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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN
ROOM 327, MICHAEL J. SMITH MEMORIAL CENTER
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, PORTLAND, OREGON
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A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in
Room 327, Michael J. Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University,
Portland, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 A.M., January 22, 1982, by the
President of the Board, Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr., and on roll call the
following answered present:

Mr. Lester E. Anderson
Mr. Alvin R. Batiste
Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter
Mrs. Harriett J. Flanagan
Mr. Robert C. Ingalls
Mr. David M. Lomnicki

Mr. Louis B. Perry
Mr. James C. Petersen
Mr. Ma·ion T. Weatherford
Mr. Loren L. Wyss
Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.

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 W. Grier, Compliance Officer; James J.
Casby, Assistant Attorney General; Jerry Lidz, Assistant Attorney General;
Richard S. Perry; Director, Management and Planning Services Division;
Thomas Berkey, Assistant Budget Director; Davis Quenzer, Assistant Budget
Director; Richard Zita, Assistant to the Chancellor; James Lockwood, Assistant
to the Chairman, Interinstitutional Library Council; Francetta Carroll, Assistant
Board Secretary.

Oregon State University--President Robert MacVicar; T. D. Parsons, Vice
President for Administration.

University of Oregon--President Paul Olum; Richard J. Hill, Provost; N. Ray
Hawk, Vice President for Administration and Finance.

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Leonard Laster; J. T. McGill,
Vice President for Finance and Administration; R. E. Tuomi, Assistant Vice
President for Facilities Management.

Portland State University--President Joseph C. Blumel; James E. Todd, Vice
President for Finance and Administration; J. K. Harris, Budget Director;
W. C. Neland, Director, Physical Plant; David R. Hertz, Director, Auxiliary
Services.

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

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

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

Western Oregon State College--President Gerald Leinwand; Glen I. Williams,
Dean of Administration; Richard E. Walker, Dean of Education; Colleen
Jackson, Associate Professor.
MINUTES
APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on December 10-11, 1981, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Perry, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Petersen was absent from the meeting at this time.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Introduction of J. Lidz

The Chancellor introduced Mr. Jerry Lidz, Assistant Attorney General, who would be assisting Mr. Casby in legal matters for the Department of Higher Education.

Report on Impact on Higher Education

The Chancellor indicated that Dr. Robert Clodius, President of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, had been invited to the meeting, and suggested that he be given an opportunity to comment on the Washington scene.

Dr. Clodius reported that the news from Washington, D.C., as it affects all institutions of higher education was bad. The object for concern is the proposed drastic cuts in federal student financial aid that are expected to be proposed in the 1983 budget. These cuts are in the order of magnitude of 40-50% in federal financial aid programs across the board, and they may well affect the lives of at least half of the people who are currently receiving some form of federal financial aid. The impact will be greatest on those institutions which get the largest part of their revenue from student tuition and fees. The consequences of these cuts will come in the future because a substantial number of the young people that this country will be depending upon in the future will be denied educational opportunities. Revival of the nation's industry and the capability and capacity to respond to national security will be crippled. People who are concerned about having a manpower pool of able and qualified people to make this country move will have to make their views known.

In response to a question as to whether there were any plans to work with the private sector to replace federal funds, it was indicated that there is increasing effort along those lines but there is no way the support could come from the private sector entirely. Several billion dollars are involved in the student aid programs alone, and drastic cuts in those funds will have drastic consequences on the students and their parents who now participate in the loan and grant programs. It was also stated that efforts are being made to combat the high delinquency rate on student loans.

Mr. Wyss asked Dr. Clodius whether the philosophical rationale for the reduction was that the states or the personal budgets of students should pick up the cost of education or was it faced and accepted that there would be a lower quality educational delivery system and a less educated population. Dr. Clodius said there did not appear to be any hostility toward assistance for students, but there is a macro-economic theory in place that says that if taxes are cut by a large amount and federal budgets cut to get them in line with the reduction in taxes, there will follow from this a revitalization of the economy, productivity will increase, and inflation will be lower. At the same time, employment and productivity will go up. In addition, the national defense posture requires heavier expenditures in that area.
Mr. Perry commented that there is a recognition on the part of the private sector of the concerns about diminishing the intellectual capacity for leadership by virtue of these proposed federal actions. This has resulted in the beginnings of an organization with the goal of offsetting some of these consequences.

Mr. Harms expressed the Board's appreciation to Dr. Clodius for his appearance before the Board.

The Chancellor stated that he had a preliminary draft of the Budget Report which was expected to represent what would constitute the final report of Subcommittee 3 of the Ways and Means Committee. It reflects the most detailed set of Budget Notes ever received by the Department of Higher Education. If approved by the full committee and by the Legislative Assembly, it will reduce the General Fund appropriation for the Department of Higher Education by approximately $10.3 million, about $12 million less than the reduction recommended by the Governor. Of that amount, a little more than $8 million would be replaced by other funds, so that the actual further program reduction necessary to comply with the budget itself appears at this moment to be in the vicinity of $2.1 or $2.2 million. In addition, the Budget Notes would instruct development of program reduction options which would permit elimination of the $49 tuition surcharge in at least two increments. The Department is further instructed to prepare a contingency plan which would enable the System to absorb a further 5% reduction in the General Fund, contingent upon the results of the March revised revenue estimates. The plan would be implemented only if necessary. The Chancellor summarized the components of the budget reductions required. The program reductions made necessary by the budget would constitute $2.1 million; $1.4 million would be required to eliminate $12 of the $49 surcharge; $4.5 million would be needed to eliminate the remainder of the surcharge; approximately $7.5 million would provide the 5% contingency, and in order to preserve quality, it would be necessary to reduce enrollments with an estimated tuition loss of $3 million. This amounts to a reduction of $18.5 million. In order to provide the Board with options in selecting program reductions, it is proposed to include an increment of $3 million to the program reduction planning, bringing the total amount to $21.5 million. Adding to this amount the $8.3 already effected brings the difference between the program levels for 1981-82 and 1982-83 to about $29.8 million. The due date for these proposals, with the possible exception of the contingency plan, is March 31, 1982. The Chancellor said the FTE reduction option has been ruled out by the Subcommittee, but with the possibility that individual institutions might be permitted to follow that route if there appeared to be overwhelming faculty support to do so. The $3 million to provide choices in program reduction would be part of the planning process, but ultimately the reduction would not include that $3 million.

Mr. Ingalls inquired whether the $3 million representing reduced tuition income was likely to be firm if the tuition were lowered. The Chancellor replied that the planning is based on a number of estimates and it was believed that these estimates have been relatively conservative with respect to tuition income. The $3 million would be tuition income lost as a consequence of determining that if faculty were reduced by an amount approaching $7.5 million, it would be necessary to limit enrollment in order to preserve quality. This process would then reduce tuition income.

Mr. Ingalls noted that the Subcommittee had said it wanted enrollment reductions to be on the basis of scholarship and not on ability to pay. The Chancellor said he interpreted the tuition increase as a means of raising funds. As a consequence, some people will be denied access due to inability to pay the higher rates. He said he did not judge the consequences of an action as representing a policy that was favored by the Board. With respect to the $3 million allowance for tuition loss, the Chancellor said it was his intention that this represented a tuition loss that would result from Board and institutional action to limit access, not on the basis of any further increases in tuition, but on the basis of admissions requirements, the number who can enroll in a particular program, and a variety of management tools to hold the enrollment down so that quality would not be diminished.
drastically as a result of the reduced number of faculty. Quality of education relates to the magnitude of educational services that can be provided.

The Chancellor pointed out that if the Budget Notes were approved, the deadline of March 31 would require that planning begin immediately for the program reductions. He then quoted from the draft of the proposed Budget Notes as they relate to the 1983-1985 biennium. The Board was directed to prepare a long-range plan for the State System which would consider changes in institutional mission statements, consolidation of programs offered in more than one location, elimination of selected programs, opportunities for utilizing educational offerings in neighboring states, and modifications of delivery systems to utilize emerging technology. It was stated further that a consideration of program consolidation should include careful attention to the number and variety of programs in teacher education and reflect a high priority for programs designed to enhance further the economic health of Oregon. The Chancellor said it was his understanding these directives would be followed by an instruction designed to give the Board guidance in the submission of the 1983-1985 budget which would ask the Board to prepare three different levels of support for consideration by the Legislature. The first would be the traditional method showing the 1982-83 level of support and access after appropriate accommodations for inflation and other factors. This would represent the adjusted level budget for 1983-1985. The second presentation would be an enhanced level of support which would provide competitive faculty salaries, improved quality in libraries, adequate teaching equipment, services and supplies at an adequate level, adequate physical plant maintenance and rehabilitation and support services. The discussion indicated that the expectation would be that the Board would bring an unlimited order of magnitude of enhancements in various percentages with a 15% enhancement as probably the maximum that would receive any serious consideration. The third presentation would be a reduced level of support which, through program reduction, would maintain the 1982-83 level of faculty salaries adjusted for inflation, and the 1982-83 level of support in libraries, teaching equipment, services and supplies, and so forth, but for a substantially smaller number of students. A final admonition is to commence planning on a ten-year high technology enhancement program to be supported on a 50-50 basis with interested industries. The final stipulation in the budget report would state that the Educational Coordinating Commission would submit its own recommendation for both the 1982-83 and 1983-1985 budgets.

In commenting on the budget matters, Mr. Lemman said that rounding the figures in each case would place the total a little on the low side. He also pointed out that the comments had been limited to the Education and General Services budget.

Dr. T. K. Olson, Executive Director of the Educational Coordinating Commission, was asked to comment on his perception of the Budget Notes. Dr. Olson mentioned the difficulty in interpreting the Budget Notes in light of the frequent changes, but said it was his belief that generally-speaking the Chancellor's description was accurate. The message that seems to be coming from the Subcommittee is that a high priority must be placed on planning and that a major increase in revenues is not anticipated. The Board and the Commission must allocate more of their resources to planning what they perceive to be the task of the State System, with the clear expectation that there will be fewer students served or that it will be necessary to find some mechanism to continue to reach a significant number of those students in some other fashion than it has been done in the past. At the same time, it is expected that quality will be maintained.

Mr. Ingalls suggested that the proposals would drive students into the community colleges and asked what the Legislature planned to do about that. Dr. Olson responded that students would move in the direction of the community colleges but that did not mean that they would be admitted automatically. Community colleges also will receive less funds and this hits them very unevenly. Some can accommodate the reduction, but others will be forced to reduce the level of service. There are political considerations apart from the curricular and academic issues in the role and mission function
of institutions. If the present trend continues, there will be change in the function of community colleges to designate priorities for admissions and the priorities will vary among the community colleges.

In response to a question concerning the need for a master plan to state the relationships between the four-year schools, community colleges, and the private schools, Dr. Olson said the Commission had been working on a master planning process. However, the budget crisis has slowed that study substantially.

Mrs. Carpenter asked whether the Legislature was aware that enormously disproportionate amounts were being spent for the various segments of education. Oregon is in the upper percentiles in state support for elementary and secondary education but it has dropped below the 40th percentile of support for higher education. Dr. Olson said he could not say that the Legislature understood these facts in the sense that the Board did, nor could he say the Legislature was acting upon the information. The information, however, has been presented at some length to a number of key individuals in the Legislature.

There was some discussion of cooperative efforts between public and private four-year institutions, the community colleges, and industry. There are tentative proposals relating to high technology, but details have not been completed.

The Chancellor said there does not appear to be any inclination to modify state priorities. Further, if the budget is approved, it is implicit that Oregon is embarking upon an effort to reduce its total level of services at the post-secondary level.

The Chancellor then turned to a presentation of the proposed guidelines for program reduction planning which must begin immediately. He indicated that he would be suggesting a priority order in this instance and noted that this had not been the case with the 4% reductions. The guidelines for retention of programs, in rank order, were:

1. Programs essential to the State System's mission as a comprehensive educational delivery system;

2. Programs essential to the mission of the individual institutions;

3. Programs directly related to economic development;

4. Quality will be protected and enhanced wherever possible;

5. Restoration of staffing balances in terms of the relationship between the number of faculty members and the students served in a particular department;

6. The Board's Office is instructed to participate directly in the process of identifying programs for possible reduction and/or elimination; and

7. Closure of institutions is not considered an effective solution to the short-term 1982-83 budget problems.

The Chancellor suggested that the Board might want to place Priority 4 at the top of the list. He indicated also that Priority 7 had been included in that form because the Budget Report instructs the Board to consider institutional closure as one of the items for review.

Mr. Batiste said he was uncomfortable with making any statements about closure. He said that if the Board did a good job on the first three, it would then be unnecessary to consider closure. If it did become necessary to consider closure of an institution or institutions, it should be done in a separate setting and not as part of the guidelines which are a planning
effort. The position that there should be no explicit reference to institutional closure was argued vehemently before the Subcommittee, the Chancellor said. Nevertheless, the directive will be included in the Budget Report.

Mr. Wyss commented that in saying the top priority was to preserve the System's comprehensive goals, the Board might be foreclosing the opportunity that exists from such things as regionalization. For example, it may be determined that the first priority should be to preserve the high quality performance of the missions of the institutions and that the comprehensiveness would be less. A good job would be done for those areas that are served within the state, and others, which it is determined cannot be served effectively within the state, may be regionalized or supplied in some other way. Mr. Wyss said that in his opinion to begin by placing the highest priority on preserving the comprehensive System means that what exists will be preserved in spite of what the lack of funding does to the ability to deliver a quality product. Perhaps the performance of mission statements within individual institutions in a quality manner should be considerably more important than the breadth of offerings. He said he would argue for quality instead of breadth and a comprehensiveness that has been developed during a period of time in which there was adequate funding for a comprehensive system.

The Chancellor indicated that the guidelines adopted in May had stated that the state's mission as a comprehensive educational delivery system would be retained. It was being changed now to state that it would be given high priority. This was similarly true for programs central to the missions of the institutions.

Mr. Harms said his interpretation of that phrase in drafting it originally had been that comprehensive was used as a term to distinguish the State System from the more limited missions of individual institutions.

Mrs. Carpenter said her interpretation of comprehensive in the statement had been that it referred to the well-being of the state and the citizens of the state and their educational opportunity. It was suggested that the wording be changed to make it absolutely clear.

Mr. Anderson commented that the state-wide public services and the matter of administration should have consideration by the Board in determining priorities. The Chancellor indicated that the public service programs had not been included because the Budget Notes directed the planning for Education and General Services, but the Board might wish to broaden the guidelines to include some reference to them. Mr. Anderson suggested that the public service activities be addressed somewhere in the guidelines because they represent a vital part of the budget.

With respect to administration, the Chancellor explained that in referring to program reductions, he had been considering programs in the very broadest sense to include those activities supported within an institution, including administrative services, physical plant, instructional support, and libraries. It was agreed that since administration had been mentioned in the Budget Notes, it would be desirable to include it explicitly in the guidelines.

The Chancellor said that in identifying the magnitude of the program reductions which would be necessary if the General Fund budget were reduced by 5%, it was planned to add an additional $3 million to the amount of the cuts required in order to provide the Board with options in selecting the 5% reductions. It was indicated that it was not intended that the institutions would cut a specific percentage across the board but that the 5% figure would give some indication of the magnitude. The Board would have options because of the additional $3 million and because the Chancellor's Office would participate in identifying possible program cuts at the beginning of the process. Mr. Batiste questioned whether this procedure would be effective in looking at the overall System.
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The Board then discussed whether the additional $3 million above the required cuts was adequate to provide alternatives. The presidents were cautioned to propose program reductions which were actual possibilities for cutting.

