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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN
ROOM 167, ERB MEMORIAL UNION
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

February 26, 1982

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in
Room 167, Erb Memorial Union, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 A.M., February 26, 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. James C. Petersen
Mr. Marion T. Weatherford
Mr. Loren L. Wyss
Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.

Absent: Mr. Perry was absent for business reasons.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary Wilma L.
Foster; J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Mrs. Clareathel
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; Jerry
Lidz, Assistant Attorney General; Richard S. Perry, Director, Management
and Planning Services Division; Thomas Berkey, Assistant Budget Director;
Keith Jackson, Assistant Budget Director; Davis Quenzer, Assistant Budget
Director; A. M. Rempel, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs;
J. Richard Pizzo, Director, High School Relations; Richard Zita, Assistant
to the Chancellor; Karen McCumsey, Secretary 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; R. R. Becker, Faculty Senate President.

University of Oregon--Richard J. Hill, Provost; N. Ray Hawk, Vice Presi­
dent for Administration and Finance; Curt Simic, Vice President for Public
Relations; R. C. Albrecht, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs; Larry Pierce,
Department Head, Political Science.

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Leonard Laster; J. T. McGill,
Vice President for Finance and Administration; Donald G. Kassebaum, Vice
President for Hospital Affairs; M. A. Lockwood, Executive Assistant to the
President; Janet E. Young, Special Assistant to the President.

Portland State University--President Joseph C. Blumel; J. K. Harris, Budget
Director.

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

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

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

Western Oregon State College--President Gerald Leinwand; Glen I. Williams,
Dean of Administration; Colleen Jackson, Associate Professor.
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Appreciation
Expressed to UO

Others--Barbara Mitchell, Assistant Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Jetta Siegel, Executive Secretary, State Federation, American Association of University Professors; Robert Watrus, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Shawn Dooley, Director, State Affairs, Associated Students/Oregon State University; Juli A. Butler, Treasurer, Associated Students/Oregon State University.

Mr. Harms expressed the Board's appreciation to the University of Oregon for the information presented during the visitation and for the courtesies extended to the Board.

Amendments to AR's and IMD's re Inventions, License Agreements, Educational and Professional Materials Development, Patents, and Copyrights

Mr. Lemman said it had been determined that further revisions may be necessary to OAR 580-43-011 and the Internal Management Directives. It was recommended that the Board open the public hearing, receive testimony from any individuals who might be present to testify in response to the notice of public hearing, and recess the public hearing to the March 26, 1982, Board meeting. At that time, any further testimony could be received concerning OAR 580-43-011, and the Board could then take action.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Harms stated that the time set for the public hearing on the amendments to OAR 580-43-011, Employee Responsibilities and Rights, had arrived and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed amendments. There being no response to his request, the Board voted to recess the public hearing until the March 26, 1982, Board meeting, in order to provide an opportunity for any public testimony to be received. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (2-82-10a)

It was recommended that the Board adopt revisions to OAR 580-22-050, Employment Discrimination, as follows:

No Discrimination Based on Race, Color, Religion, National Origin, Handicap, Age, Marital Status, or Sex

580-22-050 There shall be no prohibited employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin, handicap, age, marital status, or sex in the Department.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Harms stated that the time set for the public hearing on the amendments to OAR 580-22-050, Employment Discrimination, had arrived and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed amendments. There being no response to his request, Mr. Harms declared the public hearing closed.

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

Report on Chancellor Search

Mr. Harms reported that the Board had met in executive session for approximately two hours prior to the Board meeting. During that time, it reached no decision and would be reconvening in executive session following the Board meeting.

Mr. Ingalls explained that there had been 147 individuals who either applied or were recommended for the position. The search committee reviewed these candidates and eventually narrowed the group to eight semifinalists who were invited to spend at least two hours with the search committee. Of these eight, five were invited to return for three additional days with various individuals and groups. Three remain as finalists after two accepted positions elsewhere.
Mr. Harms indicated that the three remaining candidates were outstanding and the Board had been in the process of interviewing each of them during the past two weeks.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on January 22, 1982, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Subcommittee 3 met late last week to assign further budget reductions made necessary by the additional short-fall in the state's estimated revenue. Vice Chancellor Lemmon described the Subcommittee's actions to you in a letter dated February 20.

The share of this further budget reduction assigned to the Department of Higher Education is $6,095,146. The Education and General Services share is $5,024,811. A copy of the list of further reductions was attached. (The modified list is contained as Addendum A to the Chancellor's report to the Board on March 11, 1982.)

The Subcommittee also tentatively approved changes in the Budget Report to accomplish several objectives. The substantive changes are:

1. A modification of the limitation on the use of a furlough (or other reduction arrangement) to permit its use as a short-term response to the deficit. The discussion indicates that the Subcommittee continues to share our view that such action would be damaging to the System but may be preferable to any of the alternatives.

2. A modification of the language dealing with options to the tuition surcharge to permit a generalized, rather than a program-specific, response. The discussion suggested that the Subcommittee believes it would be unrealistic to foreclose the use of the tuition surcharge in 1982-83.

3. A change in the reporting date from March 31 to April 30.

4. The addition of a requirement that the Board consider, among its budget cutting options, the elimination of state support for intercollegiate athletics at the state colleges and OIT. A motion that failed on a 4-3 vote would have included in the Budget Bill, rather than the Budget Report, a prohibition against the use of state funds in support of intercollegiate athletics.

Another change is subject to less precise interpretation.

Extensive discussion, and some Budget Report language, was intended to focus on the amount of the deficit which the Subcommittee would permit to be accommodated by the furlough. No clear answer emerged.

The two avenues open to the Board to balance its 1982-83 budget for Education and General Services appear to be (1) further program reductions, and (2) reducing salary costs by a short-term furlough, by postponing until late in the year the scheduled salary increases, or by foregoing, for 1982-83, the scheduled salary increases.

Further reduction in programs, to be effective this fall, threatens to result in hastily-conceived decisions about programs and will terminate the employment of faculty members and classified staff on short notice.

The recent review of program cuts, stimulated by the first draft of the Budget Report, makes it abundantly clear that program cuts
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beyond those approved by the Board last December will be difficult to achieve, will result in the elimination of opportunities for Oregonians to prepare for desired employment, and will reduce access to our colleges and universities.

On the other hand, any reduction in faculty salaries inevitably will tend to cause the System's most able faculty members to be attracted to other institutions. Quality, thus, will suffer if they leave.

