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ROOM 2115, CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND REHABILITATION CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
PORTLAND, OREGON

September 11, 1981

ROLL CALL

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Room 2115, Child Development and Rehabilitation Center, University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, Portland, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A.M. by the President of the Board, Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr., and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Alvin R. Batiste
Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter
Mrs. Harriett Flanagan
Mr. Robert C. Ingalls
Mr. Louis B. Perry

Mr. James C. Petersen
Mrs. Marion T. Weatherford
Mr. Loren L. Wyss
Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.

Absent: Mr. Anderson and Mr. Lomnicki were out of the country.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary Wilma L. Foster; 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; W. T. Lemman, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Administration; Edward P. Kelley, Jr., Associate Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration; Ms. Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer; James J. Casby, Assistant Attorney General; Vern Rempel, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Kellye Wise, Director, Data Services Center; Richard Zita, Assistant to the Chancellor, Director, Public Services and Publications; J. Richard Pizzo, Director, High School Relations; Francetta Carroll, Assistant Board Secretary.

Oregon State University--President R. W. MacVicar.

University of Oregon--President Paul Olum.

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center--President Leonard Laster; James T. McGill, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Mary Ann Lockwood, Executive Assistant to the President; D. G. Kassebaum, Director, University Hospital; Janet E. Young, Special Assistant to the President; Ronald Parelius, Assistant Vice President, Management Services; Ralph Tuomi, Assistant Vice President, Facilities Management; Charles Williams, Media Relations Office, University Relations; Gordon Ranta, Director, Facilities Planning; Michael Sestric, Project Coordinator, Facilities Planning; Robert Quinton-Cox, Associate Professor of Anatomy.

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

Eastern Oregon State College--President Rodney Briggs; David Gilbert, Dean of Academic Affairs; James C. Lundy, Director of Business Affairs.

Oregon Institute of Technology--President Kenneth Light; W. M. Douglass, Dean of Administration.

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

Western Oregon State College--President Gerald Leinwand; James H. Beaird, Provost.
MINUTES
APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on August 7, 1981, and approved them as previously distributed, with the following voting in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S
REPORT

The Chancellor commented that there were some actions in the 1981 Legislative Session, other than the budgetary action, which had been discussed previously, that merited consideration. The Chancellor said the 1981 Legislature might turn out to be more significant than others which he had attended in the past 20 years. The normal practice for the Legislature has been to avoid long-range policy decisions. While the Ways and Means Committee has discussed in depth policy issues, the Legislature itself never has adopted what might be called goals for higher education in Oregon. It has not stated a level of aspiration which it holds in terms of educating Oregon's citizens beyond high school. However, this time the budget report makes very clear the desire of the Legislature that the State System reduce the quantity of its services and preserve, even strengthen, the quality of the remainder of the services. The budget report admonished the Board to reduce the number of students served and to reduce even further the number of program options available for students. The Board was urged to raise admission standards and seek to restore a greater degree of equity insofar as salary levels for faculty are concerned.

The Chancellor said it was his opinion the Legislature should establish some long-range goals and describe the aspirations it holds for the level of education in the state. The Board then should develop policies designed to implement those long-range goals and aspirations described by the Legislature. The institutions in turn should be expected to adopt those policies which will implement the Board's more general policies.

The Legislative policy directions given in the 1981 Legislative Session were appropriate in that they described general objectives but did not specify the students to be eliminated or the programs to be reduced. The Chancellor said this was an important Legislative conclusion. The consequence of the admonitions which were given will be a smaller, leaner System of Higher Education over the next few years. This will not necessarily be a bad thing if the Board is permitted to preserve and even strengthen the quality of the remaining programs, and as long as there is the opportunity for students to find their way into the State System through the community college system. However, if the reduction in the number of students and the number of program options is used as a reason for future Legislative Assemblies to reduce further the budget allocation, then the State System would be in deep trouble. One of the challenges for the Board and the Board's staff is to see that these policy directives, which can be inferred from the Budget Notes, result in an effort to release resources through program reduction and to retain and reallocate them to other programs in order to strengthen the remaining programs.

A timetable has been developed for submitting proposed program reductions and eliminations to the Board's Office and the Board. The Chancellor then reviewed the objectives to be achieved through the program reductions and eliminations. First, the Legislature mandated a certain amount of cuts for 1982-83 below the budget level for 1981-82. In addition, there are other
problems which may occur. Income from tuition may fall short for a variety of reasons, the General Fund revenue projections may not be achieved, and it is unlikely that the employee benefits package will be fully funded. Should any funds remain from program reductions and eliminations in areas of lower priority, it would be hoped that the savings made could be retained and reallocated to strengthen other remaining programs. Further, the Legislature recognized that salary levels for academic staff in the State System have fallen sharply behind the competition. All of these factors have resulted in a target of reduction or elimination amounting to 6% of the General Fund component of the Education and General Services budget. The recommendations from the institutions are to be submitted to the staff by November 1 and to the Board for action in December.

During the discussion of the proposed timetable, it was indicated that the staff and institutions have been conferring throughout the development of the proposals for program reductions and eliminations. Attention is being given to minimizing the likelihood that the proposals would impair the overall position of the State System to perform its state-wide mission.

Mr. Petersen asked what would occur if some institutions had to declare financial exigency while others could absorb a little greater reduction. The Chancellor said that it was difficult to respond until the income estimates were revised, because the action and timing of these decisions depend upon the income picture in November or December. He said the Legislature had been advised that funds would be managed to avoid declaring financial exigency in 1981-82 but no such commitment had been made for 1982-83. If income falls sharply, it is probable all institutions would have to declare financial exigency in 1982-83.

The Chancellor indicated that the budget report for 1982-83 would be submitted in the same format as the one prepared for 1981-82, with a separate report on the program decisions.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-la)

With the assistance of their consultants, Architects Boutwell, Gordon, Beard and Grimes have completed the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed addition and alterations to University Hospital South on the campus of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center based upon the program outlined by institutional officials. An expenditure limitation of $21,840,000 for the project was approved previously by the Board and is included within the 1981-1983 capital construction program authorized by the 1981 Legislature. All of the project costs are to be financed from self-liquidating bonds expected to be issued in 1982-83 under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution. A description of the work proposed is contained within the staff report. Various visual aids, including a small-scale study model of the structure, will be available for review at the time of the Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to acknowledge the acceptance of the schematic design phase of planning for the University Hospital South Addition and Alterations project and to instruct Architects Boutwell, Gordon, Beard and Grimes, and their consultants, to proceed with the design development phase of planning based upon a direct construction cost allowance of approximately $17,241,000 as soon as satisfactory contractual arrangements have been negotiated for such services.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Ingalls inquired concerning the effect of the current interest rates for bonds on financing capabilities for this project and others. Mr. Hunderup said that the adjustment in the expenditure limitation had been based on a delay of one year in completing the planning and bidding the project. It is presently anticipated that the bids for the major portion of the work on this project would be taken in March or April 1983. It is hoped that the interest
rates will be somewhat lower at that time. The institution is being assisted in making income projections to determine the debt service capabilities to undertake a project of this magnitude along with other remodeling that is part of the capital construction program for 1981-1983. Mr. Hunderup said it was not possible to indicate the fiscal capabilities at this time. However, he said the schematic design phase of the planning was being presented for approval so that planning could be completed to enable proceeding with the project as soon as a feasible market condition is available. He noted also that this project was part of the 1981-1983 program written into the law as part of the $57,220,000 for Article XI-F(1) bonds that were authorized by the 1981 Legislature for the State Board of Higher Education. No General Fund money is involved because these bonds are to be repaid from patient fee revenues, student building fees, gifts, grants, or other sources which do not involve the General Fund.

In response to a question from Mr. Wyss concerning the current inflation rate for cost of construction, Mr. Hunderup indicated that the bidding climate has been very favorable, particularly on major projects. The rate anticipated for planning purposes is presently 15% annually from the current base to the time of construction.

The Board approved the staff recommendations as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets(9-81-2a)

Pursuant to arrangements made by supplement to their contract for professional services relating to the proposed University Hospital South Addition and Alterations project at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, Architects Boutwell, Gordon, Beard and Grimes have completed the schematic design phase of planning for additional alterations proposed to be accomplished for the Department of Ophthalmology on the 10th floor of the hospital. This work constitutes a portion of the expenditure authorization of $5,480,000 previously approved by the Board and the 1981 Legislature for various Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects and would be financed exclusively from gifts and grants.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to acknowledge the acceptance of the schematic design phase of planning for Phases I and III of the proposed alterations for the Ophthalmology Department, complementing those for Phase II which are expected to be included in the University Hospital South Addition and Alterations project, and to instruct Architects Boutwell, Gordon, Beard and Grimes and their consultants to proceed with the design phase of planning for this work based upon a direct construction cost allowance of approximately $873,600 following the negotiation of a further supplement to the architects' contract for such services.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendations as presented with the following voting in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets(9-81-3a)

Immediately following the recent discovery that the tubes within each of the two boilers have become pitted and are leaking, emergency repairs to the Central Utility Plant at Eastern Oregon State College were undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of Morrison, Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., consulting engineers, at a cost of approximately $52,601. The institution needs assistance in financing these repairs.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

Pursuant to the provisions of IMD 7.145, it is recommended that the Board authorize allocations of approximately $34,191 from the Board's reserve for physical plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay and approximately $18,410 from excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees to cover the estimated expenditure requirements of $52,601 for re-tubing the boilers at Eastern Oregon State College and undertaking other modifications in the Central Utility Plant needed to prevent a recurrence of damage from excessive quantities of oxygen in the water.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Batiste commented that this kind of problem is well-known in the maintenance of boilers and should have been anticipated with normal maintenance repairs scheduled.

It was stated that in the past there has been a plant rehabilitation reserve of $200,000 to $300,000 to be used for purposes such as this, but that was lost in the budget reductions that have occurred. Now there is a very small amount available and only about $40,000 will remain after allocation for this project. If something of a magnitude greater than that should occur, it will be necessary to go to the Emergency Board or to reduce allocations to the institutions for operating purposes to meet the emergency.

Mr. Batiste said he would move approval of the recommendation but asked that the central office work with the small institutions to prevent such occurrences in the future.

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

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-7a)

It was recommended that OAR 580-10-021, Waiver of Nonresident Tuition and Fees be amended as follows:

580-10-021 Notwithstanding the provisions of OAR 580-10-015 and 580-10-020, certain students as provided below shall be permitted to pay tuition and fees at the same rates as Oregon resident students. Determination of residence shall be made in the same manner as such determination is made for those students who are claiming Oregon residency.

(1) Upper-division students who are residents of Cowlitz, Clark, Wahkiakum, Skamania, and Klickitat Counties in the State of Washington [shall be permitted to pay tuition and fees at] attending Portland State University [at the same rates as Oregon students], if [the Chancellor finds] it is found that authorities in the State of Washington make appropriate concessions to some or all residents of Oregon. [ Determination of residence shall be made in the same manner as such determination is made for those students who are claiming Oregon residency.]

(2) All nonresidents of Oregon attending Eastern Oregon State College [shall be permitted to pay the same tuition and fees as Oregon residents]. [This rule is experimental and will automatically expire two years after its adoption, unless renewed]

(3) Graduate students who are residents of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, and Washington enrolled in a WICHE Regional Graduate Program at a Department institution.

503
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Harms stated that the time set for the public hearing on the amendment of OAR 580-10-021 had arrived and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed amendment. There being no response to his request, he declared the public hearing closed.

Upon motion by Mr. Petersen, and second by Mr. Perry, the board approved the staff recommendation and adopted the proposed amendment on roll call vote with the following voting in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Revisions to OAR 580-21-100, Kinds of Appointments

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-8a)

It was recommended that the Board adopt, following public hearing, revisions to OAR 580-21-100, Kinds of Appointments.

1. It was recommended that OAR 580-21-100(1) be amended as follows:

   Appointments authorized in Department institutions are: fixed term appointments, [and] tenure-related appointments (annual tenure and indefinite tenure), and extendable contract appointments as permitted by OAR 580-21-100(1)(c).

2. It was further recommended that the following be added to Section 580-21-100 (1)(c):

   For the period July 1, 1981, through June 30, 1983, Southern Oregon State College may initiate the use of an extendable contract which is defined as a contract having a term of not more than three years and which permits, following the first year of the contract term, the term of the contract to be extended an additional year if required conditions have been met, leaving the faculty member at the beginning of each year with a contract having the same term as the original contract.

   Such appointments may be made only after an institutional policy has been adopted following faculty consideration through established governance mechanisms, or negotiated with the exclusive bargaining representative of the faculty. The policy or negotiated agreement must establish the probationary period to be served prior to an extendable contract appointment, describe the procedures and criteria for attaining such an appointment, and describe the conditions under which contracts may or may not be extendable.

   An institution utilizing extendable contract appointments will be expected to reaffirm its commitment to tenure.

3. It was also recommended that OAR 580-21-100 (1)(a)(C) be amended as follows:

   Fixed term appointments are designed for use at the discretion of the President in such cases as, but not limited to, appointments of visiting faculty (or similar category); academic staff members whose support wholly or principally comes from gift, grant or contract funds, the cessation of which funding would eliminate the budget base for the position in question; [and] part-time faculty; administrative staff with faculty rank [ ]; and faculty appointments during an initial probationary period where an institutional policy has been adopted or negotiated which establishes such probationary period. [Visiting Fixed term appointments offered to [any] visiting faculty member] shall not exceed a total of seven years.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Harms stated that the time set for the public hearing on revisions to OAR 580-21-100, Kinds of Appointments, had arrived. He indicated that it
was his intention to recommend that the public hearing be continued to the October meeting because communications had been received from interested groups stating that there had been inadequate time for preparation of statements by those groups.

Mr. Petersen asked whether the proposed permanent rule included the modifications made to the temporary rule adopted by the Board at its meeting on August 7, 1981. Mr. Lemman replied that the proposal before the Board was to adopt as a permanent rule the temporary rule adopted on August 7, which limits the application of extendable contracts to Southern Oregon State College for the period July 1, 1981, through June 30, 1983.

Mr. Harms then asked whether anyone wished to appear at this meeting, with the understanding that the public hearing would be continued in October.

