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

September 10, 1982

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

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A.M., September 10, 1982, by the
President of the Board, Mr. Robert C. Ingalls, and on roll call the following
answered present:

Mr. John W. Alltucker
Mr. Alvin R. Batiste
Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter
Mrs. Harriett J. Flanagan
Mr. Randal D. Gill

Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.
Mr. Marion T. Weatherford
Mr. Loren L. Wyss
Mr. Robert C. Ingalls

Absent: Director Perry was out of the state and Director Petersen was
absent for business reasons.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor William E. Davis; Secretary Wilma L. Foster;
J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Clarethel Kahananui,
Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; W. T. Lemman, Vice Chancellor
for Administration; Wil Post, Acting Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs; Melinda
Grier, Compliance Officer; Jerry Casby, Assistant Attorney General; Tom Berkey,
Assistant Attorney General; A. M. Rempel, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic
Affairs; Kenneth R. Jones, Assistant to Vice Chancellor for Administration; Larry
Pierce, Special Assistant to the Chancellor; J. Richard Pizzo, Director, Office of
High School Relations; Gary Christensen, Associate Director, Office of High
School Relations; Arthur Mancl, Director of Campus and Building Planning;
James Lockwood, Assistant to the Chairman, Interinstitutional Library Council;
Richard S. Perry, Director, Division of Management and Planning Services;
Susan Weeks, Coordinator of Planning Studies; Virginia Avery, Acting
Director, Public Services and Publications.

Oregon State University--President Robert MacVicar.

University of Oregon--President Paul Olum; Ray Hawk, Vice President for
Administration and Finance; N. C. McFadden, Director, Office of Affirmative
Action.

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Leonard Laster; J. T. McGill,
Vice President for Finance and Administration; Gordon H. Ranta, Director
Facilities Planning.

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

Eastern Oregon State College--Interim President David E. Gilbert; James C.
Lundy, Director of Business Affairs; William P. Wells, Dean of Student
Affairs.

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

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

Western Oregon State College--Richard E. Walker, Dean of Education; Jack
Bergman, Dean, Liberal Arts and Sciences.
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The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on July 23, 1982, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls.

The Chancellor stated that at the March meeting, the Board was advised that Ms. Beverly McNeil, formerly employed at Oregon State University, had requested the Board to review a non-disciplinary personnel action under the provisions established in the Board's Administrative Rules. The Board referred the matter to the Chancellor to take action as provided by OAR 580-21-390(4) which provides for examination; informal settlement, if possible; conference or hearing, if necessary; and report and recommendation to the Board if the grievance is not resolved. The review is subject to the limitations of OAR 580-21-390(5) which limits the consideration of any request to appellate review of alleged errors by the appointing authority with respect to procedure, adherence to Administrative Rules or applicable law, and fair consideration of the facts. The scope of the review was not to include a de novo review on the judgment exercised by the president. The Board further reserved discretion to take further action until the Chancellor reported his recommendation, or unless the matter was otherwise resolved prior to that report.

The Chancellor presented the report of the review. The report is on file in the Board's Office. He recommended that the decision not to renew Ms. McNeil's contract be allowed to stand and that no further review described by OAR 580-21-390 be undertaken. He said to give effect to this recommendation, a motion would be in order whereby the Board would exercise its discretion under OAR 580-21-390 not to proceed further with this appeal.

The Board approved a motion that the Board decline to review this matter further and that the report of the Chancellor be accepted and adopted. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

The Chancellor reported that plans had been completed for the creation of an Oregon College of Education through the merger of education programs at Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College. The Teaching Research Division will participate in research and development activities under a separate memorandum of agreement. In summarizing the developments, the Chancellor presented the following points:

1. The College will have a single dean responsible to the presidents of Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College.

2. There will be three associate deans having responsibility across all programs in the College--associate dean for teacher education; associate dean for graduate and in-service programs; and associate dean for research, development, and evaluation. (The associate dean for research will hold a joint appointment between the College and Teaching Research Division.)

3. A single departmental structure will be developed for the College.

4. The College will greatly increase and enrich faculty resources and provide for long- and short-range cost savings.
5. The merged program will give former Western Oregon State College faculty access to participation in doctoral committees and dissertations.

6. All support services (admissions, student services, advising, placement, certification, etc.) on both campuses will be reviewed with the goal of establishing single procedures to serve the College.

The Chancellor commended the action of the faculties and the leadership at the institutions and the spirit and cooperation with which they have combined the physical resources of their respective institutions. The rapidity with which this has been done is such that the elementary courses and counseling courses are expected to be combined at the beginning of the fall quarter, with a dean to be appointed for the College by the middle of October. He said it was his understanding this proposal was an internal administrative reorganization within the purview of the Chancellor to approve. He indicated the memoranda of agreement would be provided to the Board.

Mr. Ingalls and Mr. Batiste expressed enthusiasm for the plan. However, Mr. Batiste said there still seemed to be a number of details to be resolved and suggested that it might be advisable to refer the matter to the Instruction Committee to work out the details. He said he was concerned also about the name because it revived the previous name of Western Oregon State College. Issues which might affect future consolidations of other programs should be discussed.

The Chancellor said he did not believe the name would cause confusion. It was an appropriate designation and it would build on 125 years of history and tradition that should be preserved.

Mr. Wyss said previous Board decisions on the mission of Western Oregon State College specified that it should be a comprehensive liberal arts institution with a strong base in teacher education. He said separating the teacher education facilities and combining them with those of another institution now leaves Western Oregon State College as a truncated liberal arts comprehensive institution without its previous base. He said the Board should discuss the future of Western Oregon State College without its teacher education programs.

The Chancellor responded that the intent was not to take the teacher education program from Western Oregon State College. The program would still be an important component. There would be an intermingling of faculty from both institutions with courses still offered at Western Oregon State College and degrees granted from that institution. The overall projected mission of the institution would be expected to be part of the strategic and long-range planning activities between now and the first of January.

Mr. Wyss said perhaps the plan had not been explained sufficiently, but it appeared that a new organization was being formed with a different group of responsibilities. He said the policy implications seem to be more important than an administrative reorganization.

Mr. Ingalls stated that to some extent the plan would formalize a condition that already exists at the two institutions in the interchange of students for particular programs in education.

Mr. Weatherford expressed his support for the plan because he had sensed a real frustration in the lack of coordination between the complementary strengths of the two institutions.

The Chancellor indicated that the mission is to develop and deliver the highest quality of education to students in the most efficient and effective manner possible. The goal is not to reduce the number of students but to utilize most efficiently the existing resources and personnel and adapt them to meeting the needs. This does not dilute the mission of either institution. The most difficult thing is the unusual administrative structure which depends upon close cooperation between the presidents of the two institutions and the dean.
President MacVicar said the fact that the two institutions were located 20 miles apart made it possible to share faculty and was the most significant justification for the development of a different kind of administrative structure to facilitate the maximum utilization of personnel. He said neither institution was of the opinion that it was losing its teacher education program. He said he was puzzled by the objections because none had been raised when the Chancellor outlined the plan at the previous meeting.

Mrs. Carpenter said there were a number of questions, one of which involved the status of the Teaching Research Division, particularly in terms of research contracts.

President MacVicar said the plan represented a joint effort to be more efficient because of the economy of scale in the operations. Quality would be enhanced at both institutions through the sharing of extraordinarily able and skilled personnel at each institution.

Mr. Harms said he saw no objections and many things desirable in the actions that had been taken so far. However, he agreed that it might be helpful to have the memoranda of agreement and information on how the program would operate, both academically and administratively.

Mr. Wyss said the Board had a responsibility to investigate the implications of these changes on all of the institutions and he could not support the plan until that had been done.

Mr. Alltucker said he viewed the proposal as a joint venture between two institutions in which the public would gain. He said that on the assumption this action was within the purview of the Chancellor, he would move to approve the plan.

Mr. Ingalls indicated that at the conclusion of the meeting, it could be adjourned to a specific time in Newport to resolve the questions that had been raised.

Mrs. Flanagan said she could appreciate the concerns expressed but that she did not feel that the Board would be setting policy. Possible future joint ventures between other institutions would be considered on an individual basis. She pointed out that these two institutions were located very close together and have some unique features.

Mr. Harms seconded the motion by Mr. Alltucker, indicating that he viewed the policy question as being related to the mission of Western Oregon State College.

