considerable cuts were made and there is a need for this budget to provide sufficient leeway so that people can work to greater capacity. The budget is still very inadequate and just barely allows a credible operation with slight improvements in quality.

Mr. Harms said the Board's responsibility to the people had, or should have, taken place in the preparation of the budget. He suggested that the support groups be invited to the budget discussion so that they could hear the Board's concern and response of the staff to the budget recommendations.

Mr. Anderson agreed that there was a danger of over-advocacy. However, if the Board could coordinate the efforts of the various constituencies, there might be a more significant place in the lobbying process for such groups than they have presently.
In discussing the purpose of the meeting proposed for November 21, it was indicated that the meeting, if held, would be as a consequence of a recommended budget which departed significantly from the Board's proposed budget. Mr. Batiste said he would prefer to have the Board deliberate with presidents and staff before soliciting support, ideas, or recommendations from the public. Mr. Harms said he had not intended to imply that there would be a public hearing on the budget because it was too late in the budget process for that to occur. The intent was to inform the various constituencies so that they would feel that they could support the Board's position and inform legislators.

Mr. Batiste moved that the informational meeting be held following the proposed meeting of November 21, 1980. Mr. Harms concurred with the motion because he said he did not believe the Board was ready to go beyond having the groups hear the Board's discussion when it received the Governor's budget recommendations.

Mrs. Green said she could think of nothing that would be more disastrous than to have the constituents of a particular institution go to the Legislature to plead a particular cause. If there is an advantage to inviting alumni and other groups to the budget meeting, it should be for the purpose of informing them so that they would see that other institutions in the State System also had great needs. Then the constituents of each institution would be faced with the same responsibility that faces the Board in measuring one request vis-a-vis other requests under a very stringent budget. If these constituents, after being informed, are in a position to support the Board's budget, it would be valuable in seeking legislative approval of the budget.

The Chancellor asked whether the motion was intended to preclude encouraging various groups to attend the proposed November 21 meeting, not for the purpose of participation but for the purpose of educating them to the Board's position on the budget.

Mr. Batiste said it was not his intent to preclude invitations to the various groups for educational purposes. Any discussion of priorities should come after the Board deliberation.

Mrs. Green presented a substitute motion that invitations be extended to all interested groups to come to the proposed meeting on November 21 to receive the same information the Board members receive and that at a future meeting there be an opportunity for the public to provide input on the information that they have. Mr. Batiste withdrew his motion.

Mr. Anderson said the Chancellor and the President of the Board had the sense of the Board's wishes on this matter and he would be willing to yield his preferences to them and let them exercise their judgment in light of the discussion.

The Board approved the motion by Mrs. Green, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Mr. Lomnicki stated that he agreed with the motion just adopted but questioned whether it dealt effectively with the intent of Mr. Petersen's original statement that the Board should provide leadership, including the suggestion that groups be organized to make certain that the Board's priorities are properly discussed before the Legislature and the concerns adequately expressed.

Mrs. Carpenter and Mr. Harms expressed the view that many of the things would not remain unanswered but responses could not occur until the Legislature was actually in session.

Mr. Lomnicki said his remarks were intended to state his position that the Board should be exerting a little more leadership with various groups and that the Board had a responsibility to inform and coordinate an effort with them.
Mr. Wyss observed that the contacts which the institutions have are very important forces which should be used in an effort to explain to legislators the importance of higher education services within the state. He said that, in his opinion, it was unnecessary and inappropriate to coordinate the efforts through the Board. He also indicated the discussion represented the foreign policy of the Board vis-a-vis the Legislature, and a Board meeting was not a sensible place to be discussing it.

In accordance with Board regulations, the following Board members represented the Board in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas for the graduating classes at the various institutions during the 1979-80 academic year and summer sessions:

- Oregon State University
- University of Oregon (including Summer, Fall, Winter, and Spring of 1979-1980)
- University of Oregon Law School
- Portland State University (including Summer and Fall of 1979, and Winter 1980)
- Oregon College of Education
- Oregon Institute of Technology
- Southern Oregon State College
- Eastern Oregon State College
- University of Oregon Health Sciences Center

Edward C. Harms, Jr.
Jane H. Carpenter
Elizabeth Warner-Yasuda
Louis B. Perry
Lester E. Anderson
William C. Thorp III
William C. Thorp III
Mrs. Edith Green
Jonathan A. Ater

Signed copies of the degree lists are on file in the Board's Office.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board confirmed the action of Board members in approving degree lists, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

The University of Oregon requests approval by the Board of its school of music's Center for International Music Education, presently housed at Bulmershe College of Higher Education, Redding, England.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's staff recommended that the Board grant the approval requested.

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, Batiste, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.
Staff Report to the Committee

The Center for International Music Education was first established in the mid-1960's at the Padagogische Hochschule at Oldenburg, Germany, under the direction of Dr. E. A. Cykler, of the University of Oregon school of music, to provide graduate and advanced upper-division music education students opportunity to gain first-hand experience in procedures of music pedagogy in European countries, procedures which have had significant influence on American public school music. The academic-year-long program was later moved to the University of Stuttgart, and then to its present location in England. It has been approved by the Board's Office as a foreign study program since 1967, under guidelines for the approval of foreign study programs adopted by the Board in 1967. It has not, however, been approved as a "center" under provisions of IMD 2.001, and this request is to correct that oversight.

The Center operates on a balanced budget and if prospective enrollments in any year are not sufficient to cover costs of the program, the program for that year is cancelled. Because of increasing costs and reduced enrollment the program was not offered in 1979-80 and has been cancelled for 1980-81. The program will be offered again in 1981-82.

The description of the program, as presented by the University of Oregon, follows.
Subject: Procedure for the Establishment of the Center for International Music Education Serving Instructional Functions of the School of Music at the University of Oregon

1. Title: The Center For International Music Education

2. The purpose of the center is to bring each participant into the rich stream of cultural life, past and present; to give students a first-hand knowledge through participation and observation of the procedures of music pedagogy practiced in European countries today; and to add new perspectives to American music practice and attitudes. As an example, the Orff method of elementary music education is centered in Austria and Germany, but in recent years has become a dominant influence in American public school music. In a similar manner, however through a different approach, the Kodaly method, centered in Budapest, Hungary, has become an important force in American education. The purpose of the program is to provide graduate students and advanced upperdivision undergraduate students with first-hand experiences in these and other methods which are found in various European centers of Music Education.

3. The objective of the center is entirely instructional, both in the professional development of music educators, and within the cultural settings for this education provided by England and continental Europe. The center offers three terms, parallel to the University of Oregon year, of advanced instruction in Music Education, Music History, and Performance Practices.

4. Resources.

   a. Personnel: One full-time member of the Music faculty is in residence with the program as teacher and administrator. Two .15 Graduate Teaching Fellows provide additional teaching resources. The remaining faculty is drawn from the staff of Bulmershe College of Higher Education in Redding, England, and visiting European scholars.

   b. Facilities and Equipment: Classrooms, office space, library, student services, housing, and meals are provided through an arrangement with Bulmershe College. The University of Oregon owns additional library materials, audiovisual equipment, and a collection of musical instruments stored at Bulmershe College for the exclusive use of this program.
5. Funding requirements: The budget varies from year to year, depending upon the enrollment and the choice of the University of Oregon faculty member in residence. The faculty member's salary is borne by the School of Music, budget however he/she is not replaced on the Oregon campus during the period of the administration of the program. The students pay a standard tuition rate directly to the University of Oregon for their instruction. All other funds, including housing, meals, travel, the cost for use of the Bulmershe college facilities, guest lecturers, and administrative expenses are covered in full by the student fees. The program operates on a balanced budget and if sufficient enrollment is not available to cover the cost of the program, the program is not offered during that year.

6. Relation to institutional mission: A number of European centers for Music Education and a number of schools of musical thoughts, such as the Orff and Kodaly methods, have their origin in Europe. Their use in these settings is far more advanced than that to be found in the United States, which has followed other methods of study. An on the site, in-depth examination of these and other music education approaches is invaluable to advanced study for perspective music teachers. In addition, a study of performance practices with the rich heritage of European music and cultural history provides an experience in Europe which is not otherwise attainable. The program there operates as a desired adjunct to the programs offered on the campus of the University of Oregon, particularly for students entering into the field of public school music teaching.

7. There is not anticipated long-range changes in the program, nor any changes in patterns of funding.
Admissions Requirements 1981-1982

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, September 12, 1980; present--Carpenter, Anderson, Harms, Petersen, and Warner-Yasuda.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's staff recommended that the Board adopt admissions requirements for entering resident and nonresident freshmen for 1981-82 which retain the same high school grade and aptitude test cutting points and alternatives as will be in effect in 1980-81 except as follows:

1. As approved by the Board October 26, 1979, freshmen applicants for admission to the University of Oregon and Oregon State University will be required to meet a score level of 30 on the SAT-Test of Standard Written English, or, as an alternative, 12 on the ACT-English Usage Test.

2. Under the discretionary authorization granted by the Board October 26, 1979, the minimum grade point average for resident freshmen entering Southern Oregon State College will be increased by one quarter of a grade point from 2.00 to 2.25 with corresponding adjustments in test score alternatives.

3. Subject to the approval of the Board October 24, 1980, Southern Oregon State College will implement a predicted first term college grade point average (based on a combined measure of high school grade point average and scholastic aptitude test scores) of 2.00 or above as an alternate admission requirement for entering resident freshman not admissible under the high school GPA requirement or scholastic aptitude test score alone.

4. Subject to the approval of the Board October 24, 1980, the testing alternative to the minimum grade point average requirement for nonresident students entering Southern Oregon State College will be changed from a minimum test score requirement of 950 SAT or 22 ACT to a combined high school GPA of 2.25 and predicted first-term college grade point average of 2.10.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Ernest Ettlich, Dean of Academic Affairs at Southern Oregon State College, explained Southern Oregon State College's rationale for changing admissions requirements. He said efforts were made at that institution to identify high-risk students and to provide them with training and basic skills. The proposals before the Board will assist the institution in emphasizing to these students the actual risk that they will have in completing college and serve to encourage them to take advantage of the opportunities available to assist them. In the process, it will be possible also to identify the excellent student for an honors-type program.

The new high school graduation standards were reviewed briefly, and it was agreed that it would be useful for the Committee to include a more extensive discussion of these standards on a future Committee agenda, including the effect of the standards on the responsibilities of the Board of Higher Education and the expectations of both the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education with respect to the new standards. It was suggested by Mr. Harms that the Board of Education be advised of the results of the Committee discussion.

Dr. Judith Kuipers, Dean of Undergraduate Studies at Oregon State University, said the issue of retention on college campuses is a very complex one. She noted that an important factor in retention is the availability of a person that a student can turn to for support with various types of problems. Other factors have an impact on enrollment and retention, and any approach
to enrollment and retention should be a team effort. At the same time, students must be viewed as individuals. Students are more likely to stay in a welcoming and concerned situation, and involvement in student activities is important.

In discussing identification of assistance to students who may have scholastic difficulties, Dr. Kuipers said there are varying opinions expressed in the field as to whether students should be in specialized classes or whether the entire teaching faculty should be involved in teaching writing and speech skills and mathematical understanding. She suggested that a pretest followed by a combination of approaches might be the most beneficial with the total program focussed on the students particular need. She stated also that students may drop out and come back to finish their work after several years. In other instances, students are correct in deciding that college is not an appropriate goal for them.

There was some discussion of financial problems as a deterrent to enrollment and retention. It was indicated that financial aid packages usually can be developed to resolve the basic difficulty. However, concern about financial matters may interfere with academic progress. It was also noted that a study at Eastern Oregon State College of reasons for leaving the institution mid-term revealed that the original financial aid package available to students citing financial problems was probably adequate, but poor financial planning resulted in the students running out of funds before the end of the term.

The Chancellor commented that if there were no dramatic improvement in the near future in the state's fiscal condition, and if no steps were taken to see that General Fund revenues would become available for general governmental purposes, and if higher education were to continue to receive the same share of the state's General Fund resources, it would be necessary for the State System to operate on a substantially lower budget level during the 1981-1983 biennium. There are two principal ways to operate at a reduced level, he continued: to accept a lowered quality of instruction or to reduce the number served by lowering access to the colleges and universities. Access could be reduced in several ways and if it should become necessary to do so, the Chancellor said, it is probable that a combination of those ways would be adopted. Raising admissions requirements as a means of reducing the numbers served, would be one option. In response to a question concerning the timing of a modification of admissions requirements for budgetary purposes, the Chancellor said that in the event higher admissions standards were necessary to limit enrollments, he was not persuaded that a full year's notice, to which the State System has been committed, would prevail. He also indicated that it might be possible to consider possible modifications once the Governor's budget has been prepared.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Batiste asked whether the admissions requirements proposed by Southern Oregon State College were more or less stringent than the Test of Standard Written English. Dr. Ernest Ettlich, Dean of Academic Affairs at Southern Oregon State College, explained that the requirements were not related to the TSWE. In the Scholastic Aptitude Test there is a language component representing a verbal score as a measurement of the ability to deal with ideas. It does not relate to the basic questions of grammar, composition and style, as does the TSWE.

Dr. Ettlich said the SAT verbal score is used by all of the schools now for admissions purposes. The argument on the TSWE is whether a deficiency in basic skills should result in non-admission or placement in a remedial course. At Southern Oregon State College, the preference is to deal with a low TSWE score, or other indicators showing a low aptitude to do college level work at an acceptable level, by placing those students in a one-term remedial course.
Mr. Batiste then asked if the combined plan proposed by Southern Oregon State College would be more or less stringent than the TSWE.

Dr. Ettlich responded that it was proposed that there be several ways by which a student can demonstrate acceptable admissions standards. If a student has a high school GPA of 2.25 or above, the student would be admissible immediately. Similarly, students who meet the required SAT score would be admissible immediately. However, it has been possible recently to validate a formula combining SAT or ACT scores with high school GPA to provide a predicted college GPA. A student who has a 2.25 GPA but not a predicted 2.00 college GPA, would be admissible, but the student would be assigned to a basic skills advisor until the individual could demonstrate an ability to do adequate college work. The proposal represents a change but is not going to make a major difference in the admissibility of students.

Mr. Wyss asked how higher admissions requirements would provide an incentive to high-risk students to work harder. Dr. Ettlich said that the performance of a number of students in the high-risk category is affected by deficiencies in one or more of the basic skills. If they receive help in overcoming these deficiencies, they may achieve very good GPA's during their college career. If they are not identified, there is no way to be of help to these students.

Mr. Wyss said he was concerned about the institutions which had not established procedures for advising the additional students admitted as a result of raising from 3% to 5% the number of students who could be admitted without meeting requirements. Mrs. Kahananui indicated that at the request of the Board, information was being collected on all of the students admitted under the 5% provision, the criteria upon which they were admitted, what the institution has done to help these students, and how successful the institutions were in serving them. This report will be presented to the Board. Dr. Ettlich said all of the institutions were concerned with the marginal students. As Southern Oregon State College the number of students is small enough that they can be counseled on an individual basis.

Mr. Harms said preliminary information showed that the 5% group was doing at least as well as the general university population.

Mrs. Green requested an analysis of the cost to an institution of educating the average student as compared to the 5% admissions or other students who need special remedial work.

Dr. Ettlich said costs at Southern Oregon State College were principally related to operating the laboratories for the basic skills work. However, these laboratories also are used as laboratory experiences for students that are in teacher education sequences related to these programs.

Mrs. Green asked whether some students were at fifth-grade levels. Dr. Ettlich said students admitted under special admission requirements at Southern Oregon State College tended to have skills at the freshman or sophomore level of high school. He said he seriously doubted that a person with fifth-grade skills would be admitted to Southern Oregon State College under any admissions category. It would be very difficult for a person at that level to demonstrate adequately the kind of skills required to do acceptable college work. An identification of the exact cost is almost impossible when functions are mixed for service in the laboratory and supervision of the students who are providing service in the basic skills. In response to a question, he indicated that he presumed it would cost less to educate a student at Ashland High School than at Southern Oregon State College.

Mrs. Green said there is adequate testimony in the records to demonstrate that it costs an additional 50-75% to educate a student at the university level if that student must have special remedial work. In view of the stringent budget, it does not make sense to spend money in the universities to educate people with fifth-grade skills. It would make more sense to establish a preparatory school or encourage these students to take the remedial work in high school.
Mrs. Green then asked whether a study had been made of the attrition rates. Dr. Ettlich said students in the basic skills program who receive help through the laboratories have a higher retention rate and completion rate than students in the 2.25 to 2.50 GPA range.

Mr. Batiste said Mrs. Green's statements on the costs of educating the 5% group were very serious statements and were a disservice to the institutions that have in good faith pursued the program. He said he would like to see the information on which the statements were based. Mrs. Green stated that the costs were a national problem. Mr. Batiste then withdrew his request, observing that the information would not pertain to the State System institutions.

Mr. Wyss said he was sensitive to the potential need to review admissions requirements in the future if the Board reaches a point where it is necessary to limit access.

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

Staff Report to the Committee

The Board's admissions decisions are founded upon a series of basic assumptions, modified from time to time to reflect changing situations. These basic assumptions are reproduced for the convenience of the Committee as an appendix to the full report.

The admissions requirements approved by the Board are minimum standards for admission to the institutions. The institutions may establish special requirements above these minimums for admission to individual programs, e.g., teacher education, architecture, engineering.

The Board each year takes formal action to approve the basic admissions requirements for its institutions for the year following, in order to give the high schools and their students a minimum of one year's advance notice of any change in admissions requirements of the state's public four-year colleges and universities. The change in requirements for the University of Oregon and Oregon State University specifying attainment of a minimum score of 30 on the Test for Standard Written English (TSWE), or equivalent score on an alternate test of English composition, was approved by the Board October 26, 1979, for 1981-82 to allow high schools and their students two year's advance notice of this important change.

At the same meeting, the Board granted the institutions discretionary authorization to increase the minimum high school grade point average required of entering freshmen by a quarter of a point (.25). All of the institutions have considered this option, as indicated in the summaries of institutional recommendations found below and on the following pages, but only Southern Oregon State College has elected to exercise the option for 1981-82.

Admissions Requirements--Southern Oregon State College

Currently, the minimum high school grade point average required of entering resident freshmen at Southern Oregon State College is 2.00, the same grade point average required for entering resident freshmen at Eastern Oregon State College and Oregon Institute of Technology.

Increasing the requirement by a quarter of a point to 2.25 will make the requirement the same as the resident admission requirements at Portland State University and Oregon College of Education, but lower than the basic requirement of the University of Oregon and Oregon State University (2.50). The policy of differentiated admissions, (discussed in admissions assumption 5, p. 12 of the full report), would thus be retained, with Southern Oregon State College simply moving from the low to the middle threshold.
Concurrent with raising the admissions requirements, Southern Oregon State College is requesting authorization to use a predicted first-term college grade point average of 2.00 or better (based on a combined measure of high school grade point average and aptitude test scores) as an alternate admissions requirement.

