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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 8:30 a.m., February 25, 1983, 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. James C. Petersen
- Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter
- Mr. Marion T. Weatherford
- Mr. Loren L. Wyss
- Mr. Robert C. Ingalls

Absent: Mr. Perry 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 W. Grier, Compliance Officer; Jerry Lidz, Assistant Attorney General; Larry Pierce, Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Strategic Planning; J. Richard Pizzo, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services; Richard S. Ferry, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services; Susan Weeks, Coordinator, Planning Studies and Services; David Stubbs, Coordinator, Management Studies and Services; Ross Hall, Controller; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Fiscal Policies; Tom Berkey, Assistant Budget Director; A. M. Rempel, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Karen McCumsey, Secretary to the Chancellor; Tim Marsh, Information Representative, Public Services and Publications; Pat Wignes, Assistant Board Secretary.

Oregon State University--President Robert MacVicar; Sandra Suttie, Assistant to the President.

University of Oregon--President Paul Olum; Richard J. Hill, Provost; John Lallas, Acting Vice President for Administration and Finance; George Shipman, University Librarian, Member, Interinstitutional Library Council.

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Leonard Laster; J. T. McGill, Vice President.

Portland State University--President Joseph C. Blumel; James E. Todd, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Orcilia Forces, Vice President for Student Affairs; John B. Gruber, Vice President for Academic Affairs; J. K. Harris, Budget Director.

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

Oregon Institute of Technology--Interim President Jack Douglass; William W. Smith, Dean of Academic Affairs; John Smith, Dean of Administration; Don Theriault, Assistant to the President.

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

Western Oregon State College--President Richard Meyers; James Beaird, Provost; William Neifert, Acting Dean of Administration.
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CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

D. Gilbert, Appointment as President, EOSC

The Chancellor reported that at the direction of the Board he had entered into negotiations with Dr. David Gilbert for the position of president of Eastern Oregon State College. Dr. Gilbert indicated a willingness to accept the offer of the position, and the Chancellor recommended that the Board appoint Dr. Gilbert as president of Eastern Oregon State College, effective immediately.

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

R. Perry & D. Quenzer, Title Changes, CA

The Chancellor reported two changes of titles and internal promotions in the Office of Administration. Richard Perry has been designated as the Associate Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services. Davis Quenzer has been designated the Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Fiscal Policy.

Certificate Honoring Mayor & City Council of Portland

Mr. Ingalls read the following resolution honoring the Mayor and City Council of Portland:

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Portland have adopted a resolution dated January 19, 1983, authorizing the lease of the City's Water Services Building to the Oregon State Department of Higher Education for use by Portland State University as a Portland Center for Advanced Technology; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Council have authorized the lease of the Water Services Building to Portland State University for one year at a cost of one dollar; and

WHEREAS, the action by the Mayor and City Council will permit Portland State University to accelerate the development of programs in Electrical/Electronics Engineering and Computer Science by at least three to five years; and

WHEREAS, the action of the Mayor and the City Council is a highly visible demonstration of cooperation between the City of Portland, Portland State University, and the Oregon State System of Higher Education in the development of high technology programs;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, meeting in regular session on February 25, 1983, expresses its appreciation to Mayor Francis J. Ivancie and the members of the City Council of the City of Portland for their offer of the use of the Water Services Building as a Portland Center for Advanced Technology; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education accepts the offer of the City of Portland.

Others—Robert E. Hamill, Associate Superintendent, Oregon Department of Education; Edith Maddron, Vice Chairman, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Barbara Mitchell, Assistant Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Jetta Siegel, Executive Secretary, AAUP-Oregon Federation; Dick Scanlan, President, Oregon State University Faculty Senate; Debi Lance, Vice President, State and Public Affairs, Associated Students, Oregon State University; Carol Mason and N. C. McFadden, Graduate Students, University of Oregon.
Mr. Batiste said the Board should also express appreciation to the Chancellor, Mr. Hunderup, and to President Blumel and his staff at Portland State University for their efforts in achieving this lease arrangement.

The Board adopted the above resolution on roll call vote, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Petersen, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None. Director Weatherford was absent from the meeting at this time.