Mr. Wyss said he was considering the issue in terms of the possible structure of the State System institutions as the Board considers combining its divisions and schools among its different institutions. This action would be cited as a precedent.

Mr. Batiste said he was opposed to making decisions before the Board had the necessary information to do so.

The Chancellor proposed that the Board defer action so that there would be an opportunity for further discussion. He indicated the memoranda of agreement would furnish additional details and were available. He said he would invite the deans from the respective institutions to be available for information and comment.

Mrs. Carpenter said the Board had certainly backed the principle of inter-institutional efforts in the interests of students and better educational opportunities. However, major changes have been examined thoroughly and she said she would favor further discussion at the Board retreat.
The motion and the second were withdrawn and it was agreed that the matter would be discussed further at an adjourned session of the present meeting to be held at the Marine Sciences Center, Newport, on Monday, September 13, 1982, at 10:00 A.M.

### 1983-1985 Budget Summary and Recommendation for Meeting Worksheets (9-82-48a; no 48b)

In our presentation of the biennial budget material to the Board at its meeting on August 24, 1982, it was indicated that the APLS guidelines require state agencies to identify reduction options which could be used should there be insufficient General Funds to finance base budgets. It was further noted that the Board's staff was engaged in discussions with Executive Department personnel concerning whether such options could be quite general in nature or must be specific to the point of identifying particular programs, administrative units, schools, or institutions which might be reduced or closed. The Executive Department suggested generalized options would be most appropriate at this time.

The 1983-1985 base budget approved by the Board on August 24 was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$327,357,603</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>238,093,467</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$565,451,070</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board will recall the discussion that the ratio of General Funds (58%) to Other Funds (42%) is based upon the Executive Department instruction that funding ratios existing in 1982-83 be maintained in 1983-1985. The percentage of General Funds is artificially low and the percentage of Other Funds (which includes tuition) is artificially high in 1982-83 when compared to the ratios in prior years because of the General Fund cuts resulting from the state's economic crisis, and the extraordinary tuition increases which had their genesis in the same economic circumstances. The staff reported that if the forecast levels of enrollment and student mix materialize in 1983-1985 and if tuition were retained at 1982-83 rates, some $33 million less income would be realized than the $238 million required by the Executive Department ratio formula. Consequently, the Board approved as decision package #1 in the budget request a shift of approximately $33 million from Other Funds to the General Fund, which would result in largely restoring earlier funding ratios.

The Board also instructed the staff to urge the Executive Department to modify the base to include the change in funding ratios on the grounds that strict adherence to the instructions produces an irrational result.

To fulfill the requirements of the budget instructions, it is necessary for the Board to identify reduction options totaling 20% of the General Fund base in increments of not more than 5%. If we assume the Executive Department will permit us to modify the base as recommended by the Board, the base budget would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$360,320,029</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>205,131,041</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$565,451,070</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the assumption, each reduction option package would be 5% of the General Fund amount or $18,016,001. Each such package implemented would result in a reduction in student access if it is assumed necessary to retain staffing ratios contained in the base budget.
In estimating the effect of implementing each option package, the staff has used an adjusted variable cost per student of $3,630 per year composed of $2,230 General Funds and $1,400 tuition. Each option package is computed thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$9,008,000</td>
<td>$9,008,001</td>
<td>$18,016,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Enrollment Loss</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>4,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds Loss</td>
<td>5,656,000</td>
<td>5,656,000</td>
<td>11,312,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget Reduction</td>
<td>$14,664,000</td>
<td>$14,664,001</td>
<td>$29,328,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application of Reduction</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff @ $33,000*</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>$10,560,000</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>$10,560,000</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>$21,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff @ $18,000*</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,152,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,152,000</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2,304,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,952,000</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,952,001</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5,904,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>$14,664,000</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>$14,664,001</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>$29,328,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes direct salary and Other Personnel Expense costs (retirement assessment, Social Security, Worker's Compensation premium, health insurance, etc.)

Each of the additional three options would be identical. The aggregate of the four options would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$36,032,000</td>
<td>$36,032,004</td>
<td>$72,064,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Enrollment Loss</td>
<td>16,160</td>
<td>16,160</td>
<td>16,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds Loss</td>
<td>22,624,000</td>
<td>22,624,000</td>
<td>45,248,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$58,656,000</td>
<td>$58,656,004</td>
<td>$117,312,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enrollment loss at the 15% and 20% package level is undoubtedly overstated in that reductions of that magnitude may well result in closing buildings or perhaps entire campuses. Under those circumstances, fixed costs would be sharply reduced. At the 20% level then, the reduction in access would more likely be 12,000 or so.

The second alternative in looking at reduction options is to assume that the Executive Department will not modify the base to adjust the funding ratios. In that event, our expenditures would have to be reduced by $33 million to bring the budget in line with anticipated income before the reduction options are placed into effect. The results would be:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$327,357,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds (Reduced)</td>
<td>205,131,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$532,488,644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reductions to accommodate the income loss would approximate the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>$11,880,000</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$1,296,000</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$3,305,213</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>$16,481,213</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduction option packages of 5% of the General Fund will each be $16,357,880 (rounded to $16,370,000). The same approach and formula used above results in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$8,185,000</td>
<td>$8,185,000</td>
<td>$16,370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Enrollment Loss</td>
<td>($8,185,000 / $2,230)</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>3,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Funds</td>
<td>5,138,000</td>
<td>5,138,000</td>
<td>10,276,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$13,323,000</td>
<td>$13,323,000</td>
<td>$26,646,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the additional three options would be identical. The aggregate of the four reduction options would be $106,584,000, but the total effect on the Education and General budget must include the $33 million income loss as well. The grand total reduction would thus be over $139 million and would be allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff @ $33,000</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>$9,603,000</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff @ $18,000</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,044,000</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2,676,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>$13,323,000</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of students who would be denied access at this level of reduction would range from 16,000 to 19,225 depending on which and how many campuses were closed.

It was recommended that the Board approve both options, with the understanding that the appropriate option would be submitted, depending on the decision of the Executive Department with respect to the change in the base of the General Fund dollars. The options are identical in concept.
Board Discussion and Action

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

Mr. Harms commented that at the 20% reduction level, it would require closing the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, or Portland State University and one of the regional colleges. Only the largest of the regional colleges, if closed, would raise the necessary money required for the first step in the program reduction packages. He said it should be recognized that there is no way that this magnitude of cuts could be undertaken without doing great damage to the State System and the ability to educate students within the State of Oregon.

Summary and Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Science-Mathematics Building at Eastern Oregon State College, completed in 1966, be named Ralph Emerson Badgley Hall in honor of the former professor and chairman of the Science Division at that institution. He had served the College from the Fall Term 1931 through the Spring Term 1969, when he retired, and was Professor Emeritus until his death on May 3, 1982.

Staff Report to the Board

Late in 1974, the Campus Assembly of Eastern Oregon State College passed the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Ralph E. Badgley is an outstanding teacher, adviser and counselor of students and was at Eastern Oregon State College for thirty-eight years (1931-1969), and

WHEREAS, Ralph E. Badgley recognized the value of the sciences integrated with other fields of knowledge, and

WHEREAS, Ralph E. Badgley was dedicated to Eastern Oregon State College, to eastern Oregon, and to the citizens of the state of Oregon as exemplified through his long years of outstanding service at Eastern Oregon State College,

RESOLVED, that the Campus Assembly of Eastern Oregon State College herein endorses and recommends that the Science Building on the Eastern Oregon State College campus be named Ralph Emerson Badgley Hall.

Inasmuch as it is the general policy of the Board, as stated within OAR 580-50-025, that buildings or structures of the Department not be named after living persons, this recommendation was not presented at the time it was made by the Campus Assembly. There were, however, many letters submitted by former students, colleagues and other interested persons, including residents of eastern Oregon, in strong support of the proposed tribute to Dr. Badgley. These testimonials are on file in the Board's office. Dr. Badgley was held in extremely high regard as a teacher and administrator, and was honored for his outstanding contributions to science in Oregon by the Oregon Academy of Sciences in 1975. He played a prominent role in the planning of the Science-Mathematics Building and also in the design of the physics, math and chemistry programs at Eastern Oregon State College. He continued to reside in La Grande until his death on May 3, 1982.
Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-82-43a)

A Framework Master Plan for the Oregon Health Sciences University has been completed by the Zimmer/Gunsul/Frasca Partnership, Architects, Portland, and is available for review and approval by the Board. The Plan, which is a measure of existing conditions and a guideline for the potential development of the campus on Marquam Hill in Portland, is intended to serve institutional planning programs consistent with the missions of the University and community criteria and objectives.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board review, comment upon and approve the Framework Master Plan as the basis for further planning and physical development of the Oregon Health Sciences University.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Art Mancl, Director of Campus and Building Planning, described the concept of master plans for the various campuses and some of the elements included in those plans. He stressed the importance of integrating both small and large elements into the plan for the overall development of the institution.