Dr. Charles E. Coate, Professor of History at Eastern Oregon State College, and Chairman of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, said this is an important issue to faculty and required discussion. He indicated there were presently several concerns which had been expressed in preliminary discussions:

1. The proposal still seems to apply to the entire State System.

2. Are there limits to the number of years an individual may be under extendable contracts?

3. A similar question applies to fixed term contracts where presidential discretion appears to be expanded with the proposed addition of "but not limited to" in the description of the purpose of such contracts.

Dr. Coate said that before any change is made in the language of the Administrative Rules on Kinds of Appointments, he would like to see a review of Board policy with full faculty participation in the whole issue of nontenured appointments of any kind extending beyond the traditional probationary period of seven years. He asked how common was the present practice in this regard and was it authorized under existing rules. He expressed concern that the proposed changes might be a substitute for tenure with more and more faculty denied any prospect of achieving tenure. He suggested rejection or indefinite postponement of any rule change beyond one that applied only to Southern Oregon State College. He appealed for communication with faculty so that when rule changes of this importance are presented, the Board would routinely request faculty opinion before acting.

Dr. Alfred Sugarman said it was his understanding that the staff was to present new wording that would apply to Southern Oregon State College only and that there was no temporary agreement or proposal that was approved by the Board last time. Rather the Board was to vote on new wording of the original proposal.

Mr. Lemman said it was his understanding that Mr. Petersen's motion at the August 7 meeting was to adopt the temporary rule, but to limit its application to Southern Oregon State College for a limited period of time. The President of the Board instructed the staff to change the rule accordingly. He then quoted from page 458 of the minutes of the August 7 meeting, which reported the adoption of the temporary rule with the modifications recommended by Mr. Petersen. The minutes also included the statement that it was agreed the revised language could be prepared for consideration in the adoption of the temporary rule as a permanent rule. Mr. Lemman also noted that any public body may adopt a temporary rule, with or without a public hearing, and that temporary rule is in effect for 180 days. Mr. Petersen stated that the minutes correctly indicated his motion to adopt a temporary rule with the modifications which he had suggested. Further, those same modifications were included in the permanent rule now proposed for consideration.

Mr. Lemman then commented with respect to the ambiguity referred to by Dr. Coate, stating that OAR 580-21-100(1) permits the use of extendable
contracts if permitted by OAR 580-21-100(1)(c). The latter limits the application of extendable contracts to Southern Oregon State College for a two-year period.

Mr. Wyss said the third paragraph of the recommended changes was somewhat confusing in that it seemed to be moving toward an extension of the one-year extendable contract on a system-wide basis when Board action in August clearly limited the process to Southern Oregon State College. It was indicated that this paragraph had been presented before and that it did not refer only to Southern Oregon State College. This paragraph is a general rule, whereas the second paragraph is specific and carries the limitation.

Mr. Perry said the third paragraph relates to something that has been academic practice for a long time and has no necessary relationship to extended-term contracts. However, he did want to clarify that in the matter of extendable term contracts, they were limited to two years and to Southern Oregon State College. Mr. Lemman indicated this was correct.

Mr. Bill Fritz, Director of Field Services for the Oregon Federation of Teachers, said that there might be some concern with the proposal if there is not a collective bargaining relationship and a legally binding contract at a particular institution. Those with collective bargaining relationships with the institution and the State System would have no problems in having the proposed rule apply to other institutions than Southern Oregon State College. He said it provides more options and the Oregon Federation of Teachers basically would agree with the rationale presented. The proposed extendable contract provision is not regarded as a threat to tenure.

Dr. Robert Quinton-Cox questioned how it was possible to guarantee an extended contract when the Legislature funds the institution for only two years. He also asked what were the limits of the contract that would be offered to the individuals on the extended contract basis.

Mr. Harms said that the funding premise would also mean that tenure could not be awarded. Mr. Lemman said he would be pleased to meet with interested individuals to respond to questions of this nature.

The Board approved a motion to continue the public hearing on this matter at the October meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-14a)

It was recommended that Oregon Administrative Rules, Chapter 580, Division 32, Educational Broadcasting, be repealed following public hearing.

The 1981 Legislature passed SB 599 which transferred Educational Broadcasting from the jurisdiction of the State Board of Higher Education to the Commission on Public Broadcasting. The bill has been signed and is now effective so that it is no longer necessary to retain Division 32 in the Administrative Rules of the Board.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Harms said that the time set for the public hearing on the repeal of OAR Chapter 580, Division 32, had arrived and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed action. There being no response to his request, Mr. Harms declared the public hearing closed.

It was indicated that the statute required specific service would still be provided to the Commission by the Board.

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented and repealed OAR Chapter 580, Division 32, Educational Broadcasting. On roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.
Mr. Harms indicated that the agenda provided an opportunity for public comment and requested anyone who wished to make any presentation to the Board on any item to do so.

Dr. Erhard Dortmund, Associate Professor of History at Western Oregon State College, indicated that he was appearing on behalf of the Oregon Federation of Teachers. He recommended that the Board create an advisory committee, comprised of faculty, staff, students, and at-large citizens, to assist the Board in the search for, and selection of, a new Chancellor. He emphasized the importance of the position to Oregon's present and future well-being and the magnitude of the task performed by the person in that position.

Mr. Harms said the Board's search committee and other Board members had met with the consultants earlier at breakfast and had generally agreed that the groups mentioned by Dr. Dortmund should be represented for advice and assistance. The exception was the citizens at large because the Board itself represents that constituency. He indicated that he understood the consensus of those present at the breakfast meeting was to have an eight-person committee to include representatives of the presidents, of faculty, and students in addition to the Board members appointed to the Committee. Mr. Harms said unless he was advised differently by Board members, and subject to advice from the consultants, this would be the procedure. The representatives would be selected as follows: the presidents would select a representative from among their number; the faculty representative would be selected through either the Association of Oregon Faculties or the Inter-institutional Faculty Senate, and the student would be selected through the Oregon Student Lobby.

Mr. Harms said he had asked Mr. Perry to serve as chairman of the committee, and the other committee members were Mr. Wyss, Mrs. Carpenter, Mr. Ingalls, and Mr. Anderson. The committee meetings are open to all other Board members, and they are to be notified of the meetings of the committee and to attend whenever possible.

There were no other requests for public comment.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-15a)

It was recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to purchase the Sadie Prindel Estate property at 1709 Moss Street, Eugene, from Leta Strain at the option price of $46,750. This property, which measures 61.5 feet by 50 feet (or 0.071 acres) and is improved with a small residence containing approximately 1,140 square feet, is located within the approved projected campus boundaries of the University of Oregon and is expected to be utilized for student housing. The purchase would be financed from proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bonds issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available for housing operations at the institution. It would be charged against the expenditure limitation of $300,000 established for 1981-1983 within Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-5a)

The Internal Management Directives of the Board (paragraph 3.001) stipulate that the Board "shall review and set academic admissions requirements for the institutions," but make no provision for the establishment of program admission requirements in excess of these institutional requirements.
In order to establish clearly the responsibilities of the institutions in respect to the establishment of special program admission requirements, the Board's staff recommends the addition of a second paragraph under Section 3 - Student Personnel, as follows:

3.005 Establishment of Minimum Standards for Entry into Programs

Each institution may establish minimum academic and other standards for entry into particular programs in excess of those established for the institution by general Board policy. In addition, the institution may selectively admit students to the affected program on the basis of the established standards. All standards established pursuant to this directive and the procedures applying them shall comply with OAR 580-15-025.

(OAR 580-15-025 is the Board's rule forbidding discrimination in a prohibited basis in admission. The rule speaks to admission to an institution and to any school department, or college in an institution having an independent admissions process supplementary to the institution admissions process.)

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Batiste asked whether being selective and raising admission standards to such a degree, it might be restricting access unnecessarily. Mrs. Kahananui responded that the restrictions were necessary because of limited resources and the inability of the institutions to move resources into the programs. Where competitive admission occurs, there are multiple criteria in order to assure fairness to students and that discrimination does not occur.

Mr. Batiste also expressed concern about adequate notice to students. Mrs. Kahananui explained that these specific program requirements had been adopted by the faculty and departments and were published in the catalogs. Advisers make certain students have the information. However, there is a gap in the Internal Management Directives in stating who is responsible for establishing the minimum standards for entry into programs.

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.

Summary for Meeting Worksheet (9-81-4a)

Oregon Institute of Technology requests authorization to terminate six programs as listed below. The programs terminated would be phased out, beginning with the 1982-83 year, to provide students currently enrolled (1981-82) opportunity to complete requirements for their degrees. The programs to be terminated are:

- AAS in Automotive Technology
- Upper-division option in automotive technology leading to the BS in Automotive-Diesel Technology
- AAS in Welding Processes Technology
- AAS in Radiologic Electronics Technology
- AAS in Gunsmithing Technology
- Certificate and AAS in Dental Assisting

If the request to terminate programs in automotive technology is approved, Oregon Institute of Technology requests authorization to change the title of the bachelor of science degree program in automotive-diesel technology to diesel technology.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The Board's staff has reviewed the requests of Oregon Institute of Technology in view of the policies of the Board in respect to technical education as enunciated over the years, the institute's approved mission statement, need
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for the programs, the costs involved in maintaining programs of good quality in these areas at Oregon Institute of Technology, the individual program situations, and the impact of termination of these programs on the ability of Oregon Institute of Technology to carry out its primary responsibilities within the state's system of higher education. It was recommended that the requests be approved and that authorization be granted to change the title of the bachelor of science degree program in automotive-diesel technology to diesel technology.

Board Discussion and Action

In response to a question concerning the diesel technology program, Dr. Light indicated this program involved very large diesel equipment rather than the small diesel application.

Mr. Wyss said it had always been believed that Oregon Institute of Technology fulfilled a special function that it was different from the four-year bachelor's degree programs. It appeared that one of the reasons for dropping the course was that it attracted vocational students into programs that were offered by community colleges, most of which were at some distance. Presumably many students in the program would be placebound and could not take courses in the community colleges. It was also stated that many of the students needed a considerable amount of help in mathematics and English and many did not continue into the bachelor of science program. Mr. Wyss asked whether these were real reasons for eliminating these offerings, or was the institution perhaps fulfilling a service to the region at a relatively small cost that would only be replaced by establishing a community college in the area.

Dr. Light indicated that the enrollment in the program is from the entire state. He said the real reason for requesting authorization to drop the programs was because the institution is so heavily over-enrolled. It was necessary to make priority judgments. In doing this, it was thought that programs duplicated elsewhere in the state should be the ones eliminated while retaining those which were unique and where there was definitely a greater impact on the economy of the state in terms of employment outlets and opportunities. He said the institution was cutting back in areas that were decreasing in enrollment, those that were duplicated elsewhere, or ones that were high-cost low-enrollment.

The Board approved a motion to place the termination of these programs on the consent calendar for the next meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.

A System-wide policy for intercollegiate athletics was considered by the Committee of the Whole at a meeting on June 26, 1981. At that time, Board members made several changes for revisions in the language of the policy statement. These changes have been incorporated in the revised draft which appears below.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board adopt the following System-wide policy for intercollegiate athletics:

At its study session, held at Newport on Saturday, March 28, 1981, the Board discussed possible policy options for intercollegiate athletics and directed the Chancellor to draft a statement of proposed policies to be considered by the Board's Committee of the Whole.
The Board, acting as a Committee of the Whole, reviewed the proposed statement at the June 26, 1981, meeting in Eugene and suggested revisions. The Chancellor was instructed to revise the proposed statement and present it to the Board at its July meeting.

It is recognized that, under current fiscal conditions, the proposed fiscal policy cannot be fully implemented. It is recommended, nonetheless, that the policy statement be adopted for implementation to the extent feasible.

The Role of Athletics in a College or University

Intercollegiate athletic programs are considered by the Board to assist the colleges and universities in achieving their goals. They

- provide students, alumni, and other members of the public with spectator satisfaction and with an opportunity to identify with their institutions outside the classroom and laboratories;

- enable the institutions to involve the public, not otherwise related to the institutions, in support of our colleges and universities;

- contribute to the instructional programs by providing highly competitive opportunities for those students who excel in the various athletic activities;

- enable the institutions to prepare graduates to serve the schools and colleges as athletic coaches, physical education teachers, etc.; and

- provide opportunities for a few students, especially in football, basketball, and baseball, to prepare for careers in professional sports.

Categories of Intercollegiate Athletic Activities

For the purposes of establishing financial policy and determining equality of opportunity, two categories of intercollegiate athletic activities are established. They are (1) major revenue-producing athletic activities and (2) all other athletic activities.

Major revenue-producing athletic activities are defined as those which, in the judgment of the president of the institution and concurred in by the Board, are anticipated collectively to be capable of producing revenue equalling or exceeding operating and capital expenditures.

Equality of Opportunity

Equality of opportunity shall be established and judged within each of the two categories of intercollegiate athletics, "major revenue-producing" and "other."

Major revenue-producing athletic activities must include at least one activity for men and one for women.

Provision must be made for an activity to move from one category to the other.

Financing

Major Revenue-producing Athletic Activities:

Major revenue-producing athletic activities are those which, by definition, are estimated to be self-supporting from gate receipts,
television and radio income, conference income, contributions, and other revenues generated through the operation of those activities. Any incidental fees used to support major revenue-producing athletic activities will be assumed to be for the purpose of financing student admissions. No state tax funds, appropriated for education and general purposes, are to be used for either operating or capital expenditures. "Operating expenses" include both salaries and applicable physical plant costs. State funds are used and may continue to be used, however, for physical plant costs applicable to spaces within athletic facilities which are utilized for educational and general purposes, such as lectures, convocations, concerts, and commencement exercises.

Other Athletic Activities:

Other athletic activities are to be financed from student incidental fees, gate receipts, contributions, and state funds appropriated for education and general purposes. Salaries for administrators and coaches of other athletic activities and associated physical plant costs are appropriate charges against state funds appropriated for education and general purposes.

Expenditures for capital construction and capital improvements for athletics are to be financed from resources available for auxiliary enterprises such as gifts, bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution, and excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees.

Levels of Competition

Institutions should seek the highest feasible level of competition for each activity. It is assumed, however, that financial and/or ethical considerations may force reductions in the competitive levels.

Cost Containment

The presidents of Oregon State University and the University of Oregon are instructed to work with each other and to pursue within the Northwest region, the Pac-10, and the NCAA appropriate cost containment measures such as grants based only on need, fewer grants, reduced recruiting efforts, smaller coaching staffs, and other appropriate measures.