The Chancellor indicated that he had received the audit report on the Department of Higher Education. It contained certain audit exceptions and criticisms which the auditors asked be addressed. Mr. Lemman has been requested to prepare a summary of the criticisms and recommendations for the Board and to take the necessary steps to comply with the recommendations and to indicate any recommendations which should not be adopted by the Department. The report will be available as soon as possible.

Mr. Batiste said the Board's audit committee functions very well and suggested that it meet to review the audit. Mr. Ingalls concurred. He said there would need to be some modifications to the committee's personnel and he would appoint a new audit committee.

The Chancellor said that there had been discussions with the Board regarding the necessity to draft and adopt a differential funding formula. The staff is presently developing different types of courses and clusters of disciplines and analyzing costs in each of these areas. The analysis of all of the data which enters into a funding formula is a complex operation and it will be some time before a specific recommendation will be available. However, an outline of the procedure is expected to be available in the near future. The differential funding formula was not included in the Strategic Plan because of the timing of the fiscal cycle and the need for extensive study of the data.

The Chancellor said the specifics of the academic course analysis also were not included in the Strategic Plan because of the extensive analysis required.

It was pointed out that there should be a stronger footnote in the draft of the Strategic Plan so the public would be aware these elements were still pending.

The Chancellor reviewed the development of the Strategic Plan and the extent of the public hearings held in several locations throughout the state and with other segments and constituencies of higher education and the general public. More than 300 letters were received, and 1,000 people participated in the dialogues and discussions. Most of the suggestions were positive in nature and indicated appreciation for the opportunity to comment. The Chancellor said specific suggestions to cut back on programs, institutions, or on the offerings of higher education and to retrench were made by only three or four of the people who participated. If these proposals have been made, they were not forthcoming in these public meetings where an opportunity was provided for individuals to do so.

The Chancellor commented that the first draft did not explain the reasons certain changes were not made or recommended. Some of the criticism has resolved around the assertion that the Strategic Plan is basically a defense of the status quo and has questioned whether the Chancellor and the Board have thought about and considered the "unthinkable." The Chancellor said he, and he was sure the Board, had thought about the "unthinkables."

The Chancellor said there have been suggestions the fiscal policy of higher education could be resolved best by some type of drastic reorganization ranging from establishing a superboard to consolidating campuses and making minisystems within a system. He said it was his opinion all of these suggestions have in common the addition of layers of bureaucracy and additional governing authorities. He said it was his experience and belief that these proposals would add even more expense and administrative overhead and tend to confuse the channels and lines of communication rather than to simplify them.
The Chancellor cited a February 11, 1983, editorial in the Eugene Register-Guard dealing with organizational structure and the proposed superboard. It indicated the state does have a financial interest in all three levels of education and that the state needed a decision-making body to allocate state funds within the educational groups. It suggested that the Legislature was the appropriate body to do this.

The Chancellor said it was not the type of organizational structure nor the number or locations of institutions that determine quality and excellence, but the level of expectation in terms of affording diverse and appropriate opportunities for students in various levels of programs and professional schools, research activities which enhance the cultural and economic welfare of the state, and services rendered to the people in various concentrations of populations and regions. Quality and excellence also depend on the level of commitment of the people of the state as represented by their elected officials—whether they want to compete with the best or are satisfied to be among the average or below average in diversity of opportunity and quality of educational programs.

He noted that Oregon State System institutions are below the national average in most categories of comparison with other institutions. About the only areas in which the State System exceeds the national average are tuition and fees for Oregon students and the high quality of performance in its programs.

The Chancellor then responded to criticisms of the budget request to the Legislature. The requests were designed to recognize the economic realities but also to stabilize a deteriorating funding base and take some steps toward recovery. The budget includes the following:

1. A $9.2 million adjustment for loss of enrollments which will require further program and staff reductions.

2. A request for $20.6 million to freeze tuition for students at current levels which are the highest in the west.

3. Funds in the amount of $4.7 million to cover Board-approved faculty salaries for 1981-1983, which were deferred to adjust to budget cuts.

4. Salary increases for 1983-1985 in the amount of $12.7 million for academic staff in accordance with directives applying to salaries for all state employees.