Mrs. Carpenter urged that a statement be included with reference to the actual reduction of access that is implied as a result of the budget reductions.

The Chancellor said that a measure of this effect could be obtained by reviewing the third and fourth packages presented in response to the Governor's request. The General Fund budget reduction of $11.7 million in those proposals would involve the loss of 420 FTE academic staff, 84 classified staff, and 5,000 students.

Mr. Perry stated that the budgetary process has taken a certain amount of the management prerogative from the Board and the Board should be concerned about this. However, the task must be completed as soon as possible.

Mr. Ingalls inquired about the extent of faculty participation and the Chancellor referred to a statement in the Budget Notes which was interpreted to mean that the faculty groups would be invited to submit their ideas. The time constraints would not permit what might be termed as meaningful faculty involvement in the decisions. It was agreed that the intent was to have as much faculty participation as time would permit.

Mr. Petersen said there was a bigger issue of whether the Board or the Emergency Board would determine the final cuts. If the posture remains that there is an opportunity for one last try at the Emergency Board, then the Board's time and effort would be of little use. The Board has the statutory authority to make these changes in its budget and it should be made clear that the Board will make these determinations. He said comments have been made that are detrimental to the System as a whole. Mr. Petersen said the Board needs to face the issue that the State System is either a political system or an academic system.

The Chancellor observed that with respect to the programs to be bought by the $12 and $37 segments of the tuition surcharge, the Emergency Board or the Legislature in Special Session would decide whether it would prefer to have those programs eliminated or to authorize the tuition surcharge. This would not necessarily be the case in the programs for the 5% contingency reductions.

Mr. Petersen said the crucial question was whether the Board or the Legislature would decide the programs to be cut to meet the fiscal constraints. The Legislature and others have polarized, and the question is whether the Board is going to abdicate its responsibility or speak up, as the Chancellor has already done.

The Chancellor said the Budget Notes specify that the Board consider certain things in terms of long-range planning as contrasted with mandating specific actions.

Mr. Ingalls asked whether it was consistent with the Board's mission to deny access of Oregon students to higher education. The Chancellor responded that it was, because the Board has the responsibility for setting admission requirements and these do have significant impact upon the degree of accessibility to the institutions.

Mr. Wyss said he was still concerned about the use of "comprehensive goals" in the top priority of the guidelines. He said he would prefer to say the top priority is "to preserve quality education within the State System of Higher Education" because that would not commit the Board to a whole array of offerings that might or might not improve quality.
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The Chancellor said that in making program determinations, it was important to look at what the System offers as first priority as contrasted with the programs central to the mission of the institutions. What is really intended is that the educational delivery system reflected by all of the institutions would not contain gaps for the State of Oregon.

Mr. Perry asked if staff and experience were available to accomplish the objective of long-range planning. The Chancellor said staff was limited but commented on the segments of the plan. The changes in the mission statements are presently under consideration by the Committee on Instruction. The stipulation for consolidation of programs offered in more than one location is involved in the program reductions and the priorities adopted. With respect to elimination of selected programs, fifty programs have already been eliminated and it is assumed that there may be more. In terms of opportunities for utilizing educational offerings in neighboring states, there is in place a graduate education project which identifies within a five-state area regional graduate programs, with the objective of reducing the likelihood of having a proliferation of graduate degree programs in those states and reducing the cost of providing graduate educational opportunities. Modifications of delivery systems to utilize emerging technology is reflected in a proposal for a communications-based delivery system for place-bound students. The direction to give careful attention to the number and variety of programs in teacher education has been addressed by the Board on several occasions and will be reviewed again. It was also specified that the plan should reflect a high priority for programs designed to enhance further the economic health of Oregon. The capacity to do this may depend somewhat upon how it is interpreted.

It was agreed that the long-range plan should be consistent with the changing goals, but it was recognized also that it would not be possible to complete this by the March 31 budget deadline.

The Board voted to modify the first priority to read: "To preserve quality education in the State System of Higher Education." The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

It was agreed that the priority guidelines for program reduction, as presented by the Chancellor and modified by the above motion, were appropriate. It was also understood that administration, in addition to faculty, would be considered in determining any cutbacks.

Mr. Harms announced that there had been requests from Mr. Rod Moore of Portland, and from Mr. George Layman and Mr. J. W. Forrester, Jr., former presidents of the Board of Higher Education, to comment on the location of the Chancellor's Office and residence.

Mr. Moore indicated that the people of Oregon were very appreciative of the time and effort of Board members in administering higher education. He then said that when he was president of the Oregon School Boards Association it had been domiciled in Eugene and had been moved to Salem. He said this was a major issue at the time and had caused a considerable amount of turmoil and some people did not move. However, after moving, the organization shared facilities with the Association of Oregon Counties and the League of Oregon Cities and it was found that all three programs were much more effective in Salem. They were at the seat of power and better able to maintain priorities for what they were trying to accomplish. He said there had been staff problems and inconvenience and some individuals would not go, but he encouraged the Board to make the decision to move when the time comes. He said the interests of students and others would be represented more effectively in Salem through legislative contacts.

Mr. Moore said there was certainly no argument that the University of Oregon had benefited by the location of the Chancellor's Office in Eugene.
Mr. Moore also commented on the fact that the prevailing mood is for cutting programs in higher education. There is no way this can be done and at the same time improve overall programs. He encouraged the Board to push for the programs it really wants. The State System of Higher Education has been run very well, he said, and he was convinced that the people of Oregon would place a high priority on higher education if they had an opportunity to vote on this issue as they do on local education budgets.

Mr. George Layman, former member and president of the Board of Higher Education, expressed appreciation for the opportunity to present his views on the question of whether the Chancellor's Office should be moved from its present location, where it has been for five decades, to Salem or some other location.

Mr. Layman said that Oregon had led the nation in 1929, in what later became a trend, through the creation of a single Board to coordinate and set policies for all the state institutions of higher education. That has since been followed by many states, but Oregon led the way in 1929 in the establishment of a Department of Higher Education in Chapter 351, Oregon Laws. The statute abolished the boards of regents of the institutions and the board of higher curricula and directed that there be a reorganization of the institutions, with the program to begin July 1, 1931. The law at that time did not mention a Chancellor, but the Board named to that post Dr. W. J. Kerr, President of Oregon Agricultural College, who established his office in Eugene, presumably for the reason that he did not want to maintain it on his own campus. This indicated, however, a policy of the Board that the Board's Office should be connected directly with an academic atmosphere and with an institution of higher education.

Mr. Layman said the 1929 law also provided for an executive secretary who was directed to reside in Salem and maintain an office in the Statehouse. However, that law was summarily repealed outright by Chapter 266 of the Oregon Laws of 1933 and has never been there since. The first statutory recognition of the position of Chancellor, although there had been a Chancellor for many years, was in Chapter 708 of the Oregon Laws of 1971. This Chapter described the duties of the Chancellor in considerable detail and gave him administrative authority to carry out the policies of the Board with respect to the institutions. During the 50 years that the Board of Higher Education has operated under this general format, there have been proposals from time to time to move the Chancellor's Office to some other location, usually Salem. Mr. Layman said this has been a perennial issue argued formally and informally during his years in the Legislative Assembly and later on the Board of Higher Education. The pros and cons have been considered, and there are both. However, he said it was still his view that the present system should be continued for several reasons.

Mr. Layman said as far as he knew the present system has worked well although there have been those that perhaps have felt that the office was inaccessible to the political atmosphere in Salem, but there is no system that will not have some criticism or objection. Secondly, the creation of new facilities in Salem or elsewhere would involve much expense at a time of obvious severe financial limitations on the state. Many of the Board's employees would be faced with moving homes and not all would do so. Fourth, the original requirement of an Executive Secretary or an Executive Director, which is part of the Chancellor's duties, was obviously found unworkable and was abandoned with just a short amendment to the law.

Mr. Layman said the fifth reason, and the one which he considered the most important to be considered whenever this issue is faced, was the dual capacity of the Chancellor. This office combines the duties of an Executive Director of the Department of Higher Education and also the head of a complete academic program represented by the many institutions under the control of the Board, with the presidents all reporting to him. In the first capacity, the Chancellor's duties are not unlike those of the Superintendent of Public Instruction or the Executive Director of the Educational Coordinating Commission. But the Chancellor is more than an executive director of a department of state government to be housed in the state government complex.
with other people of similar duties. In addition, the Chancellor has the
added responsibility and stature of being the titular and actual head of
major academic institutions and the Chancellor and staff should continue to
be a part of the academic atmosphere.

Mr. Layman said it was true that arguments are made that in Salem there
would be more opportunities for contact with legislators and state govern-
ment, but that really has not been a problem. The Legislature is in session
biennially and there has been substantial interaction between higher education
and the Legislature. There is contact with political figures between sessions.
While this may be an argument, Mr. Layman said, he did not believe it was
a controlling one. The advantages of an academic atmosphere, some of
which are intangible as well as the tangible ones, are a real advantage.
Constant contact with the presidents and staffs of the institutions has been
found to be a real advantage in this state.

Mr. Layman concluded by saying the position of Chancellor is certainly
totally unique in state government and the dual function of that position
should be recognized at all levels of state government. Fifty years of
experience is important, but be modified. Changes, as needed and should
be made, if justified. However, Mr. Layman urged that all levels of state
government, especially the executive and legislative departments, not change
the location of the Chancellor's and Board's Offices just for the sake of
change. All of the arguments, pro and con, and the experience of five
decades should be given consideration before any move is made.

Mr. Batiste asked whether Mr. Layman believed the matter of access could
be met by having some presence in Salem and what kind of presence this
might be. Mr. Layman responded that there is a presence now during the
Legislative session by the Chancellor and the presidents and that he had
seen this presence both as a legislator and as a Board member. With
respect to contact between sessions, Mr. Layman said it would not be
difficult to arrange and that he had observed no difficulties in that regard,
either as a legislator or as a Board member.

Mr. Weatherford asked Mr. Layman whether it made any difference which
institution housed the Chancellor's Office if it were to remain on a campus.
Mr. Layman responded that the important thing was for the Chancellor's
Office to remain at an academic institution and that he thought it should be
located at least at one of the three universities. However, as Mr. Moore
also had mentioned, Mr. Layman said he had never known of any suspicion
that the University of Oregon had any special advantage because of the
Chancellor's location on that campus. For that reason, he would see no
immediate advantage in moving it to any other university.

Mr. Harms thanked Mr. Moore and Mr. Layman for their presentations.

ITEMS REFERRED The Board referred from the October 23 and/or December 10-11, 1981,
FOR INDIVIDUAL Board meetings the following items:
DISCUSSION

Policies for Off-Campus Instruction--See 10-81-27a, page 8
of October docket; also minutes, page 580. Also see
material immediately following this page and a supple-
mentary staff report.

Request To Offer BA/BS Degree Program in Liberal Studies in
Bend, OSU--See 10-81-28a and 10-81-28b, pages 11 and 8a
of October docket; also minutes, page 585.

Request To Offer BA/BS Degree in Interdisciplinary Studies in
Salem, WOSC--See 10-81-29a and 10-81-29b, pages 22 and
9a of October docket; also minutes, page 586.

Optional Admissions Requirements--during the discussion of the
admissions requirements for 1982-83, it was moved that
there be further consideration of the optional admissions
requirements.
It was recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations on the policies for off-campus instruction and the Bend and Salem programs.

Board action appears following discussion of the individual items.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (10-81-27a as revised for 1-22-82)

Presented below is a statement of policies for off-campus instruction for the State System of Higher Education which incorporates some new wording responding to concerns expressed by the Board and by the Educational Coordinating Commission.

Policies which have already been adopted by the Board, in action May 26, 1978, and May 23, 1980, in Academic Year Fee Books, and by approval of the Joint Board Statement, August 1978, are identified with an asterisk.

Policies new to the statement, considered by the Board for the first time October 23, 1981, are neither identified with an asterisk nor underscored.

Additions to the policies previously considered are underscored.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board adopt the revised policy statement in respect to off-campus instruction.

Policies for Off-Campus Instruction

*1. There shall be maintained in the State System a centrally coordinated, institutionally based off-campus instructional program, with funding of off-campus enrollments in the same manner as on-campus enrollments.

Should the Legislature not authorize funding for off-campus enrollments in the same way as on-campus enrollments, the institutions may offer such instruction as self-support courses.

*2. Campus enrollments are state-funded enrollments for credit in (1) courses conducted within the campus boundaries, and (2) courses which must be offered outside the boundaries because resources or facilities necessary to conduct the courses are available only in off-campus locations; e.g., student teaching, clinical experience, marine science instruction at Newport and Charleston. (Institutions may also schedule courses within the campus boundaries which are taught under contract or agreement where the sponsoring agency pays the full cost of instruction or which are self-supporting from fee income.)

*3. Off-campus enrollments are enrollments for credit in courses taught at a location outside the campus boundaries in order to make the courses and programs of the institution more accessible geographically. Such enrollments are limited to:

*a. Upper-division or graduate courses.

*b. Lower-division courses outside a community college or area education district.

*c. Lower-division courses inside a community college or area education district offered with the approval of the district.

4. Off-campus instructional programs will be limited to courses and activities scheduled for the convenience of part-time students.
Responsibility for off-campus non-credit courses and activities is shared among the institutions, according to institutional interest, resources, and the interests of the publics to be served. Generally, with the exception of programs of the Oregon State University Extension Service and the Labor Education Resources Center at the University of Oregon, non-credit courses and activities do not receive state-fund support and none is proposed.

Institution Responsibilities

The System's coordinated off-campus instructional program shall be based on the strengths of the institutions as regional instructional centers and statewide providers of educational programs. Each institution will have primary responsibility for service to the geographic area in which it is located, and will assist other institutions which may, in accordance with centrally approved plans, wish to schedule programs and courses in the region.

In addition to its regional responsibilities, each institution will have a statewide responsibility to identify, organize, and administer off-campus programs in curricular areas and specialties unique to the institution.

Institutions will have a shared responsibility for serving regions of the state outside their respective geographic service areas. All such programs will be conducted in accordance with centrally approved plans. When a choice must be made among two or more State System institutions seeking to serve a specific clientele in a specific location, the Board's Office will give consideration to the appropriateness of the proposed program to the need to be served, geographic proximity, ability and willingness to make available resources necessary to offer a program of good quality, and the expressed preference, if any, of the clientele to be served.

The institutions are encouraged to examine ways in which their regular degree programs can be made more accessible to the nontraditional student through appropriate modifications in such areas as admissions, registration, counseling, scheduling of courses, format of courses, system of delivery, location of courses, interpretation of residence credit required.

Efforts will be made to assure that there shall be no distinction in quality between an institution's on- and off-campus courses and programs:

- Admissions and prerequisite requirements for credit courses and programs offered off campus shall be the same as for on-campus courses and programs of the same kind.
- Curricular allocations and course authorizations as approved by the Board shall apply to all credit course offerings, on and off campus.
- Adjunct faculty employed to teach off-campus credit courses shall be subject to the same appointment criteria and review procedures as regular faculty and shall be fully qualified to teach the courses they are assigned. Each faculty person shall be informed as to the standards and grading practices of the department approving the instructional assignment.
- Degree requirements for programs offered in off-campus locations shall be the same as for on-campus programs, except as specifically indicated in respect to residency requirements. Residency requirements for off-campus programs shall specify a minimum number of hours which must be completed in course work taught by members of the regular campus-based instructional staff.
Before authorization is granted for the scheduling of credit courses or programs in an off-campus location, arrangements must be completed for student access to library resources, counseling, and support services adequate to the instruction proposed.