Southern Oregon State College is exercising its option to raise resident admissions requirements by a quarter of a point for the following reasons:

1. Southern Oregon State College student personnel offices now have the data necessary to implement a formula combining high school GPA and test scores to predict college success at Southern Oregon State College. The predictive formula improves SOSC's ability to identify and admit students who are likely to succeed in college despite a low high school GPA.

2. The increased grade point average is not expected to have a markedly depressing effect on Southern Oregon State College's overall enrollment. A study of the 712 resident freshmen enrolled fall term 1979 at Southern Oregon State College reveals that only 29 of these students (4%) would not have been admitted under revised admissions requirements as proposed above.

3. Applicants below the cutting scores of 2.25 GPA who do not have ameliorating test scores indicating success in college can be given special attention to determine their prospects for success in college and need for remedial work if admitted under the 5% admission category. (It has been observed that students admitted under the 3% (now 5%) policy and provided with diagnostic and remedial help have a better record of success in college than do students regularly admitted in the lowest admissions bracket.)

For similar reasons, Southern Oregon State College is requesting Board approval of a change in the testing alternative to the minimum grade point average (2.50) required of nonresident students. At the present time, the testing alternative is a score of 950 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test or 22 on the American College Test. By using a combined requirement of minimum high school GPA of 2.25 and a predicted first-term college GPA of 2.10, the institution will be able to identify and admit qualified students who might be denied admission on the basis of a single criterion. Southern Oregon State College believes its student body will benefit from some increased enrollment of students from across state and national boundaries. The alternative requirement, as requested, is consistent with the nonresident minimum entrance alternative requirement at the three universities (UO, OSU, PSU) and with the basic assumptions specifying that admissions standards for out-of-state undergraduate students should be maintained at a higher level than for in-state students in order to give reasonable assurance that the students admitted will represent a genuine asset to the student body.

Reports of Institutions Recommending No Further Change in Admissions Requirements for 1981-82

University of Oregon and Oregon State University. A special joint UO-OSU committee of faculty, admissions officers, and research personnel, appointed by the two presidents, has completed a study of the advisability of exercising the option to increase the minimum high school grade point average required of new-from-high-school entering freshman by one quarter of a point.

The committee found that if the raised GPA requirement had been in effect fall term 1979-80, it would have eliminated only 102 resident freshman students (56 at UO; 46 at OSU), 2.6% of the resident freshman class. A study of the success of these 102 students in college revealed that 26 of them (25.5%) earned at least a 2.00 college grade point average during their first term. The committee concluded that a further change in admission requirements at this time to eliminate so small a proportion of the freshman class was not advisable, considering the possible confusion and negative
effect the change might have for prospective students. The committee stated a desire to study the effect the new TSWE requirement will have on the academic progress of students before making any further change in admission requirements.

The committee also developed recommendations concerning the procedures to be used by the two institutions in administering the TSWE requirement. On the advice of the State Composition Advisory Committee, it was agreed that it would be practical to use the American College English Usage Test as the alternative provided in the TSWE requirement. The Advisory Committee noted that an ACT-English equivalent to a 30 TSWE score could not be ascertained because of differences in the two tests, but advised that a score of 12 on the ACT-English closely approximated the minimum level of English competence expected in the new requirement.

The two institutions indicate that they have accepted the recommendations of the joint Admissions Requirements Review Committee. They note that requirements for admission to the two universities are being changed significantly, (1) by increasing the discretionary 3% admissions category to 5% and (2) by the imposition of a minimum standard in writing competency. These two changes have a positive impact in the ability of the admissions staffs to screen and select students for admission who will benefit from the educational opportunities provided by these two institutions.

The Committee is expected to continue its investigations of impact of admission standards upon the quality of the student body as these new requirements go into effect in 1980-81 and 1981-82.

Portland State University. At the request of the President, the University's Academic Requirements Committee during the past year conducted a thorough review of admission requirements, with primary attention to two issues: (1) the wisdom of exercising the option granted by the State Board in 1979 to increase the GPA base requirement by a quarter of a grade point; and (2) the feasibility of requiring a score of 30 on the Test of Standard Written English (TSWE) of its equivalent on some alternative test of English composition, such as the College Board English Achievement Test.

Based on the detailed evidence presented in the report prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs for the September 14, 1979, meeting of the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, the Portland State University Committee concluded that only a large increase in the grade point average requirement would affect a significant change in the qualifications of students attending State System Institutions. The report data suggest that a .25 increase in high school GPA requirements would be largely cosmetic. Portland State University's own experience indicates, however, that some very capable students would be deprived of attending Portland State University as freshmen if admissions standards were to require a 2.50 high school GPA instead of the present 2.25. Given these facts, the Committee has recommended that Portland State University continue existing GPA requirements for 1981-82, a recommendation in which President Blumel concurs.

The Committee also recommended that no such criterion for admission as the TSWE or its equivalent be imposed at Portland State. The Committee believes the TSWE is appropriately used by Portland State University as a diagnostic tool to place students in appropriate instructional sequences after they enter college.

President Blumel states that it is his belief that present Portland State University admissions requirements are consistent with the institutional guidelines. While denying admissions to those with weak high school academic records, the requirements nevertheless provide opportunities for those high school graduates whose academic records were not distinguished.
Portland State University has found that students who lacked motivation or academic maturity in high school very frequently prove to be quite capable of doing college-level work. The "typical" student at Portland State is considerably older -- 26.9 years is the average -- than students at residence colleges and universities, and many thus do not enter immediately from high school. Their greater maturity and their assumption of personal and family responsibilities -- more than three-fourths are employed while attending Portland State University -- provide compelling reasons in Portland State University's view, for maintaining relatively modest admission requirements for undergraduate students.

Oregon College of Education, Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology. Oregon College of Education presently requires a minimum high school GPA of 2.25 for entering resident freshmen. Eastern Oregon State College and Oregon Institute of Technology require a high school GPA of 2.00. None of these institutions feel it is appropriate to increase the minimum high school grade point average requirement or impose a writing requirement at this time. For the present, these institutions prefer to admit students who meet their minimum grade point average and test score alternative requirements, to advise and place students commensurate with their developed abilities, and, thereby, to afford students an opportunity to avail themselves of the programs and services in a public four-year college or university.

Grade Inflation as A Consideration in Admissions Requirements

Questions are raised from time to time concerning the effect of grade inflation at high school and college levels on the validity of the high school GPA as a criterion for admission.

An examination of the mean high school GPA's of college-bound students over the past five years reveals that (whatever inflation may have occurred during an earlier period) high school grades of the present college-age group have varied only slightly from year to year. This stable grading pattern is consistent, both nationally and in Oregon, as shown in table I and II.
### TABLE I

**MEAN SELF-REPORTED HIGH SCHOOL GPA'S OF STUDENTS COMPLETING THE COLLEGE BOARD SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE TEST (SAT), 1975-1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>State System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** College Board Admissions Testing Program reports; National - all in the nation, Oregon - all in the state, and State System - all who sent scores to a State System college or university, who reported their high school GPA's.

### TABLE II

**MEAN HIGH SCHOOL GPA'S OF ENTERING FRESHMAN SIX INSTITUTIONS, STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION FALL TERMS, 1973-74--1979-80**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Nonresident</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Incomplete data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Institutional reports.
Recommended Admissions Requirements, 1981-82

The Board’s Office recommended the following admissions requirements for 1981-82.

Oregon Resident Freshman Admissions Requirements

Resident students must:

1. Have been graduated\(^1\) from a standard or accredited high school and

2. Meet institutional requirements as follows:

**UO, OSU**

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.50 high school grade point average or above in all high school subjects taken towards graduation, for admission to fall, winter, or spring terms; or

b. Have a predicted first term college grade point average (based on a combined measure of high school grade point average and scholastic aptitude test scores) of 2.00 or above; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of prescribed course work taken during the summer term at the University of Oregon or Oregon State University, respectively; or

d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 15 term hours of college-level course work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

Score a minimum of 30 on the Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English Usage Test. (Approved by the Board October 26, 1979.)

**PSU, OCE**

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.25 grade point average or above, in all high school subjects taken towards graduation to enter fall, winter, or spring terms; or

b. Have a minimum combined score of 890 SAT or 20 ACT to enter any term; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution, or in 9 term hours of a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer school.

\(^1\) Students who are graduates of non-standard or unaccredited high schools are admissible at the discretion of the institutions, which take into account high school GPA and/or SAT/ACT test scores. Students who are not high school graduates are admissible on the basis of satisfactory performance on the General Educational Development (GED) test, provided either that their high school class has been graduated, or they are adjudged by the institution to be meritorious cases justifying admission prior to the graduation of their high school class.
SOSC

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.25 grade point average or above, in all high school subjects taken towards graduation to enter fall, winter, or spring terms; or

b. Have a minimum combined score of 890 SAT or 20 ACT to enter any term; or

c. Have a predicted first term college grade point average (based on a combined measure of high school grade point average and scholastic aptitude test scores) of 2.00 or above; or

d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level course work taken in an accredited collegiate institution or in 9 term hours in a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer school.

EOSC, OIT

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.00 grade point average or above, in all high school subjects taken towards graduation to enter fall, winter or spring terms; or

b. Have a minimum combined score of 880 SAT or 20 ACT to enter fall, winter, and spring terms; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution or in 9 term hours of a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer school.

Nonresident Freshmen Admissions Requirements

Nonresident students must:

1. Have been graduated from an accredited high school and

2. Meet institutional requirements as follows:

UO, OSU, PSU

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.75 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation to enter fall, winter, and spring terms; or

b. Have a 2.25 grade point average or above and a predicted first term college grade point average (based on a combined measure of high school grade point average and scholastic aptitude test scores) of 2.10 or above; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of prescribed course work taken during the summer.

1See Footnote page 663.
term at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, or Portland State University, respectively; or

d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 15 term hours of college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

**UO, OSU**

Score a minimum of 30 on the Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English Usage Test. (Approved by the Board October 26, 1979.)

**OCE, EOSC**

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.50 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation to enter fall, winter, and spring terms; or

b. Have a minimum combined score of 950 SAT or 22 ACT; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level course work taken in an accredited collegiate institution or in 9 term hours in a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer term.

**SOSC**

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.50 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation to enter fall, winter, spring terms; or

b. Have a 2.25 grade point average or above and a predicted first term GPA (based on a combined measure of high school GPA and Scholastic Aptitude Test Score) of 2.10 or above; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level course work taken in an accredited collegiate institution or in 9 term hours in a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer term.

**OIT**

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.00 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation to enter fall, winter, spring terms; or

b. Have a minimum combined score of 880 SAT or 20 ACT; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level course work taken in an accredited collegiate institution or in 9 term hours in a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer term.

There are no summer term admissions requirements.
Administration of Foreign Study Programs in State System of Higher Education

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, September 12, 1980; present—Carpenter, Anderson, Petersen, and Warner-Yasuda.)

The Committee reviewed a report on foreign study programs of the State System of Higher Education, prepared for the Board by Dr. John Van de Water, director of international education at Oregon State University and administrator for the institutions of the State System, of the System's four Oregon Overseas Study Centers, located in Poitiers, France; Stuttgart, Germany; Guadalajara, Mexico; and Tokyo, Japan. The report is included in the document entitled, Administration of Foreign Study Programs in the State System of Higher Education, which is on file in the Board's Office.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board:

1. Affirm its long-standing commitment to international studies;
2. Pledge its support and the support of its staff in advancing the work of the Governor's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies;
3. Encourage the institutions and their faculties in their efforts to extend the international dimension of their curricula as needs suggest and resources can be made available.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Ms. Warner-Yasuda indicated that she had participated in the program in Japan and had found it a very enlightening experience. She said she was very proud of the foreign studies programs in Oregon and supported the staff recommendations.

Dr. John G. Van de Water, Director of International Education at Oregon State University said the report was presented to inform the Board on the programs and to present the rationale for increased attention to this area. He indicated that there was interest in working on an interinstitutional basis to explore the possibility of some new programs. He referred to the lack of any program in the continent of Africa. The Statewide Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies may serve as a catalyst for activities in this area if funding is obtained to make it operational.

In response to a question from Ms. Warner-Yasuda, Dr. Van de Water described the problems connected with attracting students. He said students need to appreciate the fact that the opportunity to study abroad is relevant and may be linked to their future careers. Perceptions of cost and the requirement for a foreign language may be inhibiting. Faculty support and financial aid are important. Costs can be reduced through arrangements for student exchange, he noted. The programs operated by the State System have a faculty member serve as a resident director, and credit earned in the program is State System credit. The least costly arrangement for the institutions is for students to simply enroll on their own in a foreign university and have their scholastic record sent to their home institution as transfer credit.

There was a brief discussion of the potential for federal funding, particularly through a cooperative approach.

Dr. Van de Water indicated that all students in the State System meeting program admission requirements are eligible to enroll in the State System programs. Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Oregon College of Education have adopted a home campus registration policy for students enrolling in the program. Eastern Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, and Portland State University students must transfer
to one of these institutions to participate. The necessity of transferring becomes an impediment to participation, in part because obtaining financial aid on a timely basis is more difficult for the transfer student than for the student working through the normal channels on the home campus.

Dr. Van de Water said he would like each institution in the State System to adopt a home campus registration policy and operate through the established interinstitutional committee for coordination. The difficulty is that institutions registering students and recording credit hours earned are expected to transfer funds equivalent to the average cost of instruction per FTE student to the program to cover administrative and instructional costs. Some institutions find it difficult to allocate funds to cover these costs and prefer that their students transfer to another institution for the period of international study.

Mr. Thomas Mills, Director of International Studies at the University of Oregon, said the interest in the State System programs was somewhat less at the University of Oregon than might be expected, possibly because of participation in other foreign study programs. Dr. Robert C. Albrecht, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, said the flow of students from foreign countries to State System campuses is important, also, and increases interest of American students in foreign study. He cited benefits from the State System exchange programs with foreign institutions.

Mr. Anderson said he believed it was extremely important to protect the exchange programs in the total budget-cutting process.

Acting President Olum commented that assistance provided students of Oregon institutions by foreign universities is very beneficial to the conduct of foreign study programs. If students coming to Oregon from those countries are limited, he said, that cooperation will be lost.

Dr. Ernest Ettlich, Dean of Academic Affairs at Southern Oregon State College, said the funding problem was more complex than the information presented during the discussion would indicate. For institutions under the maintenance program, home enrollment results in a direct reduction of the total budget. For this reason, it is almost impossible for an institution on a declining budget to participate. He said Southern Oregon State College felt the foreign study programs of the State System were very good. He mentioned the importance of a resident faculty member to the programs and the value of the exchange as an educational experience.

President MacVicar indicated that Oregon State University supports international programs, but he noted that a substantial number of the directors of these programs come from the other institutions and return to enrich the faculties at those institutions. Under the present circumstances, when students transfer to Oregon State University to enroll in the State System programs, they become that institution's responsibility for financial aid and compete with the already existing student body for a finite number of dollars. He said the programs should be truly State System.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations as presented and in addition that the Board (1) encourage the reactivation of the interinstitutional committee and (2) express support for the fee remission program. It was understood also that there was strong support for a System-wide approach to international studies programs and for their value in the educational program.

Board Discussion and Action

In response to a question concerning the budgetary implications of these programs, it was indicated that the Board's guidelines state that the institutions shall not invest more per credit hour of instruction in foreign study programs than the average cost of instruction on the home campus. The extra costs of providing the program overseas is paid by a surcharge to the individual students who participate.
The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

International education as defined in American colleges and universities encompasses a range of activities and programs with the basic purpose of giving an international dimension to undergraduate education. These activities include campus-based foreign language instruction, specialized curricula, problem- and area-oriented studies, general education and/or departmental requirements designed to provide an international sensitivity, education of foreign students and their contribution to the campus environment, faculty and student exchange, foreign study programs, and participation of faculty and advanced students in international development and research activities.

For the most part, these activities take place in the campus setting. Academically creditable, well-designed and administered programs of instruction in a foreign setting (foreign study programs), however, provide the most efficient mode of international education. While expensive to students and demanding of faculty, these programs offer the enormous advantage of enabling students to develop a command of a foreign language and an understanding of a foreign culture and civilization that transcends any possible competency which could be acquired by study on the home campus for a similar period of time.

Programs of instruction conducted in foreign locations are the responsibility of the respective institutions just as are any other instructional programs offered for academic credit.

The institutions understand the benefits of foreign study and all six undergraduate liberal arts colleges and universities of the System strive to make these opportunities available to their students.

There are, of course, obvious difficulties in offering academically and fiscally sound programs of instruction in a foreign land, distant from the campus. Even large universities have problems sustaining the faculty leadership and expertise and student enrollment necessary to operate overseas study programs on an on-going basis.

State System Coordination of Foreign Study Programs

Recognizing these difficulties, the Board's Office of Academic Affairs, in 1965, appointed a committee made up of representatives of the undergraduate liberal arts colleges and universities of the System to meet together and share experience and expertise in the offering of foreign study programs. A principal objective of the committee has been to assist the Office of Academic Affairs in the coordination of institutional efforts in foreign study, with the view of making available to Oregon students responsibly conducted overseas educational experiences.

The Interinstitutional Committee on International Education participated in the development of guidelines for foreign study programs of the State System, which were adopted by the Board July 25, 1967. These guidelines are reproduced for the information of the Committee as Appendix A to the full report.

The Board will be particularly interested in the following guideline stipulations:

The objectives of the program should be carefully examined to determine whether they are both worthy and feasible. They should be related clearly to the educational mission of the home institution and, regardless of length, should exact academic standards comparable to campus programs of the sponsoring institution. (Guideline 1, p. 22 of the full report.)
Programs ranging in length from a summer session of eight weeks to one of a full academic year may be equally valid, but the objectives, curricula, methods of instruction, and student needs may be quite different, and should be specified in the program plan. The timing of the foreign study should be carefully considered and the selection of the curriculum and students closely correlated with the length of stay in the host country. (Guideline 2, p. 22 of the full report.)

The program should be so designed that students will not, on balance, be penalized in terms of time expended and credits earned. Scholarships and other forms of financial assistance should be made available to them on the same basis as on the home campus. (Guideline 5, p. 22 of the full report.)

It is not contemplated that academic credit will be granted for programs that are solely or almost entirely travel or tour programs. (Guideline 6, p. 22 of the full report.)

... As a general principle, the State System would not expect to invest more in the overseas program than it would invest in providing an equal number of credit hours on the campus. (Guideline 7, p. 22 of the full report.)

Periodically the Board's Office of Academic Affairs and the Committee on International Education have reported to the Board on the extent and conduct of foreign study programs of the State System. The report is particularly timely this year (1) because of the increasing awareness in the nation and the state of the interdependence of the world and the urgency of providing an international dimension to education of American young people, and (2) because the rising costs of study abroad are making the programs increasingly difficult to maintain.