We are caught between two undesirable choices.

The presidents and the Board's Office staff have studied these undesirable choices and believe our recommendation to you should incorporate a combination of both. Further, I believe this combination is consistent with the language of the Budget Report.

Program reductions should be identified in sufficient amount to account for the $3.56 million which results from the budget originally approved by the Ways and Means Committee. These reductions, we anticipate, will consist of actions which will affect both the 1981-82 and the 1982-83 fiscal years.

The balance of the deficit, amounting to $5.5 million, probably should be accommodated through some form of salary reduction to be spread evenly throughout the System, scheduled in one of the ways described above.

We believe, however, that faculty groups should be involved in the decision. In fact, the Budget Report calls for such involvement.

You are urged, therefore, to consider these proposals but not to act on them at this meeting.

Rather, I believe you should instruct us to plan, at a minimum, for the $3.56 million program reductions and to review with the presidents and faculties the option of substituting a salary reduction plan for what otherwise would be a minimum of $5.5 million in additional program reductions.

Because of the short time available for planning specific program cuts, should you decide to require them, I believe you should schedule a special meeting, possibly by telephone conference, no later than 10 days from now, at which we would report our findings to you and you would act finally on the options.

The recommendations for the Statewide Public Services would be presented at the same time.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Ingalls suggested several possible options for consideration in addition to program reductions and personnel and payroll reductions. He asked whether any serious consideration had been given to the Kreinen plan from Michigan State. Other options mentioned were the reduction of middle management, perhaps combining department chairmen, ending post-baccalaureate degrees at the colleges, or perhaps combining some of the primary education programs at Western Oregon State College.

The Chancellor indicated that program reductions at this point were being considered in the broad sense which would permit any of the things mentioned to be presented to the Board as a part of those program reductions. However, it is essential to keep in mind that 80% of the dollars are in personnel, and there is simply no way to save large amounts of money without either terminating people, which is the meaning of program reduction, or reducing the salary rates of those people who remain. Termination of
people could be involved in any of the suggested options, but budget cuts still would require terminating people or reducing salaries for those who remain.

Mr. Ingalls said he did not want to cut quality programs and was wondering how much money could be saved without cutting programs.

There was general discussion of the elements of the Michigan State plan, a preliminary assessment of some of the advantages and disadvantages, the factors which would and would not be applicable in Oregon, and other concerns which would be involved in the possible implementation of such a plan in Oregon. The staff is in the process of analyzing the plan and further information will be available to the Board.

Mr. Harms asked whether in either the $3.56 million amount or the larger amount it was planned still to have sufficient program reductions forwarded to the Board to allow the Board flexibility to make System-wide choices.

The Chancellor explained that if the Board approved the proposal, the institutions would have assigned to them a target in excess of $3.56 million to permit Board options. If the Board said that the $5.5 million also must be accommodated in program reductions, then the target given the institutions would be about 25% greater to allow for Board options.

In response to a question, the Chancellor said the Budget Note in relation to the tuition surcharge to permit a generalized rather than a program-specific approach was intended to convey that it would be necessary to come to the Board for program specific actions, such as the elimination of a specific program and the details of that elimination. A generalized response would be to require the elimination of a certain number of academic and classified staff, with the appropriate program reductions not yet identified. Discussions with the chairman of the Subcommittee suggested that the language used in the third and fourth packages of the earlier proposals to the Governor constituted the kind of response anticipated when the budget report language was modified to seek a generalized response.

The Board approved a motion to instruct the staff to proceed with planning on the basis of the recommendations and to schedule a special meeting of the Board on March 11, 1982, at 1:30 P.M. The following voted in favor: Directors Anderson, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Ingalls, Lomnicki, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

From various announcements from the Oregon Health Sciences University and extensive media coverage, Board members undoubtedly are aware that an appropriation of $20,790,000 was made by the Congress late in 1981 to provide for the construction of facilities for an Institute for Advanced Biomedical Research on the Marquam Hill campus in Portland.

President Laster has indicated that "This Institute will emphasize a commitment to excellence in the pursuit of new knowledge for the prevention or cure of human disease and excellence in the training of the next generation of scientists and clinicians whose task it will be to apply that new knowledge at the bedside. The biomedical research center will be fully integrated into the teaching and patient care missions of the University and its staff will devote their efforts to the elucidation of problems at the cutting edge of such fields as brain sciences; control of growth, aging, and tissue regeneration; immunology; genetics; molecular biology; or cancer, as examples."

To obtain access to the federal grant funds, an application must be submitted to the Department of Health and Human Services. One of the required components of such a grant application is a conceptual design of the proposed physical facilities, so it is likely that some assistance will need to be obtained from architectural consultants. Institutional officials have drafted a brief program statement for the project and have extended an invitation to more than thirty firms to indicate whether they would be interested in being
considered for this commission. The announcement indicated that the staff of the University would review the information provided by each firm regarding potential interest, experience, background, size, work load, specialization and other qualifications, and then narrow the listing to approximately eight firms for more intensive consideration, including interviews, consistent with the procedures outlined within the Board's Administrative Rule.

Pending the receipt of the federal funds, it is proposed that the initial planning costs be financed from balances available to the institution from building use credits earned and received as indirect cost allowances on instructional and research contracts and grants. Tentatively, it is expected that such architectural/engineering costs would be limited to about $150,000 in the preparation of materials required for the grant application. As noted, however, whatever amount is advanced for the fees and expenses of planning consultants would be reimbursable from the grant when and if it is approved by the federal government.

In view of the circumstances, involving the potential construction of one of the most unique and highly specialized facility projects within the State System, it seems desirable to call this matter to your attention and to seek your endorsement of the proposed arrangements for the initial planning, including appropriate authorization to the staff to advance the amount necessary from building use credits at the Oregon Health Sciences University. The Chancellor recommended the Board's favorable endorsement with the understanding that a presentation of more specific details concerning the Institute facilities will be made to you prior to the time that the grant application is submitted to the federal government. It should also be noted that in accordance with the provisions of Oregon statutes, the prior concurrence of the State Emergency Board (or the Joint Committee on Ways and Means, if the Legislature is in session) is required for the submission of the grant application.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Batiste said the proposed facility represented a substantial accomplishment because the State System was one of two finalists and had been accepted. He asked that President Laster comment.