5. A request of $3 million for deferred maintenance and $1 million for library acquisitions and operations.

6. A request for Oregon Institute of Technology's library staffing at $103,000 and one for new building operations and maintenance at $264,000.

7. An adjustment of enrollment ceilings at Oregon State University and Oregon Institute of Technology for high demand technical programs was requested at $1.2 million.

The Chancellor indicated the only program enhancement funds recommended by the Governor were for development of high technology programs in engineering, computer science, and cellular biology at the three comprehensive universities. He explained that this totals $71 million, or a 23% increase in General Funds for the coming biennium. However, the expenditure level is up only 11% because $20 million of that is for the freeze on tuition. Virtually all of the increase resulted from modest incremental adjustments similar to those for all state agencies, badly needed restoration funds, tuition relief to students, and a limited amount for new programs in areas considered vital to the economic health of the state.
The Chancellor then reported various suggestions for consolidation or the closing of programs or institutions. These were received primarily in comments on the plan rather than in the hearings. He said the persons proposing these actions should present them in some direct fashion, either to the Board or in some form of direct proposal, so that it can be determined if it is indeed the will of the people, or those responsible for making these decisions, that such closures or consolidations should be made.

The State of Oregon, higher education, and the hard-working and dedicated faculties and students are ill-served by these devastating attacks and rumors which undermine morale and create uncertainty.

The Chancellor then described efforts which have been made, or are being studied, to make the best possible use of existing facilities and concentrations and faculties to meet the needs of the people of the state.

In summary, the Chancellor said cutting the number of institutions, programs, disciplines, and research activities would cut costs, but inevitably this would also cut access and opportunity. Major budget restrictions and program cuts reduce students. This has already happened in that there are 5,000 fewer students in the State System now than there were in 1981.

The requirements for higher levels of academic achievement and specific course content in pre-college work are an effort to assure that those who attend college are students who are able and motivated. The people of the state must eventually determine how restrictive Oregon's higher educational programs become and whether higher educational opportunity should be limited to an economic or intellectual elite.

The Chancellor said the Strategic Plan has been characterized in some quarters as uninspired because it did not advocate sweeping or dramatic change. After being here only seven months, he said he hesitated to make sweeping, irrevocable changes until he better understood the possible consequences and until the people of Oregon understood those consequences also. The plan outlines the beginning steps for a long journey. It will be changed as the needs change. For now, these precious resources are essential to the welfare of the state. Created in the distant past to serve some public purpose, these institutions, faculties, students and alumni have rendered distinguished and valuable service to the state. Much of what is cherished and passed on to generation after generation becomes traditional because it works well. Just because some of the institutions are a century or more old, or the State System itself is a half-century old, does not mean that they are feeble and should be discarded. Neither does it mean that they are sacred or perfect and cannot be improved. But that which is taken away or added to should be done with care and concern, preserving that which is good and changing that which should be changed. Also needed is the wisdom to distinguish the one from the other.

The Board requested the Chancellor to send copies of the statement to the Governor, the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the press.

Mr. Alltucker commented that in his conversations with legislators he received the impression that many members of the Legislature believe that when the financial crunch came, higher education went into a holding pattern and did not examine each program and person to see whether there really should be a place for them in the future. They believe the fiscal crisis was met by raising tuition and deferring salary increases in an effort to maintain the status quo until the economic situation is better. Mr. Alltucker said he agreed with the Chancellor that if a program or institution were closed in response to public pressure, it could not be reopened in a subsequent year if it proved to be the wrong decision. However, the perceptions of the legislators and the public need to be addressed as quickly as possible.
Mr. Wyss said he had had similar conversations. One of the problems is that of different interpretations of support dollars. This has led to confusion and seems to damage the Board's credibility. Furthermore, no matter how much data is provided, the pre-existing opinions seem to overcome any evidence that is brought forward. The data that each one of the boards has and its interpretation by staff is quite different. Mr. Wyss recalled a discussion a year ago about the appointment of a committee to study the state of higher education in Oregon. Mr. Wyss said he opposed the suggestion then on the basis that it was the Board's responsibility and that the Board members had sufficient credibility in their individual communities to affect state opinions about higher education. He said it is clear now that Board members have not been able to do that. Mr. Wyss indicated he would support a call to the Governor and the Legislature to appoint a group of citizens to study the data on higher education, community colleges, and elementary-secondary school support in an effort to make some decisions about how tax-paying citizens in Oregon have been supporting higher education throughout the last decade, where those dollars have gone, and what the return has been from the investment. If decisions could be obtained from an outside group composed of persons who are not members of either board or the commission, then it might be possible to agree upon data that has the greatest credibility.