In his report, Dr. Van de Water urges that ways be sought to strengthen Oregon programs and to ameliorate to the extent possible difficulties being caused by the increasing costs of these programs. In his words, "We need to have more students recognize the importance of foreign study, we need more financial aid for these students, and we need more programs, especially in non-European countries."

Status of State System Foreign Study Programs

It should be noted that the various foreign study programs of the State System, as described in Dr. Van de Water's report, have been operating fairly efficiently over the past several years.

Cooperative arrangements are in place; each of the institutions has some staff knowledgeable in this area of study.

The Board's Office of Academic Affairs and Budget Office have maintained the review of programs provided in the guidelines.

Participating institutions provide governance for the System's four Overseas Study Centers (located in Poitiers, France; Stuttgart, Germany; Tokyo, Japan; and Guadalajara, Mexico) and the Oregon Summer Study Abroad program in Germany and Austria.

Additional opportunities for foreign study are provided through participation of the System's three universities in the Northwest Interinstitutional Council on Study Abroad (NICSABA), a consortium of 14 public colleges and universities with more than a decade of successful experience in the operation of foreign study programs.

Institutionally offered term-long and summer programs are reviewed by experienced campus committees and by the Board's Office of Academic Affairs and Budget Office before commitments are made.
The programs are part of the regular academic offerings of the institutions and are not subject to the vagaries of external funding, although external funds are helpful and are sought.

The Board's stipulation that the State System would not expect to invest more in an overseas program than it would invest in providing an equal number of credit hours on campus does not appear to be a problem.

Great care is taken to assure that the programs are academically sound. A report of one of the programs, pulled from the Board's Office files, (Oregon Summer Study Abroad in Austria and Germany, 1979 Summer Term) is provided in Appendix B to the report, for Board members wishing an example of the operation of foreign study programs in the State System.

Future Direction of Foreign Study Programs

Dr. S. Frederick Starr, (vice president of academic affairs of Tulane University and member of a national Task Force on Education and the World View), observes in a paper developed for the Task Force that the key to the development of strong programs of international education (including opportunities for overseas study) is the willingness of the institution's chief administrator to acknowledge "the centrality of international programs and foreign language study to the life of the school as a whole." Dr. Starr further states that wherever international programs flourish, there is always evidence of strong faculty leadership: leadership to elicit the cooperation of the departments from which faculty participants in international programs are drawn; leadership to develop and maintain long-term international ties; leadership to take advantage of possibilities for collaborative arrangements among different campuses. The need for interinstitutional cooperation is imperative, Dr. Starr continues, noting that "Virtually every component of international studies today is organized into interinstitutional networks."

The programs of the State System of Higher Education have benefited from the direction given in the Board's guidelines, from institutional presidents with strong personal commitments to international education, from the dedication of participating faculty members and program directors. Because the programs have been running so well, the Interinstitutional Committee on International Education has not met in recent years, although individual members of the committee serve on the various governing bodies of cooperative foreign study programs.

Members of the committee have expressed a strong need for a reconstitution of the committee with at least annual meetings, the first meeting to be scheduled early in the fall, 1980-81, with the objective of renewing and strengthening cooperative and collaborative efforts in the furtherance of international education, with particular attention to the conduct of foreign study programs. The Office of Academic Affairs will assume responsibility for consulting with the presidents as to the makeup of this committee and for calling it into session early during the fall term 1980-81.

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, September 12, 1980; present--Carpenter, Harms, Petersen, and Warner-Yasuda.)

The University of Oregon requests that the Board modify its policies regarding the academic-year calendar to permit institutions of the State System to move to an early semester calendar without requiring all institutions to adopt the new calendar simultaneously.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's staff recommended that the Board rescind its policy with respect to maintenance of a common academic calendar, and state that it will consider approval of academic calendars for individual institutions, providing that the institution requesting a new calendar demonstrates that the proposed calendar:
provides as many days of instruction as the System's traditional three-term academic-year calendar;

is in the educational best interest of the institution's students;

is cost effective;

will not create insurmountable transfer problems.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Acting President Olum indicated that faculty groups had voted in favor of giving further consideration to an early semester calendar for the University of Oregon. He said a proposal for a semester calendar would not be presented unless it was believed that it would provide as much instruction and be better educationally than the present system. Students should be consulted and the calendar should be cost effective and not create serious transfer problems. It was indicated that more detailed information prepared at the University of Oregon had not been distributed yet to the Board pending analysis by the Board's staff. Dr. Olum said that if the Board were to rescind its policy with respect to a common calendar, then the University of Oregon and the Board's Office would analyze the early semester calendar.

Mrs. Carpenter said the reaction of the other institutions in the System would be very important and she would certainly want to hear their comments before action was taken. Dr. Olum indicated that statements from all concerned units would be included in any request. He said the issue was whether the question of uniformity would make it useless to proceed with the study.

Mr. Petersen suggested the request would provide an opportunity to review long-standing policies. There was some discussion of the possibilities for greater depth of study in the semester system as contrasted with the quarter system.

Mrs. Carpenter stated that decisions of this nature could not be made in isolation, and Ms. Warner-Yasuda said she would be interested also in hearing comments from the other presidents.

President Blume said Portland State University had been studying the semester versus the quarter system and had not reached a conclusion on the substantive question. The issue of whether students in general would be disadvantaged because of transfer problems requires more in-depth review. He indicated he had no problem with the request as presented.

President MacVicar said the Faculty Senate at Oregon State University had reviewed the request but had not reached a specific conclusion. He stipulated that the instructional time would remain the same. This means that the academic year would start about the middle of August and this diminished the enthusiasm for the early semester plan. He noted that most early semesters are shortened semesters and provide fewer days of instruction than the traditional semester system.

Dr. T. K. Olson, Executive Director of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, said the Commission had followed with considerable interest the University of Oregon discussions. The Commission would be concerned with encouraging a maximum of coordination and a minimum of confusion in whatever transition might ultimately take place.

Dr. Olum said the impetus for the early versus the traditional semester system was twofold—(1) articulation with the community colleges; and (2) the students want to finish before Christmas vacation.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations as presented, with the understanding that all interested parties would be included in the discussion in order to reflect the impact of the change on students, faculty, and staff.
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Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Batiste questioned the advisability of rescinding a policy before it was certain that a new one would be adopted. Mr. Harms explained that the University of Oregon had not yet determined that it would change to the semester system. The institution was unwilling to invest the necessary time and effort to study the desirability of the semester system in the light of existing Board policy.

Mr. Batiste moved that the Board table the discussion until a more definitive position could be taken. He commented further that the Board was neither encouraging nor discouraging the study and that the proposal represented a staff-president responsibility which should be tabled until the institution arrived at a conclusion.

Mr. Harms said it was his understanding that the University was unwilling to undertake the study and commit internal funds in the face of a Board policy which prohibits one institution from following a different academic calendar than the others.

Acting President Olum said the request to the Board was an expression of its willingness to consider letting one university act independently with respect to the calendar. There is presently a firm Board policy requiring a single calendar for all institutions.

Mr. Ingalls inquired as to which system was followed by a majority of the colleges and universities in the country. Mrs. Kahananui said there has been a strong movement from the traditional semester to the early semester plan in recent years and some movement from the term calendar. She said precise information could be obtained but she would suspect that the preponderance now might be the early semester calendar. She also stated that an institution considering a change must assess what it would do to its relationship with other institutions in terms of mid-year transfers.

Board members commented that while they might favor the semester system, it would be a very confusing situation unless all three universities went to the semester plan.

Dr. Olum said it might be possible for the University of Oregon to convince the other institutions that the semester system would be desirable if the study results were favorable. If the University of Oregon did go to a semester calendar, it would be the early semester plan. The first semester would end at the time of Christmas vacation, and Dr. Olum said transfers would not be too difficult at that time. He said he did not believe it would be too crucial for all three universities to be on the same calendar and pointed out that the University of Oregon Law School was on a semester calendar while the rest of the University of Oregon was on a term calendar.

Mr. Anderson said the Board would be acknowledging the fact that the two semester system had possible merit for application at one or all of the institutions of the State System. Stringent conditions have been specified for approval. At this point, any discussion of the merits or demerits of the semester system would be rather futile.

Mrs. Green said she would be reluctant to see the Board be so inflexible that it would not allow institutions to explore alternative methods that might be more beneficial to students and perhaps better in terms of finance and employment opportunities.

Mr. Petersen said the Committee recommendation provided a vehicle for obtaining further information and reactions. Mr. Harms added that it was his understanding the other two universities were interested in the study also.

Mr. Batiste said his motion would not prevent pursuing the study but he was concerned about rescinding a policy just for the purpose of making an investigation of the matter.
The Chancellor said that to encourage the institution to invest the time and money in the study in the face of a firm Board policy for a common calendar would be an inefficient use of resources. It might be possible to accomplish the objective by suspending the policy for a period of time, the Chancellor said, but he would not want to ask the institution to pursue this in the face of an existing Board policy against it.

Mr. Batiste's motion to table the recommendation was defeated, with Director Batiste voting in favor. Directors Anderson, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms were opposed.

The Board then approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: Director Batiste.

Staff Report to the Committee

The institutions of the State System of Higher Education have maintained a common three-term academic-year calendar since the System's establishment by the Board of Higher Education in 1932.

Board policies relating to the common calendar appear to be a by-product of the development, by the Board, of a "single, unified and coordinated system of higher education." This system of institutions, as originally designed, provided ready progression from lower-division programs of general education offered at all institutions to upper-division specialization and professional school programs, either at the same institution or at another institution of the system, without loss of time or credit. Under this arrangement, access to specialized programs was accomplished by transfer and transfer was facilitated by coordination (articulation) of programs.

Articulation of programs and ease of transfer, long a hallmark of Oregon higher education, provided the state a ready-made format which became the basis of the Board's relationships with Oregon community colleges, as they were developed.

The common calendar, while only implicit in early actions of the Board, was recognized explicitly in March, 1972, when the University of Oregon was authorized to move its Law School to early semester scheduling. In granting such authorization, the Board said:

The University will not be permitted to move unilaterally toward adoption of the semester calendar for the institution as a whole. Any such movement must be a part of a state-wide adoption of the semester calendar, including the institutions of the State System and the community colleges.

The University of Oregon has completed a fairly comprehensive study of the advantages and disadvantages of an early semester vis-a-vis the three-term academic-year calendar as they apply to its educational program. The institution believes, and the Board's staff tends to agree, that the study completed thus far provides sufficient evidence as to the educational and monetary advantages of early semester scheduling as to warrant closer examination. The University of Oregon does not wish to make the investment of time and resources involved in such a detailed examination if the institution is to be held to the present calendar until such a time as all public institutions in the state are convinced of the merits and cost-effectiveness of a change.

The Board's staff, the institutional presidents, and the State System-Community College Coordinating Committee have discussed this problem. It is not believed that the benefits of early semester scheduling would accrue in the same way and to the same degree to all institutions, because of differences in institutional missions and clienteles. There is no question but that
opportunities for transfer between institutions on different calendars are diminished. Even more so than at present, students contemplating transfer would be advised to accomplish that transfer at the beginning of an academic year. But this is not necessarily bad. There is also the problem of competition among students for summer jobs. However, none of these difficulties are of a magnitude to suggest that the Board should hold an institution to a calendar that is less advantageous academically and economically to that particular institution than would be a different pattern of scheduling, so long as the new calendar does not result in a reduction in instructional days.

The Board's staff does not recommend that the institutions be given discretionary authority to establish academic calendars of their individual choosing, but suggests rather that should an institution determine that a move to a different scheduling is desirable, it present the evidence therefor to the Board, together with a proposed calendar, for its consideration and approval.

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, September 12, 1980; present--Carpenter, Harms, Petersen, and Warner-Yasuda.)

A report prepared by the Board's Office of Academic Affairs and the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission on the result of the placement follow-up of the 1978-79 teacher education graduates was provided to the Committee, and is on file in the Board's Office as part of the document entitled Placement of 1978-79 Teacher Education Graduates of Oregon Teacher Education Institutions. Through the collaborative efforts of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, Oregon teacher education institutions, the Board's Office, and the State Department of Education, a process is now well established through which placement information about students graduating in teacher education can be secured from each year's graduating class. This is the third of such placement reports.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's Office recommended that the Board accept the report and direct the State System teacher education institutions and the Board's Office:

1. To continue their cooperative efforts, in company with the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and the Oregon Department of Education, to provide valid and reliable teacher education placement information on an annual basis.

2. To continue to make such placement information, by teaching level and teaching field, available to prospective teacher education students and to make consistent, effective use of the annual placement data in advising prospective teacher education students as to placement experience of teacher education graduates, so that the students may make informed decisions as to (a) whether to enter the teacher education field, and (b) if they decide to become teachers, which teaching field to enter.

The Board's Office made such placement information collected in the 1979 study available in printed summary form on a single-sheet to teacher preparation institutions for use with their education students, to placement and career counseling officers at the colleges and universities, and to all high school counselors in Oregon. This procedure has been highly effective, and should be continued.

3. To continue to give careful attention to the production and placement of elementary teachers so that the reasonable balance which presently exists between the supply of and demand for elementary teachers can be maintained.
The production/demand ratio for elementary teachers has been dropping steadily since the early 1970's to the point where it began to appear that a shortage of elementary teachers might develop. This has not occurred. The production/demand ratio over the past three years has remained fairly steady, with placement ranging between 62-66%.

Elementary enrollments in Oregon public schools are expected to increase for the next ten years which could increase the demand for teachers. Annual placement data will help the Board’s Office and the colleges and divisions of education keep abreast of the placement situation in elementary education.

4. To exercise careful surveillance of secondary teacher production, especially in those fields in which teacher employment of graduates is proportionately low, i.e., art, health education, and physical education, to seek to bring production in better balance with employment opportunities.

In previous teacher supply and demand studies, the list of areas in which the teacher employment of graduates was proportionately low also included modern languages and social studies. Placement for the class of 1977-78 in modern languages showed a very marked improvement over the previous year, and further gains in the placement of the class of 1978-79 have placed modern languages among the teaching fields with high teacher placement (65-100%). Placement for the class of 1978-79 in social studies increased very significantly as compared with placement for the class of 1977-78, so that placement in social studies has now reached the middle range of placement (55-65%).

A very significant decrease in the number of teacher graduates in physical education (21% from 1977-78 to 1978-79) was not enough to prevent a decrease in the percentage of graduates placed as teachers. Production of teacher graduates in health education increased, but placement improved. A sharp reduction in the number of graduates helped placement in this area.

These three teaching fields continue to be areas in which teacher employment is low. It is important that the institutions continue their efforts to reduce production and take whatever steps are necessary and feasible to bring production and employment into better balance.

Summary of Results

Summarized below are the principal findings of the follow-up study of the placement of 1978-79 graduates in elementary and secondary education:

- 67% of those individuals completing student teaching in 1978-79 had applied for a certificate as of June 30, 1980.

- For those certificated as of June 30, 1980:
  - 63% were employed as regular teachers in the schools (59% of those certificated as elementary teachers, and 58% of those certificated as secondary teachers). The highest percentage of secondary education graduates was placed in industrial education, agriculture, mathematics, business, foreign languages, and home economics; placement in music, social studies, language arts, and science fell in the middle range; and the lowest employment areas were in physical education, art, and health education.

(5% of the certificated 1978-79 graduates were employed as teachers in other states.)

(26% of the 1978-79 graduates secured regular employment as teachers after the opening of school, i.e., between September 30, 1979, and June 30, 1980.)
- 21% were in a school or college assignment other than as a regular elementary or secondary teacher, e.g., substitute teaching, pre-school or day-care teaching, serving as a teacher aide, community college teaching.
- 10% had other full-time employment.
- 3% were continuing full-time studies.
- One percent were homemakers.
- Less than one percent were in military service.
- 2% were not employed.

A comparison of the production and placement of 1978-79 teacher education graduates with that of 1977-78 graduates reveals the following:

- Production of secondary teachers dropped from 1,012 in 1977-78 to 910 in 1978-79 (a decrease of 10%). Production of elementary teachers increased from 776 to 825, or 6%.
- The percentage employed as regular teachers at the end of the school year following graduation increased from 58% in 1977-78, to 63% in 1978-79. For the elementary education graduates, the percentages employed as teachers were 61% and 68%, and for secondary education graduates 55% and 58%.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Rempel reviewed the report and responded to questions concerning the data.

Mrs. Kahananui commented that it is believed that the information on placement data has had some effect on the career decisions of young people. Admissions criteria have been revised and strengthened and students and professors have more information so that those who do graduate are interested in actual placement.

The supply and demand seems to be in better balance as a result of efforts over the past several years.

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented with the understanding that it would be used for future guidance in accordance with the staff recommendations. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Summary

Discussion of the Report of the Proceedings of a Teacher Education Seminar conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Education, originally scheduled for the June 27, 1980, meeting of the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, was postponed because of insufficient time to the Committee's September 12 meeting.
Copies of the Proceedings were distributed with the June docket. Members of the Committee were asked to bring their copies to the September meeting.

The Board's representative on the Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Education is Mrs. Jane Carpenter.

Much of the information provided during the seminar has become familiar to the members of the Board of Higher Education during its continued review and surveillance of teacher education and associated activities in the State System of Higher Education.

The need for continuing improvement in teacher education programs is recognized by the institutions and the Board and much progress has been made.

Repeatedly, during the seminar, the points were made that:

1. Oregon is far ahead of most states in both the quality of its pre-service teacher education programs and in the demonstrated capacity and willingness of all of the diverse agencies concerned with public school teaching and teacher education, pre-service and in-service, to work together to deal with shared concerns and problems.

2. Most of the elements are in place for Oregon to make a major stride forward in improving the quality of teacher education and the effectiveness of teachers in the public school context.

3. Data from research presently underway and planned, involving six State System and two independent colleges and universities preparing teachers in an evaluative follow-up of their graduates, is expected to provide important insights into the cost and benefits of different patterns of practicum experiences in the preparation programs.

4. Changes in preparation programs do not have to await completion of research. Enough is known to make intuitive judgments, which will be strengthened and defended as data become available.

5. Both the liberal arts base and the professional aspects of the pre-service programs must be improved. Accomplishing this may require an extended pre-service program, either with or without an internship.

In preparation for the discussion, members of the Committee on Instruction may wish to acquaint themselves with specific seminar presentations on areas not recently discussed by the Board or in which they have particular interest. A program of the seminar, and table of contents, is found on p. 3 of the Proceedings.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

No action was necessary. The Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Education is continuing its studies and will, in due course, be making its recommendations concerning teacher education in Oregon to the respective boards and commissions.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mrs. Carpenter said great strides have been made in identifying the kinds of things that teachers need to know and the factors that would be useful in selecting candidates for teacher education. The institutions have been developing an evaluation mechanism to evaluate teachers at every stage of training and for three years of teaching after graduation. Funding has been sought to implement a major undertaking in testing and evaluation. Progress will be limited until funding becomes available, although some of the plans can be implemented.
Dr. Richard Hersh, Associate Dean of Education at the University of Oregon, raised the issue of applying also to the Oregon Legislature for program improvement money to conduct some of the necessary research. It was pointed out that requests for program improvement funds in the coming biennium were forwarded to Salem on September 1, and prospects for funding those requests are not optimistic.