President Laster said that if congratulations were in order they should be to the people at the institution who, through their efforts over the years, had merited the confidence and faith that is reflected by the efforts of Senator Hatfield. He played a predominant role in achieving this facility. President Laster said that the effort began with an Oregon couple who wish to remain anonymous. A year before the federal grant came into being, this couple made a pledge of $5 million in support of the programmatic effort for such an institute. It was their belief that the creation of a visible circumscribed effort committed to work of this kind would help to capture the imagination of the people of the state and its Legislature, not merely for the Oregon Health Sciences University, but for higher education generally.

Mr. Petersen asked whether the planning process had within it not only the physical facilities but the long-range costs of personnel, equipment, and other costs.

President Laster said there was a requirement to provide estimates and statements on plans for support of the operation. The intention is to supplement the $5 million grant with twice that much to provide for a core annual budget of $1 million to $1.5 million to support a core group of senior scientists. The remainder of the activity would be supported by competitive research grants from outside, and operations would be supported by the indirect costs that go with those grants.

Mr. Petersen said it would appear that General Fund monies would not be used to support the ongoing operation of the institute. President Laster indicated that activities would be tailored to the volume of support that
could be generated if the endowment remained at the $5 million level. The interest from that would be the core support. An application is on file with a foundation asking its commitment to the next $5 million.

Board members asked that the Board send a letter of appreciation to Senator Hatfield for his efforts in this matter and also to the anonymous parties, if that were possible.

The proposed institute was recognized as an extremely significant advancement for medical research, both in Oregon and regionally. It was indicated that this was by far the largest capital outlay project received by the Board.

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

It was recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

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

The Board referred from the January 22, 1982, Board meeting the Policies Regarding Physical Education Courses, 1982-83. The item was presented and then referred for individual discussion at the February Board meeting. (See 1-82-7a, page 4, of January 22, 1982, Board docket, also minutes; page 26.)

It was recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

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

It was recommended that the Board authorize the President and Secretary to execute an easement to the Merle West Medical Center in Klamath Falls for a parking lot extension and an access road on land measuring 336 feet by 66 feet (0.50 acres) located between Road B at the southern boundary of the campus of Oregon Institute of Technology and the existing parking lot of the Center. The access road and parking lot would be used by the patients, staff and visitors of the Center as well as by the students, staff and visitors of Oregon Institute of Technology participating in joint educational programs conducted at the Center.

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

At its January 25-26, 1965, meeting, the Board granted the Merle West Medical Center, then known as the Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital, an easement to construct a roadway to be used for emergency purposes and as a walkway for students and staff of Oregon Institute of Technology. Subsequently, the roadway has become an important vehicular access between the two institutions because of its convenience, including use by the municipal bus system which serves the area.

Officials of the Oregon Institute of Technology request that the easement be granted to reflect the current use of the roadway and to provide the Center
staff with a location to expand this parking lot. Many classes for Nursing, Medical Technology and X-Ray Technology are held at the Center and students use the Center's parking facilities not only during the time these classes are in session, but often during the remainder of the day. The parking is not only convenient but obviates construction of more spaces elsewhere on the campus.

Inasmuch as the easement would relate to an area that is not actively maintained by Oregon Institute of Technology staff and would require landscaping and maintenance by the Center, the granting of the easement could result in enhancing the appearance of the area. The improvements and maintenance would be at no cost to the State of Oregon. The right to use the premises for access and for parking by students, staff and visitors related to joint educational programs conducted at the Center and the right to terminate the easement would be reserved to the State of Oregon.

The easement would provide for termination following 90 days after giving written notice of intent to terminate.

It should be noted that the Board, at its July 26-27, 1965, meeting, granted an underground easement to the Oregon Water Corporation, now the City of Klamath Falls, for a water line. This water line, which services the Merle West Medical Center, traverses the proposed new easement, suggesting that it would be inappropriate to make improvements other than paving and landscaping on the surface of the easement area.

Summary and Staff Recommendation for Meeting Worksheets

It was recommended that Mr. Jeff M. Sirmon, Regional Forester, Region 6, U.S. Forest Service, Portland, be appointed to the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee, effective January 1, 1982, to July 1, 1985.

Mr. Sirmon is a graduate of Auburn University and started his Forest Service career in Alabama in 1958. His experience includes assignments in the Forest Service's Pacific Southwest, Southern, and Northern regions, as well as in national headquarters in Washington, D.C.

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, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

In accordance with provisions of ORS 526.225, The Board of Higher Education approved the establishment on June 13, 1961, of two advisory committees at Oregon State University: the Forest Products Research Advisory Committee and the Forest Management Research Advisory Committee. These committees were subsequently merged into the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee at the July 26, 1971, Board meeting. The 1975 Legislature revised provisions for the Forest Research Laboratory Committee to add three members representing the "public at-large." Appointments to these positions were made at the Board meeting on August 26, 1975.
Request to Lease/Purchase Computed Tomographic (CT) Scanner for University Hospital, OHSU

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (2-82-11a)

In accordance with AR 580-30-011 which designates the Board as governing body of the University Hospital, this capital outlay item is presented for the Board's approval because (1) it involves a considerable sum of money, and (2) it will be presented to the Emergency Board.

University Hospital is the major clinical facility supporting educational and research programs of the Oregon Health Sciences University. The Radiology Department provides service for the patient care programs and is a training center for residents in radiology, neurosurgery, neurology, ophthalmology, otorhinolaryngology, general surgery, pediatrics, internal medicine, and others.

CT scanning, a computer-assisted X-Ray system, has become an essential component of medical care, a required procedure in the care of head injury and many other central nervous system disorders. Head and body scanning are non-invasive alternatives to more dangerous and expensive operative diagnosis.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board approve the University Hospital's proposal to replace its existing CT scanner with a new state-of-the-art scanner and that the staff be authorized to present the matter to the Emergency Board for its consideration. Total program costs are outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>(Price)</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT Scanner</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$472,411</td>
<td>$1,672,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations and Renovations</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>126,900</td>
<td>396,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,470,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$599,311</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,069,311</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scanner purchase will be paid for in 72 equal monthly installments of $23,228, which includes interest charges of 12 percent per year. Alterations and renovations will be funded from Article XI-F(1) bonds which are already authorized by Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981. Repayment of total program costs will be financed entirely from Other Funds (patient fee) revenues.

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, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Harms. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Batiste said he had asked previously that the Board look at the full utilization of computers and he assumed that study was under way. He said that during the visitation it had been suggested that the Board consider utilizing outside private resources in improving its computer capability. He asked that this suggestion be incorporated in the study. It was indicated this would be done.