11. Arrangements to offer a degree program in a specific off-campus setting under the off-campus instructional policies of the Board is not and shall not be considered or described as establishment of a branch campus. Institutions will develop and implement procedures to assure that all persons and agencies associated with off-campus instructional programs of the State System are cognizant of the limited nature of the programs.

12. The Board's Office will work with the institutions in assuring the orderly development of extended degree programs and appropriate coordination of these efforts with Oregon's community colleges and independent colleges and universities.

13. Subject to applicable statutory requirements, the institutions may procure off-campus office and classroom space through rental, lease, or cooperative arrangements with non-System organizations and agencies in order to provide a consistent location for registration, information, and instructional services offered in the off-campus programs. Acquisition of such a facility does not constitute establishment of a branch campus, and the costs of the facility will be charged to the programs served.

14. Off-campus instructional programs shall be scheduled within the geographic boundaries of the state, with the following exceptions:

a. Courses which are a part of the regular curricula of the sponsoring institutions; but which must be offered in out-of-state locations because the facilities necessary to conduct the courses are only available in those locations, e.g., foreign study.

b. Courses offered through independent study (correspondence and multi-media courses).

c. Credit courses which are supported entirely by student fees and other nonstate income offered in regions contiguous to Oregon which are a part of the sponsoring institution's natural geographic service area, and are not a part of the natural service area of an out-of-state institution offering similar instruction.

d. Courses and activities, credit and noncredit, offered in the Northwest region and elsewhere, which make available specialized expertise of regular campus-based faculty, when this can be done without penalty to the campus programs and when the entire cost of the offering is covered by fees, grants, gifts, and/or contract funds.

Coordination

15. Central coordination of off-campus instruction, credit and noncredit, including independent study (correspondence and multi-media courses), in the State System will be provided through the Board's Office of Academic Affairs, working in cooperation with an interinstitutional council on off-campus education. Specifically, the Board's Office will work with the institutions in coordinating policies and procedures for off-campus instructional programs, avoiding unnecessary program duplication, insuring maximum use of resources, providing special reports to interested groups, serving a clearinghouse function, adjudicating issues which may arise concerning off-campus instruction, and promoting off-campus educational opportunities for citizens residing in areas remote from campuses of the State System.
*16. It is expected that the State System institutions will adhere to the Joint Statement adopted by the State Board of Higher Education and the State Board of Education concerning coordination of off-campus credit and noncredit education and articulation among and between two- and four-year colleges and universities and secondary schools, and to any subsequent changes in that Statement as may be agreed to by the two Boards.

In accordance with this Statement, intersegmental regional coordination of credit and noncredit off-campus programs in Oregon will be maintained through regional coordinating meetings of the institutional presidents (State System, community college, independent college and university) or their designees; necessary intersegmental coordination on the state level will be accomplished through consultation between the Board's Office and the State Department of Education and independent institution representatives, or through the State System-Community College Coordinating Committee, as appropriate, with the participation of such other individuals and agencies as may be necessary. Any intersegmental issues related to coordination which cannot be resolved agreeably by the segments concerned may be referred to the Educational Coordinating Commission for review and recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Kahananui reviewed the further modification to the policies for off-campus instruction which were designed to address the problems identified by the Board in its October discussion and by the Educational Coordinating Council staff report and commission discussion in November. In response to a question, she explained that the Educational Coordinating Council had addressed the question of policies but not the question of programs because the Commission wished to have the Board's policies in place before considering the programs. Usually the Commission addresses questions after the Board has acted, but it had been willing to review the policies.

Mr. Batiste asked whether there were centrally-approved plans currently in effect. Mrs. Kahananui explained that the Board's Office is aware of the traditional offerings of the institutions and regular reports of the off-campus instructional programs of the institutions are received and reviewed at least annually. The Board's Office of Academic Affairs is charged with coordinating off-campus instruction, and the institutions do not start a program without its first being reviewed.

Mr. Perry said he favored the programs but was concerned about the net cost to the System in the present financial exigency, even though the cost might be small. Mrs. Kahananui said two kinds of costs have been considered in these programs—first, the direct instructional costs plus the overhead. Off-campus programs now are required to raise a certain percentage to accommodate the overhead charges. The programs will be entirely self-supporting under those regulations. There is also a cost in that the program might attract students from one of the campus institutions and that this self-support program might develop into a program serving full-time students. Off-campus programs in the State System have not been full-time since the Vanport program after World War II. The Vanport program ultimately became Portland State University. An effort has been made to include a specific policy statement which says that these programs will be limited to activities attracting part-time students. Baccalaureate degrees that can be offered off-campus must necessarily be of a liberal studies nature at the upper-division level.

Mrs. Carpenter said it was important to note for the record that the Educational Coordinating Commission had approved a program proposed by a very small private liberal arts college. The program has very few of the safeguards that were built into the Bend program.
Mr. Anderson said the report was a good step forward in coordinating the policies for off-campus instruction which had been lacking, in his opinion, up to this time.

Mrs. Kahananui commented that the institutions have a primary responsibility to their regional geographic area, they have a state-wide responsibility, and then there is the question of the in-between areas in places like Bend and Coos Bay. She also explained that the regional coordinating council would seek to coordinate programs of the higher education institutions within that region. The interinstitutional council for off-campus instruction coordinates activities of State System institutions.

Mr. Anderson called attention to the statement in Item 10 that there would be no distinction in quality between campus and off-campus programs and said he did not think that could be guaranteed because things available at a major university simply would not be available for off-campus programs in many instances. Mrs. Kahananui agreed that there are many courses which, because of their quality considerations, simply could not be offered to an off-campus population. However, there are different ways of achieving quality and a course offering to a non-traditional, older student may be able to achieve quality in one way while a course offered on-campus will achieve it in a different way. The institutions are expected to be responsible for assuring that there will not be first-class courses and second-class courses for reasons of location.

Mr. Anderson said he would prefer to say that every effort would be made to preserve quality.

Dr. T. K. Olson apologized to the Board for the fact that the letter from the Educational Coordinating Commission on this matter apparently had never been received. He said the letter was drafted after the Commission meeting and was then lost in the moving of the Commission's offices or was not delivered. He said the amendments proposed by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs were responsive to the concerns of the Commission. He said the Commission continued to be concerned about quality and would prefer the language suggested by Mr. Anderson. The Commission was also interested in planning and the extent to which the Board had a sense of the intentions of other institutions for potential off-campus offerings. He expressed pleasure with the efforts to clarify these policies and indicated that the Commission would consider the two program proposals as soon as they were approved by the Board.

The Board approved the policies with the inclusion of the proposed change by Mr. Anderson with respect to the statement on quality and the deletion of a similar statement immediately thereafter because it was no longer necessary. These changes have been reflected in the policies on pages 11 to 14. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

The Board then approved the request by Oregon State University to offer the BA/BS degree program in liberal studies in Bend. The following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Anderson abstained.

The Board then approved the request by Western Oregon State College to offer the BA/BS degree in interdisciplinary studies in Salem. The following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Anderson abstained.
Mr. Harms explained that when the 1982-83 admission requirements were approved, the option that individual institutions could change their admission requirements by one-quarter of a point had been eliminated and the institutions returned to the system which existed prior to the time the option had been granted. It was requested that there be further discussion about continuing the option.

Mr. Wyss said that in proposing a continuation of the one-quarter point of variation at the earlier meeting, it had been his belief that the option gave the institutions a little more administrative ability to respond to changing conditions. He said he still supported that idea.

It was pointed out by Mrs. Carpenter that the Board is required to approve admission policies before they are implemented. Since there is an opportunity for institutions to present any desired changes to the Board, it would seem important to have a coordinated approach in view of the lack of financial stability.

Mr. Wyss said he agreed there should be options that allow response to what may very easily become a necessity to limit access. It would be helpful if the institutions were able to make these shifts without further requests.

The Chancellor pointed out that if the option were approved, an institution could change the requirements once a year by one-quarter of a point. The policy of the Board which says that admission requirements will be announced in the public schools a year in advance would essentially be dropped, because the Board would not be required to act on the one-quarter of a point changes.

Mrs. Flanagan asked whether institutions could exercise the options in succeeding years. Mr. Wyss said the Board would have an opportunity to review what had happened once each year and if the actions of an institution appeared to be inappropriate at some point, the Board could give them direction to modify the requirements accordingly. Mrs. Flanagan suggested that it might be easier to have the institutions request a change than to monitor what they are doing.

Mr. Harms said the argument for uniform policy, which is really the issue, is whether the Board was going to delegate part of its ability to set admission requirements, within parameters, to the institutions.

By a vote of six to five, the Board approved a motion to allow the institutions the option of raising or lowering the admission requirements by one-quarter of a point in any given year. Those voting in favor were: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Weatherford, and Wyss.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (1-82-1a)

Inasmuch as Architects Sheldon, Eggleston, Reddick Associates, P.C., have completed their analysis of the rehabilitation requirements for the ten residential facilities on the campus of Portland State University, a report of their findings and recommendations is available for review by the Board. It appears likely that most of the expenditure authorization of $2,245,000 previously approved for this work by the Board and the 1981 Legislature will need to be applied to fulfill requirements for life safety, mechanical and electrical system revisions, accessibility for the handicapped, and compliance with other building code provisions, with some opportunity for energy conservation measures and other limited improvements in the quality of the student living units. These items have been reviewed and have been endorsed, in principle, by Portland Student Services, Inc., the nonprofit corporation which leases and operates the facilities. All of the project costs
would be financed from proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bonds under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution, with debt service to be provided from rental income. No state tax funds would be involved.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Subject to minor modifications noted in the Staff Report, it was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to accept the Portland State University Student Housing Rehabilitation Study which has been prepared by Architects Sheldon, Eggleston, Reddick Associates, P.C., and their consultants in accordance with the provisions of the professional services agreement executed with them under date of July 24, 1981, and to proceed with the design development phase of planning for those portions of the rehabilitation work which may be undertaken within a direct construction cost allowance of approximately $1,511,188 as soon as mutually satisfactory arrangements can be made for these services. Consistent with Board action on May 29, 1981, the planning costs will be financed from excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees pending the availability of proceeds from the sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Perry asked whether the interest rates for the bonds would have an impact on residence halls at other institutions. Mr. Hunderup responded that it could because under the Board's policies, the borrowings for all student housing are lumped together and each institution bears a proportionate share, based upon the capacities of the housing on that particular campus. However, as money is borrowed at rates that are higher than the current composite interest rate on outstanding issues sold a number of years ago, it has the effect of raising that average or composite interest rate so that the debt service that must be faced by all institutions will be impacted by the sale of bonds for any one institution or combination of institutions. It is anticipated that the impact would not extend to more than $10 per student per year at any residence hall on any campus.

In discussing the installation of new heating equipment for the Ondine, it was indicated that the costs for self-manufacture of steam, as proposed in the report were substantially less than purchasing the necessary energy from Pacific Power and Light.

At the request of Mr. Lomnicki, Mr. Hunderup described the modifications to provide accessibility for the handicapped. Mr. Lomnicki suggested the possibility of consolidating the accommodations for the handicapped into a single building. It was indicated that the intent was to broaden the types of facilities available to introduce apartment-type units into the mix of options. It was also stated that efforts would be made to reduce the quantity to less than the 5% presently required because the demand is not great enough to justify that number of units.

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

**Schematic Design Phase of Planning for Parking Structure No. 2 Addition, OHSU**

**Summary for Meeting Worksheets (1-82-2a)**

The schematic design phase of planning for the proposed three-level concrete and steel addition to Parking Structure No. 2 at the Oregon Health Sciences University has been completed by Breedlove-McConnell Engineers, Inc., Portland, and is available for review with the Board. Approximately 430 to 450 additional spaces would be added to this parking facility located adjacent to University Hospital South and the Dental School Building. All of the estimated expenditure requirements totaling $3,115,000 for the project would be financed from self-liquidating bonds to be issued in 1982 under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981. No state tax funds would be involved.
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 proposed major addition to Parking Structure No. 2 at the Oregon Health Sciences University and to instruct the project engineers to complete the design development phase of planning for this work based upon a direct construction cost allowance of approximately $2,680,000.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (1-82-3a)

Architects Afseth, Jacobs & Schmitz of Medford have completed the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed new Stadium at Southern Oregon State College for which an expenditure limitation of $1,530,000 was approved previously by the Board and the 1981 Legislature. The new structure would provide covered seating for more than 2,000 spectators, new field lighting, a press box and coaches' observation space above the grandstand, as well as restrooms, storage and concession areas at grade level. Except for gift funds of $300,000 now being obtained through the assistance of the College's Foundation, it is expected that the estimated total project costs of $1,530,000, including direct construction costs of approximately $1,313,915, would be financed from self-liquidating bonds. No state tax funds would be involved.

The development of adjacent areas for automotive parking may be undertaken simultaneously, but the financing thereof would be accommodated from Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings under the separate Board and Legislative authorization of $395,000 in 1979 for Parking Improvements on the campus in Ashland.

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 proposed new Stadium at Southern Oregon State College and to instruct the project architects to complete the design development phase of planning for this work based upon a direct construction cost allowance of approximately $1,313,915. It was also recommended that the authorization for planning be sufficient to permit the coordination of the proposed improvement of adjacent areas for parking (financed under a separate expenditure authorization) with the Stadium project.

Board Discussion and Action

During the discussion, Mr. Hunderup described the financing for athletic stadiums at State System institutions. The Board approved the staff recommendations as presented with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (1-82-4a)

The schematic design phase of planning for the Moehl Stadium Roof at Oregon Institute of Technology has been completed by Architects Afseth, Jacobs & Schmitz and is available for review and approval by the Board. Consistent with legislative authorization in 1981, it is expected that the total project costs of $205,000 would be financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises. No state tax funds would be involved.
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 proposed roof cover over Moehl Stadium at Oregon Institute of Technology and to instruct the project architects to proceed with the planning based upon a direct construction cost allowance of approximately $170,625.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (1-82-5a)

Architects Skidmore, Owings & Merrill of Portland have completed the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed remodeling of the Physical Education Building at Oregon Institute of Technology to provide for the swimming pool which had been planned for future construction when the building was originally designed and built in 1964. An expenditure limitation of $1,025,000 was approved for this project previously by the Board and the 1981 Legislature as part of the capital construction program to be financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings and/or other balances available for auxiliary enterprises. No state tax funds are involved.

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 proposed remodeling of the Physical Education Building at Oregon Institute of Technology to provide for a 25-meter swimming pool and related locker and drying room facilities, and to instruct the project architects to complete the design development phase of planning for this work based upon a direct construction cost allowance of approximately $863,280.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (1-82-6a; no 6b)

It was recommended that the Board approve the following amendments to Section 5 of the Internal Management Directives as it pertains to libraries. The Director of Libraries position was discontinued several years ago upon the retirement of Dr. Carl Hintz. Arrangements developed at that time for coordination of library services have worked well and it is now felt that the Internal Management Directives should be revised to reflect the present procedures.
The proposed amendments appear below:

**Libraries**

5.020 **Coordination of Libraries**

Coordination of all library development, processes, and services will be achieved through:

1. A Chief Librarian at each institution who, while working in close cooperation with other Department librarians (and the Director of Library Services) shall be directly responsible to designated institutional officers for all phases of operation of the inter-institutional library or libraries.