Mrs. Kahuanui indicated that the ad hoc committee was continuing to meet and it was anticipated that within the next few months there will be recommendations on further efforts, including consideration of financing.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Summary and Staff Recommendation

In view of the action of the 1980 Special Session of the Oregon Legislature in reducing the General Fund appropriation and expenditure authorizations for capital construction in 1979-1981, it was recommended that the listing of educational and general plant projects for 1981-1983, which the Board approved on July 25, 1980, be revised to include the following two deferred items in highest priority:

- Modifications to Remove Access Barriers for Handicapped: $4,830,000
- Correction of Safety Deficiencies: 2,375,000

These amounts reflect adjustments for projected increases in the price level because of a delay of approximately one year in proceeding with the alterations and for necessary revisions of the drawings and specifications by the professional consultants.

Board Discussion and Action

In response to a question from Mr. Ingalls, Mr. Hunderup explained that the projects would be added to the capital construction request and would increase the total amount. No projects would be deleted.

Mrs. Green said she questioned whether it would be possible financially to meet the requirements of the law and the rules and regulations for accessibility. She asked Mr. Hunderup whether, in his judgment, it might be advisable to wait and see if Congress would make changes. She cited the fact that there was a concerted effort to obtain modifications in the requirements.

Mr. Hunderup said he endorsed enthusiastically making the minimal accommodations which were requested for accessibility. The criteria specify making programs accessible, but this does not mean that every foot of space must be accessible. He said philosophically and personally he would favor making all of the higher education programs accessible to the handicapped in order to provide them with educational opportunity so that they could become productive citizens of society. The investment that the State System of Higher Education is required to make for the handicapped accessibility is a very small investment in terms of making educational opportunity available.

Mr. Hunderup said he wished that Congress also had appropriated money to assist the states in meeting the regulations. The State System is presently in violation and needs to bring itself into compliance. He noted also that the Board had placed these projects in high priority in 1979-1981 and authorization had been received, but it was not possible to execute the projects prior to the freeze.

Mrs. Green said she would not argue with the noble sentiments expressed but she seriously doubted whether any institutions, public or private, would meet the requirements. She suggested that in view of the pressure on Congress to make modifications in the law and rules and regulations, it would be advisable to delay these projects.
Mr. Petersen said he would favor approving the recommendation because he would dislike having the Board of Higher Education seek to delay or circumvent access for the handicapped. He said it was more of a moral obligation than a legal one to provide access. It is costing a lot of money now because it was not done over the years. He stated that he would not be party to any effort to delay or circumvent these requirements.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Green abstained.

Staff Report to the Board

In view of the prospect of substantially lower tax revenues during 1979-1981 than had been expected when the 1979 Legislature approved state budgets, the Governor recommended to the 1980 Special Session that significant reductions be made in the General Fund appropriations and expenditure limitations previously authorized. Among the modifications incorporated within Enrolled Senate Bill 5561 (Chapter 5, 1980 Special Session) were reductions of $966,986 from the General Fund appropriation in Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979, for the correction of safety deficiencies within the Department of Higher Education and $2,023,970 for building modifications to remove access barriers for handicapped which had been authorized by the same Act.

Inasmuch as the financing plan for these items anticipated that equal amounts would be provided from proceeds from the sale of bonds under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution, the reductions of expenditure limitations were double the amounts of the General Fund cuts. Thus it has been necessary to defer alterations totaling $1,933,972 for the correction of safety deficiencies and $4,047,940 for improved accessibility for the handicapped, all within the educational and general plant, pending re-authorization by the 1981 Legislature.

The following tabulation summarizes, by institution, the original authorizations in 1979, the adjusted program being implemented in 1979-1981, the state fund reductions imposed by the 1980 Special Session, and the estimated revised expenditure requirements for them in 1981-1983:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for Handicapped:</td>
<td>$7,240,000</td>
<td>$3,192,060</td>
<td>$4,047,940</td>
<td>$4,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$31,279</td>
<td>$448,721</td>
<td>$525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>544,400</td>
<td>135,600</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>156,400</td>
<td>1,543,600</td>
<td>1,790,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>1,705,000</td>
<td>459,055</td>
<td>1,245,945</td>
<td>1,495,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOHSC</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>53,793</td>
<td>946,207</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>590,000</td>
<td>590,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>505,000</td>
<td>505,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>272,133</td>
<td>(272,133)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$7,240,000</td>
<td>$3,192,060</td>
<td>$4,047,940</td>
<td>$4,830,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-679-
### Safety Deficiency Correction Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>2,990,000</td>
<td>2,677,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOHS C</td>
<td>985,000</td>
<td>37,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$61,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$3,066,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised expenditure requirements give effect to adjustments for projected escalation of construction costs and for extra services provided by professional consultants in effecting the changes in bid documents being prepared by them for units of work yet to be accomplished.

Because of the urgency of completing the facility modifications for improved access for the handicapped on the several campuses, the staff recommends that the expenditure requirements for them be placed in highest priority on the listing of educational and general plant projects for 1981-1983, followed immediately thereafter by the items relating to the correction of safety deficiencies. As indicated to the Board on several prior occasions, both programs are mandated by federal and state laws and regulations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>General Fund &amp; XI-G Bonds</th>
<th>Gifts and Grants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Amount Cumulative Total</td>
<td>Project Amount Cumulative Total</td>
<td>Project Amount Cumulative Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modifications to Remove Access Barriers for Handicapped: EOSC $ 525</td>
<td>$ 4,830</td>
<td>$ 4,830</td>
<td>$ 4,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UO</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OOSCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase III-B: EOSC $ 40</td>
<td>$ 4,830</td>
<td>$ 4,830</td>
<td>$ 4,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OOSCS</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UO</td>
<td></td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>School of Architecture and Allied Arts Additions and Alterations</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>7,205</td>
<td>7,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Professional Schools Building Phase II</td>
<td>5,985</td>
<td>13,190</td>
<td>13,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Campus Master Planning</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>18,265</td>
<td>18,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OOSCS</td>
<td>Basic Science Building Addition (Planning only)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>18,820</td>
<td>18,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OOSCS</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Steam Phase II)</td>
<td>3,730*</td>
<td>22,510</td>
<td>22,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OOSCS</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Chilling)</td>
<td>345*</td>
<td>22,855</td>
<td>22,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>Maaske Hall Rededication and Remodel</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>23,240</td>
<td>23,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Lincoln Hall Rehabilitation</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>25,955</td>
<td>25,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Physical Education and Recreation Facilities (Tennis Courts Phase I)</td>
<td>35*</td>
<td>25,990</td>
<td>25,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Millar Library Addition</td>
<td>7,265</td>
<td>33,255</td>
<td>33,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Library Addition and Alterations</td>
<td>5,110</td>
<td>38,365</td>
<td>38,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Crop Science Building Addition</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>40,610</td>
<td>40,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Tunnel Extension Phase III)</td>
<td>365*</td>
<td>41,275</td>
<td>41,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>OOSCS</td>
<td>Churchill Hall Remodel</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>44,235</td>
<td>44,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>OOSCS</td>
<td>Humanities Building/Arts Center Phase I</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>47,310</td>
<td>47,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>OOSCS</td>
<td>Library Mezzanine Addition</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>47,685</td>
<td>47,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Rehabilitation of Various Campus Facilities</td>
<td>3,015*</td>
<td>50,700</td>
<td>50,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Research Facility Improvements</td>
<td>2,915*</td>
<td>50,600</td>
<td>50,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>General Fund &amp; XI-G Bonds</td>
<td>Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Amount</td>
<td>Cumulative Total</td>
<td>Project Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Siskiyou Commons Rededication, Addition and Remodel (Art Department); Related Relocations</td>
<td>$2,145</td>
<td>$52,745</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>Administration Building Remodel</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>53,515</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Liberal Arts Instruction Building</td>
<td>4,895</td>
<td>58,410</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Science Greenhouse</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>58,655</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Farm Crops Building Remodel</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>59,350</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Milne Computer Center Addition</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>60,740</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>UOHS C</td>
<td>Dental School First Floor Roof Enclosure</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>61,415</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>UOHS C</td>
<td>Library Expansion/Remodeling (Planning only)</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>61,775</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Central Hall Remodel</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>61,960</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Gill Coliseum Addition (Wrestling)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61,960</td>
<td>330*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: $61,960 | $1,155 | $63,445

*Partial cost; remainder of project cost to be financed from resources for auxiliary enterprises
Meeting #469
Revised Space Standards
Recommended for Facility Planning and Utilization

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, September 12, 1980; present--Ingalls, Batiste, Harms, Lomnicki, and Wyss.)

Summary
Several years ago, it became apparent that the space standards which were approved by the Board on December 10, 1969, were published in Chapter VIII of the 1970 Planning and Procedures Handbook and were used as a valuable guide for the construction of many square feet of space, needed further review and expansion. The proposed revised standards now being presented are expected to serve various functions internal to the State System institutions, including programming for new buildings and remodeling, space allocation and reassignment, and space utilization.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee
It was recommended that the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant review and recommend for Board adoption the proposed revised space standards as outlined within the attached Chapter VIII STANDARDS below. It was further recommended that Internal Management Directive 7.105 be amended to delete reference to the date of December 10, 1969:

Space Use Objectives and Building Planning Standards
Institutions and divisions shall follow the space use objectives and building planning standards adopted by the Board on December 10, 1969. Details of the space use objectives and building planning standards are outlined in the "Planning and Procedures Handbook for Campus and Building Development" issued by the Board's Office of Facilities Planning.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee
Mr. Ingalls questioned whether the Board was qualified to approve the space standards. Mr. Hunderup pointed out that the Board had deputized its staff to do much of the detail for which planning is brought to the Board in final form. Capital construction policies have been adopted for the planning of the campus construction program for presentation to the Executive Department, the Legislative Fiscal Office, the Ways and Means Committee and the Full Legislature. One of the policy statements is to the effect that the plans for any individual project will be consistent with the building planning standards and the space utilization objectives adopted by the Board. Mr. Hunderup said he would hope that the Committee and the Board would accept the testimony that the staff work had been done in cooperation with the institutional representatives and would endorse the standards and objectives upon which the planning would go forward. With respect to adopting the standards and at a time of limited construction, Mr. Hunderup indicated that they have some application even in remodeling projects. The guidelines are helpful to the architects and institutional personnel in planning for a specific project. This helps to avoid major discrepancies in the schematic design phase of planning from what can be endorsed in terms of its consistency throughout the State System for comparable areas.

Mr. Wyss commented that in some instances the space being allocated was very small. For example, might the library standards lead to a decline in quality which would drive people away because the space is crowded and unattractive. There was further discussion of the process used in determining reader stations and space for the libraries. It was indicated that suggestions from the librarians had been included in the development of the standards.
In response to questions from Mr. Lomnicki concerning requirements that existing libraries conform to the proposed standards, it was stated that existing space could be used to best serve the purposes of an institution. The proposed standards are intended as planning standards rather than daily use requirements.

Mr. Batiste asked what procedure was available for dealing with variations from the standards when necessary. Mr. Hunjerup said the space standards included items of opportunity for the Board's Office of Facilities Planning to make exceptions to the standards, based upon the specific request of an institution. The institutions have the responsibility for documenting the need for deviations.

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

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

In 1973, following recognition of the need to review the library standards previously adopted by the Board, the Physical Facilities Data Committee, which is advisory to the Board's Office of Facilities Planning and is comprised of a representative of each institution and two members of the Board's staff, began a systematic process of reviewing, updating and making more complete each of the various space standards in anticipation of recommending changes by the Board.

Inasmuch as a reasonable consensus was expected for each category of space, with modest but realistic allocations, considerable care was taken by the committee to secure sound data and to involve knowledgeable individuals in the deliberations. The proposed revised standards were researched extensively with the help of many individuals. Some of these persons met with the committee and others contributed advice through their institutional representative.

It was the intent of the Physical Facilities Data Committee to identify the major categories of space found at the institutions and thereby make it possible to plan an entire campus. In many cases, the space allocation would be made under a fairly rigid formula, such as for class laboratories, whereas for other categories, such as research space, standards can be determined only by the characteristics of the functions housed. In such instances, the facilities of an institution are expected to accommodate only those functions that are appropriate and consistent with the mission of the institution as established or acknowledged by the Board.

An identification of some of the people involved as consultants to the committee in the review and completion process, and a brief description of the methodologies and/or sources of information used in formulating the proposed revised Standards chapter may be helpful in understanding the recommendations. From the Board's Office of Administration, Guy Lutz and Jerry Jaqua provided assistance with enrollment and student enumeration data, and Keith Jackson and Dave Quenzer identified funding sources of various activities to ensure compatibility with the program (i.e., educational and general or auxiliary). Space-use reporting needs of the Office of Facilities Planning were identified by Vice Chancellor Hunderup and numerous studies from the reports were done by Truman Baird to aid in the investigation of and writing of the standards. Additionally, reports and standards from other states, especially California, Washington and Wisconsin, were helpful in the assessment of the Standards chapter.
The individual standards which are proposed for significant modification or which have been newly developed are as follows:

LABORATORY DESIGN STANDARD

In this reformulated standard, the indicated space allocations were chosen as a representative sample. Other academic disciplines can be identified on a comparative basis and from various source books which have extensive lists.

OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITIES STANDARD

The space at each institution devoted to "other instruction" was tabulated. Although some space was found to vary considerably in similar disciplines between institutions, the Groups identified with the proposed standard represent disciplines where there was considerable consensus. This new standard is intended to serve only as a guide.

OFFICE PROJECTION STANDARD

This reformulated projection standard continues to include all offices regardless of use (e.g., offices for research, physical education, computer centers, etc.). Conference rooms associated with instructional and administrative offices, as well as office service areas such as file rooms and work rooms, are proposed to be included within the projection standard. The design standards, which have been restated, are essentially unchanged from those previously approved.

LIBRARY STANDARD

Reader Stations - To determine the necessary number of reader stations, the librarians at each institution surveyed reader station use each hour of the day during one of the busiest weeks of the year. The reader station space to be provided was derived from this study utilizing the greatest occupancy during the period of the study plus an added factor for flexibility which will provide for differential use between various portions of the libraries. The reader station space standard has been reduced from 30% of the Fall Term FTE enrollment at Portland State University and 25% of the Fall Term FTE enrollment at other institutions to 15% of the Fall Term FTE undergraduate student enrollment and 25% of the Fall Term FTE graduate student enrollment at all institutions as a reflection of the survey.

Stack Space - The proposed standards for projecting stack space (books and non-book materials) were set on the assumption that the shelves would be two-thirds full. The difference between "full working capacity" (86%) and the two-thirds factor would allow twenty percent expansion for acquisitions between reshelving. The recommended standard reflects outsized volumes at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center and the University of Oregon Law School. The standard has been redefined to reflect more accurately the operational procedures of a library. In selected areas, the refinement process required that books and materials be tape-measured. Programming of space for additional acquisitions subsequent to occupancy of a new or expanded facility was considered to be a very important factor in the standard. The proposed standard was reviewed and supported by the Interinstitutional Library Committee.

COMPUTER FACILITIES

This proposed new standard, which reflects the wide diversity of space requirements at various institutions, is related to the mission of the institution, extent of faculty involvement, and the character of equipment used.

SPECIAL SERVICE FACILITIES

It is intended to include as few functions as possible within this category.
RESEARCH STANDARD

The proposed standard for research space was the most difficult one to develop. Initially, the Committee met with a number of resource people to develop the philosophy, characteristics, and content of the standard:

1. Dr. Aaron Novick, UO, Dean of the Graduate School, Professor of Biology
2. Dr. Jack Brookhart, UO, Dean of the Graduate School, Professor and Chairman of Physiology
3. Dr. Arthur Emlen, PSU, Professor of Social Work, Director of Regional Research Institute for Human Services
4. Dr. Thomas A. Brady, Jr., UO, Associate Professor of History
5. Mr. Frederick J. Burgess, OSU, Dean of Engineering
6. Mr. Donald T. Smith, UO, Assistant Librarian

Additionally, numerous studies and inquiries by Data Committee members were made at the OSSHE institutions that have a significant amount of space devoted to research.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION, RECREATION AND ATHLETIC STANDARD

Studies of the space devoted to these functions at OSSHE institutions and the recommendations of the American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation were the primary sources for the redevelopment of this standard.

STUDENT HEALTH SERVICES STANDARD

Definitive studies of the space and satisfaction thereof of OSSHE institution health services as well as space allocations of selected models provided the basis for this reformulated standard.

COLLEGE UNION STANDARD

George Stevens, OSU Memorial Union Director; Timothy Stanaway, OIT Dean of Students; and Charles Erekson, former OIT Director of Auxiliary Services were especially helpful in identifying the character of this new standard.

Barry Savage, PSU institutional researcher and former member of the Physical Facilities Data Committee, did conceptual model analysis of space allotments and enrollments to identify a unified projection formula.

PHYSICAL PLANT SERVICES AREA STANDARD

Identification of expectations for physical plant services were made by Dr. Rodney Briggs, EOSC President, and Stephen Donnell and William Talbot of the EOSC Physical Plant. A model developed by the Association of Physical Plant Administrators and detailed studies made at OIT by Cecil Lake and at SOSC by former Committee member John Schneider all served as a basis for this reformulated standard.
GENERAL SUMMARY

Following completion of the proposed standards, copies were sent to each institution and to various members of the Board's staff soliciting further comments and suggestions. It was the intent that institutional executives and other appropriate individuals, such as vice presidents, deans, auxiliary enterprise directors, facility and use committee members and other interested institutional personnel, have the opportunity to comment. A positive response supporting the standards was received from each institution though each expressed some sense of reservation due to possible unknowns. A few of the institutions had specific comments that prompted the Physical Facilities Data Committee to make wording changes to clarify the meaning or intent of individual recommendations.
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CHAPTER VIII
STANDARDS

8.01 INTRODUCTION
The purpose of Chapter VIII is to set forth standards and planning criteria to be used in the physical development, evaluation, and assignment of spaces of institutions in the State System. The standards are flexible and must be interpreted consistent with the "mission" and "guidelines" of the institution. Physical requirements and limitations, such as the confines of existing spaces in remodeling, as well as outsize equipment which should be noted in programs and evaluations, may necessitate deviations from the standards.