Policy Statements, Evaluation and Executive Management

The Chancellor indicated that he was prepared to discuss with the Board a proposed revision to the Policy for Evaluation of Chief Administrators and a proposed revision to the Executive Management Policy. Editorial revisions were suggested for the proposed revision to policy for the evaluation of chief administrators. The Board wished to have the proposed revision to the executive management policy considered at the next meeting. Both policies will be presented to the Board for consideration at the regular March Board meeting.
Mrs. Carpenter reviewed the final report of the Joint Committee on Teacher Education entitled, "Toward Excellence in Oregon Education." A copy of the report is on file in the Board's Office and is considered an integral part of these minutes. Mrs. Carpenter indicated that the report represented two years of heavy and concerted effort on the part of many people. The report contains some very interesting conclusions, challenges, and proposed directions, the performance of which would require both the consent and underwriting of the Board if they were to be implemented.

The task force and study grew out of a motion in 1979 by the chairman of the Board of Education at that time. His conception of teacher training was that it was non-rigorous, ineffective, and consisted of undemanding course work which graduated people without adequate training and sometimes without ordinary literacy skills. The significance of this view is that it is a conception held by others and the opposite reality has been demonstrated during the course of the study. Mrs. Carpenter said it was with real confidence and conviction that she could reassure the Board that for the most part extremely good work is going on in the field of teacher education in the public institutions. Training teachers is one of the most significant things that the Board does because it serves as a foundation for a sound educational system for the State of Oregon.

Two trends are occurring--one is the enormous increase in knowledge of the learning and teaching process; the second is the nationwide scrutiny of what it takes to become a professional.

Mrs. Carpenter then described the process which involved numerous segments and groups concerned with teacher education. She stated that six things were listed on page 11 of the report as goals to be achieved in the next four years. The staff will be asked to develop the individual components for decisions with respect to implementation.

The report will be discussed further in a joint meeting with the Board of Education and the Educational Coordinating Commission on the evening of March 25.

Mr. Harms expressed appreciation to Mrs. Carpenter for her efforts in this monumental task. She in turn expressed her appreciation to Vice Chancellor Kahananui and Dr. A. M. Rempel.

Mrs. Kahananui indicated that the effort in no way had been superficial. The task force has given leadership to teacher education in Oregon and provided direction and encouragement which will enable those concerned to move more expeditiously in meeting the needs for teacher education.

The Board accepted the report of the Joint Committee on Teacher Education with gratitude and appreciation to Mrs. Carpenter, the committee, and the staff.
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Report of Inspection and Acceptance of Library Building and a Portion of Accessibility for Handicapped, OIT

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon Institute of Technology and The Amundson Associates, P.C., project architects, the work of the prime contractors for the Library Building and that portion of the modifications for the removal of access barriers for the handicapped which had been bid and contracted simultaneously with the Library was accepted on behalf of the Board as of December 14, 1981, subject to the completion of various punchlist items. The facilities were inspected by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 12/14/81</th>
<th>Original Budget 5/23/80</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General work - R. A. Chambers and Associates, Inc., Eugene</td>
<td>$2,661,091</td>
<td>$2,620,000</td>
<td>$41,091(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work - Patterson Plumbing Co., Inc., Medford</td>
<td>554,459</td>
<td>551,340</td>
<td>3,119(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work - Steeck Electric Co., Medford</td>
<td>440,624</td>
<td>429,886</td>
<td>10,738(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$3,656,174</td>
<td>$3,601,226</td>
<td>$54,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - Change order items applicable to items of work funded separately</td>
<td>17,828</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net direct construction costs</td>
<td>$3,638,346</td>
<td>$3,601,226</td>
<td>$37,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>298,509</td>
<td>266,709</td>
<td>31,800(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>313,419</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>(1,581)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art</td>
<td>36,012</td>
<td>36,012</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>89,746</td>
<td>59,913</td>
<td>29,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site development (replacement of dislocated parking)</td>
<td>23,968</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(21,032)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76,140</td>
<td>(76,140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$4,405,000</td>
<td>$4,405,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution between projects:</td>
<td>$4,240,000</td>
<td>$4,240,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility for handicapped</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$4,405,000</td>
<td>$4,405,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes substituting plastic impregnated long grain hardwood parquet flooring in lieu of end grain wood parquet flooring; providing rigid ADS drain tile on each side of all portions of new utility tunnel that are not beneath the Library's lower level floor slab; running in a 6" bed of pea gravel; adding drain into basement level footing drain tile system and existing tunnel drain tile systems; providing cast-in-place concrete at each side of tunnel running vertically with 6" clear space between ends of section and top or bottom of tunnel; revising tunnel design to provide easier continuation of utilities through the basement of P.E. Building in the future; changing door locks as requested by institutional representatives for easily changeable lock cores; revising...
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steel splice detail at second floor; revising steel for concrete slabs on lower level north; providing reinforcement at two concrete beams at Vestibule V101; increasing width of excavation for existing geothermal line; adding a door, revising door hardware to include electric strike and control and modifying casework in circulation desk area; installing carpet at File Receiving Room 224B and a portion of Equipment Storage Room 224 in lieu of vinyl asbestos tile; providing additional steel stirrups and two steel bars at roof for reinforcement; providing two cabinets for storage of screens and student books and back packs; providing interior sliding glass door at learning center; providing temporary wiring for elevator drilling; adding paper storage cabinet in duplication area; changing plant landscaping materials in various locations and adjusting irrigation to fit; painting all interior concrete columns one coat of latex paint; installing ceiling trim at wood decking under skylight; installing sidewalk along west side of Library; providing sculpture pad in courtyard and installing interior artwork; installing acoustic tile over circulation and card area; repairing water damage due to water main break (funded separately); and other minor modifications all within nine approved change orders.

(2) Includes changing material of Geothermal Heat Exchanger from titanium to stainless steel; replacing existing gas line in vicinity of P.E. Building which was leaking (funded separately); relocating geothermal line serving P.E. Building and realigning sanitary and water line serving P.E. Building at new pedestrian tunnel and elevator; providing air line and pressure reducing valve from mechanical room compressor to work rooms in lieu of owner-supplied compressor; providing sump pumps in elevator pit sumps in the Library and P.E. Buildings; deleting manhole cover and tunnel drain lines; changing planter drains from concrete to PVC; providing gate valves and expansion loops in geothermal line between Utility Improvement and Library; installing two area drains in east yard and south court; and other minor modifications all within seven approved change orders.