2. A [Library Council is established;] consisting of the Chancellor or a designee[,] and the Chief Librarian of each institution[,] [and the Director of Library Services—This]

The [Council will meet periodically to discuss problems of mutual concern and interest; [and to] coordinate and integrate development and work of the libraries; be alert to the avoidance of unnecessary duplication; develop plans for maximum development and utilization of library resources and services[,] [The Director of Library Services shall serve as Council chairman.]

and, through its elected Chairperson, advise and counsel the Chancellor on all Department-wide problems and undertakings relating to the operation of the libraries.

3. [A Director of Library Services] The Chairperson of the Library Council, who will also serve as chief librarian of one of the institutional libraries.

4. A Central Library Service Office[,] [administered by the Director of Library Services—Established] with the following functions:

   (1) Maintenance of centralized bookkeeping records for all Department libraries; furnishing each library, as frequently as it may require; a statement of its disbursements and financial status.

   (2) Pooling of orders for all supplies and equipment such as catalog cards, business forms and furniture, on which quality discounts may be obtained.
Research and planning touching all phases of library operations, including buildings, equipment, and systems design.

Coordination of activities in the application of automated systems to the libraries.

**Board Discussion and Action**

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

**Staff Recommendation to the Board (1-82-8a; no 8b)**

To finance a portion of the cost of auxiliary enterprise construction and remodeling projects and 
and acquisition, it is necessary to sell State of Oregon, State Board of Higher Education Multi-Purpose Bonds, Series 1982 A, with a total par value of $11,710,000. Authorization for the sale is granted by Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981, Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution, ORS Chapter 351, and Chapter 660, Oregon Laws 1981; and

It was recommended that the Board authorize the sale of said Series 1982 A bond issue through approval of the following resolution by roll call vote:

**$11,710,000 STATE OF OREGON, STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION MULTI-PURPOSE BONDS, SERIES 1982 A**

**RESOLUTION**

WHEREAS, THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION deems it necessary, pursuant to law, including Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351, and Chapter 660, Oregon Laws 1981, to sell general obligation STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION MULTI-PURPOSE BONDS, SERIES 1982 A, of the State of Oregon, in the principal amount of $11,710,000 to provide for the acquisition of land and for the planning, constructing, altering, repairing, furnishing and equipping of buildings, facilities and structures for the Department of Higher Education; and for payment of costs incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds; and

WHEREAS, THE BOARD, as required by ORS 351.160, has determined conservatively that said buildings and other structures financed from Article XI-F(1) will be wholly self-liquidating and self-supporting from revenues to accrue from the operation thereof and from gifts, grants, or building fees, and from unobligated revenues of higher education buildings or projects of like character; and

WHEREAS, THE BOARD is authorized and directed by ORS 351.170 to establish for projects financed from Article XI-F(1) bonds such rates, charges, and fees for use of such buildings, structures or projects, including revenue-producing buildings and structures already constructed, as, in the judgment of the Board, shall provide the required revenues to make the new buildings, structures or projects self-liquidating and self-supporting, and as shall provide the funds with which to amortize the principal of and pay the interest on bonds issued to finance such buildings, structures or projects; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE STATE OF OREGON that ELEVEN MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS ($11,710,000) par value of bonds authorized by law, including Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351, and Chapter 660, Oregon Laws 1981, be issued and sold by the State Treasurer; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said bonds totaling ELEVEN MILLION SEVEN HUNDRED TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS ($11,710,000) par value be issued and the proceeds from the sale of these STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION MULTI-PURPOSE BONDS, SERIES 1982 A, be used for the acquisition of land and for the planning, constructing, altering, repairing, furnishing and equipping of buildings, facilities, and structures for the Department of Higher Education; and for payment of costs incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds, as provided by law, including Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351, and Chapter 660, Oregon Laws 1981; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the principal of and the interest on all of the bonds issued pursuant to this resolution be paid on the due dates thereof at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, and that the said bonds be designated STATE OF OREGON, STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION MULTI-PURPOSE BONDS, SERIES 1982 A, and be numbered consecutively; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said bonds be dated April 15, 1982, be issued in denominations of $5,000 each, and depending upon the bid accepted, mature upon the dates and in the principal installments hereinafter in this resolution set forth for either twenty-year bonds or thirty-year bonds. Said bonds are subject to redemption in inverse numerical order at par value and accrued interest on any interest-paying date on and after April 15, 1991 for twenty-year bonds, or April 15, 1996 for thirty-year bonds, from the moneys and revenues indicated by law, including Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981, applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351, and Chapter 660, Oregon Laws 1981; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the bonds be advertised for sale giving the bidder the option of bidding on either a twenty-year maturity schedule or a thirty-year maturity schedule, or both, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Thirty-Years</th>
<th>Twenty-Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1984</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$ 230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1985</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1986</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1987</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1988</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1989</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1990</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1991</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>545,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1992</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>615,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1993</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td>695,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1994</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>790,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1995</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>885,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1996</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>1,005,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1997</td>
<td>740,000</td>
<td>1,135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1998</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>1,285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1999</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2001</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2002</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2003</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2004</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2005</td>
<td>385,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2006</td>
<td>440,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2007</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2008</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2009</td>
<td>630,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2010</td>
<td>715,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2011</td>
<td>810,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State furnish to the original purchaser of said bonds, without cost to the purchaser, the written opinion of accredited bond attorneys certifying to the validity and legality of the said bonds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said bonds be the direct general obligations of the State of Oregon, and that, except as to the variations in the interest rates and maturities, they be of uniform tenor and be in substantially the following form, approved by the Attorney General of the State of Oregon:

Number

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
STATE OF OREGON
STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MULTI-PURPOSE BOND
SERIES 1982 A

$5,000

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that the STATE OF OREGON acknowledges itself to owe and for value received hereby promises to pay to bearer the principal sum of $5,000 on the fifteenth day of April, with interest on said sum from the date hereof until paid, at the rate of ______ PERCENT (%) per annum, payable semiannually on the fifteenth day of April and the fifteenth day of October in each year, as evidenced by, and upon the presentation and surrender of, the interest coupons hereto annexed as they severally become due. Both the principal of and the interest on this bond are payable at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America.

The bonds of the issue of which this bond forms a part, maturing on and after April-15,-1992 (April 15, 1997) may be redeemed at the option of the State of Oregon, on and after April-15,-1991 (April 15, 1996), at par and accrued interest, on any interest-paying day or days in inverse numerical order or in the entire amount of the issue outstanding at call date, upon notice given by the Treasurer of the State of Oregon at least thirty (30) days prior to the redemption date specified therein, by publication thereof in one issue of a newspaper or financial journal of general circulation printed and published within the City and State of New York, and one issue of a newspaper of general circulation printed and published within the City of Salem, Oregon, and as otherwise required by law. From the date of redemption designated in any such notice, interest on the bonds so called for redemption shall cease.

This bond is issued by the State of Oregon in conformance to its Constitution and under and by virtue of and in all respects in full and strict compliance with its laws, and in particular Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution, Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981, applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351, and Chapter 660, Oregon Laws 1981, for the acquisition of land and for the planning, constructing, altering, repairing, furnishing and equipping of buildings, facilities and structures for the Department of Higher Education; and for payment of costs incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds.

The full faith and credit of the State of Oregon hereby are irrevocably pledged to the punctual payment of the interest on and the principal of this bond as the same become due and payable respectively.
IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, the STATE OF OREGON has caused this bond to be signed by the Governor and by the Secretary of State with their facsimile signatures, and by the State Treasurer or Deputy State Treasurer, and sealed with the seal of the State of Oregon, and has caused the annexed interest coupons to be executed with the facsimile signatures of its said officers, all as of the fifteenth day of April, 1982.

Governor
(Seal)
Secretary of State
State Treasurer

FORM OF COUPON
(For Twenty-Year Bonds)
(For coupons maturing on April 15, 1982, up to and including April 15, 1991)

No. _______ On the fifteenth day of __________, $________
THE STATE OF OREGON will pay the bearer
_________________________ DOLLARS

at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America, for six months' interest then due on State of Oregon, State Board of Higher Education Multi-Purpose Bond, Series 1982 A, No.:______.

(facsimile) (facsimile) (facsimile)
State Treasurer Secretary of State Governor

(For coupons maturing on and after October 15, 1991)

No. _______ On the fifteenth day of __________, $________
unless the bond hereinafter designated shall have been called for previous redemption and due provision made for the payment thereof, THE STATE OF OREGON will pay the bearer
_________________________ DOLLARS

at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America, for six months' interest then due on State of Oregon, State Board of Higher Education Multi-Purpose Bond, Series 1982 A, No.:______.

(facsimile) (facsimile) (facsimile)
State Treasurer Secretary of State Governor

The foregoing bond and coupon forms hereby are approved as to legal form this ______ day of __________, 1982.

Attorney General of the State of Oregon
FORM OF COUPON
(For Thirty-Year Bonds)

(For coupons maturing on April 15, 1982, up to and including April 15, 1996)

No. ______ On the fifteenth day of ________, ___, $_______

THE STATE OF OREGON will pay the bearer

_______________________________ DOLLARS

at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America, for six months' interest then due on State of Oregon, State Board of Higher Education Multi-Purpose Bond, Series 1982 A, No. ________.

(facsimile) (facsimile) (facsimile)
State Treasurer Secretary of State Governor

(For coupons maturing on and after October 15, 1996)

No. ______ On the fifteenth day of ________, ___, $_______ unless the bond hereinafter designated shall have been called for previous redemption and due provision made for the payment thereof, THE STATE OF OREGON will pay the bearer

_______________________________ DOLLARS

at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America, for six months' interest then due on State of Oregon, State Board of Higher Education Multi-Purpose Bond, Series 1982 A, No. ________.

(facsimile) (facsimile) (facsimile)
State Treasurer Secretary of State Governor

The foregoing bond and coupon forms hereby are approved as to legal form this ______ day of ____________, 1982.

Attorney General of the State of Oregon

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State Treasurer advertise the said STATE OF OREGON, STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION MULTI-PURPOSE BONDS, SERIES 1982 A, for public sale thereof on such date as he determines feasible, at a price of not less than $98 for each $100 par value thereof, with a maximum net effective rate of interest not to exceed 13%, unless the State Treasurer determines through reasonable marketing efforts that the maximum rate may be 14%, pursuant to Chapter 661, Oregon Laws 1981.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Vice Chancellor for Administration of the State Board of Higher Education be authorized to effect the necessary arrangements for the production, in accordance with ORS 287.018, of an Official Statement for bonds issued pursuant to this resolution.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary and Vice Chancellor for Administration of the State Board of Higher Education be authorized to effect the necessary arrangements with the State Treasurer to deliver the bonds and to receive payment therefor.

Board Discussion and Action

Upon motion by Mr. Anderson, and seconded by Mr. Peterson, the Board approved the staff recommendation as presented and adopted the above resolution on roll call vote, with the following voting in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (1-82-7a; no 7b)

In reviewing the Board's policies in respect to physical education, two questions must be asked:

1. Do physical education activity courses have a legitimate place in the undergraduate curriculum?

2. Are baccalaureate degree requirements of the institutions in respect to physical education and health responsive to the general education objectives of the Board.

1. Do physical education activity courses have a legitimate place in the undergraduate curriculum?

In response to the first question, it has been the position of the Board's staff that the physical being--knowledge about, appreciation of, and skills in the use of the body--constitutes a fully legitimate and desirable topic for study, not only for the student who is preparing for a career as a physical or health educator, but for all undergraduate students. The importance of such knowledge is becoming increasingly evident as civilization wipes out ancient scourges only to see its citizens fall victim to a host of new debilitating ailments, brought on by inadequate or mistaken knowledge about, appreciation of, and skill in the use of the body.

The faculties of the institutions have responded to budget cuts mandated by the legislature for 1982-83 with an earnest examination of the function of physical education activities courses in the curriculum for non-major undergraduate students. While the immediate conclusion has been to meet fiscal stringencies by making substantial reductions in programming for students majoring in physical education and in scheduling of physical education activities classes, in no instance have the faculties moved to exclude instruction in physical education activities from the academic curriculum.

This position is best expressed by the following statement, prepared by a special committee of physical educators of the State System appointed by their institutions to define the function of physical education activities for the Board's staff.

It is our opinion that the education and welfare of an individual must be considered in holistic terms rather than the categorization of experiences which are supposedly attentive to a specific facet of human life. Thus, we are committed to the concept that the sum total of human movement experience, carefully selected as to the kind and conducted as to outcome, contributes significantly to the health knowledges and practices of each student. Such activity, moreover, makes a meaningful contribution to the balanced education of that student.
Specifically, the institutions are proposing the following actions in respect to physical education activity courses for 1982-83.

The University of Oregon requests authorization to change degree requirements for the baccalaureate degree by eliminating the requirement that students complete 5 terms of physical education activity courses. With this approval, the University will offer a limited program of physical education activity courses on a self-support basis. The Faculty Assembly, in approving the proposal to delete the physical education activity requirement from the baccalaureate degree, noted: "The University Assembly recommends this action solely because of funding restrictions initiated by a legislative budget note and not for any academic reasons." The University will retain the requirement of one term of health.

Oregon State University proposes to continue to offer physical education activity courses as a part of its regular instructional program, but will reduce the number and frequency of offerings. A special activity course fee is proposed to recover partially costs of offering the courses and to reduce student demand. Oregon State will retain its baccalaureate degree requirement of three terms of physical education activity courses.

Portland State University has appointed a faculty committee to make recommendations for a restructuring of and reduction in physical education programming for non-majors to provide a combined health and fitness graduation requirement. It is expected that the University will forward a recommendation for modification of degree requirements to the Board sometime during the spring term. Course work needed to meet the new graduation requirement will be scheduled as a part of the regular academic program. In addition, a limited schedule of physical education activity courses will be offered on a self-support basis.

Western Oregon State College will reduce numbers and frequency of physical education activity courses scheduled each term. The College will retain its present liberal arts core requirement specifying completion of a 2-credit-hour course titled Health and Fitness followed by three selected physical education activity courses.

Southern Oregon State College does not require completion of course work in health and physical education for graduation. The College will continue to offer a limited schedule of physical education activity courses for students who elect to enroll for this instruction.

Eastern Oregon State College does not require course work in health and physical education for graduation. The College proposes to offer a limited schedule of physical education activity courses and to institute a course fee to recover some of the program costs.

Oregon Institute of Technology proposes to retain programming of physical education activity courses in sufficient frequency and numbers to permit its students to meet the Institute's degree requirement of three terms of activity courses, one term of health.

2. Are baccalaureate degree requirements of the institutions in respect to physical education and health responsive to the general education objectives of the Board?