If such efforts, over a five-year period, are unsuccessful, the Board will reassess its position and instruct the University of Oregon and Oregon State University whether or not to implement those cost containment policies even in the absence of Pac-10, NCAA, and regional action.

Portland State University, Oregon Institute of Technology, and the three regional colleges are instructed to adopt similar cost containment measures, as appropriate.

Code of Ethics

Each institution offering a program of intercollegiate athletics is to prepare and submit to the Board for approval a code of ethics for intercollegiate athletics. Violation of the code of ethics shall be considered an adequate basis for sanctions for cause.

Board Discussion and Action

The Chancellor reviewed the proposed systemwide policy for intercollegiate athletics commenting that the statement went beyond the role of athletics and its financing and also spoke to equality of opportunity, to levels of competition, to cost containment, and to a code of ethics. He said that
while all of these were important, probably the most significant in the long run would be the statement on equality of opportunity which is discussed much more specifically than it was in the earlier policy statement adopted by the Board. The Chancellor said that the proposed policy would require that equality of opportunity be established and judged within the two categories of intercollegiate athletics -- major revenue-producing and other. The assumption generally has been made that in judging equality of opportunity in intercollegiate athletics, it would be done within the broad category of all intercollegiate athletics.

The Chancellor said other significant additions included the sections on levels of competition, cost containment, and the code of ethics.

The Chancellor provided a change in wording that had been suggested from one of the institutions. It has been incorporated in the statement above. He then recommended that the statement, including the added language, be adopted as Board policy.

Mr. Batiste suggested that the last two paragraphs under categories of intercollegiate athletic activities applied more to equality of opportunity than to the categories of athletics. He proposed that they be moved to the section on equality of opportunity.

In response to a question, the Chancellor indicated that levels of competition referred to the levels of competition within the various athletic conferences rather than to how vigorously the individuals or teams pursue the sport.

Mr. Ingalls proposed that the last two paragraphs under the role of athletics in a college or university be moved to the top of that section. It was stated that the listing had been discussed and that it had not been intended to represent any priority order. The Chancellor said that in terms of major revenue-producing activities, the two paragraphs mentioned by Mr. Ingalls were of major importance, but in terms of the total intercollegiate program, the first paragraph of the section was significant.

Mr. Robert Watrus, Executive Director of the Oregon Student Lobby, compared the proposed policy with the 1976 policy. He said it was a weakening of the definition of major revenue-producing athletic activities. He said the equality of opportunity portion of the policy should address even more specifically the question of how to achieve equality of opportunity. He suggested that the Board reinforce its non-discriminatory athletic policy by including language to the effect that comparable opportunities would be offered to both male and female athletes in each area -- major revenue-producing and all other activities. In addition, the process by which women's athletic activities are selected for inclusion in major revenue-producing activities should be drawn more tightly. Mr. Watrus said there was also a weakening of the language in the financing portion of the policy. He asked if the proposed wording was a way of committing additional state General Fund money appropriated to Education and General Services to the athletic department budgets.

Mr. Batiste requested Mr. Watrus to repeat the statement on comparable activities and asked him to clarify the meaning. Mr. Watrus said his intention was to avoid the possibility that a program like men's football would be included in the major revenue-producing category along with a smaller participation and expenditure sport for women. His concern was that there would be equality of opportunity in fact as opposed to just in writing.

Mr. Batiste suggested that it was the president's responsibility to determine what the major revenue-producing activities were and asked if that would not take care of the objection. Mr. Watrus disagreed.

The Chancellor said he had no problem with the statement about comparable opportunity but pointed out that ORS Chapter 204, Oregon Laws 1975, makes that explicit. Mr. Watrus argued that there have been questions about the implementation of that law ever since its passage.
Mr. Petersen commented that in numerous discussions of these matters he could not recall any member of the Board expressing any intent to diminish or retreat from the goals as originally established in Title IX. The proposed policy is an effort to strengthen the existing policy.

The Chancellor added that the Board must concur in the designations of major revenue-producing activities and he could not imagine the Board using that as a device to avoid the equality of opportunity requirement. He also said he did not consider the introduction of the word "estimated" to be a weakening of the statement, but rather a recognition that it is necessary to plan and make estimates but these estimates are not always achieved.

The Board approved the policy as recommended, with the inclusion of the wording added by the Chancellor and the change in the placement of paragraphs suggested by Mr. Batiste. These modifications have been included in the statement set forth in these minutes. The following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.

Mr. Harms expressed the Board's appreciation to the president, faculty, and staff at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center for the program presented during the visitation. He said it was stimulating, informative, and tiring but improved the Board's ability to make decisions regarding the institution.

**Amendments to Residency Rules**

**Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-9a)**

At a meeting on April 24, 1981, the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service, considered and recommended for the approval of the Board amendments to the Board's Rules on residence classification set forth below. A public hearing on the proposed rule changes was held May 25, 1981, with no response. However, action of the Board was deferred until proposals for further modifications in the Rules, requested by the Committee, could be reviewed.

The Board's staff recommended that the Board approve at its September meeting, the amendments which were the subject of the hearing May 25, so that these changes, which are intended to simplify and clarify the regulations, may be in effect.

**AMENDMENTS TO RESIDENCY RULES AS PROPOSED BY ADMISSIONS OFFICERS AND LEGAL COUNSEL**

1. **THE PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENTS PROPOSED IN ITEM 1 IS TO DEFINE RESIDENCY.**

   **OAR 580-10-030** is amended to read:

   (1) [A student's parent or legal guardian, or an emancipated student, shall be deemed to have an Oregon domicile if] Residence means a bona fide fixed and permanent physical presence established and maintained in Oregon, with no intention of changing residence to outside the state when the school period ends. Factors that will be considered in determining if an Oregon domicile has been established are: include abandonment of any prior out-of-state residence, rental or purchase of a home, presence of family, presence of household goods, length of time in state, nature and permanence of employment, sources of financial support, ownership of property, place of voting, and payment of Oregon personal income taxes.

   (2) The same criteria will be used to determine whether a resident who has moved has established a non-Oregon residence.
(3) If institutional records show that the [domicile] residence of a student's legal custodian, or of an emancipated student, is outside of Oregon, the student shall continue to be classified as nonresident until entitlement to resident classification is shown. The burden of proof will be upon the student to show that the classification should be changed.

(4) In determining the residence classification of any person, recognition is to be given to the principle that residence is not established by mere attendance at a college or university.

2. THE PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENTS PROPOSED IN ITEM 2 IS TO ACHIEVE CONSISTENCY OF TERMINOLOGY BY ELIMINATING USE OF THE TERM "DOMICILE."

OAR 580-10-015 is amended to read:

Nonresident Students

580-10-015 Except as modified by section 580-10-025(1) a nonresident student is defined as:

(1) An unemancipated student whose parent or legal guardian [is domiciled] resides outside of Oregon at the time of the student's registration; or

(2) An emancipated student who has not met the [domiciliary] residency requirements of section 580-10-025(4) at the time of registration. An emancipated student is one whose [domicile] residence is independent of that of parents or legal guardian, and who receives no financial support from parents or legal guardian.

OAR 580-10-025 is amended to read:

Changes in [Domicile] Residence

580-10-025 (1) A student enrolling as an entering freshman after graduating from an Oregon high school with not less than one year of regular attendance shall be considered a resident student. If the student transfers to an institution outside of Oregon and later seeks to enroll again in an Oregon Department institution, the residence classification shall be reexamined and determined on the same basis as for any other transfer student.

(2) A student whose nonresident legal custodian establishes an Oregon [domicile] residence during a school term shall be entitled to register as a resident student at the beginning of the next term.

(3) If an emancipated student establishes [domicile] residence outside of Oregon during the school year, the resident fee shall continue to be assessed until the beginning of the fall term of the next school year. Thereafter, the student shall be assessed the nonresident fee.

(4) An emancipated student who establishes an Oregon [domicile] residence as determined by rule 580-10-030 shall pay a nonresident fee unless:

(a) The student establishes Oregon [domicile] residence at least six months prior to the time of initial registration;

(b) The student does not attend an Oregon institution of higher education, either public or independent, including a community college, during any part of such six-month period. However,
an emancipated student who does not establish an Oregon [domicile] residence at least six months prior to initial registration at an Oregon institution, and who resides continuously in Oregon during twelve months, may be considered an Oregon resident for fee purposes if circumstances in the case meet the provisions of rule 580-10-030.

(5) Once established, residence is presumed until the student provides sufficient evidence to refute the presumption.

(6) An unemancipated resident student enrolled in a Department institution, who remains in this state after Oregon-domiciled resident parents or legal guardian move from the state, shall retain resident classification so long as attendance (except summer sessions) at an institution in Oregon is continuous.

3. THE PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENT PROPOSED IN ITEM 3 IS TO ASSIST THE ADMISSION OFFICERS IN DEALING WITH MILITARY PERSONNEL, OR THEIR PARENTS, WHO CLAIM THAT DESIGNATION OF OREGON AS THEIR HOME OF RECORD FOR THE REQUISITE TIME IS SUFFICIENT TO MAKE THEM RESIDENTS, EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE NOT IN OREGON.

OAR 580-10-035 is amended to read:

580-10-035 (1) A person in federal military service on a full-time basis is qualified for resident classification for fee purposes if that person is assigned to duty in this state, performs duties within the geographical limits of Oregon, and is residing within the state. Claiming Oregon as the person's residence of record for tax or other purposes is not the equivalent of residence in this state.

(2) An Oregon resident entering federal military service retains Oregon residence classification until the claim is voluntarily relinquished.

(3) An Oregon resident who has been in federal military service and assigned to duty outside of Oregon is required to return to Oregon within sixty days after completing federal military service to retain classification as an Oregon resident.

(4) A person who continues to reside in Oregon after separation from federal military service may count the time spent in the state while in federal military service to support a claim for classification as an Oregon resident.

4. THE PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENTS PROPOSED IN ITEM 4 IS TO ACHIEVE CONSISTENCY OF TERMINOLOGY AND TO FORCE STUDENTS TO APPLY FOR RESIDENCY STATUS PRIOR TO THE LAST DATE TO REGISTER.

OAR 580-10-020 is amended to read:

580-10-020 (1) All students who are classified as nonresidents shall pay a nonresident fee.

(2) An Oregon resident student whose classification is changed to that of nonresident during the school year shall pay the nonresident fee beginning the fall term of the next school year. The student is obligated to notify the institution of any change of [domicile] residence.

(3) Refunds of the nonresident fee may be granted if the student shows that the classification previously assigned was in error, but no such refund shall be made unless the student applies for residency status prior to the last day to register for the term in which the student seeks change of status.
5. THE PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT PROPOSED IN ITEM 5 IS TO ESTABLISH A CUT-OFF DATE FOR WICHE APPLICATIONS.

OAR 580-10-050 is amended to read:

580-10-050 (1) Students attending Oregon graduate or professional schools under terms of the WICHE Compact shall be considered residents for fee purposes.

(2) Under the WICHE Student Exchange Program, certification of students as Oregon residents for purposes of attending institutions not under Board control or in other states shall be guided by rules set forth in Division 10. In order to be considered for WICHE certification, the student's completed application must be received by the certifying officer on or before October 15 of the year preceding admission. An application received after that date in an envelope postmarked not later than October 15 will be deemed to have been received on the 15th.

(3) (a) Department institutions may enter into agreements with individual institutions in other states or other countries whereby resident students specified by name in the Oregon institutions may transfer to the other institution, and an equal number of students specified by name from the other institution may transfer to the Oregon institution with a reciprocal waiving of additional fees ordinarily assessed to nonresident students in both institutions.

(b) The recommendation for a student exchange program, together with a copy of the proposed agreement between the institutions, shall be approved by the Chancellor before the exchange program is undertaken. Further, the program recommendation and the proposed agreement between the institutions shall set forth the reasons why the exchange would be of particular benefit to the students in their chosen study programs.

(c) If an approved agreement provides for exchange of equal numbers of students, then unforeseen circumstances which later might cause a student to withdraw from the program shall not void the arrangements agreed upon by the two institutions.
Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Kahananui called attention to two places which had been overlooked in changing the terminology from domicile to residence. These have been corrected above.

Mr. Harms said he disagreed particularly with the philosophy expressed in paragraph (4)(b) but had been unable to suggest a better solution or better wording.

Mr. Wyss said he had difficulty in determining whether (4)(a) and (b) should have an "and" or an "or" between them. Mr. Harms said the rule is applied as though there was an "and" between the paragraphs and this was the reason he disagreed with it. He cited examples of the inequities which he said occurred as a result of the rule. Mr. Harms said he disliked the application of the rule that requires a person who has moved to Oregon for reasons other than attending an institution to choose one of two choices -- either stay out of school for six months or wait twelve months.

Mrs. Kahananui explained that there is a real problem unless all students are declared residents almost immediately. She said there are difficulties with the rule and the present request was intended to alleviate one difficulty by using "residence" in place of "domicile." The word "residence" is better defined and more acceptable, and the change should eliminate much of the discussion which occurs with the present term.

Mrs. Carpenter said at some time the Board should discuss the content, but not at the time these tools are needed by the admissions people. However, some of the things the admissions officers are required to determine should be examined because they are very awkward.

Mr. Weatherford commented that students would be able to provide a perspective on the residency rules.

Mr. Harms said reexamination should relate to the definitions, particularly as they apply to people who are either emancipated or adults.

The Chancellor said the Board should examine whether to rely wholly on the one-year requirement, keeping in mind that it would still be necessary to deal with emancipation, or to go to the six-month requirement irrespective of whether the individuals were enrolled in school. He said the one-year requirement should not present any financial problems but there would be some with the six-months' requirement.

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, and on roll call vote adopted the proposed amendments to the administrative rules on residency. The following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-10a)

The Department of Higher Education is required by statute (ORS 351.095) to obtain legislative approval for all acquisitions of data processing equipment. The procedure now accepted by the Emergency Board requires the Department to request approval for specific acquisitions for institutional computer facilities as they are required. Approval for acquisition of mini- and microcomputers and terminals with general funds is granted annually based on estimates of quantity and cost. This request is proposed in that format, i.e., specific acquisitions for institutional facilities and a 1981-1982 request for mini/microcomputers and terminals. A tabular summary of current equipment and plans for the biennium are included in Tables I and II. The specific acquisitions requested at this time for institutional facilities are noted with an R (Requested) in the fourth column of Table II and described in the staff report.
Approval was recommended of the specific major data processing equipment acquisitions and the 1981-1982 request for acquisition of mini/microcomputers and terminals.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Wyss recalled that there had been considerable concern among the institutions that they had to use the central computer capacity which was not on the campus. Much of this has been decentralized and Mr. Wyss asked if there is unused capacity available and how much was it costing for the added convenience of having the unused capacity.