(3) Includes revisions in exit lights, alarms and lighting as requested by the City of Klamath Falls; adding conduit for future computer station; changing ballard lights to standard size; providing public address system throughout Library area; modifying AVTV circuits in four rooms in the learning center; and other minor modifications all within five approved change orders.

(4) The professional services fees applicable to furnishings and equipment were included under "Furnishings and equipment" in the original budget, but are shown with other professional services fees in the revised budget.

The Library is basically a two-story structure of cast-in-place concrete pan slab with the concrete exposed in major areas. Exterior walls are brick veneer with fenestration of double-glazed bronze glass in aluminum frames. The walls and roof are insulated to meet contemporary standards for energy conservation. Interior finishes include gypsum board walls with vinyl wall coverings; wood parquet, brick pavers, and carpet flooring in selected areas; and acoustical tile and wood grid ceilings. The basic fixed equipment and cabinetry is of natural wood or plastic laminate faced material, depending upon use requirements. Utility services are provided through connections to and extensions of the present underground campus systems, including geothermal hot water heating and cooling.

The building has a small mezzanine and partial basement and contains a gross area of approximately 51,029 square feet. The lower level and mezzanine are devoted primarily to library functions, but also include a rather spacious lobby and other service areas for the building users. The learning center, the media services department and faculty offices occupy the upper level. Mechanical equipment has been installed within the partial basement. The campus utility tunnel loop system continues through the Library Building at this level.
The portion of the work applicable to improvements for accessibility for the handicapped related to the construction of a pedestrian tunnel (with utility tunnel below) from the Library to the Physical Education Building, along with alterations to accommodate the installation of a new elevator and exterior shaft on the Physical Education Building under these contracts.

The financing plan is detailed within the final section of the recapitulation below.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OIT Library Building (and a portion of Accessibility for the Handicapped)

Architects - The Amundson Associates, P.C., Springfield

Board's priority - Part of No. 2 (Accessibility) in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant and Auxiliary Enterprises)
No. 4 (Library) in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs: Library Building $4,240,000
Accessibility for Handicapped (this portion) 165,000
Total $4,405,000

Estimated gross area (Library Building only) - 51,029 square feet

Estimated total direct construction costs: Library Building $3,495,741
Accessibility 142,605
Total $3,638,346

Library Building, including fixed equipment but excluding site work and outside utilities:
Total - $3,326,068
Average (per square foot) - $65.18

Financing plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
<th>ACCESSIBILITY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund appropriation</td>
<td>$2,120,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-G bond proceeds</td>
<td>2,120,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Educational and General Plant</td>
<td>$4,240,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General obligation bond borrowings under Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$4,240,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

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

Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon State University, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Jeppsen, Miller & Tobias, Architects, Corvallis, for the fourth and final major phase of remodeling within the Memorial Union Building were approved on behalf of the Board. Two basic bids were invited for the work, i.e., Base Bid "A" principally for interior alterations, and Base Bid "B" for certain exterior renovation work. An opportunity was provided to the bidders to quote on an optional Base Bid "C" for the combined work. The bids received at 8 p.m. on February 2, 1982, may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Bids</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>High Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Bid &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>$1,243,244</td>
<td>$1,390,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Bid &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>858,000</td>
<td>69,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Bid &quot;C&quot; (Combination)</td>
<td>1,301,810</td>
<td>1,450,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inasmuch as the sum of the lowest separate bids for "A" and "B" was $566 less than the lowest quotation for "C", contract forms were forwarded to each of the lowest bidders after a tie for "B" was resolved by a coin toss in Salem on February 5. The following tentative budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs:
- Base Bid "A" - Dale Ramsay Construction Co., Corvallis $1,243,244
- Base Bid "B" - C. A. Lantz Construction Co., Salem 58,000

Total direct construction costs $1,301,244

Professional services fees
Furnishings and equipment
Works of art
Construction supervision and miscellaneous expenses, including physical plant costs
Contingencies

Total $1,566,000

As indicated to the Board when the design development phase of planning was reviewed and approved on August 7, 1981, the work to be accomplished includes the following major components:

(a) The installation of fire sprinklers within those portions of the building which were not included within the Phase III project during 1979-1981; the concealment of sprinkler piping with new suspended ceilings and the installation of new lighting fixtures as well as architectural furring in finished areas where the existing construction does not lend itself to piping concealment; and the construction of a new exit stairway from the banquet rooms at the west end of the first floor of the building. All of these items relate to fire and life safety.

(b) The revision of the kitchen, scramble-type serving area and patron seating areas in the Commons; the remodeling of the Corn Exchange dining room and Country Store; the provision of new corridors along the north wall of the mezzanine level for east-west circulation (replacing the present narrow corridor just south of the rotunda); modifications to the landing area on each side of the main rotunda entry to connect with the proposed new corridor, including ramps for wheelchair traffic; and the remodeling of the men's toilet room adjacent to the east ballroom on the ground floor to provide separate restrooms in this location for both men and women. (The existing women's toilet room for the ballroom would be deleted because of the proposed remodeling of the kitchen area.) Some additional remodeling would be accomplished near the east ballroom to increase the storage area.
(c) The construction of porches at the east and south entries to the bookstore and at the south entrance to the Commons. This portion of the work had been bid as an alternate during an earlier phase of remodeling, but was deferred because of inadequate expenditure authorization.

It was noted that several additional items of a repair and maintenance nature would be planned, bid and undertaken simultaneously with the alterations, if possible, with separate funding of approximately $156,000 from amounts available from the building repair reserve of the Memorial Union, such as the renovation of the exterior of the building (tuckpointing, cleaning and sealing stone and brick surfaces, repairing broken and sunken walks in the promenade on the north side of the building, replacing old handrails with new ones to match those installed recently under the project for handicapped access). Inasmuch as the bids for the work were satisfactory, this objective is being fulfilled.