Objectives of the State System of Higher Education, adopted by the Board in 1962 and affirmed in 1973, include the following statement concerning general education:

2. To provide programs of general education so that students may have opportunity to: (a) be enriched by an appreciation of the arts and sciences, (b) develop the skills to communicate effectively in written and oral forms, (c) acquire an understanding of the impact of science, scientific methodology, and technology upon the world in which we live, (d) have the health knowledge basic to
sound and effective health practices, (e) become responsible citizens of Oregon and larger world, and (f) develop the resources and incentives for learning new skills or for otherwise increasing their educational capital, as changing times will require.

Reviews of the place of physical education activity courses in the undergraduate curriculum raises questions as to whether the graduation requirements of the institutions are responsive to provision (d) above.

The Board's staff does not suggest that study of the physical being is not a legitimate and desirable part of the liberal education of the undergraduate student. On the contrary. However, the variations in graduation requirements and the absence of such requirements at several institutions leads to the question as to whether requiring--or not requiring--a specified number of physical education activity courses and/or a course in health adequately addresses the Board's objective.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board approve proposals of the institutions in respect to physical education activity courses as outlined above for 1982-83, with the understanding that the Board's staff will review the experience of the institutions with this instruction and further deliberations of the faculties in respect to degree requirements in health and physical education, with the view of bringing to the Board for its consideration a more uniform policy in respect to these matters for 1983-84.

Board Discussion and Action

A motion was made and seconded to defer the policies regarding physical education courses for individual discussion at the next meeting. At the request of the Board, Mrs. Kahananui reviewed the report, indicating the plan at each institution and financial support for the program.

Mr. Harms read a telegram received from Shawn Dooley, Director of State Affairs Task Force of the Associated Students of Oregon State University, which advocated the elimination of physical education activity courses as requirements for graduation and the implementation of a users' fees as a funding source for these programs on a System-wide basis. Mr. Harms also commented that when the Faculty Assembly at the University of Oregon looked at this matter, the Assembly stated that it recommended this action solely because of funding restrictions initiated by a Legislative Budget Note and not for any academic reasons.

President Olum indicated that if there were any possibility the Board would not approve the plan proposed by the University of Oregon, the institution would need to know this as soon as possible.

The Board then approved the motion to place the physical education policies on the list of items for individual discussion at the next meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Perry was absent from the meeting at this time.

Mr. Harms said he had received a letter from Representative Mae Yih which requested that the Board consider an amendment to OAR 580-10-040(2) which provides that an alien possessing a student visa or other temporary visa cannot be classified as a resident student. Her concern was that this gives no consideration to the status of the parent or guardian and did not conform to legislative intent. Mr. Harms said he had advised Representative Yih that he would place her request before the Board. He explained that there is an appeal process and exceptions have been made. However, the decision remains as to whether the Board thinks the rule is unfair and whether it violates Legislative intent. The request resulted from the fact that Representative Yih and her husband were guardians in fact of an alien student who has been classified as a nonresident under the rule.
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The Board approved a motion to refer this matter to the appeals process on the basis that an appeals procedure is available and exceptions have been made. The following voted in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Directors Anderson and Perry were absent from the meeting at this time.

Introduction of New Business

Mr. Batiste referred to a very extensive report on computer policy which had been adopted by the Board. He suggested that the Board request a report on implementation of policy and on ways of optimizing the use of high technology and computers in higher education to enhance quality and reduce costs.

The Board approved a motion to request such a staff report, with the following voting in favor: Directors Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Perry, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None. Director Anderson was absent from the meeting at this time.

Board members also requested follow-up reports on additional topics, including the following:

1. The transfer of tenured faculty among institutions;
2. A review of the process by which professional consultants and construction contractors are selected; and
3. Information with respect to defaults on student loans.

Board members did express the view that care should be taken in adding to the workload of the staff at this particular time.

Report from Instruction Committee on Mission Statements

Mrs. Carpenter said there had been a very far-ranging discussion the preceding evening of the mission statements which were originally written in 1962 and modified some ten years later. There was general agreement that the mission statements were not an adequate document to express either the thinking, the sophistication, or the general approach of the State System at this time. It was further agreed that with the greater pressures in a number of areas there was no way in which this complex educational community could develop a revised mission objective statement in a very short time.

The Committee referred the mission statements to the staff for preparation of a new draft after further discussions with the academic vice presidents and the presidents of the institutions.

The matter of access for citizens of Oregon and how this would be related to other actions that are being taken was mentioned. The Committee also discussed the issue of quality.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Communications, Petitions and Memorials

The secretary reported that approximately 10 more letters had been received supporting the Medical Technology program and urging its continuation. There were three of a similar nature with respect to landscape architecture, and two resolutions adopted by organizations in the area of Southern Oregon State College stressing the importance of that institution and its economic benefit to the region.

A letter was received from Jordan E. Kurland, Associate General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, Washington, D.C., expressing appreciation for the fact that the Board did not allow the use of extendable contract appointments throughout the State System.

President's Report

Mr. Harms announced that the next Board meeting would be held on February 26, 1982, at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. It will be preceded by a visitation which will probably commence on Thursday morning, February 25.
Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Zimmer/Gunsul/Frasca Partnership, project architects, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for the Gilbert Hall Remodeling on the campus at Oregon State University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of November 6, 1981, subject to the completion of various punchlist items.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on May 23, 1980:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revised Budget 11/6/81</th>
<th>Original Budget 5/23/80</th>
<th>Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. A. Lantz Construction Co., Salem</td>
<td>$2,632,113</td>
<td>$2,536,631</td>
<td>$95,482 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items of landscaping and plant rehabilitation work accomplished by physical plant forces</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>(42,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$2,699,113</td>
<td>$2,645,631</td>
<td>$53,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>307,180</td>
<td>298,515</td>
<td>8,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>208,193</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>(6,807)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>84,058</td>
<td>57,116</td>
<td>26,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art (1% of direct construction costs)</td>
<td>26,456</td>
<td>26,456</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132,282</td>
<td>(132,282)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,325,000</td>
<td>$3,375,000</td>
<td>($50,000) (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes installing a structural steel header at the third floor to accommodate the removal of concrete for an outside air shaft; providing structural modifications to existing roof structure to support new penthouse and mechanical equipment; relocating and reworking existing cabinets and tops in Lab No. 276; adding ten additional taps to the first floor cold water loop; refinishing existing walls and ceilings in room Nos. 164, 166 and 220A; adding vacuum outlets and funnel attachments to floor drains in room Nos. 284 and 290; providing additional cup sinks and cold water turrets in Lab No. 226; providing two 9-inch split exhaust duct connections to fume hoods to provide proper air distribution within hood interior; relocating fume hood exhaust ducts to existing clay tile flues; substituting electrical metallic tubing for rigid steel conduit; adding plaster finish in Lab Nos. 114, 130 and 130A; adding three movable benches in Lab No. 276; replacing electrical conduit and conductors which disintegrated during demolition; providing additional electrical power to second and third floor laboratory areas; modifying alcohol vault No. 192B; painting additional rooms; and other minor modifications all included within five approved change orders.

(2) The savings were applicable to amounts budgeted originally for repair and maintenance work in the building and were utilized by the institution for other General Fund purposes.

The work of the contract included the correction of fire and life safety deficiencies throughout the building and the improvement of access for the physically handicapped, such as through the installation of an elevator and a bridge connection to the recently completed major addition to Gilbert Hall. The project also included various items of repair and maintenance which were undertaken simultaneously with the remaining rehabilitation and remodeling
work consistent with the program reviewed and approved by the Board on March 28, 1980, and by the State Emergency Board on April 25, 1980.

The expenditures were financed from various sources as outlined in the final section of the following summary:

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OSU Gilbert Hall Remodeling

Architects - Zimmer/Gunsul/Frasca Partnership, Portland

Board's priority - Part of No. 1 (Correction of Safety Deficiencies, Phase III) in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)

Part of No. 2 (Accessibility for the Handicapped) in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)

All of No. 3 (Gilbert Hall Remodel) in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979 and State Emergency Board action on April 25, 1980

Estimated total project costs $3,325,000

Estimated total direct construction costs $2,699,113

Financing plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase III</th>
<th>General Fund Appropriations</th>
<th>Article XI-G Bond Proceeds</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,330,000</td>
<td>$1,330,000</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for Handicapped Remodeling</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's reserve for physical plant rehabilitation</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional funds for physical plant maintenance</td>
<td>100,000*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals $1,750,000 $1,575,000 $3,325,000

*A reduction of $50,000 was made in the amount budgeted initially from institutional resources for physical plant maintenance, and the savings were utilized to support other General Fund purposes at Oregon State University.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendations of officials of Oregon State University, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 580-50-020, arrangements were made with The Hartman Company, Seattle, Washington, for professional services relating to a study of the energy management system for dormitories and cafeterias on the campus in Corvallis consistent with the provisions of a federal grant obtained by the institution under the Schools and Hospital Program of the Department of Energy in the total amount of $190,800.

Compensation for the professional services of the Engineers and for reimbursement of related expenses will be based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $28,000.
Funds for the planning are being provided from the grant and from balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Stastny/Graham Architects, P.C., Portland, for renovation and cover of a portion of the Washington Way tennis court complex on the campus at Oregon State University, were approved on behalf of the Board. Two basic bids were invited for the work, i.e., Basic Bid "A" for resurfacing and covering four courts, and Basic Bid "B" for work on only three of these same courts. Deductive alternates were requested for each basic bid. Quotations were received from six contractors on December 17, 1981. Giving effect to one deductive alternate which would be exercised, these bids ranged as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Bid &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>$466,300</td>
<td>$536,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Bid &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>375,100</td>
<td>442,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inasmuch as the indicated lowest bid for Basic Bid "A" is within the resources available, it is expected that a contract award will be made and the following tentative budget will be approved for the project as soon as the appropriate expenditure authorization is obtained from the State Emergency Board:

- Direct construction costs:
  - Marion Construction Company, Salem: $466,300
  - Professional services fees: 51,561
  - Construction supervision, legal and miscellaneous costs: 18,150
  - Works of art (1% of direct construction costs): 4,663
  - Contingencies (2% of direct construction costs): 9,326

  **Total**: $550,000

As indicated to the Board when the design phase of planning was reviewed and approved on August 7, 1981, the work of the contract would include the resurfacing and a cover over four of the seventeen tennis courts located on the north side of Washington Way, near Gill Coliseum, on the campus in Corvallis. The proposed roof design reflects a trapezoidal configuration which has only one-quarter of the sloping roof surface visible from either the north or the south. The primary structural system of the roof would be formed with 8-inch diameter pipe trusses located between the courts, and the secondary roof structure would be composed of glu-laminated wood beams and wood and metal truss-joists. Transparent fiberglass skylights on the flat roof area as well as in the sloped roof areas would facilitate natural lighting into the interior. Except for the triangular portions of the trusses at the ends of the structure which may be enclosed with colorful sailcloth panels if it is possible to include these panels (which were bid as the deductive alternate expected to be exercised in making the contract award), the structure would be open-sided and open-ended but would be enclosed by chain-link fencing. Expansion of the structure would be possible in either direction.

To enhance the visibility and to maintain 30-foot candles of lighting quality, metal Halide lights would be provided at the interior of the structure. These lamps would require low energy consumption and would have relatively long life compared with other types of high quality lighting.

The four courts would be resurfaced using an acrylic coating over an asphaltic concrete base in a manner similar to that used in resurfacing the first six courts.
Expenditures for the work are to be charged against the expenditure limitation of $550,000 authorized by Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981, financed from Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or other balances available to the institution for auxiliary enterprises.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS

Project - OSU Washington Way Tennis Courts Renovation

Architects - Stastny/Graham Architects, P.C., Portland

Board's priority - No. 17 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total project costs $550,000

Estimated total direct construction costs $466,300

Scheduled completion - August 1982

Tentative financing plan:
- Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or other balances available for auxiliary enterprises $550,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Briscoe & Berry, Eugene, project architects, the work of the prime contractor for the building modifications to remove access barriers for handicapped in the Erb Memorial Union on the campus at the University of Oregon was accepted on behalf of the Board as of November 25, 1981. The work was inspected by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on May 29, 1981:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 11/25/81</th>
<th>Original Budget 5/29/81</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. J. Burrows Construction Co., Eugene</td>
<td>$92,725</td>
<td>$90,989</td>
<td>$1,736(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>11,996</td>
<td>11,823</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>13,079</td>
<td>10,439</td>
<td>2,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td>(4,549)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$117,800</td>
<td>$117,800</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes adding matching plaster and tile wainscot in Room B7, modifying circuit breaker and feeder for chair lift in Room 304b, changing corridor wall framing to meet code, modifying certain hardware types to satisfy code, relocating door #2 in International Lounge, and other minor modifications all within five approved change orders.

The work of the prime contractor included construction of a second stairway exit from the International Lounge area on the second floor at the north end of the building as mandated by City of Eugene Fire Prevention Bureau, the installation of a chair lift, the replacement of call buttons and other
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retrofit work on an existing elevator, and restroom modifications. The work accomplished by Physical Plant forces included modifying the mounting heights of restroom fixtures and equipment.

The expenditures for this work were charged against the proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bond borrowings obtained under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from other balances, such as excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees, available for auxiliary enterprises.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UO Accessibility for Handicapped (Erb Memorial Union)

Architects - Briscoe & Berry, Eugene

Board's priority - Part of No. 2 in 1979-1981 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $117,800

Estimated direct construction costs (this portion only) $92,725

Financing plan:

Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $117,800

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Danielson, Driscoll, Hess Architects, project architects, Eugene, the work of the prime contractor for the new canoe house on the Mill Race on the campus at the University of Oregon was accepted on behalf of the Board as of December 7, 1981. The work was inspected by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on September 11, 1981:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 12/7/81</th>
<th>Original Budget 9/11/81</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficient Construction, Eugene</td>
<td>$33,410</td>
<td>$32,325</td>
<td>$1,085(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>$1,540</td>
<td>$1,332</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,293</td>
<td>(1,293)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$37,950</td>
<td>$37,950</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes substitution of concrete for crushed rock around eleven support posts; reimbursement to Contractor for temporary electrical service, securing carpet at seams, and other minor modifications all within three approved change orders.

The work of the contract included 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 is located near the bridge entrance to the Physical Plant offices and warehouse.
area. A portion of the site was paved with asphaltic concrete, some of which was covered with indoor/outdoor carpeting. The building measures approximately 24' x 45', containing approximately 1,116 square feet, and provides a storage area for rental canoes and kayaks, a storeroom, an office and a restroom. The wood-framed structure was finished inside and out with plywood. The office, storeroom and restroom have concrete floor slabs and the main storage area has a floor of asphaltic concrete covered with indoor/outdoor carpeting. The pitched roof, with gable ends, was finished with composition shingles. The Mill Race was enlarged immediately in front of the building with the south boundary bulkheaded to create a landing.

This was 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 was financed exclusively from auxiliary enterprise resources such as Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UO Student Union Facilities Rehabilitation (Canoe House)

Architects - Danielson, Driscoll, Hess Architects, Eugene

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total gross area - 1,116 square feet

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $37,950

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only):
  Total - $33,410
  Average (per square foot) - $29.94

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

Officials of Southern Oregon State College received notice recently from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration within the U.S. Department of Commerce that a grant award of $109,012 has been made to cover 75% of the eligible estimated costs of relocating the main transmitter of radio station KSOR from Mt. Baldy to King Mountain. Authorization to file the application with the federal agency for these grant funds was approved by the Board on January 23, 1981, and by the Joint Committee on Ways and Means on February 13, 1981. It was noted that the remaining expenditure requirements of approximately $51,338 (for the state match of 25% of eligible costs as well as the full cost of constructing an addition to the building which KSYS-TV had completed on King Mountain) would be financed from contributions from the KSOR Listeners Guild.