President Laster indicated that the presentation described a strategy for the future evolution of the Oregon Health Sciences University, based on an optimistic view of the future. He reviewed critical issues faced by the institution, particularly those related to the educational and patient care facilities. He emphasized the importance of sensitivity to the individual as a human being and improvements to facilitate access for patients.

President Laster said there are two distinct entities to the master framework plan. One is the strategy for the next decade to implement the goals of the institution. The second is the operational framework document for use specifically in dealing with city regulations.

A representative of the architectural firm then presented slides to illustrate his description of the master framework plan. One of the key elements in the plan was an improvement in the traffic circulation and parking access and pedestrian circulation among the segments of the campus. One exciting proposal in the plan is the ravine building which would connect the north and south campuses and have substantial space for any of several important purposes.

President Laster said that implicit in the strategy were some needs for additional expensive project development activities. One would be for pedestrian circulation, internally and externally. Planning for utilities should be a separate critical examination. A third important planning activity would be for providing a sense of the university. It was indicated that there had been collaboration in the parking studies with other appropriate agencies and organizations.

Mr. Mancl said that once the master plan has been approved through the public hearing process, any building could be approved by the city on a building permit basis rather than through a public hearing.

Mr. Wyss asked how much of the campus development depended upon a continual commitment to new buildings and a greater resources commitment from the state in the future and how much is a reallocation of present resources to a more comprehensive, convenient, safer campus.

President Laster said it was not intended that new buildings would be the central focus of the plan. Many things, particularly those involving pedestrian and vehicular circulation, can be improved without the addition of any buildings, but through other types of improvements.
Mr. Hunderup said the staff recommendation was for Board review, comment, and approval of the framework master plan as the basis for future planning and physical development of the Oregon Health Sciences University. He commended the efforts of the staff at the institution in working with the architects and their consultants in the development of the plan. Once this plan has been approved, whatever is done at the institution will be consistent with the framework master plan.

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

Mr. Ingalls announced that during the Board luncheon the Board would meet in Executive Session pursuant to ORS 192.660 for the purpose of reviewing pending litigation involving the Board and member institutions as permitted by ORS 192.660(1)(b) and (h). He indicated that representatives of the media would be allowed to attend but the information which is the subject of the Executive Session could not be disclosed.

The Governor's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies has completed and submitted its final report. The report was distributed to Board members, and a copy is on file in the Board's Office. The Executive Summary from the Report follows:

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Governor's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies has outlined 33 recommendations for strengthening Oregon's interest and knowledge regarding the outside world. The program concerns:

- increased citizen awareness of the importance and nature of Oregon's international ties;
- greater international interest and activity throughout the Oregon economy;
- higher standards of instruction (quantitative and qualitative) in foreign language and other international subjects at all levels.

The Commission found that there are some noteworthy programs in Oregon in international education and business activity, but severe shortcomings as well. Oregon high school students lag far behind the national average in foreign language study, and some major industries, troubled with low demand, have seemed oblivious to foreign marketing opportunities.

Specific Commission recommendations include:

- efforts by public officials, private organizations, educators, and the media to emphasize for all Oregonians their political, economic, social, and cultural relationships with the rest of the world;
- an information program, conducted cooperatively by government, business, labor, the media, and private organizations to increase information statewide, regarding international trade, investment, and tourism as they relate to Oregon's economy;
- better training in the international dimensions for business students and other economic leaders;
- more study of foreign cultural patterns, historical backgrounds and international relationships at all levels of education, kindergarten through college;
more study of foreign language at all levels, emphasizing practical communication skills, beginning in elementary school and with foreign language study required for college entrance.

- qualitative improvements in the teaching of international subjects, including foreign languages, through: new teacher education and certification requirements, inservice programs for teachers and administrators, expanded exchange programs, new teaching materials, information for educators on content, methods, and educational activities in international subjects, continuing research, and greater community participation in school activities to make use of locally available educational resources;

- a broader focus for existing international education programs to increase attention to the Pacific region and other non-European areas of growing potential for Oregon;

- expanded international exchanges for citizens, students, and educators through measures such as strengthened programs for adult exchange visits, assistance to school districts in selecting exchange programs, and improved administration of college and university exchange activities.

Existing legislation and agencies appear adequate to achieve most of the program. Implementation will depend on a commitment by the Governor, the Legislature, private organizations, and individuals to maintain interest in international matters and to review periodically the state's progress toward the goals the Commission has outlined. Organizations to coordinate action among different sectors of the community and among different educational levels and institutions are proposed.

Mr. Lester Anderson, a member of the Governor's Commission and a former member of the Board of Higher Education, presented a summary of the report and the background leading to the formation of the Commission. In discussing the report, Mr. Anderson cited Oregon's position compared to other states in terms of language study and the export business. He emphasized the importance of foreign language development to international trade and the economy of Oregon. The state has a very strategic location on the Pacific Rim, both geographically and economically, in supplying products to other countries. The recommendations would involve a program phased over a period of five to eight years which would require the cooperation of the Legislature, business, education, and other private bodies. Communication skills beyond language skills are required so that there is a comprehension and understanding of the social and cultural aspects of the world community.

Mr. Anderson then reviewed specific recommendations pertaining to education and described how some of the proposals might be implemented within a particular discipline. He suggested some of the benefits which might result from greater knowledge and ability in this field. In conclusion, Mr. Anderson indicated that efforts were in progress to continue development of programs to achieve the goals set forth in the report.

Mr. Wyss said it would be desirable to determine what factors cause individuals to retain proficiency in a language and asked if the Commission had any indication of what those factors might be. Mr. Anderson said a broad range of things probably were involved and that a job-related application would be a significant factor. He said it had been discovered that exchange programs were also an important element.
to conduct studies of the transition of severely handicapped adolescents from educational to work environments. Establishment of the Institute is contingent upon funding of the program by the U.S. Office of Education.

The U.S. Office of Education is proposing to establish four institutes for the education of severely handicapped children. Portland State University has presented a proposal for one of these institutes, as described in the staff report. The University offers instructional programs preparing teachers of the severely handicapped. The Institute, if funded, will supplement these programs by providing training opportunities for graduate students and research opportunities for faculty.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that Portland State University be authorized to establish a Research Institute for the Severely Handicapped, as requested, contingent upon receipt of funding from the U.S. Office of Education.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-82-45a; no 45b)

Larry A. Dotson, an Associate Professor in the School of Health and Physical Education at Southern Oregon State College, has requested a Board review of his termination. Dr. Dotson's termination, which will be effective December 31, 1982, is the result of program reductions arising out of Board's directives designed to respond to the budgetary shortfall. Dr. Dotson has appealed through the institutional grievance procedure. A final determination from President Sicuro was issued on July 7, 1982, upholding Dr. Dotson's termination. Dr. Dotson requests a hearing under the Board's Administrative Rule 580-21-390, Discretionary Review of Academic Nondisciplinary Personnel Decisions, which provides for appellate review by the Board upon recommendation from the Chancellor or his designee.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that such a review be provided by adoption of the following motion:

In the matter of the Appeal of Larry A. Dotson, regarding nondisciplinary academic personnel action by Southern Oregon State College submitted by letter or document dated August 2, 1982, pursuant to OAR 580-21-390, it is moved that the Board of Higher Education refer the matter to the Chancellor or his designee for the purposes provided by OAR 580-21-390 (4) and subject to the limitations of OAR 580-21-390 (5).

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation and adopted the motion as presented. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Summary for Meeting Worksheets (9-82-46a; no 46b)

Luise Walker is an Associate Professor and a librarian with indefinite tenure at the University of Oregon. Until August 16, 1982, she held the position of Head Science Librarian in the Science Library. Ms. Walker currently serves as Reference Librarian/Science Library. Ms. Walker's reassignment did not result in any salary adjustment, or other adjustments in rank or privileges.
On her behalf, Ms. Walker's attorney has requested a review of her reassignment to her current position. Ms. Walker alleges that her reassignment is a sanction for cause and requests the Board to instruct the University of Oregon to observe the Administrative Rule procedures regarding sanctions for cause. In the alternative, if the Board finds that the reassignment was not a sanction for cause, Ms. Walker requests a review as provided by OAR 580-21-390, Discretionary Review of Nondisciplinary Personnel Decisions.