Dr. Krueger indicated that cost savings have made it possible to proceed with acquisitions, but pointed out that the workload is increasing in any event. The financial management system application workload increases and the budget personnel system were cited. Dr. Krueger indicated that there will be some capacity available on the machines inevitably. He said that the utilization of the capacity is in the range of 65-75 percent, but it is necessary to have equipment to handle peak loads, which generally come at the end of the year.

Mrs. Carpenter said she was impressed with the fact that the administrative flexibility for the individual institutions was at last being incorporated because the application for management and budget seems to be so important. The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-11a)

In July 1980, the Board received a report on the current status of academic and administrative computing activities in the Department. Among the ongoing activities which were noted for a future report was the development of a 1981-1987 plan for administrative data processing. This plan has been completed and approved by all campuses and is summarized in the staff report. The complete plan entitled, "1981-1987 Information Systems Plan," and its attachments have been separately bound and distributed. A copy is on file in the Board's Office.

The Board's staff recommended acceptance of the plan in concept. It is likely that implementation will require continued Board involvement. This will include review and approval of legislative requests and future annual plans. It is anticipated that following discussion at this meeting several new IMD's will be proposed to the Board for future action to clarify this involvement.

Board Discussion and Action

Dr. Krueger reported that there had been a transition in management at the Data Services Center with the retirement of Mr. Robert Wood. He introduced his replacement, Mr. Kellye Wise.

Dr. Krueger said the planning effort has been under way since mid-1980 through the excellent efforts of the task force. The planning has been approved by the Computer Policy Council and through that process by the institutions. Dr. Krueger emphasized the importance of good planning and indicated that the plan before the Board was a consensus of specific concerns voiced by users about data processing support. However, no central computing facility ever provides services to satisfy totally all the users. The challenge is to make a decision-making and implementation structure in which the overall service responsibilities are defined as well as possible and agreed upon goals are achieved, keeping in mind throughout the process that the more central the facility is the broader the range of services provided and, therefore, the more complex the structure.
Dr. Krueger stated that a basic premise in this effort had been that decision-making responsibility and authority should be shared by the Board's staff and the institutional executives and their staffs. A second premise for the planning activity was that the institutions and centralized activities should share resources, personnel, equipment, and computer applications. Dr. Krueger then referred to specific elements in the material provided to the Board. It was indicated that an implementation plan would follow but the specific time frame has not yet been established.

Mr. Wyss asked how it is possible to develop a useful plan six years in advance in an area that is changing so rapidly. Dr. Krueger replied that it is not possible to be as precise as one might wish because the technology is changing. The fact that it takes as long as it does to develop machinery applications requires the best possible projections relative to the equipment requirements.

Dr. Krueger said his basic concern in forecasting relative to the technology was the fact that the equipment placed on the campuses may be more expensive than if it were centralized. On the other hand, the advantage of having equipment on a campus provides for improved responsiveness which, at least to date, is not possible totally with a central facility.

Mr. Wyss asked whether the software now in place would be transferrable to future needs as equipment and applications change. Dr. Krueger responded that most of the software now in use is very antiquated and part of the planning activity is to set up a life-cycle planning concept for the software so that its application will be reviewed periodically. Dr. Krueger said the budget balance between personnel and equipment probably will remain about the same but he hoped to see an increasing tendency to buy software rather than build it internally. This would involve some compromises by the users because they might not get every capability they wanted in the software. It was also indicated in response to questions that there is an exchange of information.

The Board approved a motion to place the 1981-1987 information systems plan on the consent calendar for the next meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-12a)

Oregon State University officials have proposed that the research vessel CAYUSE, which is now being leased to the State of California and is being operated by San Jose State University out of the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories as part of the national oceanographic research fleet, be sold to the lessee at the fair market value of $225,000 determined from an independent appraisal of Lally, Hubenette, Jessie, Fay & Associates, Marine Surveyors. The proceeds would be applied to purchase other capital improvements with which to promote the School of Oceanography's access to sponsored research funding.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to obtain the necessary approvals of jurisdictional agencies so that the research vessel CAYUSE can be sold or title to it can be transferred to the State of California upon payment of $225,000.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hunderup reviewed recent developments which had delayed the sale temporarily but were expected to be resolved shortly.

The Board approved a motion to place the proposed sale on the consent calendar for the next meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.
Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-81-13a)

The Board's staff recommended that the Board adopt admissions requirements for resident and nonresident freshmen and undergraduate transfer students for 1982-83 (as presented in Appendix A) which incorporate the discretionary authorization granted by the Board October 26, 1979, to raise the minimum grade point average for entering freshmen by a quarter of a point and, in separate instances, additional increases beyond the previous authorization.

The Board's staff further recommended that the Board authorize the Chancellor to approve an increase of a quarter point (from 2.00 to 2.25) in admission requirements for resident transfer students at the three universities, should studies now underway at these institutions indicate this increase is desirable.

The recommendations in the basic admissions requirements for freshmen and transfer students being made at this time, by institution, are summarized below.

**UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY**

- **Freshmen admission:** increase from 2.50 to 2.75 high school gpa for resident students; no change for nonresident students.

- **Transfer admission:** increase from 2.00 to 2.25 college gpa for nonresident transfer students with a minimum of 15 hours; no change for resident students.

**PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY**

- **Freshmen admission:** increase from 2.25 to 2.50 high school gpa for resident students; no change for nonresident students.

- **Transfer admission:** increase from 2.00 to 2.25 college gpa for nonresident transfer students with a minimum of 24 hours (formerly 15 hours); 2.00 in 15 hours (formerly 12 hours) for resident transfer students.

**EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE**

- **Freshmen admission:** increase from 2.00 to 2.50 high school gpa for resident students (except those residing in a county in EOSC's service region not in a community college or area education district, for whom a 2.00 will be retained); increase from 2.50 to 2.75 for nonresident students.

- **Transfer admission:** increase from 2.00 to 2.25 college gpa for nonresident transfer students, no change for resident transfer students.

**SOUTHERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE**

- **Freshmen admission:** increase from 2.25 to 2.50 high school gpa for resident students; no change for nonresident students; and add a requirement that resident and nonresident students new from high school have a minimum score of 30 on the Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English test, or agree to take Writing 40 (remedial writing) as a first term freshman at SOSC at an extra fee.
WESTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Freshmen admission: increase from 2.25 to 2.50 high school GPA for resident students; no change for nonresident students.

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Freshmen admission: increase from 2.00 to 2.25 high school GPA for resident and nonresident students.

Alternatives to the minimum GPA requirements (test scores, predictive formulas, and summer term work) have been adjusted as well. A complete statement of the recommended requirements appears as Appendix A. A summary chart comparing the requirements for all the institutions appears as Appendix B.

Board Discussion and Action

In presenting the report, Mrs. Kahananui stated it might be possible to bring information with respect to the transfer students to the Board at the October meeting. She reviewed the potential impact of the proposed admissions requirements and said that the institutions and the Board's Office did not recommend increasing the floor of freshman admissions requirements more than the amount proposed in the requirements.

There was some discussion of continuing the discretionary authority granted to the institutions last year to increase the admissions requirements up to a quarter of a grade point. It was stated that this authority was not continued in the proposed requirements, and the opinion was expressed that it should not be because of the interrelationships between requirements, enrollment, and the financial situation.

Mr. Robert Watrus questioned whether the increase in admission standards would provide the State System of Higher Education with more qualified enrollees or improve the retention rate. He cited studies which indicated otherwise. He said this may be the easiest way to respond to the directive to institute tighter controls but might not be the best nor the fairest and most equitable way of dealing with the limited resources.

Mr. Watrus urged the Board to reexamine the issue, and Mr. Wyss pointed out that admissions had been discussed extensively by both the Board and the Instruction Committee.

Mrs. Carpenter recalled that the information received in the previous discussions had indicated that it did not raise quality necessarily when admissions standards were raised. Mrs. Kahananui said this was correct and the proposed increases were being recommended because it was necessary to restrict admissions.

Mr. Wyss said there is no continuum that students with one-quarter to one-eighth grade-point increases have greater capacity for college work but there certainly is an indication that students entering with high grade-point averages do better than those with low ones.

Mrs. Kahananui commented that within the range of 2.5-3.0 there was not much difference in the success of students at any particular level and more students succeeded than not. The breaking point is really at the 3.0 level.

The Board directed that this item be placed on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting, with the following voting in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.
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Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendations of officials of Oregon State University, arrangements were made with Stastny/Graham Architects, Portland, through a supplement to the agreement of March 9, 1981, to provide for the additional professional services of the Architects, and their consultants, in connection with the Construction Documents, Bidding, and Construction Phases for the proposed renovation of the Washington Way Tennis Courts on the campus in Corvallis. The project was authorized, with an expenditure limitation of $550,000, as part of the Board's capital construction program for 1981-1983.

Compensation for the professional services of the Architects and for reimbursement of expenses, including the charges of consultants, for this additional work will be based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $30,781.

The planning funds for this work are being provided from resources available for auxiliary enterprises.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Autzen Stadium Improvements (Stadium Club), UO

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of the University of Oregon, the construction documents which Architects Mention.Hanns.Associates, Eugene, prepared for the proposed Autzen Stadium Improvements under arrangements with the University of Oregon Foundation were accepted on behalf of the Board and bids were solicited for the project on July 30, 1981. The quotations received from ten contractors ranged from a low of $500,227 to a high of $601,260, adjusted to include two additive alternates which were exercised.

Following execution of a gift agreement with the Foundation which outlined the financial program and itemized the donations of materials and services which had been pledged in addition to cash contributions for the project, a contract award was made to the lowest bidder and the following tentative budget was approved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildish Construction Co., Eugene</td>
<td>$500,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees (for bidding and construction phases only)</td>
<td>10,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art</td>
<td>5,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>14,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>25,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$575,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described to the Board on March 27, 1981, the work is to include the construction of multi-purpose meeting room facilities at the east end of Autzen Stadium with flexible seating space for approximately 182 persons for conferences, meals, coaching instruction, viewing of stadium events, etc. A catering kitchen, storage areas and restrooms will be included also. The structure will be elevated on concrete walls above existing ramps with access by stairs and an elevator. It is expected to contain a gross area of approximately 6,160 square feet.
The project is to be financed exclusively from gifts. Pending the receipt of payment of some of the amounts pledged for the work, the Foundation has provided certificates of deposit with Oregon banks and has assigned these certificates to the Board. The indicated budget total of $575,000 is somewhat lower than the expenditure limitation of $660,000 previously authorized by the Board and by the 1981 Oregon Legislature.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT

Project - UO Autzen Stadium Improvements (Stadium Club)


Board's priority - No. 23 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total project costs
(exclusive of estimate of $90,866 for materials and services provided in kind from individual donors or through direct purchases by the University of Oregon Foundation, and exclusive also of design fees paid directly by the Foundation) $575,000

Estimated direct construction costs (exclusive of gifts in kind) $500,227

Estimated gross area - 6,160 square feet

Scheduled completion - February 1982

Financing plan:
Gifts through the University of Oregon Foundation $575,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted 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 Danielson Driscoll Hess, Architects, Eugene, for the new canoe house on the Mill Race were accepted on behalf of the Board. Four bids were received for the work on June 30, 1981, ranging from a low of $32,325 to a high of $46,272. Inasmuch as the resources were available for the work, and appropriate expenditure authorization was granted by the Emergency Board on August 21, 1981, a contract award was made to the low bidder and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

| Direct construction costs: Coefficient Construction, Eugene | $32,325 |
| Professional services fees | 3,000 |
| Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs | 1,332 |
| Contingencies | 1,293 |
| Total | $37,950 |

The work of the contract includes site preparation and the erection of a new canoe house on a site across (south) and downstream about one block west of the present location of the canoe facility. The new structure will be located near the bridge entrance to the Physical Plant offices and warehouse area. A portion of the site is being paved with asphaltic concrete, some of which is being covered with indoor/outdoor carpeting. The building measures approximately 24' x 47', containing approximately 1,116 square feet, and
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Report of Appointment of Engineers for Performance Analysis of Food Tray Transport/Cooling System, University Hospital South, UOHSC

provides a storage area for rental canoes and kayaks, a storeroom, an office and a restroom. The wood-framed structure will be finished inside and out with plywood. The office, storeroom and rest room will have concrete floor slabs and the main storage area will have a floor of asphaltic concrete covered with indoor/outdoor carpeting. The pitched roof, with gable ends, will be finished with composition shingles. The Mill Race is being enlarged immediately in front of the building with the south boundary bulkheaded to create a landing.

This work is part of the Student Union Facilities Rehabilitation project for which an expenditure limitation of $205,000 was authorized within Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979. It is being financed exclusively from auxiliary enterprise resources such as Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - UO Student Union Facilities Rehabilitation (Canoe House)

Architects - Danielson Driscoll Hess, Eugene

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) $37,950

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $32,325

Scheduled completion - December 1981

Tentative financing plan:

Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $37,950

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of Assistant Attorney General Leslie Hampton, and upon the request of officials of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, arrangements have been made with Process Engineering, Inc., Tigard, to perform an independent test of the temperature rise and recovery to desired temperature of various foods in the prepared food distribution system located within University Hospital South, and in calculating from the data derived a close approximation of the functional capacity of the refrigerated units installed under a recent construction contract with Furber Construction Company compared with the manufacturer's rated data.

Mr. Hampton is assisting the Board with a complaint which has been filed with the Circuit Court in Multnomah County in relation to faulty refrigeration equipment installed as part of the work for Food Service Alterations within University Hospitals North and South.

Compensation for the professional services of the Engineers and for reimbursement of expenses for this work is based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $3,200 financed from resources available to the institution.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Based upon the recommendations of officials of Portland State University, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 580-50-020, arrangements were made with Sheldon, Eggleston, Reddick Associates, P.C., Architects, Portland, for professional services relating to the programming, research analysis, feasibility studies and general planning of the proposed Student Housing Rehabilitation project on the campus in Portland. The Architects shall be assisted in this assignment by Carson, Bekooy, Gulick & Associates, Inc., mechanical engineers; James D. Graham & Associates, Inc., electrical engineers; Dennis Associates Construction Consultants, Inc., cost estimators; and perhaps also a specialist for work relating to accessibility for the handicapped. Authorization for this rehabilitation work was included in the Board's capital construction program approved by the 1981 Legislature.