Except for the items of repair and maintenance work totaling $156,000 which are being charged against the building repair reserve, the project costs are being financed from the proceeds of $1,410,000 from self-liquidating bonds sold previously under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACTS

Project - OSU Memorial Union Remodel, Phase IV
Architects - Jeppsen, Miller & Tobias, Corvallis
Board's priority - No. 16 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Estimated total project costs:
  Capital construction
  Repair and maintenance

Estimated total direct construction costs:
  Capital construction
  Repair and maintenance
  Total

Tentative schedule:
  Contract awards - February 1982
  Completion - November 1982

Tentative financing plan:
  Capital construction: Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises
  Repair and maintenance: Memorial Union Building Repair Reserve

Total

Board Discussion and Action
The Board accepted the report as presented.
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Vacation of Portion of S.W. Madison Avenue, OSU

By Ordinance No. 81-74, the City of Corvallis, vacated that portion of S.W. Madison Avenue which is west of S.W. Ninth Street. This property is within the approved projected campus boundaries of Oregon State University. Title to one-half of the vacated street accrued directly to the State of Oregon acting by and through the State Board of Higher Education on behalf of Oregon State University and the other half accrued to the owners of the adjacent property on the south side of the vacated street, Robert W. and Joanna S. Wilson. The Wilsons then deeded their interest in the vacated S.W. Madison Avenue to the OSU Foundation which, in turn, deeded it to the Board on behalf of the institution. The area vacated consists of approximately 0.209 acres at the east edge of the University campus.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendations of officials of the University of Oregon, arrangements were made with Thomas R. Miles, Consulting Engineer, Beaverton, through a further supplement to the agreement of May 1, 1980, to provide for additional consulting services relating to the potential use of refuse-derived fuel as an alternate source of fuel for firing boilers at the central utility plant on the campus in Eugene.

For these additional services, which include assistance to the Owner in coordinating the efforts of Lane County, the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, Lane Air Pollution Authority, University of Oregon and others with respect to producing adequate refuse-derived fuel and conducting field test burns and stack tests, the Engineer shall be compensated an amount not to exceed $49,000, financed from resources from the institution's operating budget.

The supplement acknowledges that the various cooperating agencies will provide in-kind services as appropriate.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Report of Inspection and Acceptance for Smith Memorial Center Remodel, Phase IIA, PSU

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Thompson & O'Doherty, P.C., project architects, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for the Smith Memorial Center Remodel, Phase IIA, on the campus at Portland State University was accepted by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning on behalf of the Board as of January 15, 1982, subject to the completion of punch list items. 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 August 7, 1981:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget 1/15/82</th>
<th>Original Budget 8/7/81</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct construction costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors, Inc., Tualatin (Phase II)</td>
<td>$404,075</td>
<td>$404,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloyd R. Watt Construction Co., Portland (Phase IIA)</td>
<td>67,541</td>
<td>65,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$471,616</td>
<td>$469,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional services fees</strong></td>
<td>63,192</td>
<td>61,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings and equipment</strong></td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Works of art</strong></td>
<td>4,328</td>
<td>4,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs (including force account work)</strong></td>
<td>52,864</td>
<td>50,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingencies</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Accepted previously and reported to the Board on March 27, 1981.

(2) Includes adding birch casing, continuous at bottom of windows, in Rooms 234 and 236 in Cascade Lounge; adding trim at windows in Cascade Room doors to cover rough formica edge and painting with enamel to match plastic laminate; removing folding door covers and plaster pocket in Browsing Lounge; adding veneer plaster board and finish at northeast corner of the White Gallery and other minor modifications all within three approved change orders.

The work of the Phase IIA contract included some demolition; new partitioning; the addition of tackable and sound-absorbing wall surfaces; additional small areas of resilient floor covering and carpeting; a display case built around an existing structural column; covering certain existing doors with plastic laminate material; wall and ceiling painting; adding built-in lounge seating, planter and display or cause table; installation of new track lighting with dimmer switches and providing hanging planters and some other furnishings. Plant material was included for all planters. The work occurred on the second floor in the Main Lounge, Cascade Room, Browsing Lounge, White Gallery and Gallery Hall.

The expenditure requirements for the entire project were financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available for auxiliary enterprises, as authorized by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - PSU Smith Memorial Center Remodel, Phase IIA (part of Phase II)

Architects - Thompson & O’Doherty, P.C., Portland

Board's priority - No. 21 in 1979-1981 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project cost $720,000
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Estimated total direct construction costs:
Phase II - $404,075 (acceptance reported previously)
Phase II A - 67,541 (acceptance in this report)
Total $471,616

Financing plan:
General obligation bond borrowings under
Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution
and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $720,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and KEI/Kruchek Engineers, Inc., Portland, the work of the prime contractor for the Variable Volume Fan System Conversion in the Science Building II on the campus at Portland State University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of February 1, 1982, subject to the completion of unfinished punch list items.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on March 27, 1981:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget 2/1/82</th>
<th>Original Budget 3/27/81</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan exchange -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase - NOR-AIR, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>$35,520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation - PSU Physical Plant Department</td>
<td>19,349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$54,869</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls and related work - Jaggar-Sroufe Company, Portland</td>
<td>128,536</td>
<td>119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metering - Portland General Electric, Portland</td>
<td>5,746</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items purchased by PSU Physical Plant Department</td>
<td>31,627</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$220,778</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserved for subsequent phases of work</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct construction costs</td>
<td>$420,778</td>
<td>$410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>21,010</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>58,212</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Four variable volume fans were purchased under a separate earlier contract and installed by Physical Plant Department personnel.

(2) Includes finishing and installing an air dryer for service on the PSU branch supply serving the four pneumatic operators which control the
pitch of the fan blades, installing appropriate hardware in order to alter the start-up/shut-down sequence of the four supply fans and other minor modifications all within two approved change orders.

(3) Controls and metering equipment purchased by Physical Plant Department.

The work of the contract with Jaggar-Sroufe Company included the installation of approximately 100 volume dampers in the ventilation system and related electrical control changes involving supply and exhaust fans in this six-story science building which contains approximately 214,000 gross square feet.

Previously, each laboratory within the building was served with a constant volume of 100% outside air required by the use of the space. The four new variable volume fans permit more accurate zoning, and their variable feature matches loads determined by the number of fume hoods operating. The hoods exhaust air only when the laboratory is being used, thus reducing the energy required to supply the 100% outside air. Determination of room use is made by the sensing of room lights being on; and an override switch has been installed to allow hood use when a room is darkened for audio-visual projections. It is anticipated that annual energy savings will effectively return the investment in less than four years.