Ms. Walker filed her grievance under the University's Administrative Memo 16.140 (now OAR 571-03-000) which provides a three step review of employment actions. At each step the reassignment was upheld. President Olum notified Ms. Walker of his final decision. Throughout the process the University stated that the reassignment was not a sanction for cause.

The Board's staff has conducted an appropriate examination, has concluded that the reassignment was for appropriate reasons within the authority of University officials, and concurs that the reassignment was not a sanction for cause. Therefore, any consideration by the Board should be under its Rules permitting discretionary review of nondisciplinary personnel decisions. This provides for the Chancellor or his designee to examine the allegations, informally settle if possible, conduct a conference or hearing if necessary and make a report and recommendation to the Board.

Staff evaluation of the University of Oregon's examination indicates that the type of discretionary review available under OAR 580-21-390 already has been undertaken by the University of Oregon. Furthermore, the staff believes that the Board should not review reassignments unless there are alleged errors with respect to procedure or allegations that the personnel action was contrary to rules, statutes or case law. Ms. Walker's attorney does not allege that any of the above have occurred. Therefore, staff recommends that no review be undertaken.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board adopt the following motion:

In the matter of the appeal of Luise Walker submitted by letter or document dated August 3, 1982, regarding a personnel action taken by the University of Oregon, the Board finds that the action was not a sanction for cause. Inasmuch as the appeal does not allege procedural errors or that the action was contrary to rules, statutes or case law, the Board declines to review the matter under the provisions of OAR 580-21-390.

Board Discussion and Action

There was some discussion to ascertain that the procedures were comparable to those of similar requests. Assurance was given that they were.

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

R. Hawk,
Designation as
Vice President
Emeritus, UO

Summary and Recommendation for Meeting Worksheets (9-82-47a; no 47b)

Dr. N. Ray Hawk, Vice President for Administration and Finance, will retire on December 31, 1982, after more than 32 years on the administrative staff of the University of Oregon. It was recommended that emeritus status be conferred upon Dr. Hawk with the title of Vice President for Administration and Finance, Emeritus, effective on the date of his retirement. As a tenured professor in the College of Education, the University of Oregon intends to give Dr. Hawk the honorary title.
Board Discussion and Action

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

Board members mentioned several items of concern which were referred for discussion at the Board retreat.

Resolution Honoring R. Briggs, EOSC

Mrs. Flanagan read the following Certificate of Recognition honoring Dr. Rodney A. Briggs, President of Eastern Oregon State College:

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION HONORING RODNEY A. BRIGGS

The members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education wish to express their warmest appreciation to Dr. Rodney A. Briggs for a job well done.

Briggs, who served as President of Eastern Oregon State College since 1973, has demonstrated outstanding leadership which earned Eastern the respect it enjoys today. During his tenure, Briggs totally reorganized Eastern Oregon State College, redefined its mission, and gained for it a national recognition as an outstanding regional education center tailored to the needs of a remote and rural area.

A dynamic and warm person, with a reputation for not mincing words, Briggs succeeded in pulling together faculty, staff, and students to build a first-rate educational team. The curriculum changes he initiated reversed EOSC's declining enrollment--bringing a steady growth in its place. His open door policy and cooperative style of leadership helped achieve exceptional community support for Eastern Oregon State College.

Rodney Briggs' contributions as president will remain as testimony of his accomplishments. We know that the American Society of Agronomy is most fortunate in its new Executive Vice President. We wish him the very best in his new position and in the years ahead.

Upon motion by Mrs. Flanagan, the Board adopted the Certificate of Recognition, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 351.130 authorize the Board of Higher Education to accept gifts and invest such donated funds. The endowment funds maintained by the Board are a portion of this Donation Fund. ORS 293.701(2) defines "investment funds" and includes in subsection (u) "investment funds of the State Board of Higher Education lawfully available for investment or reinvestment." ORS 293.736 specifies that the State Treasurer shall invest and reinvest moneys in the investment funds. ORS 293.706 establishes the Oregon Investment Council and 293.716 designates the State Treasurer as the investment officer for the Council. The Council is also authorized to contract with investment managers to perform to the extent provided in the contract the duties of the investment officer. The authority to manage the investment funds of the State Board of Higher Education rests with the State Treasurer.

In cooperation with the Board, the Oregon Investment Council has always contracted the management of the endowment funds with outside managers. For several years the funds were split between two management firms. As of September 1, 1978, they were consolidated and placed with Dodge & Cox, where they reside today. The present managers have performed satisfactorily over the past four years, but the record of the Oregon Equity Fund has
been better. There appears to be no valid reason for the Board of Higher Education to maintain its funds with the one manager, when it can avail itself of the opportunity to utilize the services of the 12 Equity Fund managers, which cover a broader spectrum of investment philosophy. Following are the equity investment performance comparisons from the period September 1, 1978, through December 31, 1981:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dodge &amp; Cox</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dow-Jones Industrials</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard &amp; Poor 500</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Investment Council</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual-Growth &amp; Income</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Balanced</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff has been discussing with the State Treasurer the consolidation of the Board's Endowment Funds with the funds managed by the State Treasurer and the Oregon Equity Fund with the transfer to be effective October 1, 1982, or as soon thereafter as practical. Under past arrangements, the investment manager has been making the determination of the amount of funds to invest in Fixed income securities within general guidelines provided by the Vice Chancellor for Administration. In the future, the Treasurer's Office will be making this decision. The result is a reduction in investment manager's fees, as the bond portion of the Board's portfolio has been included in the market value on which the investment management fees were formerly based.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented. Mr. Wyss was requested to act as a consultant in these matters.

Staff Report to the Board

In accordance with the recommendation of officials of Oregon State University, and pursuant to the provisions of AR 580-50-020, arrangements have been made with CH2M Hill Northwest, Inc., Engineers, of Corvallis, for consulting services on minor capital improvements and/or rehabilitation work on the campus in Corvallis.

Compensation is to be based upon time and materials within a maximum limitation of $25,000 during the period beginning June 1, 1982, and ending June 30, 1983.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the Board's staff has acknowledged the acceptance of the completed construction documents phase of planning for accessibility for handicapped within Friendly and Fenton Halls on the campus of the University of Oregon in Eugene prepared with the assistance of Architects Unthank, Seder, Poticha. The project has been advertised for a scheduled bid opening on September 9, 1982.

The work within Friendly is expected to include the installation of a chair lift within an existing hoistway in order to provide access to the basement where the Language Lab and Learning Resources Center are located, and modifications to the west entrances and first floor restrooms also. In Fenton Hall, the work is to include only the installation of a wheelchair lift in the main stairwell.
The direct construction cost allowance for the work within Friendly Hall is $32,100 and for the work within Fenton Hall is $42,800 for a total direct construction allowance of $74,900. These costs and related project expenditures are to be financed from state funds in the total amount of approximately $100,000 authorized by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - UO Accessibility for Handicapped (Friendly and Fenton Halls)

Architects - Unthank, Seder, Poticha, Eugene

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $100,000

Estimated total direct construction costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hall</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>$32,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>$42,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$74,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative schedule:
- Bidding - September 1982
- Completion - December 1982

Tentative financing plan:
- Article XI-G bond proceeds $100,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Housing Improvements (Amazon Housing Roof and Foundation Drains), UO

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Architect Albert Pastine, Eugene, and his engineering consultants for adding gutters, downspouts and foundation drain connections for 15 buildings within the Amazon Student Housing Complex at the University of Oregon, were accepted on behalf of the Board. Five bids were received for the work on June 29, 1982, ranging from a low of $49,750 to a high of $135,228. Inasmuch as the low bid was within the direct construction cost allowance and expenditure authorization had been granted by the State Emergency Board, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Raymond Roth and Herschel F. S. Roberts, A Joint Venture</td>
<td>$49,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>5,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>5,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>4,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $65,700

The work is part of a larger project, Housing Improvements, for which an expenditure limitation of $1,415,000 was authorized by the 1981 Legislature. All of the expenditures applicable to the roof and foundation drains are being financed from resources available to the institution in its sinking fund reserve from student family housing operations. No state tax funds or bond borrowings are involved in this work.
RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - UO Housing Improvements (Amazon Housing Roof and Foundation Drains)

Architect - Albert Pastine, Eugene

Board's priority - Portion of No. 14 in 1981-1983 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $65,700
Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $49,750
Scheduled completion - November 1982

Tentative financing plan:
Balances available for auxiliary enterprises
(Student family housing reserves) $65,700

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

With some assistance from Marquess & Associates, Inc., consulting engineers in Medford, the staff of the Physical Plant Department of Southern Oregon State College prepared drawings and specifications for the installation of a Halon fire suppression system within the institution's computer center in the Britt Center. The four bids received for the work on June 24, 1982, ranged from a low of $8,100 to a high of $11,272.