Consistent with statutory requirements, a request for expenditure authorization for the estimated total project cost of $160,035 is being presented to the State Emergency Board. This amount excludes incidental in-kind services of station personnel for administration and for supervision of contract work. The scope of work remains essentially the same as that described when the grant application was reviewed and approved but minor adjustments have
been made in the budget estimates. The time schedule anticipates soliciting bids for the new FM antenna within the new few weeks, and it is expected that the erection of the tower and the expansion of the building would be undertaken in 1983.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendations of officials of the Oregon Health Sciences University, arrangements were made with Boutwell, Gordon, Beard and Grimes, Architects, Portland, through a supplement to the professional services agreement of October 23, 1980, for programming and schematic design services to provide also for their services in the design development, bidding construction documents and contract administration phases of the proposed University Hospital South Addition and Alterations project on the campus in Portland. Authorization for this planning was included in the Board's capital construction program approved by the Legislature in 1979 and 1981.

Inclusive of the amounts applicable to the pre-design and schematic design phases authorized within the original agreement, the total compensation for the professional services of the Architects and for the reimbursement of related expenses, including the charges of their consultants, is to be based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $1,628,400. Separate limitations are prescribed for each of the planning, bidding and supervision phases.

The planning costs through design development are being financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings previously issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Morrison, Funatake, Inouye, Andrews, Inc., project architects, the work of the prime contractor for the modifications to provide recovery of the exhaust heat in the Quinn Coliseum on the campus at Eastern Oregon State College was accepted on behalf of the Board as of March 4, 1981. Inadvertently, this acceptance was not acknowledged until December 10, 1981, immediately following receipt of the institutional recommendation.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on October 24, 1980:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 3/4/81</th>
<th>Original Budget 10/24/80</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler Plumbing and Heating Co., Pendleton</td>
<td>$60,930</td>
<td>$58,944</td>
<td>$1,986(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant force account</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct construction costs</td>
<td>$81,930</td>
<td>$68,944</td>
<td>$12,986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Professional services fees  8,000  6,894  1,106
Construction supervision and  
miscellaneous costs  3,070  5,000  (1,930)
Contingencies  -  12,162  (2,302)

Total  $$93,000$$  $$93,000$$  $ (1,930)

(1) Includes providing additional wiring necessary for two-speed motor controller, providing protective grating over plenum opening on roof air plenum, rotating existing exhaust fan 90 degrees for access to motor and fan, providing access to gymnasium electrical outlet for relocation of two outlets, providing light and convenience outlet in roof penthouse with switch, relocating two convenience outlets to outside of return air plenum in gymnasium, providing switch on two-speed motor in fan room, and other minor modifications all within four approved change orders.

The work of the contract included the installation of a fan unit within the swimming pool air exhaust system to recover heat which warms incoming outside air. It also included the installation of directional ducts on the hot-air supply units in the gymnasium to prevent air stratification and permit a rapid heating of the space just prior to use. In addition, the college's physical plant forces made and are making certain improvements within this building including, among other minor items, weatherstripping of all exterior doors to reduce air infiltration, installing new lighting fixtures to increase lighting efficiency and reduce heat gain, and installing new shower heads to reduce hot water use.

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

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - EOSC Quinn Coliseum Exhaust Heat Recovery System

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

Board's priority - not applicable

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

Estimated total project costs  $93,000

Estimated total direct construction costs  $81,930

Financing plan:  
Federal grant funds  - $46,500
General Fund appropriation  - 46,500

Total  $$93,000$$

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the work of the prime contractor for the removal of architectural barriers for improved accessibility for the handicapped within the Hoke College Center Building and Dorion Hall, a residence hall, on the campus at Eastern Oregon State College, was accepted on behalf of the Board as of November 23, 1981. The project architects were not available to assist in the conclusion of the project and did not participate in the final inspection or in the recommendation for acceptance.
A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on January 23, 1981:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 11/23/81</th>
<th>Original Budget 1/23/81</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael A. Becker, General Contractor, Union</td>
<td>$46,693.12</td>
<td>$46,229.12</td>
<td>$464.00 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>7,543.91</td>
<td>4,623.00</td>
<td>2,920.91 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>762.97</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>(237.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,147.88</td>
<td>(3,147.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$55,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes deleting three doors at Dorion Hall, cutting and removing the existing concrete footing and pouring new concrete wall and footing at Hoke College Center, and other minor modifications all within two approved change orders.

(2) Includes payment for services provided for accessibility for the handicapped work deleted by the August 1981 Special Session of the Legislature.

The work of the contract included a new entrance and ramp at the north of the Hoke College Center Building for access to the first floor and modifications to toilet rooms on this same level. Guest room and resident managers' apartment bathroom facilities within Dorion Hall were modified and an exterior ramp was provided at the east entrance to that residence hall.

All of the expenditures were charged against proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bond borrowings obtained under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or other balances available to the institution from auxiliary enterprises. This work was part of Board's priority No. 2 (Auxiliary Enterprises) as authorized by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979.

**RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE**

Project - EOSC Accessibility for the Handicapped

Architects - Wayne Card & Associates, Portland

Board's priority - Part of No. 2 in 1979-1981 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) | $55,000.00

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) | $46,693.12

Financing plan:

Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises | $55,000.00

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board accepted the report as presented.

**Staff Report to the Board**

On October 23, 1981, the Board's staff was authorized to offer for sale a strip of unimproved land 370 feet long and 20 feet wide, known as Tax Lot 290 in Jackson County, located just outside of the city limits of Ashland, Oregon. The selling price was to be in line with an appraisal
which was being prepared. Subsequently, and in accordance with ORS 273.201, an appraisal was obtained. Notice was also received from the Department of General Services that no other state agency was interested in the property. In addition, and in accordance with ORS 283.235, Jackson County and City of Ashland officials were contacted regarding their interest in purchasing the property. Jackson County elected not to exercise such option, whereas the City of Ashland expressed an interest and subsequently purchased the property for $2,000. The selling price was sufficient to cover the cost of the appraisal, title search, and all legal costs associated with the sale, leaving a balance of approximately $1,400 for student scholarships. The Board President and Secretary executed the bargain and sale deed prepared by the Board's Chief Counsel.

The proceeds of the sale will be used by Oregon Institute of Technology, in accordance with Ada Matthews' will--for scholarship loans to students of OIT who reside in Klamath County.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

In response to the Board's request in 1967 for an annual report of student housing, a study has been prepared for the Fall Term 1981. Data on residence hall capacities and occupancies were obtained from all eight institutions. However, data on family dwelling units were obtained only from Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon State University, Southern Oregon State College and the University of Oregon. Residential facilities at Portland State University are leased to Portland Student Services, Inc., a non-profit corporation. Family dwelling units are not owned and operated now by the other institutions within the State System of Higher Education.

The arrangement of data and the tables within the report are similar to those prepared for the Fall Term 1980. Inasmuch as current civil rights legislation allows the collection of data on marital status on a voluntary basis only, few institutions attempt to collect and analyze such data and the current information does not include tables or portions of tables referring to students' marital status. The tables for the Fall Term 1981 do identify (a) where students live, (b) residence hall capacities and occupancies, (c) capacities of housing for students with families, (d) student enrollments by academic level, (e) the academic classification of occupants of institutionally-owned family dwelling units, (f) typical rental rates at each of the four institutions with family dwelling units and (g) comments on the age, condition and assignment policies applicable to these units.

Some of the main features of the Fall Term 1981 report may be summarized as follows:

Where Students Live

1. The eight institutions provided housing accommodations for 12,088 students, or 19.2% of the total headcount enrollment of 63,101 students. This 19.2% figure was comprised of 17.0% within single student housing and 2.2% in other housing, principally student apartments. (See Table 1.)

2. The number of students living in all institutionally-owned housing decreased 442 students, while headcount enrollment of 63,101 for the Fall Term 1981 was down by 2,488 from the total of 65,589 for the Fall Term 1980.

3. Fraternities and sororities housed 3,204 students, or about 5.1% of the total headcount enrollment. (See Table 1.) This represented a decrease of 138 students from the data reported last year.
4. Of the total headcount enrollment of 63,101 students in Fall Term 1981, 47,305 students (74.9%) were living in private homes, apartments, etc. (See Table I.) In the report for Fall Term 1980, the comparable figures were 49,139 and 74.9%, respectively.

Residence Halls

5. For the State System as a whole, the occupancies of all residence halls averaged about 83.7% of the rated capacities. (See Table II.) This compares with an occupancy rate of 86.4% for the Fall Term 1980. Based upon "marketable capacities", however, the average occupancy factor was 94.3% in the Fall Term 1981 compared with 97.9% a year ago.

Housing Capacity

6. Institutionally-owned housing facilities could accommodate a total of 14,401 students at the eight institutions. This total includes a capacity of 12,779 spaces for students in permanent residence halls and cooperative houses. (See Table III.)

7. Of the 803 family dwelling units constructed or acquired specifically to accommodate students with families, 160 were occupied by graduate assistants and research fellows and 353 were occupied by other graduate students. Thus, approximately 63.9% of all of these units were assigned to graduate students. (See Table IV.)

8. Of the 232 miscellaneous family dwelling units available during Fall Term 1981, 179 were rented to students. Of these, 97 units were occupied by graduate students, including 37 who were classified as graduate assistants or research fellows. (See Table V.)

9. The number of students with families living in institutionally-owned family dwelling units decreased from 985 in 1980 to 963 in 1981. The distribution of students by class level is indicated for the four institutions where such housing is provided. (See Table VI.)

10. Of the grand total of 1,035 family dwelling units at these four institutions, 518 (50.0%) have been completed within the last twenty-one years and are classified as permanent housing. At Oregon State University, 94 apartments in Orchard Court were completed for initial occupancy during Fall Terms 1961 and 1963. At the University of Oregon, 408 apartments in Westmoreland Village were completed for initial occupancy between Fall Terms 1960 and 1964. At Eastern Oregon State College, 16 apartments were completed by Fall Term 1962. The remainder of the family dwelling units available consisted primarily of war surplus buildings obtained from the federal government or of residences of varying ages and conditions acquired with property within the campus boundaries of the institutions. (See Table VII.)

11. In accordance with the Internal Management Directives adopted by the Board on December 14, 1979, it is expected that student housing facilities shall be fully self-supporting and self-liquidating, primarily from user fees, gifts, or grants. Inasmuch as the circumstances and conditions at each institution are unique, the Board adopted a staff recommendation on March 27, 1973, to delegate to the institutions the rental rate determination for family dwelling units, subject to approval by the Chancellor and with the understanding that the rate structure would be consistent with policies adopted by the Board to assure fiscal adequacy and propriety. Because of the variety of facilities available for miscellaneous housing, rental rates differ markedly. (See Table VII.)

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

REPORT ON STUDENT HOUSING FOR FALL TERM 1981

The attached exhibits have been prepared in response to the request of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education for an annual report on student housing, including various categories of housing for students with and without families.* Data for the Fall Term 1981 study were obtained from the institutions within the State System and reflect conditions at the close of the fourth week of classes. Information concerning housing for families is included for Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon State University, Southern Oregon State College and the University of Oregon, which currently are the only institutions in the State System owning and operating housing for students with families.

The arrangement of data within the current report is the same as last year. It includes an analysis of student enrollments, housing capacities, occupancies and housing characteristics, etc., as follows:

TABLE

I. Summary Analysis of Where Students Live
II. Analysis of Residence Hall Capacities and Occupancies, including Institutionally Owned Cooperatives
III. Summary Analysis of Student Housing Capacities
IV. Analysis of Institutionally Owned Family Dwelling Units Constructed and/or Acquired Specifically to Accommodate Students with Families - By Classification of Occupants
V. Analysis of Institutionally Owned Miscellaneous Family Housing Dwelling Units - By Classification of Occupants
VI. Analysis of Male and Female Student Enrollments by Class Level; Number of Students with Families Living in Institutionally Owned Housing
VII. Summary Analysis of Institutionally Owned Family Dwelling Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancies:</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>Sub- totals</th>
<th>CHSU</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within institutionally owned facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>11,927</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>12,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In residence halls &amp; cooperatives</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>4,882*</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>271#</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>10,539</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>10,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other housing</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>425#</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within privately owned facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>12,450</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>12,928</td>
<td>14,75</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>49,633</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>51,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In fraternities and sororities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,204</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In private homes, apartments, etc.</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>10,295</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>11,675</td>
<td>14,475</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>45,925</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>47,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (Headcount enrollment)</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>17,460</td>
<td>4,414</td>
<td>16,645</td>
<td>15,471</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>61,560</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>63,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage analysis of occupancies:
Within institutionally owned facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>21.5%</th>
<th>18.5%</th>
<th>28.7%</th>
<th>23.1%</th>
<th>22.3%</th>
<th>4.5%</th>
<th>19.4%</th>
<th>19.4%</th>
<th>10.4%</th>
<th>19.2%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In residence halls &amp; cooperatives</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other housing</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within privately owned facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>78.5%</th>
<th>81.5%</th>
<th>71.3%</th>
<th>76.9%</th>
<th>77.7%</th>
<th>95.5%</th>
<th>80.6%</th>
<th>80.6%</th>
<th>89.6%</th>
<th>80.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In fraternities and sororities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In private homes, apartments, etc.</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%
COMMENTS ON TABLE I

Table I indicates that during the Fall Term 1981 institutions within the State System provided housing accommodations for 12,088 students, or 19.2 percent of the 63,101 students who were enrolled at the close of the fourth week of classes. This 19.2 percent was comprised of 17.0 percent within residence halls and cooperatives and 2.2 percent within other housing, principally for students with families.

Fraternities and sororities housed 3,204 students, or 5.1 percent of the total headcount enrollment within the State System. All of these accommodations were at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon. (In the Fall Term 1980, this figure was 3,342 students, which was also 5.1 percent of the enrollment of 65,589 that term.)

Of the total enrollment of 63,101 students in the Fall Term 1981, 74.9 percent were living in private homes, apartments, etc. The comparable figure for 1980 was 49,139 or 74.9 percent of the total enrollment of 65,589 that term.

* For OSU, the 4,882 occupancies include 366 students living in cooperative houses owned by the institution.

# For PSU, the 271 occupancies represent residents within the Ondine and the 425 occupancies represent those housed in apartments and sleeping rooms, all institutionally owned facilities leased to Portland Student Services, Inc. The 300 occupancies noted in privately owned cooperative facilities represent those students housed in properties owned and/or managed by Portland Student Services, Inc., a non-profit corporation, such as the Goose Hollow apartment building which contains 112 efficiency units, 78 one-bedroom units and 31 two-bedroom units.
### TABLE II

**ANALYSIS OF RESIDENCE HALL Capacities AND OCCUPANCIES**
**INCLUDING INSTITUTIONALLY OWNED COOPERATIVES**

**FALL TERM 1981**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Rated</th>
<th>Percent Occupied</th>
<th>Marketable Capacity</th>
<th>Percent Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>4861</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon State College</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>7048</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>5,098</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>4,969$</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1,194**</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>2,976</td>
<td>3,570</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>2,981$</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>288*</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotals</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,539</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,609</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,178</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health Sciences University</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,779</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,348</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS ON TABLE II**

Table II indicates that for the State System as a whole, the occupancy of the residence halls and institutionally owned cooperatives in the Fall Term 1981 was 83.7% of the rated capacities of such facilities.