Compensation for the professional services of the Architects and for reimbursement of direct expenses for this work, including the charges of consultants, is to be based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $49,300.

In accordance with Board authorization on May 29, 1981, funds required for the initial planning are being advanced from excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

The following report was presented pursuant to IMD 2.001 (2), which provides: "The Board's Office shall submit a report to the Board each year regarding courses added, deleted, or significantly altered with comments on the budgetary implications of these changes on institutions, programs, employes, and students affected by these changes."

No action on the report was required.

As shown in Table I, on the following page, the Board's Office approved a net increase of 923.8 credit hours of course work for seven State System institutions effective 1981-82. This is somewhat higher than the net increase of 879.1 credit hours, effective 1980-81, for eight institutions. (Western Oregon State College has been presenting its curricular change requests in an alternate year basis and is not included in the 1981-82 figures.)

The net increase in credit hours does not reflect any substantial increase in new programs or academic majors in the institutions. Rather, three goals seem to be achieved through these recent curricular changes:

1. Improvement of already approved curricular programs through addition of courses designed to strengthen majors.

2. Continued transition of course work developed under seminar, experimental, or topics numbers into specific courses with individual course numbers and titles.

3. Continued utilization of current faculty to keep curricula up-to-date without significant increase in FTE.
TABLE I

SUMMARY OF COURSE CHANGES APPROVED FOR 1981-82
EXPRESSED IN CREDIT HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>OSC</th>
<th>ESC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Courses Added</td>
<td>451.5</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1,316.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Courses Changed</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>235.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Dropped</td>
<td>-186.0</td>
<td>-185</td>
<td>-96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
<td>-627.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Change</td>
<td>302.0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>923.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II, below, summarizes course changes in State System institutions, effective 1972-73 through 1981-82. The ten-year view suggests that current curricular activity is commensurate with that of previous years. The 6,350.6 credit hours added over this period, an increase of 15.6%, is remarkably consistent with the marginal rise in State System enrollment past from 57,133 fall term 1972-73 to a projected enrollment of 65,293 for fall term 1981, an increase of 14.2%.

TABLE II

NET ADDITIONAL CREDIT HOURS APPROVED
FOR THE INSTITUTIONS FOR YEARS 1972-73 THROUGH 1981-82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>OSC</th>
<th>ESC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-11.5</td>
<td>322.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>813.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>530.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-221</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>141.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>270.5</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>926.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>196.5</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>566.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>836.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>409.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>879.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>302.0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>925.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for 10 years</td>
<td>1,501.0</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>192.6</td>
<td>6,350.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per year</td>
<td>150.1</td>
<td>125.2</td>
<td>128.4</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>635.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Changes by Institution
Effective 1981-82

University of Oregon

The University of Oregon added 451.5 credit hours of new courses while dropping 186 credit hours. Numerous changes in existing courses resulted in a net increase of 36.5 credit hours. Total net increase for the institution was 302 credit hours. This is the largest increase in credit registered by the University of Oregon during the 10-year period reported in Table II and reflects efforts of schools and departments throughout the institution to make their catalog listings reflective of the instruction being offered.
A large part of the increase (73 credit hours), for example, is the result of the biology department providing numbers and descriptions for courses previous listed under "selected topics." The change of several 3-credit-hour mathematics courses to 4 credits, a move to accurately reflect the student and faculty effort involved, resulted in a net increase of 33 credit hours. In contrast, curricular changes in the classics, philosophy, and Russian departments, and in the College of Education resulted in a negative net total of 43 credit hours.

Over all, the College of Arts and Sciences reported a net increase of 238 credit hours. The School of Architecture and the colleges of Health, Physical Education and Recreation and Business Administration account for the larger percentage (68 credit hours) of the remaining increase.

Oregon State University

Oregon State University added 338 credit hours of new courses, dropped 185 credit hours, and changed old courses for a net addition of 89 credit hours. The College of Liberal Arts reported an increase of 157 credit hours, 24 hours of which are for internships in anthropology and history. Net additions of 126 credit hours reflect major revisions within the art and speech communications departments. The art department underwent extensive curricular revision effective 1979-80, consolidating a number of courses for a decrease in catalog listed hours of 107. The revision has created student advising, scheduling, and transcripting problems which are being corrected by restoration of some of the course identification deleted at that time. The College of Science has reorganized its rapidly growing graduate program in computer science for an increase of 34 credit hours. The School of Pharmacy, in response to recommendations from its national accrediting agency, the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education, has made several course changes resulting in 10 credit hours of new courses, 2 credit hours through changes in courses, and a decrease of 44 credit hours from courses dropped. For the most part, the courses dropped are ones which have not been taught during the past five years.

Portland State University

Portland State University added 78 credit hours of new courses. Changes in old courses resulted in a net addition of 22 credit hours. A total of 96 credit hours were dropped, giving Portland State University a total net increase of 4 credit hours. A majority of the credit hour activity involved the conversion of omnibus course number to discrete numbers within the various departments.

Western Oregon State College

Western Oregon State College has not requested any permanent curricular changes for 1981-82. The Chancellor's Office has approved a number of temporary changes, most of which are expected to be included in a request for permanent change effective 1982-83.

Southern Oregon State College

Southern Oregon State College added 131 credit hours of new courses, course changes resulted in a net increase of 78 credit hours, and 97 credit hours were dropped, leaving a net increase of 112 credit hours for 1981-82. Almost all of the net increase is accounted for by providing individual catalog and registration identification for 90 credit hours of instruction in art to offer students an opportunity to continue individual study in various art media, and have this study identified on their transcripts. Separate identification of these studies will not materially increase the cost of instruction. Criminology has added 21 credit hours which are the result of converting instruction offered under open-ended courses to specific courses.
Eastern Oregon State College

Eastern Oregon State College added 157 credit hours of new courses with changes in old courses resulting in an additional 3 credit hours. Twenty-two credit hours were deleted from the curriculum. Forty-four of the 157 new credit hours represent courses being offered in Eastern Oregon's satellite ROTC program. The 22 credit hours dropped represent the institutional honors program, which was discontinued several years ago.

Oregon Institute of Technology

Oregon Institute of Technology added 140 credit hours, course changes resulted in one (1) additional credit hour, and 24 credit hours were dropped, netting a total increase of 117 credit hours. The Division of Allied Health added 75 new credit hours to its curricula. The bulk of these courses will comprise the new upper-division curriculum in nursing inaugurated in 1980-81. The divisions of arts and science and engineering technology added 27 and 24 new credit hours respectively.

Oregon Health Sciences University

Oregon Health Sciences University added courses totaling 20.5 credit hours, course changes resulted in an increase of 5.8 credit hours, and 17.5 credit hours were dropped, netting an total increase of 8.8 credit hours. Largest increment of new course work was 12 credit hours to provide opportunity for graduate students in the School of Denistry to complete studies in physiology most useful to their individual areas of specialization.

Budgetary Implications of Course Changes for 1981-82 for Institutions, Programs, Employes, and Students Affected by the Changes

Courses approved for 1981-82 have:

1. been evaluated for financial impact on institutions and approved as consistent with efforts to contain expenditures and maximize use of existing institutional budgets;
2. been reviewed and approved as significant to the instructional missions of the institutions.

Curricular additions, changes, and deletions are the result of critical review by academic departments, faculty committees, administrative officials, and the Board's Office.

An academic department need not, and does not, offer every term or even every year every course it is authorized. It plans its term-by-term schedule of courses so as to provide its students with the necessary educational services within the limits of the budgetary and other resources available to the department.

The entire curricular process is intended to serve students. Revised, up-to-date curricular offerings, utilizing the instructional resources of the departments in an effective manner, give the student and the state the best possible value for the educational dollars spent.

With the approval of curricular changes for 1981-82, faculty of instructional departments will be able to put into effect curricular changes which originated as proposals at the departmental level some 12-18 months earlier.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Mr. Wyss suggested that the Board might want to investigate more closely the matter of course changes to understand the incentives for adding new courses and the effect on tuition, state funding, and more staff positions.
Meeting #479

September 11, 1981

It was agreed that a staff report would be presented at the next meeting which would give information about the process.

Staff Reports

The staff reports provided to the Board for the September meeting (Items 9-81-1b through 9-81-13b) are on file in the Board's Office and will be bound with the permanent minutes as pages 537 to 555.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 P.M. on September 11, 1981.

Edward C. Harms, Jr. President
Oregon State Board of Higher Education

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

Admission Requirements, 1982-83

The Board's Office recommended the following admissions requirements for 1982-83.

Oregon Resident Freshmen Admissions Requirements

Resident students must:

1. Have been graduated from a standard or accredited high school and
2. Meet institutional requirements as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

a. Meet one of the following:

(1) Have a 2.75 high school grade point average or above in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; or

(2) 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

(3) 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

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

b. Score a minimum of 30 on the Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English Usage Test. (Does not apply to options (3) and (4) above.)

---

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.
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.50 grade point average or above, in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; or

b. Have a minimum combined score of 890 SAT or 20 ACT; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours (English composition, literature, social science, science) taken during the summer term at Portland State University; 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.

EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a minimum grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation of:

   (1) 2.00 if high school is in Baker (non-community college portion), Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Wallowa, Wheeler or Union counties and

   (2) 2.50 if high school is in any other county; or

b. Have a minimum combined score of 890 SAT or 20 ACT, or 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 9 term hours (two or more courses in the sciences, humanities or social sciences) taken in a regular collegiate summer school; or

d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

SOUTHERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

a. Meet one of the following:

   (1) Have a 2.50 grade point average or above, in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; or

   (2) Have a minimum combined score of 890 SAT or 20 ACT or 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
(3) Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 9 term hours in a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer school; or

(4) Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level course work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

b. Score a minimum of 30 on the Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English Usage Test or, if scoring below the minimum, agree to enroll in Writing-40 (remedial writing) first term at SOSC at an extra fee. (Does not apply to options (3) and (4) above.)

WESTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.50 grade point average or above, in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; 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 on 9 term hours (English composition and two or more courses in humanities, social science, natural sciences or mathematics) taken during the summer term at WOSC; or

d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.25 grade point average or above, in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; or

b. Have a minimum combined score of 890 SAT or 20 ACT; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 9 term hours of prescribed coursework taken during a summer term at OIT or another State System college or university; or

d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours (or 2.25 block transfer) in college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.
Nonresident Freshmen Admissions Requirements

Nonresident students must:

1. Have been graduated from an accredited high school\(^1\) and

2. Meet institutional requirements as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

a. Meet one of the following:

   (1) Have a 2.75 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; or

   (2) Have a 2.25 high school 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

   (3) 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

   (4) Have a minimum grade point average of 2.25 in 15 term hours of college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

b. Score a minimum of 30 on the Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English Usage Test. (Does not apply to options (3) or (4) above.)

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.75 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; or

b. Have a 2.25 high school 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) or 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 term at Portland State University; or

   d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.25 in 24 term hours of college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

\(^1\) See Footnote page 1.
EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.75 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; or

b. Have a minimum 2.25 grade point average combined with a satisfactory combined score of 890 SAT or 20 ACT; or

c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 9 term hours in a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer term.

d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.25 in 12 term hours of college-level course work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

SOUTHERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

a. Meet one of the following:

(1) Have a 2.50 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; or

(2) Have a 2.25 high school grade point average or above and a predicted first term GPA (based on a combined measure of high school grade point average and scholastic aptitude test score) of 2.10 or above; or

(3) Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 9 term hours in a prescribed program in a regular collegiate summer term.

(4) Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level course work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

b. Score a minimum of 30 on the Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English Usage Test or, if scoring below the minimum, agree to enroll in Writing-40 (remedial writing) first term at SOSC at an extra fee. (Does not apply to options (3) and (4) above.)

WESTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.50 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; 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 2.10 or above; or
c. Have a grade point average of 2.00 for 9 term hours (English composition and two or more courses in humanities, social science, natural sciences or mathematics) taken during the summer term at WOSC; or
d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours of college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Meet one of the following:

a. Have a 2.25 grade point average in all high school subjects taken towards graduation; or
b. Have a minimum combined score of 890 SAT or 20 ACT; or
c. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 9 term hours of prescribed coursework taken during the summer term at OIT or another State System college or university; or
d. Have a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in 12 term hours (or 2.25 block transfer) in college-level work taken in an accredited collegiate institution.

Summer Term Admissions Requirements

There are no summer term admissions requirements for resident or nonresident students.

Admissions by Exception (5% Policy)

Institutions are authorized to admit a quota of freshmen totaling no more than 5% of the institution's previous year's freshman class as exceptions to the stated admissions requirements.

The institutions shall maintain records of the characteristics and achievement of students admitted under the 5% policy for review by the Board's Office and periodic report to the Board.
## ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS, 1982-83

**(Proposed to the Board September 11, 1981)**

**(Draft – August 18, 1981)**

### Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Basic Minimum HSGPA</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00 (regional non-cc counties)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Testing Alternative</td>
<td>2.00 predicted GPA</td>
<td>2.00 predicted GPA</td>
<td>890 SAT or 20 ACT</td>
<td>890 SAT or 20 ACT or 2.00 predicted GPA</td>
<td>2.00 predicted GPA</td>
<td>890 SAT or 20 ACT</td>
<td>2.00 predicted GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Summer Term Alternative</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 9 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 9 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 9 hours prescribed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Transfer Alternative</td>
<td>2.00 in 15 hours</td>
<td>2.00 in 15 hours</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Additional*</td>
<td>30 TSWE or 12 ACT-English</td>
<td>30 TSWE or 12 ACT-English</td>
<td>30 TSWE or 12 ACT-English or enroll in Writing 40 at extra fee</td>
<td>30 TSWE or 12 ACT-English or enroll in Writing 40 at extra fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Basic Minimum HSGPA</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Testing Alternative</td>
<td>2.25 HSGPA and 2.10 predicted GPA</td>
<td>2.25 HSGPA and 2.10 predicted GPA</td>
<td>2.25 HSGPA and 2.10 predicted GPA</td>
<td>2.25 HSGPA and 2.10 predicted GPA</td>
<td>2.10 predicted GPA</td>
<td>890 SAT or 20 ACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Summer Term Alternative</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 9 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 9 hours prescribed</td>
<td>2.00 in 9 hours prescribed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Transfer Alternative</td>
<td>2.25 in 15 hours</td>
<td>2.25 in 15 hours</td>
<td>2.25 in 12 hours</td>
<td>2.25 in 12 hours</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours</td>
<td>2.00 in 12 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Additional*</td>
<td>30 TSWE or 12 ACT-English</td>
<td>30 TSWE or 12 ACT-English</td>
<td>30 TSWE or 12 ACT-English or enroll in Writing 40 at extra fee</td>
<td>30 TSWE or 12 ACT-English or enroll in Writing 40 at extra fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not apply options 3 or 4 above.
As noted in a report to the Board on January 23, 1981, arrangements were made with Boutwell, Gordon, Beard and Grimes, Architects, Portland, for professional services relating to the predesign and schematic design phase of planning for the proposed University Hospital South Addition and Alterations project at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center on a time and materials basis not to exceed $250,000. Authorization for this planning had been included within the Board's capital construction program approved by the 1979 Legislature. It was indicated that the architects would be assisted in this assignment by The NBBJ Group, including Naramore, Bain, Brady and Johansen (medical planning and design consultants), Seattle; Moffatt, Nichol and Bonney, Inc. (structural engineering consultants); Carson, Bekooy, Gulick & Associates, Inc. (mechanical engineering consultants); and Peterson Associates Engineers, Inc. (electrical engineering consultants).