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, a contract award was made to the lowest bidder and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct construction costs:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warren Oliver Company, Inc., Lake Oswego</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force account work</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the resources required for this work were provided through prior allocations of state funds for the correction of safety deficiencies on the campus in Ashland.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - SOSC Correction of Safety Deficiencies, Phase II (Britt Computer Center Fire Protection System)

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977

Estimated total project cost (this portion only) $11,640
Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $10,100
Tentative schedule:
   Contract award - July 1982
   Completion - August 1982

Tentative financing plan:
   Article XI-G bonds
   $11,640

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

On May 28, 1982, the Board approved the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed remodeling of space on the 8th floor of University Hospital South to develop a cardiac catheterization laboratory for the Oregon Health Sciences University. The plans had been prepared with the assistance of Architects Petersen Kolberg & Associates, P.C., Wilsonville. The project is expected to be undertaken as part of the 1981-1983 capital construction program for Hospital and Clinics Rehabilitation and Alterations and received expenditure approval by the State Emergency Board on July 16, 1982, with an estimated cost of $310,000.

Based upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the Board's staff has acknowledged the acceptance of the completed design development phase of planning and has authorized the architects to complete the construction documents phase so that bids may be solicited and a contract award made for the work. The description of the proposed facilities remains essentially the same as that outlined in the May 28, 1982, Board minutes.

The direct construction cost allowance continues to be $237,000, and all estimated expenditure requirements are expected to be financed from proceeds from the self-liquidating bonds which were sold on April 6, 1982, under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution. No state tax funds are involved. The debt service requirements for the bonds are to be met from patient fee revenues.

RECAPITULATION UPON ACCEPTANCE OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OHSU Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects (Cardiac Catheterization Laboratory Installation)

Architects - Petersen Kolberg & Associates, P.C., Wilsonville

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $310,000
Estimated direct construction costs (this portion only) $237,000
Estimated area to be remodeled - 1,995 square feet

Tentative schedule:
   Bidding - October 1982
   Completion - March 1983

Tentative financing plan:
   Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $310,000

Board Discussion and Action

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

On April 23, 1982, the Board received the report of acceptance of the design development phase of planning for the proposed Parking Structure #2 Addition at the Oregon Health Sciences University, which had been prepared with the assistance of Breedlove-McConnell Engineers, Inc., of Portland.

Based upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the Board's staff has acknowledged the acceptance of the completed construction documents phase. The bid opening date for the project will be established following the completion of the Conditional Use process required by the City of Portland.

The description of the work of this project remains essentially as described to the Board when the schematic design phase of planning was approved on January 22, 1982. The project proposes a three-level addition consistent with the original cast-in-place and precast concrete construction. It would contain about 136,536 gross square feet. Depending upon final distribution of spaces for regular-size and compact cars, the capacity of the addition would range between 430 and 450 spaces.

The direct construction cost allowance continues to be $2,680,000. These costs and the related expenditures for professional services fees, artwork, construction supervision and other project expenses are to be financed 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. No state tax funds are involved.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OHSU Parking Structure #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 - To be established at a later date
  Completion - circa June 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

Board Discussion and Action
The Board accepted the report as presented.
The results of this bidding may be summarized within a brief outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item of Work</th>
<th>No. of Bidders</th>
<th>Name of Low Bidder</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>High Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment items:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water heaters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consolidated Supply</td>
<td>$52,484</td>
<td>$52,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boilers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bert Farnes Company</td>
<td>45,715</td>
<td>54,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion burners</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bert Farnes Company</td>
<td>15,087</td>
<td>22,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bert Farnes Company</td>
<td>4,471</td>
<td>7,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bid packages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nos. 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>McKinstry Co.</td>
<td>284,850</td>
<td>342,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Plumbing; HVAC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Guard Sprinkler Systems</td>
<td>195,111*</td>
<td>347,849*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3 (Fire protection)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Empire Electrical Co.</td>
<td>190,505</td>
<td>269,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4 (Electrical)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Empire Electrical Co.</td>
<td>81,565*</td>
<td>106,045*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of contract awards made $869,788

* Net of a deductive alternate which was exercised

For the remainder of the alterations to the various residential buildings contemplated within the total direct construction cost allowance of $1,462,442 and the project expenditure limitation of $2,245,000 previously approved by the Board and the Legislature, it is expected that one or more bid invitations will be processed through the Office of Facilities Planning in the usual manner. A report thereof, including the post-bid budget, will be made to the Board at a later time.

To date, self-liquidating bond borrowings in the amount of $1,200,000 have been allocated to cover the contract requirements listed above, professional services fees and other related project costs.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARDS

Project - PSU Student Housing Rehabilitation
Architects - Sheldon Eggleston Reddick Associates, P.C.
Board's priority - Part of 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:
  Total $1,462,442
  Portion for which contract awards have been made by Department of General Services $869,788

Tentative financing plan:
  Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds $2,245,000

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 The Amundson Associates, P.C., project architects, Springfield, for remodeling within and providing an elevator addition to Siskiyou Hall on the campus at Southern Oregon College were approved on behalf of the Board. Two basic bids
were provided for the work--Basic Bid "A" for the elevator addition and the remodeling of toilet and shower rooms and Basic Bid "B" for the electrical service conversion including a new panel and power distribution system. An optional Basic Bid "C" was also provided for combining Basic Bids "A" and "B".

Five bids were received for the work on July 13, 1982, ranging from a low of $243,100 to a high of $309,155 for Basic Bid "C" including the two additive alternates which were exercised.

Inasmuch as the lowest combination bid, including the two additive alternates, was within the resources available, a contract was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs:
- Adroit Construction Co., Ashland $243,100
- Physical Plant force account work 10,000
  Total direct construction costs $253,100

Professional services fees 30,372
Works of art 2,431
Furnishings and equipment (air-conditioning units) 26,500
Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs 3,862
Contingencies 12,655

Total project costs $328,920

The work of the contract includes the addition of an elevator and shaft, modifications to the toilet and shower facilities on each floor of the building, and the installation of air-conditioning units within the study-bedrooms. The additive alternates provide windows, an automatic door system, entry matting, guardrails, and sloped overhead glazing system to enclose the ground floor elevator lobby; and the relocation of existing showerheads and their controls.

All of the project costs are to be financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings and other resources available for auxiliary enterprises. No state tax funds are involved.

With the earlier approval of the Board and with Emergency Board authorization on June 3, 1982, bond proceeds of $275,000 previously reserved for parking improvements at Southern Oregon State College are being applied to the remodeling of Siskiyou Hall, supplemented with $53,920, or as much thereof as may be required, from balances available from student housing operations at the College.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

- Project - SOSC Siskiyou Hall Remodeling
- Architects - The Amundson Associates, P.C., Springfield
- Board's priority - Not applicable
- Legislative authorization - Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979 and State Emergency Board action on June 3, 1982

Estimated total project costs $328,920
Estimated total direct construction costs $253,100
Scheduled completion - February 1983
Meeting #493

Progress Report on State System Response to Recommendations of the Joint Boards' Committee on Teacher Education

Staff Report to the Board

The Joint Boards' Committee on Teacher Education issued its final report and recommendations, Toward Excellence in Teacher Education, in February 1982. This is a brief progress report on the response of the State System institutions to two of the recommendations of the Committee for which teacher education institutions were to assume major responsibility.

The two recommendations are quoted here as they appeared in the report:

1. A pre-test of basic skills should be required prior to admission to teacher preservice programs in addition to multiple indicators now in use.