It was moved by Mr. Wyss and seconded by Mr. Batiste that the Board adopt a resolution requesting the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House to appoint a citizens committee for this purpose.

In the discussion, the Board considered whether there was sufficient time for a lay group to understand the problems and come to conclusions before the close of the Legislative session, whether any members of the boards or the commission should be included on the committee, the type of data that should be included in the study, and the need to determine what causes the transformation of the State System figures by the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission so that they are quite different.

Later in the meeting, the Board discussed drafts of a proposed resolution. There was discussion about the ability of the requested committee to accomplish the task by the suggested date of May 1. There was also discussion of the precise assignment requested for the committee in order to achieve the immediate objective of clarifying the interpretation of the data and the possible longer-range objective of achieving common bases for the figures used by the various boards in preparing their financial reports. Mr. Alltucker said he would want a uniform system of reporting the costs and a summary of expenditures using the new format to be developed by the committee. It should include total tax support for all segments of education.

The Board approved a motion that the Executive Committee draft a resolution to be sent to the Governor and the Legislative leadership requesting that a committee be appointed to review information about expenditures of tax dollars to support all segments of public education. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None. Director Petersen was absent from the meeting at this time.

The resolution, as drafted by the Executive Committee and transmitted to the Governor and the legislative leadership, appears below:

RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC FUNDING OF EDUCATION IN OREGON

During public hearings on the Board’s Strategic Plan, questions were raised about the current levels of public tax support for the State System, public schools, and community colleges.

The State Board of Higher Education believes it is essential to resolve conflicts over data describing the funding of public education in the State. The Board therefore requests that the Governor and Legislature
appoint a citizens committee to study the statistics used to describe state and local tax support for public schools, community colleges, and the State System, and to determine which should be used in educational planning. Particular attention should be given to public tax support for the educational segments in Oregon relative to that in other states. We also request that any methods developed in analyzing such data be preserved for future use.

The committee should submit a report to the Governor, Legislature, and the educational segments by May 1, 1983, so that the information can be used by the current legislative assembly.

The Board then continued the discussion of the Strategic Plan. Dr. Pierce indicated that a final draft of the document would be mailed to the Board on March 16 so that the Board could discuss the specific recommendations at the March Board meeting and approve those upon which there was agreement. One exception would be the new entrance requirements proposed in the Plan. Action on this section would be deferred until the conclusion of the hearings being held across the state by the Joint Boards' Committee. This would occur at either the May or June Board meeting.

Dr. Pierce then reviewed some of the changes made in the present draft. These included:

1. A change in name to specify that the plan was for the Oregon State System of Higher Education, and a statement of authorship.

2. The rewriting of Chapter 1 to address some of the major issues and to identify an assessment of the State System at this time. In commenting on the issues of radical change to the structure of the State System, it was suggested that the centrally-managed system has been in existence for fifty years and is basically sound, and that closing institutions and rebuilding them elsewhere or changing programs is very costly. In a time of fiscal constraint, it is essential to protect existing quality rather than try to build new quality.

The first chapter summarizes the major proposals and the mechanisms being developed to be responsive to changing conditions in the future.

3. Chapter 3, under the governance issue, now includes a discussion of the superboard proposal.

4. Chapter 4 has two changes. The first deals with the issue of degree programs in areas unserved by the community colleges. Recommendation 14 has been reworded to be acceptable to the community college people in the state. The second change adds a new section on access for special student populations.

5. The requirements in mathematics and science have been modified slightly to allow a greater flexibility in meeting the mathematics and science requirements.