Following a refinement of the architectural program statement which institutional officials had prepared for the project in advance of the involvement of outside planning specialists, and as the architects and their consultants proceeded with the schematic design phase of planning, it became evident that an adjustment in the estimated total cost would be required. Consequently, on May 29, 1981, the Board authorized the staff to request a revised expenditure limitation of $21,840,000 for the work as part of the capital construction program for auxiliary enterprises being reviewed at that time by the 1981 Legislature. This request was endorsed by the Executive Department and appropriate authorization was included within Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981, with the understanding that all of the planning, construction and equipment costs would be financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution, with debt service to be provided from patient fees and other revenues available to the hospitals and clinics.

The architects' schematic design report contains a section on Space Plan which describes the proposed space utilization process; a section on Building Design which includes a narrative specification on building systems as well as a preliminary code review summary and several drawings and photographs of a scaled study model describing the project; an estimate of probable direct construction costs for each of the major components; and a projected time schedule for the planning, construction and completion of the work. These materials are summarized in the following paragraphs.

**Space Plan**

By way of introduction, reference is made to the design recommendations which were prepared by the facilities planning staff of the institution, noting that the long-range plan of University Hospital is to consolidate acute care services in the South Hospital, using the older sections of the North Hospital (the former Multnomah Hospital) to house administrative and support services and diagnostic laboratories. In keeping with this plan, and to solve immediate problems of space, amenities and operational efficiency, it is proposed that a 5-story addition to the C-Wing of the South Hospital be completed and that related remodeling be undertaken in the A and B Wings. Under the direction of a steering committee chaired by Dr. Donald G. Kassebaum, Vice President for Hospital Affairs and Director of the University Hospitals, several program planning committees were formed—one for each of the new floors, one for the proposed helipad, and one for other support programs. Each of these committees included medical staff physicians, nurses, ancillary service representatives, and personnel from the hospital administration, fiscal services and facilities management and planning. The efforts of these groups culminated in the preparation of the comprehensive architectural program statement, mentioned above, which assigned highest priority to the improvement of direct patient care services and also identified other objectives expected to be accomplished within the project, such as necessary support activities, including educational support and clinical research.
In February 1981, the architects and their consultants completed their analysis of the "paper program" and of the building systems and then submitted a summary "Pre-Design Report" to the staff of the institution for review and consideration. Following the approval of this report, the architects proceeded with the schematic design phase of planning, developing in preliminary detail the various departments' space requirements and functional disposition proposed for the project as well as the structural, mechanical, and electrical systems needed to accommodate the proposed addition and alterations.

As reflected in the materials filed with the Board's Office of Facilities Planning in mid-August, the schematic design anticipates that the additional area to be constructed on the 10th floor would be utilized by the Department of Ophthalmology, enabling the eye clinics to increase the total number of examination rooms, provide new special procedure rooms, add an ophthalmic surgery suite, increase the photographer's suite and consolidate administrative services of that department. Two parallel circulation corridors would be provided—one for the public and the other for the hospital staff. Patient admitting, waiting, examination and billing functions would be located along the public corridor to the north of the floor, with the more internal functions of surgery, photography and staff offices paralleling the south (staff) corridor. The spaces assigned to administrative functions and the dispensing optician would be centralized in the existing area, which would be remodeled as required. This work would be coordinated with other alterations proposed for the Department of Ophthalmology in the total amount of $1,245,000 under separate legislative authorization for various Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects.

On the proposed 11th floor of the C-Wing, all radiology activities (other than those in certain areas of University Hospital North, such as the Emergency Room) would be consolidated, thus relocating these activities from the third floor of the Outpatient Clinic Building to become an integral part of the radiology facilities on this floor of the South Hospital. The addition would provide an opportunity to develop a central staff corridor with procedure rooms on either side. Staff office space would be provided at the end of this wing, allowing a separation of patient and staff/service circulation. The staff core would be developed around the light view area with process rooms adjacent for easy film delivery and checking. Consultation rooms would be situated at each end of the core and would be entered by students from the patient corridor. The procedure rooms would be positioned so that those that are most used would be placed nearest to the patient entrance. The storage area for film files would be placed centrally to the department for physician access on viewing and film delivery. The C-Wing area would be intended primarily for inpatient use, and the existing B-Wing procedure rooms would be designated chiefly for outpatient flow. An additional control desk would be added for supervision and for assistance to waiting patients, and the A-Wing space would be modified to provide more offices and group pediatric procedure rooms and support areas.

The basic concept proposed for the 12th floor would bring together all of the inpatient obstetric care and neonatal nursing: Labor and Delivery, Medium Risk Nursery and Post Partum Care from the North Hospital; and Neonatal Intensive Care from the South Hospital. This would enhance the family-centered care concept and would increase the efficiency of the individual units. In developing the floor as the Perinatal Services Center, necessary public services would be provided, such as a family waiting room with information center, adequately-sized public toilets and a smoking lounge. All of these areas would be located along the main circulation route linking the three departments and the elevators. (The present medicine nursing ward would be relocated to the new 14th floor, as described in a later paragraph.)

The schematic design for the new 13th floor, identified for Pediatrics, would provide several rooms large enough to accommodate two standard hospital beds, each of which could function either as a semi-private or
live-in room. Three additional rooms the size of private rooms would be provided for live-in parents, and four slightly larger ones would be provided as isolation rooms. The main entrance to the unit would be from the south corridor, with the north corridor used for exiting and patient traffic only. One of the design goals was to open up as much of the central core as possible. For this reason, the nurses' station would be combined with charting and would be located opposite the infant play area. The play area would be surrounded by a low rail, which, while protecting the area from through traffic, would contribute to the "open" feeling of the core. A central service area for staff and public support would be created immediately accessible from the C-Wing elevator lobby and the main circulation route connecting the three wings. The public toilet rooms and family waiting areas would be located the three wings. The Child Life Therapy Room, Social Services Office, Nursing Clinical Administration Office and the Play Coordinator's Office, a conference room and a storage room would be located off a small lobby in this same central area.

The proposed 14th floor would accommodate the Medicine nursing ward of 24 beds which would be displaced by the reassignment of 12A to postpartum care. In addition, space for the Bronchoscopy lab and the Gastrointestinal lab, associated with Medicine activities, would be provided on this level. A loop corridor configuration with patient rooms outboard and service/support care inboard (a design characteristic dictated by building on top of the existing C-Wing) would include 12 private and 6 semi-private bedrooms.

A helipad would be provided on the roof of the addition.

Other major areas of the South Hospital which are expected to be remodeled in this project include portions of the 8th and 9th floors for Admitting. Currently, this function is divided between the North and South units, but would be consolidated into the South Hospital in this work. The primary procedure would take place on 9B at the main patient entrance, where Admitting would share use of both the main reception and lobby areas. Patient service, interview, and cashier areas would be located centrally for access by incoming and outgoing patients; while admitting management, census management, and financial counseling work stations would be located at the perimeter. A secondary admitting area would be developed on 8B with a new entrance and ambulance parking area, clearly separating the ambulatory and non-ambulatory admitting traffic.

To meet contemporary expectations, many of the public showers and bath rooms constructed in the original building circa 1956 would be upgraded and converted into private restroom facilities.

Building Design

The proposed addition would contain approximately 69,553 square feet of new area, including about 10,501 square feet on the 10th floor, 13,915 square feet on each of floors 11 through 14, and a mechanical penthouse of 3,392 square feet. It would consist of 2 1/2 inch concrete fill over 2 inch composite metal floor decking spanning 8'6" and 9'2". The new floors would extend 2'6" farther on the north and south sides of the building than the existing lower floors in order to fulfill functional space requirements. The decks would be supported by 12 and 16 inch deep steel purlins spanning 24 feet to 16 and 18 inch deep steel beams spanning 17'0" and 28'6". Steel columns would support the floor and roof framing. The typical story height would be 12'4 1/2". Shear walls would be provided by continuing the reinforced concrete stair and elevator shafts. The mechanical penthouse would be framed with structural steel columns and beams with metal deck roof and light gauge steel stud walls. The heliport would be framed with structural steel and metal deck with concrete fill.

In lieu of brick veneer which was used on the original construction and subsequent additions, most of the exterior walls of the addition would be of cement plaster or synthetic plaster finish on metal stud backup with foil-faced insulation. The change is attributed to a number of factors including
structural weight, energy considerations, difficulty in matching the existing brick color, the need to provide exterior air ducts to supplement interior mechanical chases, and aesthetic relationships to adjacent facilities such as the bridge connector to the Outpatient Clinic Building. Exterior mounted air supply duct enclosures would be insulated and clad with copper. Extensions of existing elevator and utility shafts would be painted concrete. Windows would be of clear, insulating glass set in operable, natural anodized or factory painted aluminum frames.

Two new 6,000 lb. electric elevators would be installed in an existing space by converting a stair tower to a shaft and creating a new stair at the C-Wing. This equipment would be coordinated with an upgraded control system for all elevators in the building. A standard wet pipe sprinkler system would be provided for fire protection.

The heating, ventilating and cooling systems would be designed to maximize energy conservation within the limitations imposed to meet hospital standards. Selective shading would be provided on the south wall of the addition to minimize heat gain. Multiple air handling units would allow spaces to be served with systems that are as energy-efficient as possible to meet the requirements for that space. For example, a variable air volume system would be used for the eye clinic and administration areas, and a low air volume perimeter induction fan system would be used for patient rooms. All fan systems would utilize up to 100 percent outside air for "free cooling" during moderate weather. All new fan systems would maximize the use of recirculated air during very cold and very hot weather. A "run-around" loop would be installed to recover exhaust air heat from existing and new exhaust systems. This heat would be transferred to temper outside air makeup to existing 100 percent outside air fan systems. The existing utility plant located in the basement of the A-Wing would be the source of most mechanical services for the C-Wing addition. In response to the Board's action on May 29, 1981, the Legislature authorized an expenditure limitation of $870,000 for interim steam improvements needed to serve the enlarged hospital.

A new 120/208 volt diesel generating system would be provided and connected to the existing and new loads. It would consist of generators, transfer switches, paralleling equipment, distribution panels, etc. Normal power for the emergency systems would be derived from a pad-mount transformer adjacent to the generators. There would be extensions of other electrical systems, such as for paging, television, nurses' call, fire alarm, intercom, data processing, etc., and possibly of the pneumatic tube system.

Preliminary Code Review

Initial contacts with representatives of local jurisdictional agencies have suggested that some features of the schematic design may require appeals or conditional use permits, but no major problems are anticipated. For example, the concept of having lobby, waiting, office, reception and related areas open to the exit corridors must be appealed during the design development phase of planning, but such an appeal should be enhanced by the full fire sprinkler protection proposed in the project. Similarly, the helipad installation would require a conditional use permit through the City of Portland's Planning Bureau process.

Probable Direct Construction Costs

As escalated to reflect the start of construction early in 1983, with beneficial occupancy in the new addition by April 1984 and in remodeled areas of the A and B Wings by December 1984, the architects' consultants have indicated a total estimated direct construction figure of approximately $17,241,000. This excludes certain work which was identified separately in the alterations work budgeted for the Ophthalmology Department, but includes other items, such as the heat recovery "run-around" system for the A, B and C Wings which may be considered for bidding as alternates. At the request of institutional officials, the architects' consultants have included in their
preliminary cost figures a somewhat higher than normal estimating contingency as an extra precautionary measure and have provided an allowance of approximately $485,000 for the temporary relocation of departments during construction.

In view of the extent of the remodeling contemplated with the addition, it is expected that subsequent phases of the architectural planning will be done in such a way that bids for the construction work, either for the entire project or for major phases thereof, will be solicited on a lump-sum basis rather than to request separate quotations for the general, mechanical and electrical work.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - UOHSC University Hospital South Addition and Alterations
Architects - Boutwell, Gordon, Beard and Grimes, Portland
Board's priority - No. 4 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total project cost: $21,840,000
Estimated direct construction costs: $17,241,000

Estimated gross areas:
- New construction - 69,553 square feet
- Remodeling - 35,248 square feet

Tentative schedule:
- Bidding - April 1983
- Completion - December 1984

Tentative financing plan:
- Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings: $21,840,000

On March 27, 1981, a report was made to the Board that the professional services agreement with the architects for the pre-design and schematic design phase of planning for the University Hospital South Addition and Alterations project had been supplemented to include their assistance, and that of their consultants, in similar initial planning phases for proposed alterations for the improvement of the Ophthalmology Clinic on the 10th floor of the hospital (B-Wing and overpass) which may be undertaken independently or in conjunction with the larger project. Subsequently, at the May 29, 1981, meeting, the Board amended the 1981-1983 capital construction program to include $1,245,000 of gift and grant funds for remodeling for this department and ratified a grant application filed with the National Eye Institute to cover part of the costs. Except for modifications to The John E. Weeks Memorial Laboratory on the third floor of the Medical Research Building, the proposed alterations would occur on the 10th floor of the South Hospital.