2. As a first step (in strengthening teacher education programs), demonstration projects testing different organizational and curricular models of preservice should be implemented and tested against comparable evaluative criteria.

We will discuss the State System response to each of these recommendations in turn.

A report in response to the third recommendation of the Committee of major concern to the institutions, calling for strengthening of programs for preparation of administrators, and will be brought to the Board at a later date.

Proficiency in the Basic Skills as a Condition for Entry to Teacher Education

Use of Basic Skills Tests

The Joint Committee on Teacher Education recommendation concerning proficiency in the basic skills of applicants for teacher education supported policies already adopted by the Board of Higher Education at its meeting in June 1981.

All six State System teacher preparatory institutions have been administering the California Achievement Tests in reading, language, spelling, and mathematics to students applying for admission to teacher education this past year (1981-82). The institutions score the tests, make any use and analysis of the test scores they wish to make, and then send the test answer sheets to Dr. Richard Rankin, University of Oregon. This procedure is making it possible to establish a centralized data bank for analysis, evaluation, and research purposes.

The interinstitutional basic skills committee, appointed by the State System deans and directors of education to study the issues and make recommendations concerning the effective use of basic skills tests and measures as a condition of admission to and graduation from teacher education programs in the State System, recommended the use of the California Achievement Tests. Suggested cut-off scores for admission, based on the scores of high school graduates, were the 60th percentile for the reading and language tests, and the 50th
percentile on the mathematics test. This means that the applicants would need to score at or above the scores made by the top 40% of the high school graduates in reading and language, and the top 50% of the high school graduates in mathematics.

Preliminary test data suggested these cut-off scores, but these standards were to be re-examined as more comprehensive data became available.

Four of the institutions (UO, OSU, PSU, and SOSC) are implementing the cut-off scores recommended by the Committee for entry to teacher education. Both WOSC and EOSC are expecting to have the standards in place this coming fall term (1982). The institutions have the option of raising the standards for proficiency in the basic skills beyond the current minimum, and some are exercising this option. For example, at the University of Oregon the 70th percentile is used currently as the standard that must be achieved on the tests for admission to the elementary education program.

The institutions have developed policies and procedures regulating the conditions under which students can re-take the test(s) in which their scores are unsatisfactory. Essentially, the candidate is given the opportunity to re-take the test(s) in which he/she scored below the standard upon presenting evidence that appropriate efforts have been made to strengthen his/her competencies in the areas of deficiency.

The basic skills committee is of the opinion that a candidate should be limited to two re-takes of a test. Again, more light will be shed on this subject as additional data become available.

In addition to the California Achievement Tests described above, all of the institutions are requiring students seeking admission to teacher education to make satisfactory scores on an essay test. An essay test (basic skills examination) has been developed under the auspices of the basic skills committee. In a supervised situation the student has an hour to write an essay on one of three suggested topics. The topics consist of a brief quotation in which the author takes a position on some educational issue. The examinees are asked to explain whether they agree or disagree with the position taken by the author, detailing their own points of view as carefully and fully as they can. Two of the institutions (OSU and PSU) used the committee test this past year. The other institutions are using their own institutionally developed writing tests (quite similar to the committee test). With further refinement of the committee test and the scoring scale, it is expected that all of the institutions will use the test, thereby achieving greater consistency in scoring standards and providing comparable data for research purposes.

The institutions are also making effective use of the interview as a screening device for entry into teacher education programs. The importance of the interview in the admission to teacher education is well-recognized, particularly as a means of gaining some meaningful insights into the candidate's orientation to and perception of teaching. In the State System colleges and divisions of education, we have come to the realization that the interview can also be used as an effective device to assess the candidate's proficiency in the communication skills, particularly speaking and listening. In order to achieve greater consistency in the interview procedures and interpretation of the results, we are moving to make the interview more structured, and are using a carefully designed rating scale and a small cadre of trained observers to conduct the interviews.

Preliminary Results

The table on page 456 presents data based on the test scores of 1,101 individuals applying for entry to teacher education in 1981-82. The percentile equivalents of the test scores based on the norms for high school graduates are given.
for three populations: (a) all applicants who took the test, (b) applicants who met the minimum test standards (60th percentile in reading, spelling, and language, and 50th percentile in mathematics); and (c) applicants who did not meet the standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All applicants</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum standards*</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting minimum</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school graduates</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Applicants meeting the minimum standards are those who made satisfactory scores on all four tests. Applicants not meeting the minimum standards were below the cut-off scores in one or more of the tests.

It can be seen that those applying for admission to teacher education are considerably above the national average for high school graduates, with scores at the 82nd percentile in reading, 81st percentile in spelling, 75th percentile in language, and 70th percentile in mathematics. As would be expected, for applicants meeting the minimum test score standards for admission on all of the tests, the percentile equivalents are substantially higher: 93rd percentile in reading, 87th percentile in spelling, 82nd percentile in language, and 75th percentile in mathematics.

To demonstrate more clearly how the test scores are distributed for the various populations in the table above, we have included a graphical display, on the following page, of the percentile distribution of the combined basic skills test scores1 for all teacher education applicants, applicants meeting minimum standards, and the total population of high school graduates.

It can be seen that whereas the scores for high school graduates follow the normal distribution curve, the scores of the applicants for entry to teacher education are bunched at the upper end of the scale. The concentration of scores at the upper end of the percentile scale are even more marked for those meeting admission standards.

In the light of the data that have been presented, are the current standards for basic skill scores appropriate, or should they be set at a higher level? It should be noted that of the 1,101 applicants who took the tests in 1981-82, 352 or 32% failed to meet the standards on one or more of the tests. This is a significant percentage of students being denied admission because of unsatisfactory scores on the basic skills tests.

With the exception of mathematics, the current standards require students seeking entry to teacher education to score above the average for high school graduates in the basic skills. This assumes that the candidates have made some gains in reading and language as a result of their college experience. In mathematics, many of the students will have had little further exposure to the subject, and may even be less skilled in mathematics than they were at the time of their high school graduation. This is the rationale for setting the cut-off score in mathematics at the 50th percentile.

1Sum of the test scores in reading, spelling, language, and mathematics.
Percentile Distribution of Combined Basic Skill Scores for All Applicants, Applicants Meeting Minimum Standards, at the Total Population of High School Graduates
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Total population of high school graduates.

Population of applicants.

Population of applicants meeting minimum standards.
So far there have been 120 re-takes of the various basic skills tests. The success rate on the second try is high, with 76, or 63%, scoring at or above the cut-off point. The institutions report that those who make a serious effort to improve their skills in areas of weakness are the most likely to be successful.

It should be emphasized that the basic skills committee and the institutions will continue to examine the data and make necessary changes in procedures and policies. The centralized data bank is making it possible to provide essential feedback so that enlightened decisions can be made.

Achieving Excellence in Oregon Teacher Education Through Alternative Teacher Preparation Programs

The Joint Committee on Teacher Education felt that a first step in assuring excellence in teacher preparation in Oregon was to test different organizational and curricular models of preservice education. To do this, it recommended that the institutions set up demonstration projects. These projects are to be carefully monitored and evaluated, so that the results may serve as the basis for future program design in Oregon.

Currently, we can point to one alternative teacher education program that has been in operation in its present form since 1974, and two pilot programs which will be initiated this coming fall (1982).

UO Resident Teacher Master's Program

The University of Oregon Resident Teacher Master's Degree Program, selected by the National Association of Teacher Education as the 1982 Distinguished Program in Teacher Education, combines graduate study with a year of full-time teaching in public school under the direction of jointly appointed school district and college of education faculty. Program strengths include (1) cooperation between district and University personnel in providing advanced training and supervision for beginning teachers, (2) a close relationship between coursework and simultaneous classroom experience, and (3) assurance of high quality education for students in beginning teachers' classrooms.

Resident teachers, all of whom hold state teaching certificates and school district contracts, enroll as graduate students. They attend workshops and seminars conducted by clinical professors at field center sites prior to and during the school year. Through application of educational theory and research, resident teachers learn to select materials and employ strategies that best help their students achieve success.

There were 23 resident teachers in the program in 1981-82, but this number will be reduced somewhat because of budget cutbacks in the Eugene School District.

OSU Fifth Year Internship Program at Beaverton

A joint experimental OSU-Beaverton School District Fifth Year internship program leading to a master's degree will be initiated in the fall of 1982. The program sets up a new induction pattern into teaching for recent college graduates.