All of the expenditures for this project were financed from equal shares of a federal grant from the U.S. Department of Energy under Title III of the National Energy Conservation and Policy Act of 1978, Institutional Buildings Grants Program, 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 - PSU Science Building II Variable Volume Fan System Conversion

Engineers - KEI/Kruchek Engineers, 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 $500,000

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only; excluding $200,000 reserved for subsequent phases of work) $220,778

Financing plan:

Federal grant funds - $250,000
General Fund appropriation - 250,000

Total $500,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
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**Report of Inspection and Acceptance of Drama Laboratory (Theater), SOSC**

**Staff Report to the Board**

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Broome, Oringdulph, O'Toole, Rudolf & Associates, PC, project architects, Portland, the work of the three prime contractors for the Drama Laboratory (Theater) on the campus of Southern Oregon State College was inspected and accepted on behalf of the Board by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning, subject to the completion of unfinished punchlist items. The Mechanical work was accepted as of December 14, 1981, and the General work and the Electrical work were accepted as of December 31, 1981.

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></th>
<th>Revised Budget 12/31/81</th>
<th>Original Budget 5/23/80</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct construction costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General work - Jack Mathis General Contractor, Inc., Roseburg</td>
<td>$2,380,823</td>
<td>$2,344,610</td>
<td>$36,213 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work - Patterson Plumbing Co., Inc., Medford</td>
<td>502,233</td>
<td>497,858</td>
<td>4,375 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work - Sims Electric of Medford, Inc., Medford</td>
<td>443,335</td>
<td>458,383</td>
<td>(15,048)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal for direct construction costs</td>
<td>$3,326,391</td>
<td>$3,300,851</td>
<td>$25,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional services fees</strong></td>
<td>331,189</td>
<td>329,406</td>
<td>1,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Works of art</strong></td>
<td>33,008</td>
<td>33,008</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Furnishings and equipment</strong></td>
<td>45,718</td>
<td>45,718</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction supervision, other Physical Plant costs, legal and miscellaneous expenses</strong></td>
<td>98,694</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>38,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingencies</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66,017</td>
<td>(66,017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$3,835,000</td>
<td>$3,835,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes reinstating bid alternates one through four for landscaping, floor finish, theatrical equipment and elevator; installing seeded lawn in lieu of sodded lawn; deleting one-third of specified ground cover (Baltic Ivy) and adjusting spacing of remainder; substituting plastic sprinkler heads with brass inserts in lieu of brass heads; installing taped and finished gypsum drywall in lieu of thin coat veneer plaster system; installing taped, finished and painted drywall ceilings in lieu of glued acoustic tile in seven rooms; deleting venetian blinds for various exterior windows; deleting mid-stage traveller track, drapes and one counterweight set; deleting curtain bags and the painting of slipweights; adjusting subcontract quotation for acoustical doors; compensating for additional structural excavation and backfill; substituting carpet material; furnishing and installing fifteen additional theater chairs; deleting access manhole at tunnel; deleting requirement to "sack" finish exposed concrete ceilings in basement areas; adding continuous sheet metal counter flashing at all parapet walls; furnishing and installing removable railing anchor sleeves at front edge of stage; and other minor modifications all within eleven approved change orders.

(2) Includes modifying heating system and controls to provide for Owner's installation of a dust collector to serve Scene Shop 109; furnishing and installing new sink in Room 212; installing a transfer opening for ventilation air to equipment rooms in northwest wall of basement Room 04; furnishing and installing a by-pass timer for exhaust system in Laundry
Room 116; deleting manhole and connecting new 15' SD line to existing catch basin/manhole in Mountain Avenue; deleting drain flashing from four deck drains and adding one roof overflow drain assembly; furnishing and installing fire damper at fire wall above door 207; adding pressure taps in HVAC water lines; deleting sewer connection in Palm Street; and other minor modifications all within five approved change orders.

(3) Includes reinstating bid alternates, including a passenger elevator car and platform, hoistway entrances, guide rails and brackets, pump units, controller, cylinder and plunger; adding two manual fire alarm stations in accordance with instructions from the Oregon Department of Commerce, Plans Review Section; providing additional lighting controls and circuits in various rooms; installing special outlet in Rehearsal Room 118; installing four type-"E" lights in Auditorium; electrical changes in sound and lighting terminal cabinets; increasing output of emergency battery inverter system; revising stage lighting system; adding concrete curb/platform under electrical motor control panel in Mechanical Room 209; providing service to Owner's dust collector; changing from rigid to PVC conduit; providing conduit for future radio intertie; furnishing and installing one additional program clock in Make-up Room 133; and other minor modifications all within six approved change orders.

The new structure is essentially a high one-story building. It includes a full-size basement (for the orchestra pit and trap room, mechanical service connections to the campus utility tunnel and storage space) and a partial mezzanine floor level (for the control rooms, catwalks, storage, and mechanical services). Several areas on the main floor level, such as the auditorium, the black box theater, the scene shop and other student workspace, are high-ceiling areas which extend through the mezzanine level to the roof. Other areas (the dressing rooms, make-up room, rest rooms, etc.) are typical single-story height.

The main theater provides seating for approximately 328 persons, and the black box theater seats about 125 spectators. The lobby serves both performing areas. Student workspaces (the costume room, the scene shop and the multi-purpose area leading to the Green Room), as well as the two faculty offices and ticket window, are placed at the perimeter of the building to obtain light and view. These areas have their own entrance/exitways, separate from the main lobby. Public circulation space and corridors throughout the building serve other functions, such as rehearsal rooms. An exterior covered colonnade space at the northeast corner of the building serves as a shelter for the box office, exterior lobby and entry area for those approaching from other portions of the campus.

The structure is placed below grade into the existing hillside. A depressed service ramp is provided to the scene shop and loading dock at the east side of the building. The present parking lot south of the Music Building was modified to create a vehicular drop-off and turnaround for spectators attending performances at either the Music Building or the theater, but the principal orientation of the Drama building and access to it by the students and staff is from the east side.

The exterior wall finishes are of brick veneer and plaster. The structural and framing systems are of wood, including glued-laminated wood beams, wood truss-joists for the roof and wood stud wall framing. A complete fire protection system has been installed. Utility services have been extended from the south campus central plant through the tunnel system. Interior finishes include acoustical treatment within the theaters, carpeting in the lobby and offices, ceramic tile in rest rooms, and either concrete or vinyl asbestos tile flooring in workspaces.