As part of their report upon the completion of the schematic design phase of planning for the major 5-story addition and alterations to the hospital, the architects have indicated their recommendations applicable to this supplemental assignment. The Phase I portion relates principally to the remodeling of the existing adult eye clinic, with some revisions also in the children's clinic areas, all directed to the objective of providing a more adequate and efficient layout for the activities of the Ophthalmology Department. The Phase III portion would be concentrated in the south end of the overpass connector between University Hospital South and the Outpatient Clinic Building. It would provide special ophthalmologic laboratory spaces, offices and examination rooms.
For the area of approximately 5,800 square feet within the Phase I portion, it is estimated that the direct construction costs will be about $655,000. For the area of approximately 2,815 gross square feet within the Phase III portion, the estimated direct construction costs total about $218,600. These amounts include projected increases to a proposed bid date of April 1983. The estimated total project costs, including work to be accomplished in The John E. Weeks Memorial Laboratory in the Medical Research Building, are expected to be $1,245,000. Of this total, $200,000 has been requested from the federal agency, the National Eye Institute, and the remainder would be financed from private donations.

In general, the description of work corresponds with that identified in a separate agenda item concerning the larger project, but in view of the fact that the expenditure limitation is contained within a different section of Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981, and that all costs for the smaller project are to be financed from gifts and grants rather than from bond borrowings, it appears advisable to present the schematic design phase of planning for it as a discrete item.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - UOHSC Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects
(Ophthalmology Department Alterations)

Architects - Boutwell, Gordon, Beard and Grimes, Portland

Board's priority - Portion of No. 5 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total project costs ($1,123,006 for this portion plus $121,994 for proposed alterations to The John E. Weeks Memorial Laboratory) $1,245,000

Estimated direct construction costs (this portion only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>218,600*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>873,600*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated total area to be remodeled (this portion only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5,800 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>2,815 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bidding</td>
<td>April 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>December 1984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative financing plan:

- Grant requested from National Eye Institute $200,000
- Private donations 1,045,000

Total $1,245,000

* Excludes estimate of $85,400 for direct construction costs applicable to remodeling expected within The John E. Weeks Memorial Laboratory.

Allocation from Board's Reserve for Physical Plant Rehabilitation and Minor Capital Outlay for Boiler Repairs, EOSC

Staff Report to the Board (9-81-3b)

Late in July, a leak was detected in one of the boilers at Eastern Oregon State College. Upon investigation, it was discovered that the tubes were pitted in both boilers and would need to be replaced before heat could be provided to campus facilities this Fall and Winter. The engineers who serve as consultants to the staff of the institution indicated that it was essential that more adequate water treatment systems be installed so that this problem would not reoccur. Accordingly, upon the advice of the consultants,
arrangements were made through the purchasing division of the Department of General Services to obtain the necessary materials and services, including tubing, a sparge tube heater, a chemical feed pump and the chemicals required for the system.

President Briggs has requested financial assistance to meet the expenditure requirements for these emergency repairs.

Inasmuch as the Central Utility Plant serves all campus facilities, it is proposed that the cost of the repair work be divided between resources available for the educational and general plant (about 65% of the total) and the auxiliary enterprises (about 35%). The state fund portion would be provided from the 1981-82 Board's reserve of $76,278 for physical plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay, and the auxiliary enterprise portion would be financed from excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees.

Staff Report to the Board (9-81-7b)

Statutory Authority:

OAR 351.070 authorizes the Board to adopt tuition and fees for the institutions in the State System of Higher Education. The temporary amendment is required in order that the Board may implement provisions of OAR 580-10-021 during the 1981-82 academic year for the three categories of students indicated. Without the amendments, the present rule will expire August 22, 1981.

The reciprocity agreement with Washington and the provision for fee waiver at Eastern Oregon State College have been economically and educationally advantageous to the State of Oregon and to the students served and it is recommended that they be continued. Action to renew the enabling rule has been delayed in order to ascertain the impact on this provision, if any, of legislative action.

However, negotiations for renewal of the reciprocal agreement with the State of Washington are now in process and budget estimates for Higher Education anticipate continuation of the fee waiver at Eastern Oregon State College. The addition of Section (3) to the Rule will permit the Department to participate in the five-state WICHE Regional Graduate Programs project. Under this project graduate students who are residents of the five northwest states may attend selected graduate programs not generally offered in the region at resident or reduced tuition rates. Fourteen institutions offering a total of 33 programs are cooperating in the project. Department institutions and programs are:

Oregon State University

Marine Resource Management (M.S.)
Foods and Nutrition (Ph.D.)

Portland State University

Environmental Sciences and Resources (Ph.D.)
Urban Studies (Ph.D.)

University of Oregon

Molecular Biology (Ph.D.)
Neurosciences (Ph.D.)
Historic Preservation (M.S.)
The Board adopted the revisions to OAR 580-21-100, Kinds of Appointments, as temporary rule changes at its meeting on August 7, 1981. At that time the Board suggested modifications which have been incorporated in the rule changes proposed for adoption at this time. The discussion at the August 7 Board meeting is included in the minutes for that meeting.

The staff rationale for the addition of a new type of appointment at this time stems primarily from difficulty experienced in recruiting highly qualified candidates for available faculty positions at at least one System institution. Due to the relatively high percentage of tenure at some System institutions and the current need to maintain if not increase flexibility, few if any tenure-track appointments are made. As a result, at least one system institution has experienced a significant number of withdrawals from among the top three of four candidates recruited for various faculty positions. Permitting System institutions to offer extendable contract appointments will enable the offer of a contract with more security than a fixed term contract and thus attract more qualified candidates. The extendable contract of three years, for example, would permit, following the first year of the contract, the term of the contract to be extended for an additional year if certain conditions have been met, leaving the faculty member with a three-year contract. This could be repeated year after year until conditions require otherwise. The addition of the extendable contract as an authorized appointment will permit the maintenance of flexibility while tending to lessen the negative impact upon recruitment of the lack of available tenure-track appointments. The extendable contract, normally of a three-year term, would maintain or increase flexibility by development or negotiation of institutional policy which would permit the interruption of the extended contract for all the traditional reasons as well as at the discretion of the President after adequate input. At the same time an institution would be able to offer an appointment having somewhat more security than fixed term appointments and thus be able to attract and hold more qualified candidates who have been withdrawing as a result of the fixed term appointment only practice. Overall, having the extended contract appointment as an option will enable System institutions to maintain and even increase quality through attracting highly competent faculty while maintaining the flexibility necessary to respond to the changing needs of students.

The descriptive section under Recommendation 2, above, conforms to the pattern of OAR 580-21-100 and provides in brief the information necessary to a basic understanding of the new type of appointment.

The change under Recommendation 3, above, will permit the use of fixed term appointments consistent with use of the extendable contract appointment and alleviate the concern expressed by some faculty and administrators that fixed term appointments are not being used in a manner provided by the OAR. The "not limited to" language will confirm a broader base use of the fixed term appointment.
Meeting #479

Staff Report to the Board (9-81-15b)

On September 8, officials of the University of Oregon provided an option from Leta Strain for the sale of the Sadie Prindel Estate property at 1709 Moss Street, Eugene, to the Board in the amount of $46,750. The option price is equal to the average of two independent appraisals obtained recently by the institution, one from J. Richard Larson and the other from David F. Knox, both of Eugene.

The corner lot property contains approximately 3,075 square feet of land, or 0.071 acres, with 61.5 feet fronting on Moss Street and 50 feet fronting on 17th Avenue. It is within the east campus area designated for student housing within the long-range development plan of the University, and the adjoining properties were acquired by the Board previously.

The wood-frame residence has a living-dining room, kitchen, bedroom, bath, laundry and storage area on the main floor and two bedrooms in an attic space. There is an attached single-car garage. The improvements are presumed to have been constructed about 50 years ago and are in fair to good condition.

Funds required for the purchase of the property would be provided from proceeds available from the sale of bonds under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available from housing operations at the institution.

Staff Report to the Board (9-81-5b)

Special program admission requirements have been in effect for many years in a number of professional and advanced study programs offered by the institutions of the State System. The purpose of special program admission requirements is to assure (1) that students admitted to the programs are prepared to undertake study at the level required, (2) that the number of students admitted are commensurate with the resources available, and (3) that where selective admissions are necessary, the selection is made on the basis of published, reasonable and equitable criteria and procedures. These kinds of special program requirements are becoming increasingly necessary as programs become more demanding and rigorous and as the resources which can be directed to the support of highly specialized, costly programs of high student demand become more limited.

A summary of program admission requirements in effect in 1981-82 has been compiled by the Board's office and is available upon request.

Staff Report to the Board (9-81-4b)

All of the programs to be terminated except the program in radiologic electronics technology are vocational in nature and as such are not central to Oregon Institute of Technology's mission. The programs in automotive technology, welding, and dental assisting are widely available in the Oregon community colleges. Two community colleges have expressed an interest in offering a program in gunsmithing, were the OIT program to be dropped.

The vocational programs at Oregon Institute of Technology have consistently attracted a disproportionate number of students with relatively low academic aptitude. The students have required a great deal of remedial instruction in mathematics and English and have experienced a high attrition rate.

The numbers of students completing the associate degree program in automotive technology, the largest of the six programs, have numbered fewer than 20 for four of the last five years; in 1980-81 the number of graduates fell to 11. Only a few of these graduates have proceeded into the bachelor of science degree program and fewer still graduated. Maintenance of a quality
program in this area will require expenditure of approximately $215,000 for equipment. The diesel program, in contrast, is the only program in the state, has attracted strong students, and has excellent placement. Oregon Institute of Technology will retain this program at both the associate and baccalaureate levels.

Welding is seen as a vocational program by students and many decline to enroll in general education courses required for graduation. Students in gunsmithing also exhibit low persistence toward a degree. For those who have graduated, placement has been poor because most refuse to relocate in the eastern section of the United States, where jobs are available.

The dental assistant program is a high cost program, which in recent years has enrolled few (10-12) students, and which has limited placement at low salaries.

Termination of the vocational programs will involve release of five faculty members effective 1982-83 and 1.45 FTE faculty effective 1983-84. Two of the faculty to be released are tenured.

The program in radiologic electronics technology is a three-year highly specialized program with limited placement opportunities. There were no enrollments in the program in 1980-81. With the termination of the program, effective in 1981-82, the faculty member who was assigned as curriculum coordinator and laboratory supervisor in the program will be assigned full-time to a vacant position in the medical radiologic department.

Information concerning numbers of enrollments and graduates in each program, courses to be eliminated, faculty impact, and rationale for the termination of the program is on file in the Board's office and will be provided upon request.

Termination of the programs will eliminate 26 courses specific to the degree programs. Oregon Institute of Technology will continue to offer service courses in welding for programs in diesel, machining processes, and mechanical engineering technologies.

Amendments to Administrative Rules, Residency Rules

Staff Report to the Board (9-81-9b)

The additional modifications in wording requested by the Committee at its April meeting would extend provisions of the rules for federal military personnel to certain other federal personnel and would modify the definition of emancipation as it pertains to parental financial support. Each of these modifications, if approved, would have some negative effect on the Board's tuition income. In view of the uncertainties concerning enrollment 1981-82 and the tenuous budget situation, the staff suggests that consideration of these modifications be postponed for the present.

Staff Report to the Board (9-81-10b)

The 1979-81 biennium was a period of significant computer equipment procurements. Major acquisitions were accomplished by Oregon State University, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon. The 1981-1983 acquisition program will be considerably less in magnitude. This is a consequence, in part, of the extraordinary number of major acquisitions last biennium and, in part, because of this biennium's limited funds.

The specific acquisitions requested at this time for institutional facilities are:

**Oregon Institute of Technology**

Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) acquired a Harris System 200 computer in 1976 as a part of a two-institution competitive procurement. Through augmentation, it was planned to meet the academic computing requirement to the end of a seven-year lease/purchase...
contract. A six-year plan was developed by Oregon Institute of Technology in March of 1980 for the year 1981 through 1987 which describes a need for increased capacity.

Two factors, both in response to the graduate job market plan, have imposed a greater demand for the computer: First, a larger number of departments than anticipated are requiring computer knowledge as a prerequisite for graduation. Second, the students are taking more computing courses. For example, the FORTRAN course last spring term was three times as large as the same course the prior spring term.

The result of this growth in demand is the need to expand computer services on an accelerated time table. Accordingly, Oregon Institute of Technology entered into discussion with the Harris Corporation on possible solutions to the problem. The Harris Corporation proposed the replacement of the Central Processing Unit, the Memory, and some associated equipment with the equivalent units in their model H500 line. Financing has been arranged for a 60-month lease/purchase within the same budget constraints per month as the present System 200.

The institution anticipates this system to be usable through 1986. The requested augmentation will allow Oregon Institute of Technology to meet the needs projected for this biennium with presently available funds. The institution will complete a replacement study in the 1985-86 academic year. If this study results in a decision to replace the H500, the Department would anticipate releasing an RFP for that purpose during the following year.

Oregon State University

Oregon State University (OSU) upgraded their CDC CYBER 73 computer to a CYBER 170/720 in 1980 on the basis of a $285,000 savings over the then-planned augmentations to the CYBER 73 (see State Board of Higher Education minutes of Meeting #461, page 87. January 25, 1980). No new major components have been added since that time. Oregon State University is presently completing a study on alternative strategies for meeting increased computing needs. Depending on the results of that study, we are anticipating a request during the current fiscal year to augment the CYBER's capacity to transfer data.

University of Oregon

During 1980, both main computer systems at the University of Oregon, the IBM 360/50 and the DEC 1050, were replaced by new computers: the IBM 4341 and the DEC 1091. The IBM 360/50 was not configured to support interactive access through time-sharing terminals. The DEC 1050 was configured with 48 such access ports. The IBM 4341 is initially configured with 62 access ports and the DEC 1091 with 96, both of which were specifically expandable to 128 and 175 access ports respectively.

A digital switching system is now requested to allow timesharing terminals to access either computer by means of a selection code. The digital switch will cost approximately $85,000 with the vendor to be chosen by request for proposals. The preferred method of acquisitions is outright purchase. However, using our presently available best estimate for financing over a 5-year period, the savings are $290 per month over the present method of operation. These savings are from two sources. Staffing needs are expected to be reduced by approximately $1,088 per month as the present manual intervention method is eliminated. It is also anticipated there will be an equipment savings of $1,158 per month by returning some presently leased terminal equipment to IBM.