8.02 SPACE STANDARDS
The facility needs of an institution are projected on the basis of the mission, the approved programs of an institution and enrollment projections. (Refer to Section 7.02)

Three biennia enrollment projections, which are used to project instruction related space, need to be reliable because the planning and construction of a facility typically has a lead time of at least five or six years. If appropriate, more than one enrollment projection for which assumptions and reliability are stated should be made to a target planning period. For facility needs, enrollment projections must be reconciled with enrollment ceilings established by the Board.

Facility needs of an institution which are not entirely dependent upon enrollment and staffing must be projected using appropriate unit sizes (room size, station size, etc.), program bases and relevant criteria. Examples are spaces for activities or functions such as research and public services which are variable in relation to enrollment and partially related to staffing, spaces for physical education which should have at least a minimal size, spaces for libraries which are to a considerable extent dependent upon collection size and spaces for the physical plant which are dependent primarily upon the area served as well as the character or amount of service rendered. The basic or unit size of space, below which the function cannot be served, may also be a determinant of space size.

Projection Standards - Projection standards are for use by the institution's planning office and Board's Office of Facilities Planning in estimating total space needs of an institution and may not reflect an exact spatial configuration for any one category because it may vary depending on the special characteristics of the functions housed.
Design Standards - Design standards are for use by institutional personnel and planning consultants in identifying optimums of unit size and efficiency in the design of proposed facilities.

Classrooms are defined as general purpose instructional rooms with equipment suitable for lecture, discussion and dry-demonstration formats. Rooms which are known as lecture halls, classrooms and seminar rooms are all expected to be subject to regular central assignment in order to achieve utilization at the maximum practical level. The objective shall be to achieve at least the following minimum hours of scheduled occupancy of classrooms and student stations as an average on an institution-wide basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom Scheduled Occupancy</th>
<th>Classroom Student Station Scheduled Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 hours per week</td>
<td>20 hours per week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which is a Classroom Student Station Occupancy of 60 percent for 33 hours per week of Classroom Scheduled Occupancy.

Inasmuch as the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center is a special purpose institution with unique scheduling of classroom facilities for the medical, dental and nursing schools, it is not expected that the standards applicable to the other institutions within the State System will apply. However, the objective shall be to achieve utilization of classroom space at the maximum practicable level at the Center.

Classroom space needs will be projected on the basis of student stations in conformance with classroom space use objectives (Section 8.03). Area requirements will be determined utilizing a norm of 15 square feet per student station including related service areas (weighted mean derived from survey of the typical distribution of classroom sizes and related service areas).

The number of square feet per station in general purpose classrooms will vary with the size of the room and the type of station, ranging from chairs around a table in a seminar room to a fixed-seat lecture hall. Additional square footage for special equipment may be required. Typical classroom sizes are:
Teaching laboratories are defined as rooms used by regularly scheduled classes which require special-purpose equipment for student participation, experimentation, observation, or practice in a field of study.

The expected utilization of laboratory space at each institution shall be the maximum practicable level. The objective shall be to achieve at least the following minimum hours of scheduled occupancy of laboratories and laboratory student stations as an average on an institution-wide basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Laboratory Scheduled Occupancy</th>
<th>Class Laboratory Student Station Scheduled Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division 22 hours per week</td>
<td>18 hours per week which is a Class Laboratory Student Station Scheduled Occupancy of 80 percent for 22 hours per week of Class Laboratory Scheduled Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division 16 hours per week</td>
<td>12 hours per week which is a Class Laboratory Student Station Scheduled Occupancy of 75 percent for 16 hours per week of Class Laboratory Scheduled Occupancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inasmuch as the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center is a special purpose institution with unique scheduling of class laboratory facilities for the medical, dental and nursing schools, it is not expected that the standards applicable to the other institutions within the State System will apply. However, the objective shall be to achieve utilization of class laboratory space at the maximum practicable level at the Center.
Class laboratory space needs will be projected on the basis of student stations in conformance with laboratory space use objectives (Section 8.06). Area requirements will be determined by the character of special-purpose equipment, the number of students expected to be served, and the associated service area requirements.

The design standards for class laboratories vary with the academic discipline and must conform to the student station size, equipment and service requirements. Examples of area allowances for some disciplines, including the student station and the ancillary service areas, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Net Assignable Square Feet per Student Station (fully developed academic program)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Science</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are instructional spaces on most campuses which are used for instructional programs not included within the previously identified categories outlined in this chapter. These include spaces such as special class laboratories, music practice rooms, programmed-instruction study areas, individual study laboratories, drama facilities, museums and galleries related to the instructional program. The justification of these facilities is related directly to the mission and guidelines for the institution and the areas are determined by an analysis of the specific requirements.

Examples of groupings of disciplines are suggested below, but space entitlements for each institution must be justified by programmatic needs.

Group I - Disciplines suggested which have very little, if any, special instructional space needs:
- Economics
- History
- Sociology

Group II - Disciplines suggested which have minimal special instructional space needs:
- Business Administration
- English
- Political Science
Group III - Disciplines suggested which have moderate special instructional space needs:

- Applied Science
- Entomology
- Foreign Language
- Vocational Training

Group IV - Disciplines suggested which have considerable special instructional space needs:

- Chemistry
- Engineering
- Health Sciences
- Physics

Group V - Disciplines suggested which have extensive special instructional space needs:

- Art
- Drama
- Music
- Zoology

An office is defined as a room or suite of rooms equipped with desks, chairs, files, bookcases, word processing equipment, etc. that is assigned to one or more persons primarily for the performance of administrative, clerical or faculty duties, other than meeting classes. The projection standard includes active office service areas such as reception-waiting areas, conference rooms directly associated with instructional and administrative offices, file rooms and work rooms.

Office space needs will be projected at an institutional level based upon the number of FTE faculty and staff, the head count of non-employed advanced graduate students, and FTE senior administrative staff. The projection standard, which will include the types of areas identified in the preceding paragraph, is 150 net assignable square feet per FTE faculty, staff and non-employed advanced graduate students (three non-employed advanced graduate students head count equals one FTE for purposes of office space projections), and 210 net assignable square feet per FTE senior administrative staff.

The following office design standards will be used except where special equipment, such as pianos and drafting tables, requires larger areas. When office sizes and lay-out are determined, it is important that flexibility be maintained so that assignments can be made without regard to rank for efficient functioning and ease of reassignment.

a. Faculty offices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. per Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Faculty (Instructor-Professor)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate and/or Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Administrative offices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. per Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidents</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Dean or Director</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Staff offices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. per Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary/clerk</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception area</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Room space:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with work space 10/file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>without work space 6/file</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Sq. Ft. per Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced graduate student study space (multiple office)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference room</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.12 LIBRARY STANDARD

Libraries are defined as a room or group of rooms used for the collection, storage, circulation, and use of books, periodicals, manuscripts, and other reading or reference materials.

Libraries in the State System are to be programmed to provide for the space outlined below. Stack space and non-book material space will be based on the estimated size of collections six years following the completion of a facility or facility addition. (Warehouse operations are not applicable.)

Library Reader Space - Reader stations are to be provided for 15% of the Fall Term FTE undergraduate students and 25% of the Fall Term FTE graduate students at all institutions. Reader station space will allow 25 square feet for each FTE undergraduate student and 30 square feet for each FTE graduate student.

Faculty Research Reader Space - Research space standards are outlined under Section 8.15 RESEARCH STANDARD. In addition, there is an entitlement of 15 square feet of carrel space in the library for each FTE faculty identified primarily in Groups I and II of Section 8.15 RESEARCH STANDARD, such as the humanities, social sciences, etc. There is an entitlement of three square feet of carrel space for each FTE faculty identified primarily in Groups III, IV and V of Section 8.15 RESEARCH STANDARD, such as the life, physical and behavioral sciences, agriculture, etc.
Stack Space - The following allowances, which reflect a higher percentage of bound periodicals at health science and law libraries will be used in providing stack space:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stack Allowance</th>
<th>HS &amp; Law</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000 vols.</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next 900,000 vols.</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next 1,000,000 vols.</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volumes/nasf</th>
<th>HS &amp; Law</th>
<th>All Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000 vols.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next 100,000 vols.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next 800,000 vols.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next 1,000,000 vols.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Book Material - The following space allowances, which have been developed by measuring collections and the space required for storing, handling and using non-book materials, will be used in projecting their space needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Items per Sq. Ft. of Floor Space</th>
<th>Suggested Standard</th>
<th>Space to be Allotted in Minimum Units of Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microcards</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microprints</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiche 4&quot; x 6&quot;</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfiche 3&quot; x 5&quot;</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm reels</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film strips</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparencies</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion picture reels</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tape reels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer tape reels</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape reels</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonograph records</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picture files</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlets</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test files</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-media kits</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government documents</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbound periodicals</td>
<td>15 bibliographical units</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Space requirements for collection will be submitted by institutional librarian.

Archives

Manuscripts

Space requirements for collection will be submitted by institutional librarian.
Library Services and Administration - An additional area equal to 25% of the space generated by the reader and stack space will be allotted for library services and administration.

8.13 COMPUTER FACILITIES

Computer facility needs beyond instruction and research vary at each institution and may or may not be separated into instructional, research and administrative components. Inasmuch as the amount of equipment may range from input/output terminals to centralized system-wide components, space requirements will reflect the equipment housed and the size of the supporting staff.

Technological advances may reduce the area required for equipment or permit expansion of capabilities without increasing facilities.

8.14 SPECIAL SERVICE FACILITIES

In general, facility projection and space standards are associated with specific functions. Special and independently administered services such as printing, central duplicating, cafeterias independent of student unions and housing, and parking structures, which are not identified elsewhere in these standards, will be programmed in accordance with institutional needs.

8.15 RESEARCH STANDARD

These standards recognize research as a creative inquiry. A number of factors unique to each institution must be identified and correlated to the needs of the institution in the application of research space standards. The mission of the institution, which is relatively constant, must be identified and only those standards which are consistent with the mission should be applied. Some research space requirements within the institution will vary from year to year and others will be relatively constant for a long period of time. It must be recognized that changes of entitlement to research space occur and that a process for an institutional review of space assignments needs to be identified and applied. Further, space needs must be differentiated by discipline and may be differentiated by the functional orientation of the discipline.

The use of research space standards for projecting institutional space requirements will utilize a composite methodology with the components identified hereafter.

The entitlement to the space by any one individual or department is responsive and flexible; it must relate to the extent of faculty involvement in research, the level of grant funded research and the needs of the discipline. It is implicit that under-utilized research space should be promptly reassigned by the appropriate administrator.
Departments will be expected to share, as far as practical, specialized equipment as well as common and/or interdisciplinary support space. It is expected that the design and layout of research space will allow for maximum flexibility for reassignment.

The amount of space that is allocated to research for each institution and the allotments within each institution are dependent upon the following factors:

1. Consistency with the mission of the institution.
2. Level of involvement in research
   a. Consistency with teaching appointments for "instruction and related research".
   b. Levels of grant funded research in addition to that which can be integrated with research expected as a part of an instructional appointment.

The derivation of research space entitlements will require officials at each institution to develop a distribution of the programs associated with 1 and 2 above into the appropriate space projection group as outlined hereinafter. The space entitlement is a function of the number of FTE faculty, where FTE faculty is the sum of the full time equivalent professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, research assistants unclassified, research associates, graduate teaching and research assistants, as well as one-third of the advanced full time graduate students (9 hr.) not included above. (Classified support personnel associated with research do not generate space but are accommodated by the proper Group assignment of the FTE faculty.) See also 8.12 LIBRARY STANDARD, Faculty Research Reader Space. Office space associated with research appointments is provided for in office projections. Refer to 8.10 OFFICE PROJECTION STANDARD.

The Discipline distribution outlined below is based upon functions required by the research undertaking. Groups II through V include those disciplines which require minimal to extensive amounts of laboratory, laboratory service, studio and studio services space for research, while Group I includes disciplines with primarily library and office space needs only. The disciplines suggested for each group are subject to adjustment to a higher, lower or intergroup level depending upon the substantiated differing character of the research.
Group I - Disciplines with primarily library and office associated space needs only. Examples of disciplines suggested in this group are:

- Business & Management
- Economics
- Languages & Linguistics
- Literature & History
- Math
- Philosophy
- Political Science & Administration

Group II - Minimal research space requirement

This group generates 30 square feet per FTE Faculty. Examples of disciplines suggested in this group are:

- Computer Science
- Education
- Fine & Applied Arts - primarily non-studio
- Social Sciences (General Psychology, Sociology, etc.)
- Theoretical Studies (Public Affairs & Services, etc.)

Group III - Moderate research space requirements

This group generates 110 square feet per FTE faculty. Examples of disciplines suggested in this group are:

- Architecture & Environmental Sciences
- Communications & Theater (Films, TV, etc.)
- Home Economics - Non-Laboratory Setting
- Music
- Physical Education
- Social/Physical Science (Anthropology, Geography, etc.)

Group IV - Considerable research space requirements

This group generates 300 square feet per FTE faculty. Examples of disciplines suggested in this group are:

- Engineering (Industrial, General)
- Fine & Applied Arts - Studio
- Home Economics - Laboratory setting (Foods, Textiles, etc.)
- Natural Sciences (Biology, Botany, Zoology, etc.)
- Physical Sciences (Chemistry, Geology, Pharmacy, Physics, etc.)
- Psychology - Experimental
- Clinical Sciences - Medical
- Dental
Group V - Extensive research space requirement
This group generates 360 square feet per FTE faculty. Examples of disciplines suggested in this group are:

Agriculture & Natural Resources (Crop Sciences, Animal Sciences, Forestry, etc.)
Engineering (Chemical, Civil, Mechanical and those not included in Group IV)
Basic Sciences - Medical

Physical education activity and support areas are used frequently for recreation and also, to a lesser degree, by athletic teams. It is expected that many of the areas can be used for a full schedule of instruction and when not being used for instruction be available for physical recreation and athletics, in contrast to having duplicate facilities for use by physical recreation and athletics. Facility requirements from the three categories may be combined for translation into an overall facility program.

Physical Education areas are those which are used principally by students and faculty for physical education instruction.

Recreation areas are those which are used principally for physical recreational activities.

Athletic team areas are those which are used principally for interinstitutional team sports.

Space projections shall be made on the basis of Fall Term FTE total undergraduate enrollment and twenty-five percent of Fall Term FTE graduate enrollment.

(It is acknowledged that larger institutions may experience somewhat more intensive use of facilities due to diversity factors.)

Projection Standards for physical education instruction with compatible use for physical recreation and athletics are:

a. Indoor space is projected at twelve square feet per FTE student as defined above. This includes approximately nine square feet for the activity areas and three square feet for the ancillary services areas of lockers, showers, etc. The space allocation must be made in units of complete teaching stations/activity areas. The minimum facility should be projected on the basis of a 3,000 FTE student enrollment as defined above.

Approximately fifty-five percent of the activity area required high ceilings, such as 25 feet for basketball, and somewhat lower ceilings for court games such as handball and apparatus requirements of gymnastics. Another thirty percent of the area may have lower ceilings for combative activities, dancing and weight lifting, with an additional fifteen percent for swimming and diving pools.
b. Outdoor activity areas are projected at 100 square feet per FTE student as defined above. The space allocation must be made in units of complete teaching stations/activity areas for all types of field sports. The areas need to be convenient to lockers and showers, and those areas used for classes should be within a ten-minute walking distance from academic classrooms. The minimum total facility should be projected on the basis of a 3,000 FTE student enrollment as defined above.

Approximately sixty percent of the areas are sodded or turfed for games such as soccer, touch football and softball. Another fifteen percent is for courts, such as tennis and volleyball, with an additional twenty percent in specialized areas, such as for track and field, baseball, archery, and golf. An additional five percent is for related service areas.

Recreation and Athletic Areas - In addition to the indoor and outdoor physical education areas outlined in "a" and "b" above, provisions may allow for additional square footage in sports fields and buildings for use in intramural sports, varsity sports and recreational uses as appropriate for the institution.

Design Standards should conform to recognized planning criteria such as those outlined in publications by the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, the National Recreation Association, and other standard sources.

The type of health service facilities required is usually a matter of institutional policy as well as proximity to and working arrangements with local hospitals. They include such areas as examination rooms, treatment rooms, observation rooms, laboratories, reception-waiting areas, supply rooms and infirmary facilities. The latter are appropriate primarily at larger institutions.

Space projections of this category should be based upon the number of people served, typically on the basis of one to one and a half square feet per Fall Term FTE student. Office space for physicians and supporting staff is projected under Section 8.10 OFFICE PROJECTION STANDARD.

The functions which college union facilities house and the composition of the college community served may vary considerably from one campus to another but they exhibit an overall balance in relation to the size of the student body. College unions are institutional centers that provide services as required and/or desired by the users to complement those provided in the community.
A nominal level of college union facilities may include the following functions:

1. Organizational Activities
   - Publications
   - Rooms for meetings
   - Organizations and interest groups - offices, workspace and storage
   - Broadcast - radio, television

2. Recreation
   - Active - table tennis, bowling, etc.
   - Passive - lounge, music listening, television viewing, etc.
   - Hobbies - crafts, arts, etc.
   (Extensive physical recreation facilities as well as some off-campus facilities may be considered outside the guidelines.)

3. Socio-Cultural
   - Galleries
   - Auditoria
   - Ballrooms
   - Etc.

4. Administration

5. Food Service
   - Cafeteria
   - Snack Bar
   - Dining Room
   - Service

6. Specialized Services
   - Bookstores
   - Concessions
   - Etc.

The area required for a college union must be responsive to the services expected to be provided, and varies with size of the institution by the following approximation:
Using Fall Term student FTE as a base, a straight line curve with a minimum of 14 NASF per Fall Term student FTE for institutions with 2,400 FTE enrollment to 8 NASF per Fall Term student FTE for those with 20,000 or more FTE enrollment. An institution with fewer than 2,400 Fall Term student FTE may use the standard for 2,400 or provide a smaller amount of space as appropriate to the needs of the institution.

Nonassignable spaces, such as elevators and mechanical rooms, as well as work and storage areas necessary for the maintenance
and custodial functions, are important to the operation of college unions and need to be included. In addition to the net assignable spaces noted above, the PHYSICAL PLANT SERVICE AREA STANDARD is applicable. There usually are some additional unique needs dependent upon the activities housed in the union facilities; for instance, specialized and adequate storage is very important to service multipurpose spaces such as dining room/ballrooms.

It is expected that institutions will provide a reasonable amount of residential housing to supplement living accommodations available within the community. While projections of need may be appropriate for an individual institution, diversity of student populations and campus locations do not lend themselves to system-wide standards.

Residence housing areas may include food service, as well as central food storage, furniture storage and maintenance as appropriate for the institution.

Design standards for residence halls are:

a. For residence halls including kitchen and dining areas, either within the dormitory building or an allocable area in a different building, the gross area per student based upon the outside dimensions of a building would, in general, range between 215-235 square feet.

b. For kitchen and dining facilities, included in the area referred to in Item "a" above, regardless of the location thereof, the approximate gross area per resident would range between 30-40 square feet.

c. For a typical two-student sleeping/study room included in Item "a" above the net inside room area would be about 140-180 square feet.