The rated occupancy for seven institutions (excluding the Oregon Health Sciences University) varied from a low of 47% at Portland State University to a high of 95.8% at Oregon State University.

1. The percentage of occupancy is shown for each of two classifications of capacity. Rated capacity is the number of students that facilities were indicated to accommodate according to the original designs and remodelings. Marketable capacity is somewhat less as a result of: (1) some double rooms assigned as single occupancy in response to student preference and (2) the assignment of study bedrooms to other functions.

1 For Eastern Oregon State College, approximately 61 students were assigned as single occupants in rooms that had been designed originally for double occupancy.

@ For Western Oregon State College, Arbuthnot Hall with 81 resident rooms and a capacity of 162 was assigned for Police Academy use. Within residence halls, approximately 45 students were assigned as single occupants in rooms that had been rated originally for double occupancy.

$ For Oregon State University, the data include a capacity for 378 students and an occupancy of 366 students within institutionally owned cooperative houses. Within residence halls, approximately 60 students were assigned as single occupants in rooms that had been rated originally for double occupancy.

** For Southern Oregon State College, approximately 329 students were assigned as single occupants in rooms that had been designed originally for double occupancies; and 129 rooms with a capacity of 253 had other occupancies.

& For the University of Oregon, approximately 201 students were assigned as single occupants in rooms that had been rated originally for double occupancy.

* For Portland State University, the data relate to the Ondine which has 96 dormitory style sleeping rooms with private baths and 192 efficiency apartments with shared kitchens and baths all usually in single occupancy.
TABLE I

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STUDENT HOUSING CAPACITIES - FALL TERM 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated capacities of institutionally owned facilities:</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>CHSU</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent residence halls</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>5761</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>12,231</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative houses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>5,098</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>12,609</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent housing for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/family</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other housing for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/family or wo/family</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other housing for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/family</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>14,231</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>14,401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rated capacities of privately owned facilities:

| Fraternities and sororities                          | -   | -    | 2,348 | -    | 1,378 | -   | -   | 3,726     | -    | 3,726  |
| Cooperative houses                                   | -   | -    | 135   | -    | 129   | 300 | -   | 564       | -    | 564    |

Percentage of institutionally owned permanent residence halls and cooperatives to headcount enrollment:

| Plants                                               | 31.0% | 31.9% | 29.2% | 33.1% | 20.2% | 3.7%  | 20.8% | 20.5% | 11.0% | 20.3% |

COMMENTS ON TABLE III

Table III indicates that during the Fall Term 1981 institutions had a rated capacity of 12,779 students within permanent residence halls and cooperative houses. Fraternities and sororities had a rated capacity of 3,726, and private cooperatives had a rated capacity of 564.

Exclusive of Portland State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University, the percentage of rated capacities of permanent residence halls and institutionally owned cooperatives to headcount enrollment varied from 33.1 percent at Southern Oregon State College to 20.2 percent at the University of Oregon.

For PSU, the capacity of the Ondine is listed in the permanent residence halls category and the capacities of nine other residential buildings leased to Portland Student Services, Inc., a non-profit corporation, are shown under other housing. The rated capacity of privately owned cooperative housing is that of the Goose Hollow apartment building which is owned and managed by Portland Student Services, Inc.
### Table IV

**Analysis of Institutionally Owned Family Dwelling Units Constructed and/or Acquired Specifically to Accommodate Students with Families - By Classification of Occupants**

**Fall Term 1981**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupant Classification</th>
<th>EOSC*</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate assistants and research fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Male students with families</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Female students with families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Male students with families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Female students with families</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total graduate students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Undergraduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Male students with families</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Female students with families</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total undergraduate and graduate students with and without families</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty and staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other occupancies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vacancies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total of units (Items 1-8)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments on Table IV**

Table IV has been prepared to indicate the classifications of occupants renting institutionally-owned family dwelling units which were constructed or acquired specifically to accommodate students with families.

Of the 803 units identified in Table IV, 747 were located at the two universities.

Of the total of 777 units occupied by students, 513 (or 66.0%) were occupied by graduate students. Of these 513 dwelling units, 160 (or 31.2%) were occupied by graduate assistants and research fellows, and the remaining 353 were occupied by other graduate students.

* For EOSC, the data included in the classification of family dwelling units by the classification of occupants reflect 16 units in the new EOCene Courts and 40 units in the old (temporary) EOCene Courts.

+ For UO, the data included in the classification of family dwelling units by the classification of occupants reflect 408 units in Westmoreland Housing and 245 units in the Amazon Housing.
**TABLE V**

ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONALLY OWNED MISCELLANEOUS FAMILY DWELLING UNITS - BY CLASSIFICATION OF OCCUPANTS

**FALL TERM 1981**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPANT CLASSIFICATIONS</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate assistants and research fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Male students with families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Female students with families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Male students with families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Female students with families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Undergraduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Male students with families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Female students with families</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Students without families</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total undergraduate and graduate students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other occupancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vacancies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total miscellaneous family housing rental units (Items 1-8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS ON TABLE V**

Table V indicates that there were 232 miscellaneous family dwelling units available during the Fall Term 1981. The total of 119 units at the University of Oregon does not include some miscellaneous dwelling units and 58 wood-frame World War II surplus apartments on Columbia Street and Agate Street, formerly used as dwelling units for students with families, which are now assigned for office use.

Of the 179 units rented to students, 97 were occupied by those with graduate student classification including 37 in the graduate assistants or research fellows classification.
### Table VI

**ANALYSIS OF MALE AND FEMALE STUDENT ENROLLMENTS BY CLASS LEVEL: NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH FAMILIES LIVING IN INSTITUTIONALLY OWNED HOUSING**

**FALL TERM 1981**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Male Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Female Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Male &amp; Female Students With Families Living In Institutionally Owned Family Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Graduates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>886</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,135</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY**           |                         |                           |                                                                                          |
| Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc. |                         |                           |                                                                                          |
| Other Graduates                       | 1,056                   | 650                       |                                                                                          |
| Seniors                               | 2,505                   | 1,556                     |                                                                                          |
| Juniors                               | 1,909                   | 1,295                     |                                                                                          |
| Sophomores                            | 1,780                   | 1,401                     |                                                                                          |
| Freshmen                              | 2,230                   | 1,851                     |                                                                                          |
| Special                               | 73                      | 100                       |                                                                                          |
| **Totals**                            | **10,303**              | **7,157**                 | **128**                                                                                   |

| **SOUTHERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE**    |                         |                           |                                                                                          |
| Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc. |                         |                           |                                                                                          |
| Other Graduates                       | 110                     | 158                       |                                                                                          |
| Seniors                               | 375                     | 355                       |                                                                                          |
| Juniors                               | 352                     | 356                       |                                                                                          |
| Sophomores                            | 456                     | 431                       |                                                                                          |
| Freshmen                              | 716                     | 796                       |                                                                                          |
| Special                               | 94                      | 208                       |                                                                                          |
| **Totals**                            | **2,106**               | **2,308**                 | **42**                                                                                   |

| **UNIVERSITY OF OREGON**              |                         |                           |                                                                                          |
| Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc., and other |                         |                           |                                                                                          |
| Graduates                             | 2,241                   | 1,908                     |                                                                                          |
| Seniors                               | 1,625                   | 1,506                     |                                                                                          |
| Juniors                               | 1,390                   | 1,175                     |                                                                                          |
| Sophomores                            | 1,387                   | 1,384                     |                                                                                          |
| Freshmen                              | 1,688                   | 1,896                     |                                                                                          |
| Special                               | 184                     | 261                       |                                                                                          |
| **Totals**                            | **8,515**               | **8,130**                 | **741**                                                                                   |

| **GRAND TOTAL - 4 INSTITUTIONS**      |                         |                           |                                                                                          |
| Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc., and other |                         |                           |                                                                                          |
| Graduates                             | 4,193                   | 3,079                     |                                                                                          |
| Seniors                               | 4,663                   | 3,586                     |                                                                                          |
| Juniors                               | 3,779                   | 2,981                     |                                                                                          |
| Sophomores                            | 3,791                   | 3,384                     |                                                                                          |
| Freshmen                              | 4,894                   | 4,840                     |                                                                                          |
| Special                               | 490                     | 860                       |                                                                                          |
| **Totals**                            | **21,810**              | **18,730**                | **963**                                                                                   |

**Comments on Table VI**

Table VI has been prepared to analyze the male and female student enrollment in each class (year of academic standing). In addition, the numbers of those male and female students with families who were living in institutionally owned family dwelling units have been indicated.

Of the 1,035 institutionally owned family dwelling units constructed and/or acquired specifically to accommodate students with families (803) and miscellaneous family dwelling units (232), 956 are occupied by 963 male and female students with families.
### TABLE VII
SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONALLY OWNED FAMILY DWELLING UNITS
FALL TERM 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Life Expectancy</th>
<th>No. of Stories</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>0-1-2-3 &amp; +</th>
<th>Charges Per Month</th>
<th>Other Occupancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td>EOCene Court (New)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16-0</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EOCene Court (Old)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>10 yrs.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40-0</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous Housing</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4-3</td>
<td>$140-300</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td>Orchard Court</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Indef.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22-62-10</td>
<td>$115, 130, 145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous Houses &amp; Apartments</td>
<td>Poor-Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9-14-13</td>
<td>$70-275</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>31-76-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneous Housing</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2-27-14</td>
<td>$110-270</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2-27-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF OREGON</strong></td>
<td>Westmoreland Village</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Indef.</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>76-332-2</td>
<td>$111-131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amazon Apartments</td>
<td>Fair-Good</td>
<td>10+ yrs.</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>2-241-2</td>
<td>$88, 98, 108</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous Housing Units</td>
<td>Fair-Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>4-31-50-34</td>
<td>$75-350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>772</td>
<td>4-109-623-36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS - 4 INSTITUTIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>4-142-786-76</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS ON TABLE VII

AGE, CONDITION AND NOTES ON LIFE EXPECTANCY OF DWELLING UNITS

The grand total of 1,035 dwelling units available on the four campuses during the Fall Term 1981 included 518 (50.0%) that have been completed within the last twenty-one years. At Oregon State University the 94 apartments in Orchard Court were completed for occupancy in 1961 and 1963. At the University of Oregon the 408 apartments in Westmoreland Village were completed for occupancy in 1960 to 1964. At Eastern Oregon State College 16 apartments were completed for occupancy in 1962. These are in good condition.

Other housing complexes, including 40 units within EOCene Court (old) at Eastern Oregon State College, and 245 units within Amazon Apartments at the University of Oregon, are war surplus buildings obtained from the federal government. These have a life expectancy dependent upon upkeep, condition and need for housing.

Other housing includes miscellaneous dwelling units acquired within campus boundaries. These vary from fair to excellent condition and will be retained subject to their condition, need for land and use of the structures for housing or other projects.

Assignment Policies:

Eastern Oregon State College - Assignments are made to family units by date of application of full time students for each category of housing, including EOCene Court (new), EOCene Court (old) and miscellaneous housing.

Oregon State University - Occupants must be graduate students registered for nine or more hours or undergraduates registered for twelve or more hours. Assignments are made first to graduate students, followed by seniors, juniors, sophomores and freshmen, and within each academic classification by date of application. The percent of foreign national students will be maintained at about 30-35% to provide effective interchange between visiting and native students.

Southern Oregon State College - Assignments are made to married students by date of application followed by single students. Undergraduate students must be registered for a minimum of twelve hours.

University of Oregon - Applicants must submit a financial statement and those with financial priority will be assigned first. Assignments are then made in order to graduate assistants followed by graduate students, seniors, juniors, sophomores and freshmen, and within each academic classification by date of application.
The staff reports provided to the Board for the January meeting (Items 10-81-27b and 1-82-1b through 1-82-5b) are on file in the Board’s Office and will be bound with the permanent minutes as pages 52 to 61.

ADJOURNMENT The Board meeting was adjourned at 3:15 P.M.
Revisions of policies in respect to off-campus instructional programs proposed for consideration by the Board January 22 are in response to concerns expressed by members of the Board during its October 23, 1981, discussion and by the Educational Coordinating Commission November 6, 1981.

The Board's Office has not received a communication from the Commission expressing its concerns. However, the staff report which formed the basis for its November 6 discussion, as well as the Commission's 1980 document titled Access to Postsecondary Educational Services, Part II: Off-Campus Instruction and the 1978 Joint Statement of the boards of Higher Education and Education are on file in the Board's Office. Copies can be provided on request.

The concerns, as understood by the Board's staff, and proposed responses are:

1. A concern that the policies as originally proposed did not specifically address the possibility that off-campus programs might develop schedules of course work attractive to full-time students, thereby becoming de facto branch campuses competing with campus institutions for enrollments. An associated concern is that offering upper-division programs on community college campuses will encourage the community involved to seek full-time scheduling and development of the college into a baccalaureate degree granting institution.

These concerns are addressed in the revised policies as follows:

a. A provision is added to Policy 3 limiting off-campus enrollments to:

4. Off-campus instructional programs will be limited to courses and activities scheduled for the convenience of part-time students.

b. A policy statement is added providing:

11. Arrangements to offer a degree program in a specific off-campus setting under the off-campus instructional policies of the Board is not and shall not be considered or described as establishment of a branch campus. Institutions will develop and implement procedures to assure that all persons and agencies associated with off-campus instructional programs of the State System are cognizant of the limited nature of the programs.

2. A concern that the policies did not provide sufficient direction in respect to assignment of institutional responsibilities in areas outside the institution's geographic service area. This is a concern both that areas remote from a four-year campus will not be served at all and a concern that the policies do not provide instruction as to the criteria which should be used in determining which of two or more competing State System institutions should provide service to a specific clientele and location.

It will be noted that policy statements 5 and 6 provide that each institution will have a primary responsibility for service to the geographic area in which it is located and a statewide responsibility for programs in curricular areas in which it has a sole or unique allocation. The staff recommends that a third policy statement be added to this series, as follows:

8. Institutions will have a shared responsibility for serving of the state outside their respective geographic service areas. All such programs will be conducted in accordance with centrally approved plans. When a choice must be made among two or more State System institutions seeking to serve a specific clientele in a
specific location, the Board's Office will give consideration to the appropriateness of the program to the need to be served, geographic proximity, ability and willingness to make available resources necessary to offer a program of good quality, and the expressed preference, if any, of the clientele to be served.

3. The Educational Coordinating Commission has expressed concern that the proposed policies of the Board of Higher Education do not provide sufficiently for intersegmental coordination of off-campus activities as, for example, when a State System and independent institution seek to serve the same clientele. The Commission also observes that the Board's policies "are silent on joint intersegmental needs assessment and planning activities by region."

Coordination of off-campus activities of educational agencies under the general jurisdiction of the state boards of Education and Higher Education is governed by the 1978 Joint Statement of these two boards. This is a detailed document, first developed by the two boards in 1970 and reviewed in 1977 by a Joint Task Force on Postsecondary Education made up of representatives of the two boards, the Legislative Assembly, and the Educational Coordinating Commission. The resulting Joint Statement is designed to "enhance access of Oregon residents to effective programs of education without unnecessary duplication of effort." The Statement includes guidelines for the "articulation between educational segments and other public and private agencies," but, of course, these are only binding on the public institutions.