6. The section on teacher education has been rewritten to deal with some of the criticisms stated in connection with the five-year teacher education program.

7. A recommendation has been added on page 31 dealing with engineering.

8. Recommendation 34 develops the idea of a joint policy council between the community colleges and the State System.

9. The section on faculty salaries has been rewritten.

10. The section on building equipment resources and bringing computers up to date has been modified to make the statements stronger than in the first draft.
11. The chapter on the State System and Oregon's economy has several changes dealing with a joint program in engineering technology in the Portland area and with the Asian Studies program.

12. The discussion of the institutional roles and missions in Chapter 8 has been changed and the chapter contains a rationale that lower-division education should continue to be provided in the seven undergraduate institutions of the State System.

Mr. Batiste commented that the Strategic Plan itself was greatly improved. He suggested that the 1983-1987 time frame be emphasized because there may be other Strategic Plans in future years. He said there also should be a statement that the Strategic Plan is an external document dealing with externalities of the State System as well as those areas that have a statewide or systemwide impact. It does not supersede the planning process which is initiated at the institutional level. Further, Mr. Batiste said there should be a statement as to the need for a high technology educational delivery system and a recommendation in that respect.

Dr. Pierce said the CASEERI group would be dealing with many of the issues about higher education programs that affect high technology. He suggested the discussion of its responsibilities specify considering alternative delivery systems. Mr. Batiste concurred.

Mrs. Carpenter suggested that specific cognizance be taken of the population of women returning to the work force and the special obligation the State System carries in that regard. She referred specifically to daycare needs and other special needs that have been identified by affirmative action people for this segment of the population.

The Chancellor mentioned that there had been a lengthy discussion with the presidents on the definitions on page 41. The deletions of everything except the first two paragraphs on page 41, up to the section on "Guidelines," was proposed. Comments from Board members would be useful on whether that first part was helpful in defining what the institutions are, or whether that could be done in the institutional missions of the state.

Mr. Batiste said the use of the date for the implementation of the course requirements was weakening the discussion effort. The Chancellor responded that there was an urgency, particularly with respect to the mathematics and science requirements. He said he would not want to change his recommendation for implementation in 1985. However, if the report on the Joint Committee hearings recommends a different date, both the Chancellor's recommendation and the Joint Committee's recommendation can be considered at the time the admission requirements are adopted.

Mr. Harms commented that he believed the communications to the high schools were part of the problem and should be worded carefully in terms of the dates and the course requirements, so that it does not appear the State System is dictating to the high schools. There was some discussion of whether the Board would have an opportunity to review the comments and expressions of concern about the various recommendations in the Strategic Plan. It was indicated the tapes were available. Dr. Pierce explained the type of testimony which had been received. Many of the comments discussed programs or were supportive, but did not affect the planning document directly. In some instances there were problem areas. Information was collected and language was developed in cooperation with the people concerned.

There being no further comments, Mr. Ingalls concluded the discussion of the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Ingalls said Representative Peter Courtney from District 33 in the Salem area and Ms. Doris Warr of Salem had requested an opportunity to present a proposal for a school of tourism in the State System of Higher Education. He invited them to make the presentation.
Representative Courtney indicated that tourism was receiving a great deal of attention in Salem in terms of economic development. In conversations with Ms. Warr, she suggested the possibility of a school or department of tourism within one of the State System institutions, or that a degree in tourism be available. She cited the tourism program at Cornell University. The program would not be restricted to food or hotel management but would cover the whole aspect of tourism.

Ms. Warr explained that she had attended hearings on tourism in the Hawaiian legislature and it had been stated that the Northwest was going to be a threat to the tourism market in Hawaii. After some research on the subject, she learned that the market would be as highly competitive as high technology and also that students represent a major element in tourist travel and many come from Pacific Rim countries. This led to her conversations with individuals in higher education. Further research revealed that the West does not have a Cornell-type degree in tourism. Oregon could have that. There would be an investment to establish the program, but this would be offset by the substantial increase in the tourism industry that would result from the expanded programs. She indicated there are various components in the tourism program.