"Savings" which had been realized in the bidding of the new Library Building at Oregon Institute of Technology were utilized for the Drama Laboratory (Theater). Inasmuch as both capital construction projects were financed from General Fund appropriations and Article XI-G bond borrowings authorized
by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979, an increase of $100,000 in the original
budget of $3,735,000 was authorized by the Board on May 23, 1980, and
received concurrence by the State Emergency Board on June 6, 1980.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - SOSC Drama Laboratory (Theater)
Architects - Broome, Oringdulph, O'Toole, Rudolf & Associates, PC, Portland

Board's priority - No. 7 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979 (amended by the
Emergency Board on June 6, 1980, to reflect
increase of $100,000 in expenditure limitation)

Estimated total gross area - 39,855 square feet

Estimated total project cost $3,835,000

Estimated direct construction costs (this portion only):
Total (including landscaping, utility tunnel extension
and other sitework, plus theatrical equipment and
fixed seating) $3,326,391

Building only (excluding sitework and fixed equipment) $2,646,456
Average (per square foot) - $66.40

Financing plan:
General Fund appropriation $1,917,500
Article XI-G bond proceeds 1,917,500
Total $3,835,000

The Board accepted the report as presented.

COMMUNICATIONS, PETITIONS, AND MEMORIALS

The Secretary summarized briefly the communications which had been received
with respect to program eliminations and reductions and other budgetary issues.
With one exception, the communications were opposed to the program cuts. They
included the following:

Correspondence concerning the Law School, UO
Corrections and Law Enforcement--one general and four each
with respect to programs at Eastern Oregon State College
and Southern Oregon State College
Landscape Architecture, OSU--1
Concern for Handicapped Accessibility--1
Marine Biology at Charleston, UO--1
Staff Furlough--1 in favor
Nursing, OHSU--2
Educational Media, WOSC--6
Geology, SOSC--28
Spanish, SOSC--8
Counseling--2

The Secretary was asked to provide the Board with a summary of the corre-
respondence received.

Staff Reports

The staff reports provided to the Board for the February meeting (Items
2-82-9b through 2-82-11b) are on file in the Board's Office and will be bound
with the permanent minutes as pages 84 and 85.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 P.M.

Edward C. Harms, Jr., President

Wilma L. Foster, Secretary
Amendments to AR's and IMD's re Inventions, License Agreements, Educational & Professional Materials Development, Patents, and Copyrights

Staff Report to the Board (2-82-9b)

A significant revision of policy pertaining to invention, patent, licensing, and copyright policy was approved by the Board on November 17, 1978. One major impetus for amending the rules and internal management directives at that time was to motivate faculty and staff interest toward inventions which might have commercial value. This was accomplished by increasing the inventor's share in net royalty income which might evolve from an invention from a straight 30 percent to the sliding scale beginning with 40 percent. There is ample evidence, particularly at Oregon State University, that the policy change has served that purpose. Another purpose was to generate more income for the institution from marketable inventions. Such income is placed in the higher education invention fund of the inventor's institution and is used to underwrite further research and to initiate commercialization of new technology. Again, the 1978 rule change appears to have served that purpose, especially at Oregon State University, where approximately $250,000 of net royalty income has been received by the University in the past year. Of this amount, approximately $82,500 has been paid to the inventors.

The proposed amendments to AR 580-43-011(4)(a) and IMD 6.250(4) are designed to extend the royalty distribution schedule so that an institution's share of the net royalty income will increase as the total royalty income from the invention exceeds $500,000, while still providing a reasonable share to the inventor. The faculty, institution, and State of Oregon should benefit from the broader distribution of royalty income because the additional income for the institution will be utilized to fund additional research.

Amendments are proposed to AR 580-43-011(5) to make clear that graduate and undergraduate students who may become inventors or co-inventors as a result of research in connection with their work assignments are entitled to the benefits and subject to the responsibilities of policies, rules and internal management directives pertaining to inventions, technological improvements, and educational or professional materials.

The amended portion of IMD 6.215(1) will enable the institution author who desires or is invited to submit research papers to scholarly journals for publication to assign the copyright to the publisher so long as the author is not compensated or paid a royalty for allowing the article to be published. This proposed amendment will eliminate the current requirement for obtaining institution clearance for each of hundreds of articles published each year and will conform to contemporary practices.

Amendment of OAR 580-22-050, Employment Discrimination

Staff Report to the Board (2-82-10b)

Oregon Statutes prohibit discrimination in employment based on marital status. Discrimination on the basis of marital status is already prohibited in educational programs. This amendment makes the Rule consistent with Oregon Statutes and other related Board policy.

Request to Lease/Purchase Computed Tomographic (CT) Scanner for University Hospital, OHSU

Staff Report to the Board (2-82-11b)

The hospital's existing CT scanner is a 1975 EMI 5005 model which is now obsolete, having limited application, slow scanning time, and frequent breakdowns.

A new scanner would offer several advantages:

1. New technical applications including the ability to scan tissue slices which are three times thinner; to reduce scanning exposure time from 18 seconds to 3 seconds; to move the image plane from the existing fixed plane by as much as ±20 degrees, and thus allow creation of images from a series of different angles.
2. Elimination of interhospital transfer of patients due to equipment breakdowns and need for high quality diagnostic scanning. During the first five months of 1981-82, the existing scanner was inoperative 20 percent of the time. Approximately 200 inpatients were transferred to other hospitals for scanning services in 1980-81. Transferring critically ill patients in this manner increases patient costs and places the University in an untenable legal position since diagnostic delays may result in increased patient disability.

The limitations of existing equipment have impaired the development of clinical and educational programs directed toward management of intervertebral disk disease, diagnosis of head and neck cancer, spinal cord or nerve root compaction, and other abnormalities within the head and neck area. Since Oregon Health Sciences University is a center for treatment of pituitary tumors, the superior performance of a new scanner is required frequently. These and other head and neck cancer patients currently must be transferred to other institutions for CT scanning services.

Alternatives have been considered, including the purchase of a lower cost scanner, but the increasing acceptance of scanning as a diagnostic procedure, the essential higher accuracy and image quality of the more expensive unit, and the hospital's high workload requirements justify the $1.2 million expenditure.

Debt service requirements and project costs will be met by patient fee revenue over the six-year life of the project. The estimated impact of the construction costs will be $18.76 per CT scan. The estimated impact of the incremental equipment costs will be $48.09 per CT scan. The total additional CT scan cost will be $66.85, raising the average patient scanning charge from $308.11 to $374.96, or 22 percent. These charges will be competitive with those in the Portland metropolitan community.

Acquisition procedures will include prior approval by the Northwest Oregon Health Systems Agency, the review and issuance of a Certificate of Need by the State Health Planning and Development Agency, and vendor selection by competitive bid.