Areas required for the operation and maintenance of the campus physical plant are identified in two categories: for the support of (1) central service functions and (2) building custodial functions.

1. Central Service Functions - This encompasses all of the areas used for buildings and grounds operation and maintenance, including heating plants, service shops, garages, storerooms and warehouses. Central and building area required for the delivery, pick-up and holding/storage of materials should be included also, and should be located in conjunction with custodial areas. The area is calculated at 5% of the net assignable square feet of the buildings fully served. It may or may not include various auxiliary enterprise areas and other areas such as agricultural facilities. If these are included, they should be in proportion to the amount of service rendered.
2. **Building Custodial Functions** - This encompasses all of the area used for regular custodial functions, including deliveries of supplies, collection and pick-up of waste and materials for recycling within each building. The area is calculated as approximately 0.7% of the usable area of a building, excluding mechanical rooms. To allow for satisfactory and efficient use and storage of equipment and supplies, the basic custodial area should have the following minimal characteristics:

   **A. In buildings with elevators**

   1. An approximately 8' x 12' supply and equipment room close to the elevator on the main floor

   2. An approximately 5' x 8' supply and equipment room close to the elevator on all other floors

   3. For all floors with 15,000 usable square feet or more, an additional approximately 3' x 5' closet adjacent to washrooms

   **B. In buildings without elevators, custodial area should be provided as in A.1. above on each floor and A.3. above if applicable.**
President Harms announced that a short Board meeting would be held in connection with the Committee meetings scheduled for December 12, 1980, at the University of Oregon. The next full regular Board meeting will be on January 23, 1981, at Portland State University.

A meeting of the Board with the Board of Education and the Educational Coordinating Commission has been scheduled for the evening of December 4, 1980, in Salem. Details will be provided at a later date.

The Secretary read the following letter and resolution from the Reverend Joseph P. Brown, C.S.C., Director of the Wilson W. Clark Memorial Library at the University of Portland:

The enclosed resolution, passed on September 5th, speaks for itself of the concern of the librarians of private colleges and universities over the recent budget cuts in OSSHE libraries. I was directed by the group to send a copy of this resolution to you.

RESOLUTION

The librarians of the Oregon schools in the Northwest Association of Private Colleges and Universities have learned with dismay of the serious reductions made recently in the acquisitions budgets of libraries in the Oregon State System of Higher Education. The impact of these budget cuts upon the scholarly community in Oregon and especially in Portland will be very serious if not disastrous. The University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University are among the major research libraries in the Pacific Northwest. They have shared their resources generously with the academic community of Oregon. For them to weaken their collections by being unable to purchase recent materials will affect not only the faculty and students of their own institutions but the academic community of the entire region.

Therefore, the Oregon NAPCU librarians strongly urge that these budget reductions be reconsidered and as much funding as possible be provided for library acquisitions.

Unanimously accepted at the September 5, 1980, meeting of the NAPCU librarians.

The Board approved a motion by Mr. Ingalls that copies of the letter be sent to the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the Governor. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

The Secretary then read the following resolution from the Oregon Veterinary Medical Association urging budget support for forest and agriculture research and extension:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Oregon's agriculture is one of the most diverse in the United States, and on an equivalent land basis, the most diversified agriculture in the world; AND

WHEREAS, Oregon's forests are the state's most important natural resource supporting the single largest sector of the state's manufacturing activity; AND

...
WHEREAS, Oregon's resource based economy is dependent upon agriculture and forestry to the extent that 55% of Oregonian's individual income is derived directly from these industries; AND

WHEREAS, the forestry and agriculture industries of Oregon are experiencing a prolonged economic regression; AND

WHEREAS, Oregon State University's statewide research and extension services have been highly instrumental in the development of these most diversified industries; AND

WHEREAS, Oregon State University's forestry and agriculture research and extension services have already experienced some 50% reduction in their fair share of Oregon General Fund expenditures since 1970; AND

WHEREAS, an additional 15% budget reduction for these agencies coupled with a 15% inflation rate would create a functional 30% budget deficit from existing revenues; AND

WHEREAS, curtailment of research and information dissemination to these industries during a period of economic regression would be counter-productive to the economy of these industries and therefore, counter-productive to Oregon's economy; AND

WHEREAS, the total dollar savings legalized by these proposed budget cuts are of so little significance to the state's total general fund budget, yet represent a staggering blow to the functional capacity of Oregon State University's Research and Extension services;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Oregon Veterinary Medical Association opposes any further budget reduction for Oregon State University's forestry and agriculture research and extension; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that these agencies' budgets should be restored to their fair share of Oregon's General Fund expenditures in parity to those revenues received in 1970 so that Oregon State University's research and extension may aid the industries that support Oregon's economy and better serve all citizens of Oregon.

The Board approved a motion by Mr. Batiste that copies of the resolution be sent to the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the Governor. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Elorriaga, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyse, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

President Harms expressed the Board's appreciation to President and Mrs. MacVicar and to Oregon State University for their hospitality during the visitation and Board meeting.

Appreciation to OSU
Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of James M. Montgomery, Consulting Engineers, Inc., Salem, for improvements to various parking lots on the campus at Oregon State University, were accepted on behalf of the Board. Two bids were received for the work on August 13, 1980, one in the amount of $249,000 and the other for $261,745, including the amounts for two additive alternates (for Lot Nos. 3 & 4) which were exercised. Inasmuch as resources were available for the work, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td>$249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildish Corvallis Construction Co., Corvallis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>20,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$280,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the contract includes regrading and rebuilding of gravel bases and subbases, applying new asphaltic concrete paving, installing new concrete sidewalks and curbs, providing improvements to drainage, and installing lighting, irrigation systems and landscaping at four parking lots. Lot 1, having about 300 spaces, is along the west side of 26th Street south of Parker Stadium and west of the new Cultural and Conference Center. Lot 2 is south of Campus Way, east of 35th Street and near the campus motor pool and provides approximately 212 spaces. Lot 3, located west of the Administrative Services Building on the south side of Jefferson Way is an existing 44-space lot in close proximity to the McAlexander Fieldhouse. Providing parking for about 112 cars, the fourth lot to be improved is at the northeast intersection of Jefferson Way and 15th Street, east of Education Hall. A proposed fifth lot, which was designed as a new gravel-surfaced parking area for 39 cars located north of Washington Way and west of the Mall, was not included in the contract award because of funding limitations.

All of the expenditure requirements for the improvement of the four lots are to be financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available to the institution from its parking operations. No state tax funds are involved.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

**Project** - OSU Parking Improvements

**Engineers** - James M. Montgomery, Consulting Engineers, Inc., Salem

**Board’s priority** - No. 20 in 1979-1981 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

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

**Estimated total project costs** $280,000

**Estimated total direct construction costs** $249,000

**Scheduled completion** - December 1980

**Tentative financing plan:**
Self-liquidating bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or auxiliary enterprise balances (from parking operations)

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board received the report as presented.
Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon State University, the construction documents prepared with the assistance of Hewlett, Jamison, Atkinson & Luey, Architects, Portland, for the proposed Newport Research Support Facility of the National Marine Fisheries Service at the Yaquina Bay Marine Science Center were accepted following appropriate notice of approval by the contracting officer of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Seven bids were received for the work at 8:00 p.m. on August 13, 1980, ranging from a low of $2,052,000 to a high of $2,348,000. Inasmuch as the lowest bid was under the pre-bid estimate and the funds were available, the federal government authorized the Board to proceed with the project. The following project budget was approved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td>$2,052,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and contract administration by project architects (Hewlett, Jamison, Atkinson &amp; Luey) - 5.77% of $2,052,000</td>
<td>$118,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting engineering services</td>
<td>$30,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys, soils tests, balancing and other testing</td>
<td>$18,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total professional services fees</td>
<td>$167,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable equipment</td>
<td>$443,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous project expenses (construction supervision, utility service connections, plan reviews, bid advertising, project administration, etc.)</td>
<td>$35,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies (2% of direct construction costs)</td>
<td>$41,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,740,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The description of the project corresponds with that reported to the Board on March 28, 1980, following the acceptance of the schematic design phase of planning. The total gross area of the "U"-shaped building is expected to be approximately 32,172 square feet.

The project is being funded totally by the federal government from an appropriation to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the U. S. Department of Commerce, and is being accomplished in accordance with contractual arrangements which the Board authorized October 26, 1979.
Meeting #469  
October 24, 1980

Scheduled completion - October 1981

Financing:
National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U. S. Department of Commerce $2,740,000

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

Staff Report to the Board
A report was made to the Board on March 28, 1980, concerning the National Science Foundation having made $195,750 available to Oregon State University for facility improvements at the H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest near Blue River, Oregon. Construction documents were prepared by the U. S. Forest Service and reviewed and approved by the officials of the Board. Only one bid was received for the work on July 30, 1980. Inasmuch as it was within the resources available for the work, a contract award was made upon the approval of officials of the U. S. Forest Service, and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs</td>
<td>$171,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE Associates, Eugene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>16,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$195,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the contract includes a water well, water storage tank, and water distribution lines; an electrical transformer and electrical distribution lines; gravel pads for thirteen trailers, including septic tanks and effluent leaching fields; and general site grading.

Authorization to expend the grant funds of $195,750 from the National Science Foundation for these facility improvements was granted by the State Emergency Board. No state tax funds are involved.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BID AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OSU H. J. Andrews Experimental Forest Administrative Site (Blue River)

Architects - U. S. Forest Service staff

Board's priority - not applicable

Legislative authorization - Emergency Board action on March 11, 1980

Estimated total project costs $195,750

Estimated total direct construction costs $171,228

Scheduled completion - April 1981

Financing plan:
Federal grant from the National Science Foundation $195,750

Board Discussion and Action
The Board received the report as presented.
Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon State University, the agreement with CH2M Hill Northwest, Inc., Corvallis, for professional services relating to the Spring Sports Complex has been supplemented to provide for the additional services of the Engineers in studying an adjacent portion of the campus which is bounded on the east by 17th Street, on the west by the Cultural and Conference Center, and on the north and south by Stadium Way and Western Boulevard proposed for future landscape development, including the construction of parking facilities. It is expected that the scope of these professional services will include the following:

a. Preparation of a schematic plan for the entire area indicating vehicular and pedestrian ingress and egress to coincide with the Spring Sports Complex, the existing residence hall and parking facilities to the north, and the new Cultural and Conference Center currently under construction west of the study area.

b. Consultation with representatives of the University for preliminary review and discussion of the effect on the overall plan of the surrounding area.

c. Determination of vehicular and pedestrian connections with Western Boulevard, and review with officials of the City of Corvallis.

d. Delineation of possible construction phasing based upon the schematic plan.

e. Preparation of a cost estimate for the initial phase of construction.

Compensation to the Engineers is to be based upon time and materials within a limitation of $6,900. Funds for the planning are being provided from excess sinking fund reserves available to the institution from its residence hall operations.

Committee Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of McArthur/Gardner/Partnership, project landscape architects, Portland, for the Sports and Recreation Improvements (Playing Fields) development proposed on University of Oregon property along the south bank of the Willamette River, were accepted on behalf of the Board. Two bids were received for the work on August 7, 1980, one in the amount of $336,228 and the other for $345,880, when taking into account one deductive alternate to be exercised (for deleting turf grass maintenance). Inasmuch as resources were available for the work after negotiating with the low bidder minor deletions from the contract amount by a change order executed simultaneously with the contract, an award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

---

Staff Report to the Board

October 24, 1980

Report of Engineering Services Related to Future Landscape Development of SW Portion of Campus, OSU

---

Staff Report to the Board

---
Meeting #469

October 24, 1980

Direct construction costs:
Wildish Construction Co., Eugene
(Basic Bid less Alternate No. 1) $336,228
(Less change order No. 1) 3,963(1)
Subtotal for direct construction $332,265

Professional services fees 23,000(2)
Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs 13,082
Contingencies 6,653
Total $375,000

(1) For reducing the depth of the turf grass/growing media materials from 18 inches to 17 inches and adjusting, accordingly, the height of the vertical support walls for soccer field liner.

(2) Net of $12,934 for site master development planning paid from a 1973 legislative authorization for Sports and Recreation Improvements.

The work of the contract includes site clearing, site grading and drainage, installation of a Natural Turfgrass System of surfacing for soccer field, bicycle path relocation, water service and irrigation piping, electrical service and fencing. The entire site will be cleared and graded and one soccer-pitch field will be constructed.

Expenditures for this work are to be charged to Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available to the institution for auxiliary enterprises in accordance with the financing plan previously approved by the Board and the 1979 Legislature.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - UO Sports and Recreation Improvements (Playing Fields)
Architects - McArthur/Gardner/Partnership, Portland
Board's priority - No. 6 in 1979-1981 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs $375,000
Estimated total direct construction costs (net of deduction by Change Order No. 1) $332,265

Scheduled completion - January 1981

Tentative financing plan:
Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $375,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of the University of Oregon, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Sheldon, Eggleston, Reddick Associates, P.C., project architects, Portland, for modifications to the "fishbowl" area within the Erb Memorial Union Building were accepted on behalf of the Board. Three bids were received for the work on August 26, 1980, ranging from a low of $115,100 to a high of $139,000. Inasmuch as the resources were available for the work, a contract
award was made to the low bidder and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs:
- Morris P. Kielty General Contractor, Inc., Eugene $115,100
- Professional services fees $22,368
- Furniture and equipment $15,300
- Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs $7,376
- Works of Art (1%) $1,151
- Contingencies $5,755
- Total $167,050

The work of the contract includes selective demolition, reworking an entrance, fire-retardant treated wood framing for a raised platform, finishing of the platform, painting, new ceiling and lighting modifications, minor remodeling of the serving area and the installation of banquet seating.

All of the expenditures for these alterations are to be financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings and/or other balances available for auxiliary enterprises as authorized by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979, as part of the Student Union Facilities Rehabilitation project. No state tax funds are involved.

RECAPITULATION UPON THE RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - UO Student Union Facilities Rehabilitation ("Fishbowl" Renovation)

Architects - Sheldon, Eggleston, Reddick Associates, P.C., Portland

Board's priority - Part of No. 22 in 1979-1981 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $167,050

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $115,100

Scheduled completion - November 1980

Tentative financing plan:
- Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $167,050

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Upon the recommendation of officials of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, the agreement with Keith Kruchek Consulting Engineers, Inc., Portland, for professional services applicable to various maintenance, repair and/or minor improvement projects at that institution has been supplemented to include assistance to the staff in the design and contract administration of two energy conservation projects for which federal grant applications and state matching funds have been approved recently:

a. Incinerator with Heat Recovery (estimated total expenditure requirements of $345,000)

b. Waste Heat Recovery System in University Hospital South (estimated total expenditure requirements of $180,000)
Compensation to the Engineers is to be based upon time and materials within maxima of $26,000 for Item (a) and $15,600 for Item (b). Funds for the planning are being provided from the federal grant and the state appropriation within Chapter 290, Oregon Laws 1979.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Final drawings and specifications were prepared by the staff of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center with the assistance of Carson, Bekooy, Gulick & Associates, Consulting Engineers, Portland, for the installation of deluge showers and eyewash fountains in the Medical Research Building, the Dental School Building and University Hospital South. Four bids were received for the work on August 27, 1980, ranging from a low of $25,341 to a high of $28,111. Inasmuch as resources were available for the work, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Engineers, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>$25,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>4,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>2,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the contract includes the installation of fixtures, piping and connections necessary to provide an emergency system of deluge showers and eyewash fountains in various corridors and laboratories within three buildings. These areas will thus be provided with the capability of providing for emergency use in the event of chemical accidents to personnel.

The total expenditure requirements are to be charged against the expenditure limitation for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II, at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977, financed in equal shares from the General Fund appropriation in the Act and Article XI-G bond proceeds.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - UOHSC Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Medical Research Building, Dental School Building and University Hospital South, Installation of Deluge Showers and Eyewash Fountains)

Engineers - Carson, Bekooy, Gulick & Associates, Portland

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $36,000

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $25,341

Scheduled completion - January 1981

Tentative financing plan:

- General Fund appropriation $18,000
- Article XI-G bond proceeds 18,000

Total $36,000

Board Discussion and Action

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

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and W. E. Group, P.C., project architects, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for the safety deficiency corrections work involving exitway improvements within Lincoln Hall on the campus at Portland State University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of July 18, 1980.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget 7/18/80</th>
<th>Original Budget 10/26/79</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. C. Schommer &amp; Sons, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>$129,943</td>
<td>$117,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>2,857</td>
<td>6,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$140,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>$140,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes additional cost for conducting concrete drilling and coring and channeling of walls at off hours, providing twenty parallel arm mechanisms and mounting brackets for Owner-furnished door closers, adding fire sprinkler protection in Room Nos. 145, 322 and 330, concealing sprinkler piping at first floor, rebuilding twenty-five Owner-furnished door closers, providing thirty-six parallel arm mechanisms, and other minor modifications all within seven approved change orders.

The work of the contract included automatic sprinkler protection, fire alarm detection and related electrical work, repair and replacement of doors, reglazing and painting, and the rehabilitation of door hardware. The major portion of the work was in exitways to improve their fire safety and a minor portion was for the installation of three automatic doors at exitways to facilitate accessibility by the physically handicapped.

The expenditure requirements for the project were charged against the allocations to Portland State University of funds authorized by Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977, in the amount of $135,000 for the second phase of the safety deficiency corrections program and by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979, in the amount of $5,500 for the accessibility for the handicapped.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - PSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Lincoln Hall Exitway Improvements)

Architects - W. E. Group, P.C., Portland and Eugene

Board's priorities - Part of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant) Part of No. 2 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorizations - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977 (Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II) Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979, (Accessibility for the Handicapped)

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $140,500
Meeting #469

October 24, 1980

Estimated direct construction costs (this portion only) $129,943

Financing plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund appropriation</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-G bond proceeds</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Zaik/Miller, A.I.A., project architects, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for the initial construction phase of Parking Structure III on the campus at Portland State University, was accepted on behalf of the Board as of October 8, 1979. The project was inspected on behalf of the Board by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning, but inadvertently a report of this acceptance was not made to the Board. By means of a separate item in this section of the docket, a report is being made of the inspection and acceptance of Parking Structure III Addition on August 15, 1980.