The Board approved a motion by Mr. Harms that the Office of Instruction, Research, and Public Service review and report to the Board on the programs in tourism and the possible economic benefits to Oregon of an expanded program in tourism. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Appointments to CASEERI Group

The Chancellor indicated that one of the suggestions received concerning the Strategic Plan was to add community college representatives to the Committee on the Advancement and Support of Engineering Education and Research for Industry (CASEERI). He announced that Dr. Eldon Schafer, President of Lane Community College, and Dr. John Anthony, President of Portland Community College, had accepted appointments to that group.

Purchase of Sowards Property, UO

On January 28, 1983, Charles E. and Susan R. Sowards signed an option for the sale of their property at 1843 1/2 Moss Street, Eugene, to the Board in the amount of $35,500. The option price is equal to the average of two separate independent appraisals obtained recently by officials of the University of Oregon, one from David F. Knox and the other from Roger Reich, both of Eugene.

The property contains approximately 5,328 square feet of land, or 0.12 acres, with 66.6 feet of frontage on an alley which runs between 18th and 19th Streets. It is within the east campus area designated for student housing within the long-range development plan of the University. Most of the other properties in this area have been acquired by the Board previously.

The single-story wood-frame residence has a living room, kitchen, two bedrooms and bath. There is a detached studio unit which was originally a garage. Both buildings have been maintained well and are rated by the appraisers in "average" to "good" condition.

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

Summary and Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to purchase the Charles E. and Susan R. Sowards property at 1843 1/2 Moss Street, Eugene, at the option price of $35,500. This property, which measures 66.6 feet by 80 feet (or 0.12 acres) and is improved with a small
residence and studio unit containing about 800 square feet and 240 square feet respectively, is located within the approved projected campus boundaries of the University of Oregon and is expected to be utilized for student housing. The purchase would be financed from proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bonds issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available from housing operations at the institution. It would be charged against the expenditure limitation established for land acquisition in 1981-1983 by Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981, as amended by the State Emergency Board.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

On January 24, 1983, Mrs. Mary Modrich provided an option for the sale of her property at 485 South Mountain Avenue, Ashland, to the Board in the amount of $51,750. The option price is equal to the average of two independent appraisals obtained recently by officials of Southern Oregon State College, one made by Kent L. Puckett and the other by Curtis E. Riegel, both of the Medford-Ashland area.

The property contains approximately 10,000 square feet of land, or about 0.23 acres, on the west side of South Mountain Avenue across from the new Drama Laboratory Building. It is adjacent to other property previously acquired by the Board for parking use.

The one-story frame residence is about 35 years old. It has a living room, kitchen-dining area, two bedrooms and bath within a gross area of approximately 800 square feet. There is an attached oversized one-car garage. The improvements to the property are rated by the appraisers as being in "average" condition.

Funds required for the purchase would be provided from self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution or other auxiliary enterprise balances and the expenditure would be charged against the authorization for land acquisition within Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981, as amended by the State Emergency Board.

Summary and Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to purchase the Mary Modrich property at 485 South Mountain Avenue, Ashland, at the option price of $51,750. The property measures 50 feet by 200 feet and is improved with a small residence and garage. It is located within the approved projected campus boundaries of Southern Oregon State College and is expected to be utilized ultimately for automotive parking. The purchase would be financed from auxiliary enterprise funds. No state tax funds are involved.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Based upon more current estimates of need and in view of the difficulties anticipated in developing satisfactory financing plans for meeting debt service requirements, institutional officials have acknowledged their concurrence in deleting or deferring certain auxiliary enterprise projects which had been included in the Board's requests and the Governor's budget recommendations for 1983-1985:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority No.</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Student Housing Expansion - Phase II</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Student Health Center Dental Clinic</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Housing Improvements</td>
<td>1,985,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Campus Entry and Street System Improvements</td>
<td>675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,340,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An expenditure authorization of $2,815,000 for the first phase of Student Housing Expansion at Portland State University was obtained in 1981. Because of high interest cost projections, which would have a major impact upon the institution's ability to finance the project and an impact also upon the composite rate for student housing on other campuses, it is expected that the construction of additional residential facilities at Portland State University will not be undertaken during the remainder of this biennium. The expenditure authorization will continue to be available in 1983-1985 without further legislative authorization (except for bonding) in 1983. The fiscal capacity to start two major housing projects within the same biennium appears most unlikely, so the request for Phase II can be deleted from the 1983-1985 program.