The following are the main characteristics of the program:

- The students will be certified teachers, working for a year as paid interns in the Beaverton schools ($6,000/year).
- The students enroll for a full summer of coursework prior to the internship, complete one course on-site each term, and then complete the remaining course work (45-hour program) during the following summer.
Each student will have a mentor relationship with selected Beaverton teachers so as to provide outstanding models of teaching for fifth year teachers in training.

University staff will spend one day a week on-site observing, supervising, and collaborating with teacher-mentors to offer teacher preparation coursework. (This coming year the Oregon Teacher of the Year, now a doctoral student at OSU, will be a member of each of the faculty teams working with the interns.)

Each intern will be involved in a research project during the academic year in areas such as evaluation and curriculum development.

The interns are selected by a joint OSU-Beaverton School District faculty committee. Four interns have been selected for fall 1982, all in elementary education. OSU hopes to extend the program to other grade levels and to other districts.

PSU-Beaverton Cooperative Field-Based Teacher Education Program

PSU has been in the process of developing a cooperative field-based teacher education program with the Beaverton Public Schools. The program is planned in two phases. The program in Phase One is designed to permit elementary and secondary education students to complete their professional work in the field during the final three or four terms of their program. Successful completion of the program will qualify the student for both the baccalaureate degree and the basic teaching certificate.

Phase Two will be initiated after the Phase One program is in place and operating successfully. Phase Two will be focused on cooperatively planning and developing a program to strengthen and support beginning teachers in the school district as they move through the three years of probationary service toward being awarded tenure.

The Phase One program will be tested on a pilot basis beginning in fall 1982 (three students). Essential characteristics of the pilot program include the following:

- Each student will be assigned to a model classroom teacher in the district who will act as a "mentor" for the student.
- A university faculty member will be assigned to support and work with the model teacher and the student.
- An individualized learning plan (ILP) will be developed by the student, the model classroom teacher, and the university faculty member. The ILP will be based on performance standards developed by district and university personnel for all participants in the program.
- The learning will take place through direct instruction in half-day seminars by both PSU and Beaverton personnel and through various kinds of classroom and other learning activities in a wide variety of settings, including a full term of student teaching.
- A support team will be assigned to each student consisting of personnel from both PSU and Beaverton Schools and chaired by the principal of the building to which the candidate is assigned. The support team will approve the student's individual learning plan and monitor and evaluate the student's progress.

Extended Program at the University of Oregon

Dean Robert Gilberts and the UO teacher education faculty have proposed the development of an extended (5-year) program which would be available to all elementary and secondary education students. The program would permit the strengthening of both the liberal arts and professional education components.
A task force has been established under the aegis of the Consortium Council to explore various options. Several alternatives will be developed to provide an extended repertoire of teacher knowledge and skills through strong links between theory and practice, strong linkages to liberal arts components, and opportunities for an induction to the profession which will develop confidence in the use of a variety of teaching strategies and the development of a strong personal teaching style.

Evaluation

A careful evaluation of these and other alternative programs after they are implemented is essential if the model programs are to serve as the basis for improving the quality of teacher education in Oregon. The Board's Office, in cooperation with the deans and directors of education, will designate an interinstitutional committee with the desirable expertise to develop criteria and standards for the evaluation of the programs and assist in the evaluation process.

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Carpenter presented important points from the report on teacher education and cited some of the major efforts toward excellence.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

ADJOURNMENT & RECONVENING DATE

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 P.M. until September 13, 1982, at 10:00 A.M., at which time the Board would reconvene in the meeting room of the Marine Sciences Center at Newport, Oregon.

Adjourned Session of Meeting of Sept. 10, 1982

President Ingalls called the adjourned session of the regular State Board of Higher Education meeting of September 10, 1982, to order at 10:00 A.M., on September 13, 1982. The following answered present:

Mr. John W. Alltucker
Mr. Alvin R. Batiste
Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter
Mrs. Harriett J. Flanagan
Mr. Randal D. Gill
Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.
Mr. Marion T. Weatherford
Mr. Loren L. Wyss
Mr. Robert C. Ingalls

Absent: Director Perry was out of the state and Director Petersen was absent for business reasons.

Merger of Education Programs

The Chancellor reviewed the developments leading to the proposed merger of the teacher education programs at Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College. He indicated that the Board had wished to consider the policy issues involved and to have more information on the proposed merger than had been available at the meeting on September 10.

The Chancellor said he supported the proposal and recommended it to the Board for approval. He said that reference had been made to the fact that this proposal would set a precedent. He indicated that he did not view the eight institutions as one autonomous system, nor did he view the System as one institution on eight campuses. However, there are opportunities to enter into memoranda of agreement for a more tightly coordinated and more effective delivery system. This proposal represents an outstanding example of faculty and administrators cooperating in a joint program.

Dean Robert Barr of Oregon State University described some of the efforts at Oregon State to eliminate duplication in teacher education. Efforts were then undertaken by both Western Oregon State College and Oregon State University to explore ways of eliminating duplication. These included a study of placement records, enrollment data, admissions, programs, and staffing. This led to preliminary planning for a joint program which was subsequently accelerated.
Dean Richard Walker of Western Oregon State College added that Dr. Victor Baldwin, Director of the Teaching Research Division, had joined the planning group during the last two meetings. He was enthusiastic about the plan and expressed the view that the Teaching Research Division could make significant contributions. This is reflected in a memorandum of agreement and addresses one of the concerns expressed earlier.

In response to questions during the discussion, it was indicated that while faculty expressed some anxiety and concern, there were no negative comments about the proposed plan itself.

Mrs. Carpenter pointed out that there were strong areas of emphasis at each of the institutions that were totally different.

It was stated that there are still a number of unknowns and the memoranda of agreement are interim agreements which may be modified. They represent a compromise among a number of different positions. The Teaching Research Division would be an independent agency reporting to the Chancellor, but with negotiated relationships with the College of Education.

Mr. Wyss indicated that he had expressed some reservations about the program which perhaps had been misunderstood. He said Board members were of the opinion that such cooperation was desirable. It would provide a focus for an institution. Western Oregon State College needs that focus, and it probably would benefit Oregon State University as well.

Mr. Wyss asked, however, whether Western Oregon State College would become a very small and somewhat less important area of the school as a somewhat separate entity is developed and its focus begins to be determined by disciplines and areas of interest and concentration instead of the traditional kind of campus which has been more geographically based than subject-area based. There are serious implications to this kind of model. Mr. Wyss asked what this merger would do to the current mission of Western Oregon State College if the education program becomes something of a separate entity.

Dean Walker pointed out that teacher education is a professional degree program which students enter after two or two and a half years devoted to the liberal arts. Western Oregon State College and Oregon State University both have a strong liberal arts base for their education programs. The Dean of Liberal Arts at Western Oregon State College has indicated that the proposed college would not heavily impact the liberal arts base. Last year, about half of the graduates were in teacher education and others were in liberal arts. This is not expected to change. At this point, each institution has an opportunity to share the expertise of the other institution. There is an opportunity to regain stability which has not been available in this period of financial crisis.

Dean Barr said a primary requirement in the development of the proposal had been that there would be no weakening of Western Oregon State College in whatever plan was developed. In fact, the proposal is expected to strengthen Western Oregon State College through opportunities for faculty to participate in doctoral committees and other features of the program which will add vitality to the instruction at that institution. The degrees granted will carry the names of both institutions.

Mr. Wyss referred to the proposed mission statement for Western Oregon State College which places a great deal of emphasis on teacher education. He asked if this signified a movement in that direction and represented a portion of that mission.

Dr. Walker explained that in discussions with faculty on the goals for Western Oregon State College in the next five years, three concerns had emerged: (1) Teacher education should be emphasized because Western Oregon State College was noted for this and that was the direction in which the faculty wanted to go; (2) there should be a strong liberal arts base;
and (3) there should be support for research. Dr. Walker said that in considering the five-year plan, the faculty viewed this as the mission of the institution, even though it had operated for the last five years under something a little different.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Mr. Harms moved that the Board approve the proposed merger of the education programs at Western Oregon State College and Oregon State University as presented and that the college be named the Joint College of Education, OSU-WOSC. The motion was approved, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Opposition to Ballot Measure 3

The Board discussed a possible statement in opposition to Ballot Measure 3 for a tax limitation. It was agreed that a proposed statement would be drafted and considered for adoption later in the day. The following statement was submitted for consideration:

The Board of Higher Education believes that the present unstable and unreliable tax structure of the state is not providing necessary support for Oregon education. Current deficits are only the most recent manifestation of this problem. We believe the impact of the current tax policies on all segments of education and resulting influence on the economy of Oregon is disastrous. Well-educated citizens have always provided a strong competitive advantage for the state.