The Joint Statement provides procedures for intersegmental coordination and policy #15 of the proposed Board's policies provides that State System institutions "will adhere" to them. A second paragraph in policy #15 summarizes procedures for intersegmental coordination and articulation put forward in the Joint Statement. The Board's staff believes further summarization of the detailed provisions of the Joint Statement would tend to substitute the summary of the provisions for the provisions themselves.

The Commission recommendation that needs assessment be done jointly by all segments through the regional meeting process may be desirable, but cannot be accomplished by action of the Board of Higher Education. Needs assessments, if they are to be reliable, must be done by persons with knowledge of sampling techniques and questionnaire design. It is not always possible to reach agreement among institutions as to the nature of an assessment, let alone how it is to be paid for. Needs assessments conducted by State System institutions are focused on particular problem situations, are public documents, and are and have been used by independent colleges and others interested in serving these off-campus clientele. The Board's staff believes the regional planning and exchange of information provided for in the 1978 Joint Statement provides an appropriate framework for such joint activities as are practicable.

4. The Commission is concerned with evaluation of student learning in off-campus instruction. Evaluation of student learning is the responsibility of the instructor and is carried out in the grading process. This concern is addressed in the proposed Board policies in policy #9 (d).

5. The Commission urges that the Board encourage use of technology to provide off-campus programs in the most cost-effective manner. The omission of "system of delivery" from policy #8, originally adopted in 1978, was, undoubtedly, an oversight, which is being corrected in the revised proposal.
kitchens which had been approved by the Board but was deferred by the State Emergency Board. Institutional officials have advised that the in-depth analysis by the consultants and by Portland Student Services, Inc., reveals that a more satisfactory program could be achieved by the individual unit approach, with substantially reduced operating and managerial costs, and without having to sacrifice eight units from residential use. The proposed electrical improvements would include the replacement of some of the building services, the upgrading of distribution panels and other modifications which would result in increased service within the tenant units. The plumbing improvements would include the replacement of some bathroom lavatories and also the replacement of some bathtubs with shower units. The extent of these replacements, however, will be determined during the design development phase of planning.

Within the total expenditure authorization of $2,245,000 for the Student Housing Rehabilitation project, as noted, it is anticipated that the direct construction costs will need to be limited to approximately $1,511,188 and that the amount budgeted for furnishings and equipment will be about $299,590. Tentative allocations contemplated by the institution for various classes of work within each of the ten buildings may be summarized as follows:

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT HOUSING REHABILITATION (1981-1983)
DISTRIBUTION OF ESTIMATED DIRECT CONSTRUCTION COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Units</th>
<th>Life Safety</th>
<th>Energy Conservation</th>
<th>Access for Handicapped</th>
<th>Improvements to Common Spaces</th>
<th>Tenant Units</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Appliances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King Albert (64) 1809 SW 11th</td>
<td>45,921</td>
<td>23,660</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33,446</td>
<td>87,364</td>
<td>190,391</td>
<td>42,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adeline (20) 1208 SW Montgomery</td>
<td>24,590</td>
<td>13,503</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>34,933</td>
<td>82,936</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford (31) 1609 SW 10th</td>
<td>18,334</td>
<td>13,503</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,104</td>
<td>54,102</td>
<td>102,043</td>
<td>20,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helens (51) 1131 SW Montgomery</td>
<td>37,659</td>
<td>14,742</td>
<td>18,538</td>
<td>29,483</td>
<td>85,301</td>
<td>185,723</td>
<td>33,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway (54) 1609 SW Park</td>
<td>35,020</td>
<td>21,059</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,483</td>
<td>77,195</td>
<td>162,757</td>
<td>30,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ondine (288) 1912 SW 6th</td>
<td>79,826</td>
<td>149,176</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>235,196</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham (13) 1824 SW 12th</td>
<td>10,864</td>
<td>6,194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,105</td>
<td>26,640</td>
<td>52,803</td>
<td>8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery (145) 1802 SW 10th</td>
<td>74,449</td>
<td>20,564</td>
<td>54,413</td>
<td>29,483</td>
<td>91,049</td>
<td>269,958</td>
<td>87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone (57) 1831 SW Park</td>
<td>41,623</td>
<td>20,936</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,483</td>
<td>77,358</td>
<td>169,400</td>
<td>30,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryanne (17) 1824 SW 11th</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>12,388</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,343</td>
<td>25,110</td>
<td>59,981</td>
<td>9,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (740 units)</td>
<td>$380,426</td>
<td>$295,725</td>
<td>$72,951</td>
<td>$203,034</td>
<td>$559,052</td>
<td>$1,511,188</td>
<td>$299,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In submitting these recommendations, institutional officials have advised that the impact of the proposed expenditure of $2,245,000 for the rehabilitation of student housing at Portland State University will involve an increase of approximately $13 per month per unit in the rental charges if the interest on the bonds is in the range of 12.5%. However, the energy conservation measures recommended could provide savings of over $10 per unit per month when in place, so the net rental adjustment may be quite minimal.
Inasmuch as the scope of the architects' services outlined within the professional services agreement did not extend beyond the programming, research analysis, feasibility studies and general planning (believed to be comparable to schematic design for a more typical assignment), it will be necessary for the Board's staff to negotiate with them for a supplement to cover at least the design development phase of planning, but preferably also for the construction documents and contract administration, before further efforts are expended on the project. Assuming that mutually satisfactory terms can be agreed upon, and assuming that the Board approves the recommendations outlined within this agenda item, authorization will be given to the architects to proceed with the design development phase of planning within the direct construction cost allowance of $1,511,188 outlined above.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF ARCHITECTS' STUDY

Project - PSU Student Housing Rehabilitation

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

Board's priority - No. 12 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

- Estimated total project costs: $2,245,000
- Estimated direct construction costs: $1,511,188

Tentative schedule:
- Bidding: Late Spring 1982
- Completion: 1983

Tentative financing plan:
- Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises: $2,245,000

As part of the Board's capital construction program for auxiliary enterprises during 1981-1983, the 1981 Oregon Legislature authorized an addition to Parking Structure No. 2 at the Oregon Health Sciences University within an expenditure limitation of $3,115,000. At the December 11, 1981, meeting of the Board, it was reported that arrangements for the professional services relating to the design and contract administration of this project had been made with the firm of Breedlove-McConnell Engineers, Inc., Portland, successors to one of the joint venturers responsible for the planning and construction supervision of the initial structure.

The existing facility, completed in 1973 at a cost of $2,540,000, is a reinforced concrete structure containing a total gross area of about 206,741 square feet. It is located west of the Dental School building and south of University Hospital South with points of access and exit to Campus Drive. It has five levels and provides a total of approximately 651 parking spaces. Structural capacity was provided for the future construction of three additional levels of parking, each accommodating about 130 vehicles.

The parking requirements of the Oregon Health Sciences University are unique within the State System. In addition to the needs of students, staff and visitors, there exists the rather extensive parking requirements of patients utilizing the hospitals and clinics and their guests. Additionally, the topography upon which the campus is located is unique in the System. The campus is geographically limited by hills and canyons which preclude extensive surface parking facilities nearby. These conditions, along with the special needs of the patients and visitors, contribute to the parking requirements.
Parking at the institution generally is oversubscribed in lots that are utilized for students, faculty and staff. Metered parking used by patients and others is in serious need of expansion. With additional construction anticipated in the near future, such as the proposed major addition to University Hospital South also authorized by the Board and the Legislature, the urgency of proceeding with the vertical expansion of Parking Structure No. 2 is intensified.

After examining the potential of providing as many as four additional levels of parking on this existing facility by using steel rather than reinforced concrete, the project engineers have concluded that this would not be a viable option in view of structural code requirements, fireproofing problems and aesthetics. Consequently, the schematic design phase of planning reflects a proposed three-level addition consistent with the original cast-in-place and precast concrete construction. It would contain about 136,536 gross square feet. Floor members would be precast double T's, individually lifted into place, and the exterior concrete surfaces would be sand-blasted lightly and sealed. Depending upon final distribution of spaces for regular-size and compact cars, the capacity of the addition would range between 430 and 450 spaces.

This project was included as priority No. 6 in the Board's capital construction program for auxiliary enterprises in 1981-1983 and was endorsed by the Governor and approved by the 1981 Legislature with financing to be provided from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds and/or balances available from parking operations. All of the debt service requirements would be provided from parking revenues.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OHSU Parking Structure No. 2 Addition

Engineers - Breedlove-McConnell Engineers, Inc., Portland

Board's priority - No. 6 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total area - 136,536 square feet

Estimated total project costs $3,115,000

Estimated direct construction costs:

Total $2,680,000

Average per square foot - $19.63

Tentative schedule:

Bidding - July 1982

Completion - July 1983

Tentative financing plan:

Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises from parking operations at OHSU $3,115,000

The minutes of the Board meeting of December 11, 1981, reported the commissioning of Architects Afseth, Jacobs & Schmitz, Medford, to provide professional services for the design and construction administration of a proposed stadium facility for Fuller Field on the north portion of the campus of Southern Oregon State College.

The project consists of replacing the old existing metal and wood bleacher stand located on the west side of the field with a new covered concrete grandstand and related improvements. The new facility would be constructed...
of concrete or concrete and steel and would have a seating capacity of approximately 2,100 persons. If the width per seat were decreased from twenty inches to eighteen inches, the seating capacity could be increased to approximately 2,300. In either configuration, 544 of the seats would be provided with backs. The area under the grandstand would accommodate rest rooms, a concession stand, storage area, and also would include a large unimproved space which could be developed at some future time. A pressbox and the coaches' observation areas would be constructed directly under the roof structure. New field lighting would replace the existing system.

This Stadium project was included as priority No. 20 in the Board's capital construction program for auxiliary enterprises in 1981-1983 and was endorsed by the Governor and approved by the 1981 Legislature with the understanding that all of the expenditures would be funded from gifts of approximately $300,000 (now being solicited through the Southern Oregon College Foundation) and from $1,230,000 of Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds and/or auxiliary enterprise balances. Pending the receipt of cash from amounts pledged by donors for payment in installments extending over several months, it may be necessary to utilize excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees in the same manner that interim financing was provided recently for the stadium replacement at Western Oregon State College.

Institutional officials have advised the Board's staff of their interest in having the Architects' assistance in developing the plans for adjacent parking lots which might be coordinated with the bidding and construction of the Stadium. The grading and paving of these areas would be financed from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds authorized by the Board and the 1979 Legislature as part of the $395,000 expenditure limitation for Parking Improvements at Southern Oregon State College, and the debt service requirements related to them would be provided from parking revenues—not from student building fees.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - SOSC Stadium
Architects - Afseth, Jacobs & Schmitz, Medford
Board's priority - No. 20 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981
Estimated total project costs $1,530,000
Estimated direct construction costs $1,313,915
Estimated direct construction costs for grandstand only (including fixed equipment but excluding sitework and service parking) - $1,245,405
Cost per seat @ 2,100 seats - $593.05
Cost per seat @ 2,300 seats - $541.48
Tentative schedule:
Bidding - March 1982
Completion - September 1982
Tentative financing plan:
Gifts through the Southern Oregon College Foundation $ 300,000
Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises 1,230,000
Total $1,530,000
As reported to the Board on October 23, 1981, Architects Afseth, Jacobs & Schmitz of Medford were commissioned to design and provide construction contract administration of the proposed roof cover over Moehl Stadium on the campus in Klamath Falls.

The architects have now completed the schematic design of the roof and have indicated that it would be constructed with steel beams, girders and "H" series bar joists with exposed steel deck roofing. It would measure approximately 276 feet by 63 feet, including overhangs of 9 feet over the front and back of the seating area. The metal would have a painted finish. Structural capacity would be provided for the potential future addition of a pressbox and coaches' area on top of the central portion of the roof. In the interim, these functions will continue to be located in the existing structures housing restrooms, concession booths, etc. at the top of the grandstand. On both ends of the upper portion of the seating area, there would be a 12-inch thick concrete block wall as a windbreak.

This project was included as priority No. 22 in the Board's capital construction program for auxiliary enterprises in 1981-1983. The Governor's budget recommendations and the legislative authorization for the project anticipated that all of the project costs would be financed from bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available for auxiliary enterprises. The debt service requirements on the self-liquidating bonds would be provided from commingled student building fees.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OIT Moehl Stadium Roof

Architects - Afseth, Jacobs & Schmitz, Medford

Board's priority - No. 22 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total project costs $205,000

Estimated direct construction costs $170,625

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - April 1982
Completion - August 1982

Tentative financing plan:
Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $205,000

The existing Physical Education Building was constructed in 1964 under the new campus development program. Due to the enrollment limitation of 800 students at that time, the decision was made to defer the completion of a swimming facility. The master plan, however, did envision a pool to supplement the existing Physical Education teaching station requirements and for recreation when enrollments reached the 1,600 student level. For this reason, the gymnasium was designed to accommodate a 25-yard intercollegiate swimming facility in the basement. Column footings were
lowered, pump and filter mechanical space was reserved, a large
below-grade access way was provided, and a high-ceiling room was
developed to house the future pool. In the interim, this space has been
used as a student government/union center and, most recently, as a
temporary library.

Due to the proposed change from English to Metric measurement in athletic
competition, the new pool has been designed to be a 25-meter facility in lieu
of the original plan for a 25-yard pool. This change in pool length
required that the athletic team locker facilities (used principally for
basketball teams) be relocated to the area originally planned for the
swimming shower and dressing rooms.

The proposed new pool would extend too far south to permit the development
of proper locker, shower and toilet facilities for the swimmers. Consequently,
the storage area originally designated for the fallout shelter food and medical
supplies has been redesigned to work with the new larger athletic locker
rooms to provide shower and toilet facilities.

The pool would be of concrete and ceramic tile construction and would have
the minimum 4-foot depth at the shallow end and a 12-foot depth under the
one meter diving board in accordance with NCAA requirements. There
would be an underwater viewing room at the deep end with underwater
speakers for instructing diving, swimming and sub-aquatic sports. Swimmer
starting platforms, lane dividers, life-saving chairs, and other such safety
equipment, as required by the State and local authorities, would be provided
in addition to a direct emergency telephone line to the fire department. A
special davit with sling chair would be provided for access for handicapped
persons.

A pool viewing area would be created adjacent to the lobby on the main
entrance floor level.

The pool would be heated by a heat exchanger utilizing the geothermal
campus water system. The design water temperature for the pool would be
86 degrees F (or 30 degrees C).

This remodeling project for the swimming pool was included as priority
No. 9 in the Board's capital construction program for auxiliary enterprises
in 1981-1983 and was endorsed by the Governor and approved by the 1981
Legislature. The funding is available from proceeds from the sale of
Article XI-F(1) bonds and/or from excess sinking fund reserves from
commingled student building fees.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE
OF PLANNING

Project - OIT Physical Education Building Remodel (Swimming Pool)
Architects - Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Portland
Board's priority - No. 9 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total project costs
Estimated direct construction costs
Estimated area to be remodeled - 11,784 square feet
Direct construction cost per square foot - $73.26

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - May 1982
Completion - December 1982

Tentative financing plan:
Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds and/or other
balances available for auxiliary enterprises $1,025,000