Two alternative solutions other than the recommended switch result in higher costs and less user convenience. The first alternative of having each low-speed asynchronous terminal able to connect to either
computer through a dial-up arrangement would result in approximately $5,000 per month for telephone billings in addition to installation charges and the cost of modems. The second alternative of obtaining additional terminals for those users with the need to access both computers would require the addition of approximately $135,000 in access ports on both computers plus the purchase cost of the added terminals.

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center

i) IBM 370/148

During the first year, The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center's IBM 370/148 will require an additional Disk Controller in January, with additional Disk Capacity installed in June 1982. This will provide for the forecasted volume of Phase III of the Admis­sion/Discharge/Transfer (ADT) System and the initial stages of the Order Entry System.

ii) CYBERMED

The CYBERMED system was originally implemented as a totally redundant system to provide instantaneous support for the Clinical Laboratory. The volume of data storage required has increased resulting in both disks reaching 70-75% of capacity. This situation has unacceptably deteriorated the redundancy requirement resulting in the need for additional disk.

An implementation group of nurses, physicians, and hospital adminis­trators has studied ways to improve the promptness of delivery of laboratory test results. It determined that additional terminals should be procured to allow medical staff immediate access to all available laboratory patient data. A preprocessor and additional memory would also be required to offset the increased processor workload in order to ensure adequate terminal response time. The total estimated cost of these acquisitions is $233,000 which will be supported from patient revenues.

iii) Stat Lab

The Statistical Laboratory, University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, provides support in the areas of statistical consulting, computational services, and data base management for the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, the Veterans' Administration, and other hospitals.

A mini-computer is requested to consolidate some of these functions at the Laboratory for a net savings of $1,200 per month over present operations. The mini-computer will be selected through a request for proposal process. The equipment will be financed by a 5-year lease/purchase plan with monthly costs not to exceed $6,800.

This consolidation of functions will result in reduced payments to other Oregon State System of Higher Education organizations and in elimination of all payments to commercial vendors for data entry services.

Data Services Center

The workload for this central administrative facility continues to grow. The primary source of this increase is the increasing use of existing applications, e.g., accounts receivable, and the implementation of new applications, e.g., budget and personnel system. From an equipment perspective, the increasing workload impacts processing power, processor memory, and disk storage. The latter two are planned for augmentation in 1981-82. The cost for this augmentation is $5,000/month on a lease/purchase contract extended to the end of 1987. This acquisition will be funded through overall equipment savings at the Center.
CA-Network Upgrade

The Department of Higher Education maintains a communications network to allow all institutions to access the central Data Services Center, the Oregon State University computers, and the DEC computer at the University of Oregon. In 1977, network management was consolidated into the Office of Educational Systems and a switch was installed to enable remote job entry access to different host computers. A year later, other communications equipment (modems) were replaced, and since then, some additional monitoring and error detection equipment has been installed. A network upgrade to replace the oldest time-sharing terminal communication equipment and improve bandwidth capacity is planned for fiscal year 1981-82. The replacement equipment will be acquired through a request for proposals process with installation beginning in December 1981. Installation of sophisticated data monitoring capabilities in the new equipment will allow us to replace the present communications equipment with a total resultant savings of approximately $430 per month. This savings will be used to make other replacements in order completely to equip the network with compatible new equipment.

EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE, WESTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE, SOUTHERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE, PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

No major changes this year.

The mini/microcomputers and terminals requested for acquisition with general funds are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini/microcomputers</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average purchase costs are used in these estimates. Requests for the specific items are approved at the institution before purchase proceeds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Present Equipment (June 1981)</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Status*</th>
<th>Primary Function</th>
<th>Procure By</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Installation</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost**</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Equipment as of June 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add Minicomputer</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dec. 1982</td>
<td>$2500/mo.</td>
<td>Gen. Fund</td>
<td>Data 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Adm/Aca.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Univac 1900/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harris 200</td>
<td>Harris 500</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Sole Source</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Nov. 1981</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Gen. Fund</td>
<td>Harris 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Honeywell DPS 440</td>
<td>Upgrade to 90 Ports</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Sole Source</td>
<td>Honeywell</td>
<td>Sept. 1982</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>Cntr. Inc.</td>
<td>Honeywell DPS 440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CYBER 170/720</td>
<td>Add Disk</td>
<td>Adm/Aca.</td>
<td>Sole Source</td>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Aug. 1982</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Cntr. Inc.</td>
<td>CDC CYBER 170/720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPU (10 to 14)</td>
<td>Adm/Aca.</td>
<td>Sole Source</td>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Jan. 1982</td>
<td>$68,500</td>
<td>Cntr. Inc.</td>
<td>CDC CYBER 170/720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data 100 RJE</td>
<td>Add Distributed Process Stations</td>
<td>Admin.</td>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mar. 1983</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>Cntr. Inc.</td>
<td>(3) Data 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSGC</td>
<td>Harris 500</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Harris 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remcom RJE</td>
<td>Replace RJE</td>
<td>Adminis.</td>
<td>State Contr. or RFP</td>
<td>Univac or Unknown</td>
<td>Oct. 1981 or Sept. 1982</td>
<td>$2500/mo.</td>
<td>Gen. Fund</td>
<td>Univac or Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IBM 4341</td>
<td>Add Memory</td>
<td>Adm/Aca.</td>
<td>Sole Source</td>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Cntr. Inc.</td>
<td>IBM 4341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>DEC 1091</td>
<td>Add Memory</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Sole Source</td>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Cntr. Inc.</td>
<td>DEC 1091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add Disk</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add Ports</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univac 1900/10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Adminis.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Univac 1900/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data 100 RJE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Adm/Aca.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Data 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Honeywell 66/40</td>
<td>Memory Upgrade</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Sole Source</td>
<td>Honeywell</td>
<td>Aug. 1982</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Cntr. Inc.</td>
<td>Honeywell 66/40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data 100 RJE</td>
<td>Power Pack</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *R* = Routine

**Total Estimated Cost** is the estimated cost associated with the respective changes.

(continued)
Table I

PROPOSED CHANGES IN HARDWARE FOR 1981-1983
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Present Equipment (June 1981)</th>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Primary Functions</th>
<th>Procure By</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Installation</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Equipment as of June 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBSU Data 100 RJE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adm/Aca.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Data 100 RJE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add Memory</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Sept. 1981</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add Preprocessor</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Sept. 1981</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add Terminals</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Sept. 1981</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add Printers</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Jan. 1982</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add Disk</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Oct. 1981</td>
<td>2,627/mo.</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot DPS 6 Processor</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Mar. 1982</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Console</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>Dec. 1982</td>
<td>516,000</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status: A = Already Approved; R = Request approval at this time.
** Purchase Price except where otherwise indicated.
### Table II
**SUMMARY OF NETWORK CHANGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminals</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>OYT</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
<th>CA**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminals As of 6-30-81</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes as of 6-30-82/83</td>
<td>Replace 10/15 Add 60/65</td>
<td>Replace 25/25 Add 43/50</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>9/11</td>
<td>Replace 2/1 Add 2/3</td>
<td>Replace 1/0 Add 8/6</td>
<td>89/56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated As of 6-30-83</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals As of 6-30-81</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes as of 6-30-82/83</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>34/39</td>
<td>15/15</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>4/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated As of 6-30-83</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minicomputers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As of 6-30-81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes as of 6-30-82/83</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>Replace 1/0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated As of 6-30-83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1) IBM 4341.
2) DEC 1091.
3) Honeywell DPS 440.
4) As of 6-30-81.
5) Changes as of 6-30-82.
6) Estimated Additional Changes as of 6-30-83.
7) As of 6-30-81.
8) Changes as of 6-30-82/83.
9) Estimated As of 6-30-83.
10) Honeywell 66/40.
11) 3 Network Host Nodes.
12) 7 Network User Nodes.
13) 2 Digital Switches.
14) Front-End Processor.
15) Upgrade Network Bandwidth.
16) Add 1 Network Host Node.

**Notes:**
- **Cybers Space:**
  - 1) CYBER Honeywell
  - 2) Honeywell DPS 440
  - 3) Univac 1900/10
  - 4) Harris 500

- **Changes:**
  - 1) Upgrade 4341 Memory.
  - 2) Upgrade 1091 Memory, Disk, & Ports.

- **Add Central Minicomputer**

---

**Electronic Switch**

- **Upr. Harris 200**
- **Add StatLab Minicomputer.**
- **Add 370/148 Tape Drive.**
- **Uprgr 370/148 Power Supply & Comm. Controller.**
- **Add 370/148 Processor.**
- **Add 370/148 Prntrs & I/O Switch.**
The 1981-1987 Information Systems Plan for the Department is conceptual in nature; it is intended to provide a framework for the development and use of administrative systems. Supplementary to the plan are four related documents:

1. A report on existing administrative systems;
2. An assessment of needs for new or modified administrative applications;
3. An interinstitutional organizational structure for implementing the conceptual plan; and

The plan and its related documents collectively describe the Department's current status of information systems—what the targeted capabilities should be and how they should be reached.

Generally, the operational systems currently in place within the Department (accounts receivable, budget/personnel, payroll, etc.) are those commonly used by other systems of higher education or institutions outside of Oregon. The Department's investment in these systems is substantial. Most of these systems are in need of replacement or major reworking. In addition, the campuses have substantial need of capabilities for strategic planning and management control. In the planning activity, extensive effort was directed toward anticipating how the Department should use technology in 1987 to support its administrative processes.

Using its understanding of the current status of information systems, the Task Force addressed the 1987 target with a specific set of actions which were developed to maximize institutional flexibility, promote resource sharing to meet common requirements, and encourage continual planning activities by the institutions and the Board's staff.

The primary steps to achieve the objectives include:

1. Establishment of a Department-wide data element dictionary. This dictionary will serve to standardize terminology throughout the Department. It will also serve as the basis for a data processing method to better control changes in programming systems as they are required. This project is underway.
2. Increased involvement by institutional personnel in the development of new applications. Institutions may develop unique applications using their own resources and will share resources with those of Centralized Activities to develop applications which are mutually required. Institutions are expected to document plans for systems implementation.
3. Distribution of computer hardware among the institutions in order to increase responsiveness and flexibility to develop administrative applications. The central facility in Corvallis (Data Services Center) will store data and develop and maintain programs required by the controller to carry out the fiduciary responsibility dictated by statute.
A plan for a pilot project to distribute computer hardware to the campuses will be developed during Fall 1981. It is anticipated the project will be implemented in January 1982.

4. Personnel and other budgeted resources for 1981-1983 were assumed to be unchanged from 1980-1981 base levels. This may be an optimistic assumption based on the Department's appropriation. The application needs described in the plan will in later biennia require a commitment of new resources or a reallocation of existing resources, regardless of whether the new applications are purchased from external sources or developed within the Department.

Proposed Sale of R/V CAYUSE, OSU

On May 25, 1979, the Board authorized a lease agreement (identified as a "Bareboat Charter") with the State of California for the use of Oregon State University's research vessel CAYUSE for an 18-month period beginning July 1, 1979, for nominal consideration ($1.00). It required that the lessee be responsible for all operating and maintenance costs. Furthermore, it was noted that the National Science Foundation was providing the necessary funding for the operation of the vessel by San Jose State University out of the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories as part of the national oceanographic research fleet. By way of background, it was also noted that the vessel had been built in 1968 for Oregon State University's School of Oceanography at a cost of $390,000, of which about $172,000 had been received as a grant from the National Science Foundation and the remainder had been financed from University resources, primarily research overhead. The vessel had been operated out of Newport until May 1979, when a combination of declining demand for its services and escalating costs of operation resulted in a high daily rate that further suppressed demand. In addition, the National Science Foundation assisted Oregon State University in obtaining a larger vessel, the WECOMA, which is more efficient to operate and has a greater range.

The operation of the R/V CAYUSE from Moss Landing has been successful because of the local demand for research support services which can be satisfied by a day-boat-type operation at a relatively low cost. Accordingly, the term of the original "Bareboat Charter" which had been prepared with the assistance of the Attorney General's office, was extended for an additional year at the request of San Jose State University. The current lease will expire December 31, 1981.

A recent survey by the School of Oceanography at Oregon State University has revealed no likely resurgence of demand for a vessel of the CAYUSE class in the Pacific Northwest. At the same time, San Jose State University has indicated that it would like to obtain title to the vessel, and it has been reported that the National Science Foundation has indicated its willingness to assist that institution in acquiring the title so that the vessel will remain a part of the national oceanographic research fleet.

An independent appraisal of the R/V CAYUSE has been obtained by Oregon State University from Lally, Hubenette, Jessie, Fay & Associates, Marine Surveyors, San Francisco, indicating a top fair market value of $225,000. This price is satisfactory to San Jose State University and assumes delivery at the present location, namely Moss Landing, California, thus avoiding the substantial costs of moving the vessel to some other port. The purchase would be made possible through the financial assistance of the National Science Foundation in view of its expressed desire to have the vessel remain as part of the national oceanographic fleet.

As indicated in the summary of this agenda item, officials of Oregon State University have indicated that the proceeds from the sale of the R/V CAYUSE would be applied toward the purchase of other capital improvements with which to promote the School of Oceanography's access to sponsored research funding. Such funding provides about 95% of the school's total annual income. This concept is endorsed by the National Science Foundation because the result will benefit indirectly the NSF programs which amount to about 50% of the school's annual research grants and contracts.
Staff Report to the Board (9-81-13b)

Recommendations for modifications in the undergraduate admissions requirements of the respective institutions have been developed following review of admission criteria and examination of the impact of modification of these criteria on educational services by the faculties and administrations of the respective institutions. The objective of these reviews has been to assure that reductions in numbers of students admitted to the respective institutions, required to adjust enrollments to limited resources, will be accomplished in a fair and equitable manner, consistent with the efficient use of these resources.

It is anticipated that higher tuition levels, restrictions on financial aid, and the continuing decline in the size of Oregon high school graduating classes will reduce higher education enrollments in 1982-83 even without increased admission requirements. The impact of some of these factors will be better known after the institutions have opportunity to review their enrollment experiences in 1981-82.

Additional enrollment control will occur as the result of (1) the implementation of selective standards for programs where student demand exceeds resources, e.g., engineering; (2) increases in program admissions and retention standards, e.g., education; (3) program reduction, suspension, and elimination; and (4) imposition of arbitrary cut-off dates when admission activity indicates enrollment will exceed budget limitations.