A revised semifinal project budget for the first unit of the new facilities is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on November 17, 1978:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 10/8/79</th>
<th>Original Budget 11/17/78</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rededication of site</td>
<td>$222,459</td>
<td>$222,459</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Building Company, Roseburg and Portland</td>
<td>1,635,335</td>
<td>1,596,237</td>
<td>39,098(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>84,317</td>
<td>82,734</td>
<td>1,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>72,889</td>
<td>35,683</td>
<td>37,206(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47,887</td>
<td>(47,887)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,015,000</td>
<td>$2,015,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes changing type of fill under slabs on grade; modifying structural detail at slab connections to precast concrete panels; revising precast concrete work to accommodate future addition; adding reinforcing bars along slab edge at tendon heads; deleting backfill of basement excavation; deleting light pole bases and their underground conduit; deleting four catch basins and collection line; modifying trench drain and floor drain; changing 3-inch sprinkler main to 6-inch; revising southeast stair to accommodate future addition; installing paving, curbs, sleeves and topsoil in accordance with landscaping drawings; replacing grout with backer rod and sealant in joints above finish grade only; adding reinforcement at wall panel connections with roof slab; adding signage and traffic striping; adding extra cost of concrete due to weather and other delays and other minor modifications within eight approved change orders.

(2) Includes $16,319 for building cleaning equipment.

The work of the contract included the construction of a five-level, including basement, poured-in-place and precast reinforced concrete structure providing 404 parking spaces within a total gross area of approximately 118,208 square feet.

-714-
The expenditures for the facilities were charged against self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available to the institution from parking operations.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - PSU Parking Structure III
Architects - Zaik/Miller, A.I.A., Portland
Board's priority - No. 6 in 1977-1979 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Legislative authorization - State Emergency Board actions on July 28, 1978 and October 13, 1978

Estimated total project costs (including $222,459 for rededication of site) $2,015,000
Estimated total direct construction costs $1,635,335

Statistical analysis:
Total gross area - 118,208 square feet
Parking capacity - 404 cars
Direct construction cost per square foot of gross area - $13.83
Direct construction costs per parking space - $4,048
Total project cost ($2,015,000) per parking space - $4,988

Financing plan:
Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available from parking operations $2,015,000

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

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Zaik/Miller, A.I.A., project architects, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for an addition to Parking Structure III on the campus at Portland State University, was accepted on behalf of the Board as of August 15, 1980. The project was inspected on behalf of the Board by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on January 25, 1980:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revised Budget 8/15/80</th>
<th>Original Budget 1/25/80</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rededication of site</td>
<td>$232,373</td>
<td>$232,373</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Building Company, Roseburg and Portland</td>
<td>1,421,394</td>
<td>1,416,700</td>
<td>4,694 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>69,730</td>
<td>76,980</td>
<td>(7,250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>42,747(2)</td>
<td>38,112</td>
<td>4,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related closure of surface parking and landscape development</td>
<td>128,756</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>68,756(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,835</td>
<td>(70,835)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,895,000</td>
<td>$1,895,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes the excavating, backfilling and compacting of existing drywells; relocating and adding electric heaters in existing mechanical and electrical rooms in original structure; deleting sandblasting...
of cast-in-place concrete; changing lighting circuitry and fixtures in original structure to accommodate addition; deleting three light fixtures from roof of addition; modifying structural connections including raising and lengthening inserts in precast wall; adding dry automatic sprinkler system and other minor modifications all within four approved change orders.

(2) Includes $4,871 for pressure washing equipment.

(3) As noted in the description of this project within the 1979-1981 capital construction program, it was necessary to conform to the program of the City of Portland for the gradual elimination of existing surface parking and the development and use of multi-level structures at the edges of the campus in an effort to remove some of the conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles and to improve air quality and still stay within the "quota" of 2,232 off-street parking spaces allotted to the university by the City's program. A substantial number of surface parking spaces were removed and the expenditures for this work and related landscape development were charged to this project. This work included the removal of asphaltic concrete street surfaces and replacement with a 25-foot wide asphaltic concrete roadway, recontoured to enhance drainage for service and emergency access to residential and academic facilities in the west campus area.

The work performed by the prime contractor included a reinforced concrete addition to the original five-level parking structure completed in October 1979. The addition is a "mirror image" of the original structure and includes approximately 115,546 square feet of gross area with places for 415 additional cars. The total capacity of Parking Structure III, as enlarged by the addition, is 819 cars. The design of this facility, both the first phase and the addition, incorporated lift-slab concrete construction in the ramped areas to permit ready conversion to selected alternate uses, if ever required, by leveling the sloped ramps.

The expenditures for the project were financed from proceeds from the sale of bonds issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available to the institution from parking operations.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - PSU Parking Structure III Addition
Architects - Zaik/Miller, A.I.A., Portland
Board’s priority - No. 18 in 1979-1981 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs (including $232,373 for rededication of site) $1,895,000

Estimated total direct construction costs $1,421,394

Statistical analysis:
Total gross area - 115,546 square feet
Parking capacity - 415 cars
Direct construction cost per square foot of gross area - $12.30
Direct construction cost per parking space - $3,425
Total project cost ($1,895,000) per parking space - $4,566

Financing plan:
Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available from parking operations $1,895,000

Board Discussion and Action

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

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Marquess & Associates, Inc., project engineers, Medford, the work of the three prime contractors for the foundation and erection of a biology greenhouse on the campus at Southern Oregon State College was accepted on behalf of the Board as of March 10, 1980:

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on January 25, 1980:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revised Budget 3/10/80</th>
<th>Original Budget 1/25/80</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General work - J. B. Steel, Inc., Medford</td>
<td>$25,341</td>
<td>$24,950</td>
<td>$391 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work - Western Mechanical, Inc., Medford</td>
<td>15,580</td>
<td>15,580</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work - Jack Mathis General Contractor, Inc., Roseburg</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefabricated greenhouse</td>
<td>23,822</td>
<td>23,822</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less donated materials</td>
<td>- (1) (1,472)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>72,443</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,580</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,863</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees (donated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>(1,363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$73,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Two approved change orders covered a deduction in the amount of $1,440 for donated material (32 cubic yards of concrete at $45 per cubic yard) and an addition in the amount of $1,831 for change of grade level, replacement of suitable fill material and modification of various parts of the prefabricated building.

The general work contract included all sitework; concrete slabs, walks and foundations; all storm drains and irrigation; the installation of the prefabricated metal greenhouse and its glazing. The mechanical work included all heating, cooling and ventilating. The electrical work included all power, lighting and control wiring. The prefabricated greenhouse structure was purchased by the SOC Foundation as a gift of the institution.

The expenditures for the work were charged against a federal grant of $49,378 from the National Science Foundation and from gifts of $23,822 obtained through the SOC Foundation.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - SOSC Biology Greenhouse Facility

Engineers - Marquess & Associates, Inc., Medford

Board's priority - Not applicable

Legislative authorization - Approval to file the federal grant application was given by the State Emergency Board on February 14, 1978. Inasmuch as the expenditure requirements were less than $100,000, no further legislative approval was required.
Meeting #469  

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Quinn Coliseum Exhaust Heat Recovery System, EOSC  

October 24, 1980  

Estimated total project costs $73,200  

Estimated total direct constructions costs $72,443  

Average (per square foot) for gross area of 2,150 sq. ft. - $33.69  

Financing plan:  
National Science Foundation grant - $49,378  
SOC Foundation gift funds - 23,822  

Total $73,200  

Board Discussion and Action  

The Board received the report as presented.  

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Morrison, Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., project engineers, Portland, for duct extensions and other modifications to provide recovery of the exhaust heat in the Quinn Coliseum on the campus at Eastern Oregon State College, were accepted on behalf of the Board. Four bids were received for the work on September 18, 1980, ranging from a low of $58,944 to a high of $76,468. Inasmuch as the low bid was well within the direct construction cost allowance and resources were available for the work, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs</td>
<td>$68,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler Plumbing and Heating Co., Pendleton</td>
<td>$58,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant force account</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for direct construction costs</td>
<td>$68,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>6,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>12,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$93,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of the contract includes the installation of a fan unit within the swimming pool air exhaust system to recover heat which will be used to warm incoming outside air. It also includes the installation of directional ducts on the hot-air supply units in the gymnasium to prevent air stratification and permit a rapid heating of the space just prior to use. In addition, the college's physical plant forces will weatherstrip all exterior doors to reduce air infiltration.

All of the expenditure requirements for the improvements are to be financed from equal shares of a federal grant available from the U. S. Department of Energy under Title III of the National Energy Conservation and Policy Act of 1978 and a matching General Fund appropriation which was made to the State Emergency Board by Chapter 290, Oregon Laws 1979.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD  

Project - EOSC Quinn Coliseum Exhaust Heat Recovery System  

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

Board's priority - not applicable  

Legislative authorization - Emergency Board approval on April 25, 1980 pursuant to Chapter 290, Oregon Laws 1979
Meeting #469

Estimated total project costs $93,000
Estimated total direct construction costs $68,944

Scheduled completion - February 1981

Tentative financing plan:
Federal grant funds $46,500
General Fund appropriation 46,500
Total $93,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of the Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Service and Architect Edward C. Wundram, Portland (acting for Dielschneider Associates, Inc., project managers and engineers), the work of the four prime contractors for the remodeling work within the KOAP-FM and KOAP-TV Building in Portland was accepted on behalf of the Board. The work of the prime contractor for the roofing work was accepted as of June 12, 1979, and the work of the prime contractors for the general, mechanical and electrical work was accepted as of August 31, 1980.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on March 30, 1979 (the latter revised to correct a ten dollar error in the amount of the contract for the general work):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revised Budget 8/29/80</th>
<th>Original Budget 3/30/79</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Gene H. Settergren, Portland</td>
<td>$83,459</td>
<td>$81,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>Sunset Fuel Co., Portland</td>
<td>10,820</td>
<td>12,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>McCoy Electrical Co., Inc., Portland</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>17,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing</td>
<td>Easter &amp; Nichols, Forest Grove</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>20,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$132,979</td>
<td>$131,925</td>
<td>$1,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>9,702</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of Art (1% of direct construction)</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,256</td>
<td>(10,256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes the exercising of Alternate No. A-1 which deleted a new sink cabinet in Production Room No. 103; adding glass vision panels to three existing stair doors; adding acoustical ceiling in Ramp B; installing two door closers; removing deteriorated linoleum floor covering in Room Nos. 120 and 103 and installing new underlayment; installing three wireglass sidelights and other minor modifications included within five approved change orders.
(2) Includes the exercising of Alternate No. D-1 which deleted a new sink in Production Room No. 103, and adding a fiberglass duct in existing supply duct below master control room, all within three approved change orders.

(3) Includes providing temporary power for copy machine; replacing certain existing light fixtures; making switch modifications for lighting; providing permanent wiring for copy machine in new location and other minor modifications all within five approved change orders.

(4) Excludes $4,250 for exercising Alternate B-1 which was funded separately from the OEPBS operating budget in order to provide a mineral surface cap sheet, associated sheet metal work and wood roof walkways on the existing flat built-up roof areas. Work was added by one approved change order which also changed the mineral surface cap sheet to a three-ply 20-year bondable roof system.

The general work contract included the renovation of the existing facilities to reduce the architectural barriers for the physically handicapped, corrections of violations of building codes, and improvements to the building's general condition for energy conservation. The roofing work included the application of new asphalt shingles, hot-mopped mineral surface cap sheet, sheet metal flashing, and a roof-walk over existing surfaces. The mechanical work included the correction of code violations and changes to mechanical systems, both plumbing and heating, improving energy conservation capabilities of the building. The electrical work included the correction of code violations, improvements to the general electrical system (with particular attention to grounding and emergency lighting), and the addition of a fire alarm system.

The total project budget of $180,000 was part of the 1977 legislative authorization for the acquisition and remodeling of the building, as amended by the State Emergency Board on June 16, 1978. Of the total authorization of $580,000, all but $180,000 was required for the purchase of the property at 2828 S.W. Front Avenue, Portland, Oregon.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OEPBS KOAP-FM and KOAP-TV Building Remodeling

Engineers - Dielschneider Associates, Inc., Portland

Board's priority - No. 7 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977 and State Emergency Board action of June 16, 1978

Estimated total project costs (remodeling portion only) $180,000

Estimated total direct construction costs (four contracts, excluding $4,250 for roofing repairs funded separately) $132,979

Financing plan (remodeling portion only):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund appropriation</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-G bond proceeds</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Report of Meeting To Consider Affirmative Action Matters Related to Employment

(Considered by Committee of the Whole, September 11, 1980; present—Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Green, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Warner-Yasuda, Wyss, and Harms.)

The following components of the institutional affirmative action/equal employment opportunity programs were presented by system affirmative action officers at a meeting of a Committee of the Whole of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, on September 11, 1980:

- Executive Order 11245 as Amended
- Recruitment
- Hiring and Retention
- Promotion, Tenure, Salary Review, and Working Conditions
- Grievances
- Special Problems of Affirmative Action Officers of the Smaller Institutions

The presentations were intended to provide Board members with information pertaining to equal opportunity/affirmative action matters.

Discussion by the Committee

Ms. Melinda Grier indicated that the main focus of the discussion would be on academic employment because the merit system provides the regulations and procedures for classified positions. She mentioned that discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, and national origin was prohibited under Executive Order 1125. It applies to all federal contractors who have contracts in aggregate or individually of more than $50,000 per year and it requires an affirmative action plan and affirmative action program which is in compliance with that required by the federal government and monitored by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs. She then described briefly the various elements required in the format and content and the formulas for obtaining the statistics included in an affirmative action plan.

In response to a question concerning the definition of availability, Ms. Grier said that availability is the number of people who are available in the work force who are qualified for the particular position in the recruiting area. For example, the number available nationally would be the availability figure for an administrative or professorial position recruited on a national basis. Other positions might be based on a local or regional pool.

Ms. Pearl S. Gray discussed recruitment for academic positions and recruitment practices at Oregon State University for graduate students in the graduate program. She indicated that recruitment means that information pertaining to faculty and classified positions and undergraduate and graduate opportunities would be widely disseminated for an appropriate length of time. Special systematic efforts should be made to reach those groups previously left out of the work force. It requires total commitment by all segments of the university community. Details of the position, its requirements and salary should be included in the original position announcement.
She noted that efforts to recruit graduate students require special attention to providing information about the opportunities available in Oregon and to reach protected groups with that information. Ms. Gray cited several cooperative efforts of Oregon State University with other institutions.

In discussing hiring and retention, Mr. M. Morris said that the assembled pool resulting from all recruitment efforts is compared against national availability data to determine if it reflects realistically the available affirmative action type candidates in the marketplace. If it is acceptable, the pool then is reduced to the most desirable candidates and the individuals invited to the campus for interviews. The affirmative action officer monitors and reviews the basis upon which the final candidate is selected. If qualified protected class candidates were in the pool and were not selected, the affirmative action officer determines the reason, particularly if the employing unit is underutilizing. He emphasized that the point at which many affirmative action people are eliminated is in the determination of the best qualified candidate because they are not getting the opportunity to develop the extraneous qualifications. He suggested the institutions might not need the superstar for every position but could employ individuals from the protected classes and develop their own superstars.

In the matter of recruitment, Mr. Morris said that people will move until they find the place where they comfortably can develop their ideals and values and pursue their goals, or they get tenure. The protected groups are no exception. He also stated that this location is not well-known and disseminating information about the region and its opportunities is essential if the institutions are to diversify their faculties. Once the individual arrives, retention depends upon being made to feel a real part of the institution and the community.

Mrs. Green asked whether the institutions would be required to hire a qualified person from a protected class instead of a person who was genuinely better qualified but who was not a member of a protected group. Mr. Morris said the procedure would be to evaluate the utilization profile of the hiring department, to determine whether all of the individuals met the required criteria for the position, and to review very carefully what made the selected individual better qualified and whether these were extraneous factors for the performance of the duties of the position. However, he said there was no automatic approval or disapproval under those conditions.

Mr. Bill Jackson said salaries are reviewed annually at his institution to determine if there are any deviations of 5% or more and the reasons for those deviations. Frequently these are easily explained or resolved at the departmental level. An annual review eliminates the possibility of backpay charges. Promotion and tenure are reviewed by committees based on established criteria. After the decisions have been made, the percentages are reviewed for any discrepancies. Opportunities for participation in training programs are also checked periodically.

Ms. Bean McFadden commented that an effort had been made at the University of Oregon to assure that all academic people had equal access to information about the promotion and tenure process by holding a university-wide workshop for all interested academic persons.

The grievance process and procedure was then described by Ms. McFadden. She indicated that one of the responsibilities of the affirmative action officer is to explain all avenues available to individuals who believe they may have a grievance. The grievance may be handled formally or informally in accordance with established rules. The person with the grievance determines at what point in the process their concerns are resolved.

Mr. John Smith said affirmative action officers at smaller institutions may have difficulty in devoting adequate time to affirmative action duties because they also have other responsibilities. However, in most instances, the load would not support a full-time position. Funding is another problem for small schools and limits recruitment, as does the more remote location. The
lack of employment opportunities for a spouse is an impediment to some individuals when considering a position in a more remote location. Oregon Institute of Technology has a special problem in that its positions often are in fields which are in greater demand. Prospective staff members can be very selective.

Mr. Felipe Veloz concurred in many of the statements by Mr. Smith. He noted that one of his activities had been discrimination workshops throughout eastern Oregon.

Ms. Dee Tiger said she disagreed that the affirmative action officer at a smaller institution should not be a full-time position because in viewing affirmative action in its entire perspective, one person could not implement or develop the programs needed to meet both the legal and moral obligations of an institution in terms of its employes and students.

Mr. Harms closed the meeting by asking that any affirmative action officer who perceived a lack of support for affirmative action or equal opportunity inform the Board of those concerns. The affirmative action officers present indicated that they had very good support but that funding was very critical, particularly now with the budget reductions.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Committee

The information following was provided for the information of the Board.

Suggested Format and Content for Affirmative Action Programs

Foreward/History

I. Report of Results of Prior Year’s AAP
II. Development or Reaffirmation of EEO Policy
III. Internal and External Dissemination of Policy
IV. Establishment of Responsibilities for Implementation of the AAP
V. Work Force Analysis
VI. Minority Availability/Utilization Analysis
VII. Female Availability/Utilization Analysis
VIII. Identification of Problem Areas by Organizational Units and Job Groups
IX. Establishments of Goals and Timetables
X. Action Programs to Attain Goals and Objectives
XI. Internal Audit and Reporting Systems
XII. Compliance of Personnel Policies and Practices with Sex Discrimination Guidelines
XIII. Support of Programs to Improve Employment Opportunities of Minorities and Women
XIV. Consideration of Women and Minorities not Currently in the Work Force
XV. Compliance with Religion or National Origin Discrimination Guidelines
XVI. Affirmative Action Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors for Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era
XVII. Affirmative Action Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors for Handicapped Workers
XVIII. Material to be Provided for Desk Audit (This is Support Data to be included at the end of the AAP)
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DEVELOPMENT OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN

Representative Workforce = Availability x Workforce

Utilization = Representative Workforce - Actual Workforce

Annual Goals = Projected Vacancies x Availability

Timetable = Annual Goals x Years Necessary to Eliminate
Underutilizations Greater than 1 FTE
### Table 10

Comparison of Existing Goals with Achievement in Full-Time Academic Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Professorial Ladder</th>
<th></th>
<th>Professorial Non Ladder</th>
<th></th>
<th>Instructor/Lecturer</th>
<th></th>
<th>Research Associate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Research Assistant</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women %</td>
<td>Minority %</td>
<td>Women %</td>
<td>Minority %</td>
<td>Women %</td>
<td>Minority %</td>
<td>Women %</td>
<td>Minority %</td>
<td>Women %</td>
<td>Minority %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Allied Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services and Public Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Phy. Ed., and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
- "Ladder" indicates regular or fixed term tenurable positions; "Non Ladder" indicates visiting or grant related positions.
- "PV" means projected vacancies; "AV" means actual vacancies filled (new hires).
- Zeros show that at least one vacancy did occur.
- Goals were set only by those units having ranks in which the underutilization of women and/or minorities occurred.