Oregon needs a restructured tax system, and citizens are being ill-served by its delay. In the meantime, however, we oppose the passage of Ballot Measure 3 which seeks to limit property taxes without providing an acceptable alternative. This will continue a burden on Oregon, extending it from property taxpayers to all those who will suffer from an impoverished economic and cultural environment.

The Board approved the statement as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

The Board requested that a news release be prepared and distributed concerning the action taken.

Discussion of Academic Calendar

The Board adopted a policy statement pertaining to semester calendars at a meeting on October 24, 1980. In that policy, the Board rescinded the requirement that the institutions retain a common academic calendar and indicated it would consider approval of academic calendars for individual institutions, subject to certain conditions.

The Board discussed whether it wished to modify that policy. It approved a motion by Mr. Harms to retain the existing policy. Those voting in favor were: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, and Wyss. Those opposed were: Directors Carpenter, Flanagan, and Ingalls.

Staff Reports

The staff reports provided for the September 10, 1982, meeting (9-82-43b and 9-82-44b) are on file in the Board’s Office and will be bound with the permanent minutes as pages 463 to 465.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 1:00 P.M., September 13, 1982.
Staff Report to the Board (9-82-43b)

Based upon requirements outlined in the Request for Proposal prepared by Oregon Health Sciences University officials more than two years ago, the Zimmer/Gunsul/Frasca Partnership, Architects, Portland, have developed a Framework Master Plan for that institution. As reported to the Board on March 27, 1981, the arrangements with the architects provided for the assistance of Carl H. Buttke, Inc., Consulting Transportation Engineers; David Evans and Associates, Inc., Consulting Civil Engineers; and Dames and Moore, Consulting Geotechnical Engineers.

The Plan is an assessment of the context of the University within the larger Urban Design Framework, a composite measure that considers the existing conditions and the potential for new development. The intent of the Framework Master Plan for the institution is to consolidate and guide its planning programs while helping to fulfill established University and community objectives. A Framework Master Plan is particularly important for the Oregon Health Sciences University because the campus:

(1) Is characterized by severe topographical relief which limits building sites, divides the campus into two major areas and restricts access to the campus;

(2) Has areas of high building and population density; and

(3) Contains a multiplicity of separate but interrelated functions that all serve the general health and well-being of citizens of the State.

The Plan is expected to fulfill the City of Portland's requirement that any further development of the University be based upon a campus land-use plan which will support the comprehensive land-use plan of the City. Further, acceptance of the Framework Master Plan will reduce the need for public hearings on conditional use applications for any future development identified within the Plan.

The Framework Master Plan is organized into seven major components: Urban Design Framework, Transportation, Pedestrian Circulation, University Development, Geotechnical Analysis, Utility Systems, and Campus Energy. Each of the components includes guidelines for future development and proposed actions which would be undertaken whenever development occurs. As noted in the architects' report, these several components are sensitive to the following general guidelines:

(1) The University's physical and visual presence on Marquam Hill should be enhanced.

(2) Campus entries or gateways should be developed to create a University "front door."

(3) The North and South Campuses should be integrated to form a cohesive and continuous environment.

(4) The University's circulation system should provide clear and orderly access to and throughout the campus.

(5) The University should be integrated into the general neighborhood structure to minimize impacts.

Proposed actions within the Urban Design Framework include improved pedestrian and vehicular access at a number of locations with particular attention to campus entry points, establishing a clear boundary between the 116-acre campus and adjacent neighborhoods, and improving pedestrian connections from the western edge of the campus and to Terwilliger Boulevard by linking existing sidewalks, pathways and open spaces. The
architects recommend that a landscape program be implemented to establish visual and physical connections to the 40-mile Loop Marquam Hill Nature Trail Segment and city park land along Terwilliger Boulevard.

The Transportation guidelines emphasize the need to serve the separate and distinct needs of the functional components of the University community. Improvements proposed include intersection modifications especially at campus entry points, the separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic in all public rights-of-way, an ambulance entrance to University Hospital South, and various other improvements including signage, parking revisions, and the encouragement of rideshare and mass transit programs.

The Pedestrian Circulation section emphasizes that the pedestrian network is the primary campus circulation system leading to and linking the various campus facilities. At the head of the list of proposed improvements within this part of the architects' report is a direct pedestrian link across the central ravine to connect the North and South portions of the campus.

Studies for the University Development section indicate that future expansion should occur principally within the existing campus boundaries. The potential building sites have been ranked into four categories according to desirability and ease of use related to present use, geotechnical requirements and functional adjacencies. The architects comment that any expansion should enhance the prominent visual location of the University while improving the north/south campus circulation, access to the campus and facilities, functional adjacencies and campus identity.

The Geotechnical Analysis emphasizes that new development should respect, stabilize and enhance the campus environmental conditions. It is proposed that a landscape program be designed and implemented to minimize erosion and to stabilize the steep grades found on the campus.

The Utility Systems section identifies present weaknesses in the water, steam and sewer systems serving the University. Included in the proposed actions are the maintenance of fire flow requirements for the water system, the separation and expansion of storm and sanitary sewers, the provision of more adequate steam service from a unified system and improved steam distribution network serving both the North and South portions of the campus, all developed in accordance with state-of-the-art technology.

The Campus Energy section acknowledges the University's efforts to develop an energy program which conserves resources and increases the efficiency of energy use in a cost-effective manner. It is expected that actions in the energy area, such as periodic energy audits for all campus facilities and the development of additional waste recovery systems and solar energy applications, will impact positively on the utility systems.

A copy of the Framework Master Plan has been submitted to the City of Portland's Bureau of Planning in response to the requirements of earlier requests applicable to the Conditional Use Permits for various projects, including the new Shriner's Hospital for Crippled Children (now under construction). It is expected that the Framework Master Plan will be utilized also in connection with the Conditional Use Permit application for the proposed major addition to Parking Structure No. 2 for which construction bids are to be solicited later this year.

Visual aids, including various sketches of existing conditions and the framework for the recommended improvements, will be available for review by the Board at the time of the meeting.
Establishment of a Research Institute for the Severely Handicapped, PSU

Staff Report to the Board (9-82-44b)

Information concerning the proposed institute, in the format prescribed by the Board, is presented below:

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PROPOSAL FOR NEW INSTITUTE

1. TITLE: Research Institute for the Severely Handicapped

2. LOCATION: Special Education Department
   School of Education
   Portland State University

3. GOAL, MISSION, OBJECTIVES OF THE INSTITUTE:

   The primary goal of the proposed institute is to study the transition of severely handicapped adolescents from educational to work environments. Also, the institute will provide training opportunities for graduate students and research participation for faculty members. Specifically, the institute will conduct research studies to address the variables of student assessment procedures, habilitative and rehabilitative services, daily living skills training, employment options, on-the-job placements and follow-up, community transportation restrictions, housing concerns, and resource agencies.

   The Institute has a projected span of five years.

4. RESOURCES NECESSARY TO THE INSTITUTE:

   a. Personnel

      |                      | 1982-83 | 1983-84 |
      |----------------------|---------|---------|
      | FTE (classified)     | 4.7     | 4.7     |
      | Budget (classified)  | $162,740| $177,111|
      | FTE (unclassified)   | 3.5     | 3.5     |
      | Budget (unclassified)| $47,287 | $51,463 |

   b. Facilities:

      Additional office space for three classified employees.
      Work stations for six unclassified employees.

5. FUNDING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1982-83</th>
<th>1983-84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$321,483</td>
<td>$336,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>$26,875</td>
<td>$26,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. RELATIONSHIP TO INSTITUTIONAL MISSION:

   The Institute enhances the Institutional goals of increasing opportunities for new knowledge to students; of achieving effective and efficient use of facilities; of pioneering new knowledge in socially relevant areas; and of extending Institution impact into the Portland metropolitan area.

7. LONG-RANGE GOALS:

   A major long-range goal would be to broaden the focus of the Institute from severely handicapped adolescents to include research questions related to pre-school and school age severely handicapped. Any future growth would be supported from Federal funding sources.