October 24, 1980

Meeting #459
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no underutilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no underutilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no underutilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no underutilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Underutilization of minorities is 2 FTE. Based on availability and projected vacancies that goal will not be reached within the five year period projected by this plan.

2 No underutilization; however, because of the desire of the school to obtain a more diverse faculty a goal has been established.

3 Underutilization is 2 FTE; however, the school has established a higher goal in order to have a more diverse faculty.
Summary

On July 3, 1980, the Governor announced a predicted revenue shortfall approximating $217 million for the current biennium. On July 13 the Board’s Executive Committee examined a staff outline of possible budget reductions designed to identify budget savings representing 30 percent of the Department’s 1980-81 General Fund resources. The Committee’s recommendations were presented to the Governor’s staff on July 14 to reflect:

1. Reductions approximating $60 million.
2. The distribution of reductions among programs in 6 packages of about 5% ($10 million) each.
3. Descriptions of the program impact for each package of reductions.

These data were the basis for a Governor’s recommendation, prepared for submission to the Ways and Means Committee and 1980 Special Session of the Legislative Assembly beginning August 4, 1980, which cut $29.4 million from Higher Education programs. That reduction reflected nearly 15 percent of the Department’s 1980-81 General Fund appropriation.

The reductions made by the Special Session are summarized on the attached Exhibit 1. General Fund reductions for all programs total $28,156,685. The Legislature recognized the severity of the cuts, and $5,337,167 in Other Fund resources plus $571,431 of the General Fund appropriation (which had been unscheduled when enrollments and tuition income exceeded expectations) were applied to adjust the expenditure level. As a result, the net reduction of program expenditures became $22,248,087. The Education and General Services program share of the reduction is $13,190,000. The expenditure base and the amount of the reduction allocated to each institution and division is displayed on Exhibit 2.

The increase in expenditure limitation for Other Fund resources came as a result of efforts by legislators, the Governor, and the Board’s staff to minimize the effect of such sizable General Fund reductions. Although the Governor declined to recommend tuition increases as a funding alternative, he did support the use of other funds available to the Department. Funds identified for use represent a combination of balances on hand, current income in excess of budgeted levels, and projection of increases in 1980-81 income. The resources identified or projected are:

Contingency reserve recognized by the Legislature and carried as a beginning balance on July 1, 1979 $ 890,000
Overrealized Board income and unexpended budget balances from 1978-79 498,981
Income in excess of budgeted level for 1979-80 420,848
Institution income from indirect cost recoveries and special fee programs in 1978-79 461,059
Indirect Cost Recoveries overrealized in year 1979-80 916,472
Hospital fees transferred to education by Special Session 300,000
Anticipated overrealization of indirect cost recoveries in 1980-81 975,000
Anticipated tuition and fee income in excess of prior estimates for 1980-81 874,807
Total $5,337,167
The Education and General Services reduction descriptions provided to the Special Session's Ways and Means Committee included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Activities Reductions</td>
<td>$466,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions in Student Support Services</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions in Administrative Services</td>
<td>$1,609,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Acquisitions, 50%</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete Out-of-State Travel</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies Reductions</td>
<td>$3,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Projects</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Teaching Faculty</td>
<td>$4,560,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Classified Support Staff</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Library Book Acquisitions by One-Third</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce General Fund Support for Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,440,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the restorations recommended by the Governor modified the reduction (to $13,190,000), it was expected that lesser cuts in teaching faculty and support staff and restoration of state support for intercollegiate athletics would occur. As a result, reductions planned by the institutions are at the discretion of the presidents except that out-of-state travel must be reduced, the impact on direct instruction must be minimized, and presidents must be mindful of the restorations recommended by the Governor.

University Hospital reductions will affect levels of service for indigent patients, principally in out-patient clinics and ancillary services. The out-patient workload is reduced about 22% by limiting care to full paying patients.

The Crippled Children's Division will curtail the use of purchased services, thus reducing care for crippled children in health care facilities other than the CCD clinics. Actions affect approximately 100 hospitalizations and 700 other services for 300 children.

Cooperative Extension Service plans to hold 25 positions vacant (either vacant now or forecast to be vacant). These vacancies produce program reductions in Agriculture, 4-H Youth, and Family Living Programs at the county level; Veterinary Medicine, Range Science, Forestry, Community Development at the state level.

Agricultural Experiment Station plans reductions affecting FTE on research concerning grasshopper control, predators, animal and poultry diseases, volcanic ash, etc.; FTE on research affecting mineral nutrition in beef and sheep, pesticides, experimental equipment grass diseases, chemical weed control, etc.; and FTE for services related to production agriculture. Reductions include program support costs and the deferral of scientific equipment purchases.

Forest Research plans the reduction of staff and research effort in Effects on Thinning and Partial Cuts and in Effects on Partial Cuts in Coastal Forests. The reductions in this program were held to a smaller percentage in recognition of program reductions made earlier when Forest Products Harvest Tax collections began to decline.

Special appropriations (Regional Services Institutes, Handicapped Assistance Act, Poison Control) reductions will alter the level of services planned to be provided through those programs.

Student Loan reductions represent less in state match funds expected to be needed to match federal loan funds for 1980-81. Federal resources are less than had been anticipated.
Debt Service reductions represent an amount of General Fund not needed to fund interest and principal repayments on outstanding bonds, principally as the result of higher interest earnings which are earmarked for debt service and substitute for the General Fund payments on XI-G bonds.

Capital Construction reductions consist of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for the Handicapped</td>
<td>$2,023,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Deficiencies</td>
<td>966,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT Library Budget Reduction</td>
<td>32,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEPBS Tower/Transmitter Budget Reduction</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reductions are being made on the assumption that nearly all may be nonrecurring. If that is in fact the correct assumption, reductions will have been made to do the least possible harm to the long-range future of the institutions and divisions.
### Department of Higher Education
#### 1980 Special Session Budget Adjustments
**Senate Bills 5560 and 5561**
**Affecting Fiscal Year 1980-81**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter 300</th>
<th>General Fund Allotment</th>
<th>General Fund Reduction</th>
<th>Percent. Reduction</th>
<th>Other Fund Increase</th>
<th>General Fund Rescheduled</th>
<th>Initial Expend. Plan</th>
<th>All Funds</th>
<th>Net Reduction</th>
<th>Percent. Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education and General Services</td>
<td>$149,065,029</td>
<td>$19,098,598</td>
<td>12.81%</td>
<td>$5,337,167</td>
<td>$571,431</td>
<td>$224,563,226</td>
<td>$73,190,000</td>
<td>5.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>15,460,004</td>
<td>1,526,000</td>
<td>9.87%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>66,513,954</td>
<td>1,526,000</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled Children's Div.</td>
<td>3,510,754</td>
<td>351,075</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5,859,362</td>
<td>351,075</td>
<td>5.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Clinics</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,083,087</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>6,780,135</td>
<td>1,016,980</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13,551,114</td>
<td>1,016,980</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>10,504,407</td>
<td>1,573,954</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16,029,865</td>
<td>1,573,954</td>
<td>9.82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Research Lab.</td>
<td>1,080,007</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,086,501</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Loans</td>
<td>466,342</td>
<td>139,903</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10,467,695</td>
<td>139,903</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEPBS</td>
<td>2,001,279</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>17.49%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,156,805</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>16.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,093,849</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 511</td>
<td>Capital Construction</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,024,261</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,024,261</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 619, Regional Services Institutes</td>
<td>123,721</td>
<td>12,372</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>123,721</td>
<td>12,372</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 657, OEPBS Commission</td>
<td>38,625</td>
<td>11,587</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>38,625</td>
<td>11,587</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 759, Handicapped Assistance Act</td>
<td>93,031</td>
<td>13,955</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>93,031</td>
<td>13,955</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 782, Poison Control Center</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **$28,156,685** | **$5,337,167** | **$571,431** | **$22,248,087** |

* University Hospital is scheduled to transfer $300,000 of Other Fund revenues to Education and General Services income to apply toward generation of the $5,337,167 increase cited in the Education and General Services limitation.
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## Education and General Services
**Special Session Reduction by Institution**
**Fiscal Year 1980-81**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure Level</th>
<th>Institution's Fee Supported Expenditures</th>
<th>Base for Allocation of Reduction</th>
<th>Not Reduction Dollar Amount</th>
<th>Not Reduction Percent of Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>$54,104,761</td>
<td>$4,255,908</td>
<td>$49,848,853</td>
<td>$2,730,517</td>
<td>5.4776%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>$60,127,687</td>
<td>$6,288,388</td>
<td>53,839,299</td>
<td>2,949,097</td>
<td>5.4776%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>$36,007,046</td>
<td>$1,303,129</td>
<td>34,703,917</td>
<td>1,900,939</td>
<td>5.4776%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>$10,148,480</td>
<td>787,794</td>
<td>9,360,686</td>
<td>512,740</td>
<td>5.4776%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td>$11,592,226</td>
<td>206,275</td>
<td>11,385,951</td>
<td>623,676</td>
<td>5.4776%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>$5,626,402</td>
<td>382,564</td>
<td>5,243,838</td>
<td>287,236</td>
<td>5.4776%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$8,268,415</td>
<td>248,597</td>
<td>8,019,818</td>
<td>439,293</td>
<td>5.4776%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Center</td>
<td>$28,572,074</td>
<td>3,151,629</td>
<td>25,420,445</td>
<td>1,392,428</td>
<td>5.4776%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Research</td>
<td>$260,173</td>
<td>88,385</td>
<td>171,788</td>
<td>9,409</td>
<td>5.4776%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Activities</td>
<td>$6,866,560</td>
<td>988,944</td>
<td>5,877,616</td>
<td>684,726</td>
<td>11.6497%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's Accounts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$713,107</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$713,107</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>94.6562%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Reserve</td>
<td>$1,085,758</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,085,758</td>
<td>984,939</td>
<td>90.7144%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Inflation</td>
<td>$1,190,537</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$1,190,537</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$224,563,226</strong></td>
<td><strong>$17,701,613</strong></td>
<td><strong>$206,861,613</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,190,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3762%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion by the Committee

In response to questions from Mr. Ingalls, Mr. Lemman indicated that money used from the reserve funds would not be returned. If the two anticipated over-realizations in estimated tuition fees and income do not materialize, additional budget cuts would be required. With respect to the present status of the $1 million requested from the Emergency Board, Mr. Lemman said action was postponed until the October meeting of the Emergency Board with a request for even more specific information than the detailed data already provided. It is expected that the funds will be released when that information is presented to the October Emergency Board meeting. The Chancellor added that the Emergency Board indicated the expectation that one-third of the $1 million would be committed for fall term. In the event the additional major emergency made it extremely difficult or impossible for the Emergency Board to release these dollars, it would be necessary to absorb the one-third share in each of the winter and spring terms. The funds are limited to education and general services to restore class sections that were perceived to be needed urgently and that would be eliminated in the absence of the $1 million.

Mr. Wyss commented that many of the reductions in the budget were in areas that were very important to many people in the state. He then cited the cuts in public service budgets and various special programs. Mr. Lemman added that the cuts were harsh, devastating cuts and would have a severe impact on the quality of instructional and research efforts.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

It was requested that future items of this nature be presented to a Committee of the Whole or to the Board so that all members would have the benefit of the verbal presentation.

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, September 12, 1980; present--Ingalls, Batiste, Harms, Lomnicki, and Wyss.)

Summary

This report is in response to a question raised by a member of the Board's Finance Committee at the June Committee meetings regarding the procedures for procuring data processing equipment.

Acquisitions of data processing equipment by the Department must be accomplished in accordance with Public Contract Review Board procurement requirements and must be approved by the Legislative Assembly or Emergency Board (ORS 351.095) and the Executive Department. Procedures for gaining these approvals are structured around Executive Department requirements. A copy of Executive Department Administrative Rule 02-030-01, which describes the process was distributed. These guidelines require that written justification must be provided for each equipment item. The justifications include:

1. Planned uses.
2. Expected benefits.
3. Costs including those associated with personnel, maintenance, and supplies.
4. Sources of funding.
5. Alternatives considered.
6. Selection procedures.
7. Relationship with long-range plan.

8. Effect of denial.


Last year the Department's Office of Educational Systems processed 246 transactions ranging from small terminal devices which cost less than $1,000.00 to major computer procurements costing over one million dollars.

Acquisition justifications are prepared by an individual or group at the institution planning to acquire the equipment. These materials are reviewed by both budget and technical personnel on campus and by the Board's Office before they are forwarded to the Executive Department for final approval.

The current procedures are improved from those of two years ago. There are no allowances, however, for minimizing the justification in the case of procurement of items of small cost. The Executive Department has expressed a willingness to review and entertain proposals to simplify the process for these types of acquisitions. We will report back to the Finance Committee on the outcome of this effort.

Discussion by the Committee

Mr. Wyss commented that he questioned whether these bureaucratic procedures led to the best selections of appropriate machinery and software in any system which is changing very rapidly.

He suggested that a new spirit of analysis might be needed which would be more responsive to individual job requirements.

It was agreed that the Board's staff should explore and suggest possible recommendations for change to simplify procedures.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Mr. Wyss commented that concern has been expressed by various individuals in the past with the amount of money lumped together in non-line-item budgets within the State System. This has led to criticism that the State System is hiding funds and statements that if library books, for example, are a critical need, the presidents have the power to determine where the money should be spent. At the same time, the lump-sum budget may be trimmed by the Legislature to 85-90% of the total amount. Inevitably, library books get cut as one of the discretionary items in that budget. Mr. Wyss asked if it might be appropriate to develop a line-item budget since legislators state that they give the State System money for the budgets and it decides that the money will not be spent on library books.

Mr. Lemman said this is simply a convenient excuse because what is not said is that often there are other constraints and other underfundings placed upon the State System that lead to the decision to reduce expenditures for library books or other discretionary items. Further, any unexpended money that might remain toward the end of a fiscal year is usually channeled to the library for acquisitions. Mr. Lemman said he would be reluctant, however, to suggest a legislatively-established line-item budget but would be less reluctant if the Board wished to issue instructions on expenditures and the priority of non-reductions.

Mr. Ingalls requested information on the beginning budget for expenditures by the institutions for libraries in the last biennium and what they would like to spend if money were available.
Mr. Batiste said it was the responsibility of the presidents to make those decisions and he would dislike having the Committee become involved in such detailed decisions.

Mr. Wyss said that if the Board becomes more involved in seeking legislative support, the members need to know how the money is spent in much greater detail than has been the case previously. If the Board believes there are areas in which there have been distinct under-support, then the Board should find out how that has happened before determining what its priorities are. Things which have very high priority perhaps should not be left in a lump-sum budget.

Mr. Lemman commented that many factors have an impact on the decisions, including the order of magnitude of the reduction and the time at which it occurs. Another important factor is that 80% of the money is used for staff, either classified or academic.

Dr. Ray Hawk, Vice President for Finance and Administration at the University of Oregon, said the 20% remaining after staff costs does not allow much flexibility. He concurred that any money remaining would go to the libraries but indicated that there has never been enough funding for library purposes. The increased costs for publications and the decline in the dollar in the world markets have compounded the financial situation for the libraries. Dr. Hawk said if the State System could get concurrence and funding for an appropriate work force level and then get the Legislature to look at the way the remainder of the money is divided, there might be an advantage. The only budgetary flexibility now results from not filling a position and then the institutions are understaffed.

Mr. Lemman said the real question was whether the line-item budget would provide any additional dollars. Dr. Hawk concurred because if it did not, there would no longer be any flexibility in the budget and there would be no additional funds.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented. At another point in the meeting, Mr. Wyss called attention to his remarks on line-item budgeting in connection with the above report to the Finance Committee. During the Committee discussion he had stated that a lump-sum budget is subject to criticism from legislators who state that the Legislature appropriates funds and the Board is responsible for allocating them. Consequently, if a given area is underfunded, it is because of a Board decision rather than because the Legislature refuses to fund a particular program or activity.

Mr. Harms said comments to him by some of the same legislators indicated opposition to the line-item budget format. They may criticize the lack of it, but at the same time say that those decisions are ones for the Board to make, not the Legislature.

Mr. Petersen said he would agree with Mr. Wyss that the line-item budget is one of the mechanisms that must be pursued in terms of better explaining what is in the budget. There must be some way to inform legislators what is behind each one of the percentage figures. It was stated that the line-item budget format is expensive.

Mr. Elorriaga expressed his frustration that considerations would even be given to line-item budgeting. He said there would be problems with the Legislature beyond anything one could imagine and the procedure would bring no more money. It would just confuse the issue completely.

Mr. Anderson commented that several years ago at a meeting of the Association of Governing Board, line-item budgeting was a primary issue. Those present opposed it almost overwhelmingly because of the increased concern it brought as a result of legislative bodies target-shooting at all the different items that appear in the budget. Further, it took control from the governing boards.
Mrs. Green said in her experience in committees working on budgets there were times when a lump-sum budget was reduced just on the assumption that the needs were overestimated whereas in a line-item budget, the specific cuts are clear.

It was agreed that the Board must seek ways to present its budget requests so that they will be more clearly understood.

Condition of Board's Special and Plant Rehabilitation Reserves
As of October 24, 1980, For the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1981

Staff Report to the Board

I. Board's Reserve for Plant Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount in Initial 1980-81 Budget Plan</td>
<td>$713,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied to Special Session Budget Reduction</td>
<td>675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Available as of October 24, 1980</td>
<td>$38,107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Board's Reserve for Energy Inflation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount in Initial 1980-81 Budget Plan</td>
<td>$1,190,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no change)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Available as of October 24, 1980</td>
<td>$1,190,537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Board's Unallocated Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount in Initial 1980-81 Budget Plan</td>
<td>$1,085,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to University of Oregon, Southern Oregon State College &amp; Oregon Institute of Technology to Correct Pay Plan Funding</td>
<td>100,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied to Special Session Budget Reduction</td>
<td>$984,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Available as of October 24, 1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 11:55 A.M.

Wilma L. Foster, Secretary
Oregon State Board of Higher Education

Edward C. Harms, Jr., President
Wilma L. Foster, Secretary