Officials of the University of Oregon have suggested that the $180,000 item for the conversion of a former kitchen area of the Student Health Center into another use be deferred until 1985-1987, and that the title of the project be re-named as Student Health Center Improvements. The deletion of this item from the 1983-1985 listing will reduce the requirements for debt service dependent upon student building fees.

Although an expenditure authorization of $1,415,000 had been approved in 1981 for various Housing improvements at the University of Oregon, only a small portion thereof has been committed to date, leaving more than $1 million for expenditure during 1983-1985 or later. Some of the items originally proposed have been abandoned or deferred indefinitely, so it would be possible to obtain the concurrence of the State Emergency Board to utilize a portion of these resources for the most urgent projects contemplated in the request of $1,985,000 which had been assigned Priority No. 18 in the listing of auxiliary enterprises for 1983-1985. These would include the proposed plumbing and ventilating improvements within the campus residence halls. The amount carried forward would be sufficient also to cover the cost of making improvements to housing and dining facilities at the Institute of Marine Biology, Charleston, for which a separate expenditure authorization had been obtained in 1981. Portions of the costs of the Housing Improvements would be financed from balances available within the sinking fund reserves, and the remainder would require bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution.

The final item mentioned in the tabulation above, which is also the final item in the Board's priority listing for auxiliary enterprise projects in 1983-1985, would involve expenditures of $675,000 for Campus Entry and Street System Improvements at the University of Oregon. In view of the potential impact of these costs upon debt service requirements from parking revenues, institutional officials have agreed to postpone the request to 1985-1987.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to advise the Executive Department and the Legislative Fiscal Office that the four auxiliary enterprise projects named above within the staff report and included as subsections (2)(e), (2)(f), (2)(g), and (3)(a) of Section 1 of House Bill 5008 be omitted from the capital construction requests for 1983-1985.

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

Staff Report to the Board

The University of Oregon requests authorization to modify requirements for its doctoral program in English linguistics and to award students completing the modified program, the Ph.D., in Linguistics.

The University of Oregon currently offers baccalaureate and master's degree programs in linguistics and doctoral studies leading to the Ph.D. degree in English. It has assembled a small but excellent staff of six faculty in the department of linguistics, supported by 29 faculty in areas of linguistics and language in allied disciplines of psychology, neurology, anthropology, computer science, education, biology, philosophy, and English, Romance, French, Spanish, German, Chinese, Japanese, Sino-Tibetan, and East Asian languages.

The M.A. program in linguistics is very successful, enrolling some 30 students a year. Most of the students specialize in Teaching English as a Second Language and Second Language Acquisition, both high demand areas in the United States and abroad. The only other degree program in linguistics in Oregon is an option in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) offered by Portland State University. The program leads to the M.A. in English.

The University is prepared to offer graduate students opportunity for advanced training and research in areas of linguistics where there is still non-academic job demand (English as a Second Language, Second Language Acquisition, Speech Pathology, Language Data Processing) or where the forefront of future academic research is likely to be (Language Perception and Processing, Discourse Processing and Machine-Man Communication, Language and the Brain, Language Evolution and Primatology). Currently five doctoral students are pursuing interdisciplinary programs in linguistics. Under present requirements, they will receive their degrees in English, although none of their dissertation topics are English linguistics. Authorization to offer the Ph.D. in linguistics would free up the program to enable students to take advantage of the varied resources of the University in linguistics, provide students completing programs with specialization in language and linguistics other than English with a general degree title, and enable the University to attract and retain energetic, high-quality faculty now collaborating in linguistic studies and research across departmental lines.

The University offers all the core courses required for the Ph.D. program, plus a rich array of supporting course work in related disciplines. Facilities and equipment available for doctoral level research are located in the linguistics, speech pathology, psychology, and computer information science departments, the Institute of Neurosciences, the American English Language Institute, and, for selected students, the Oregon Regional Primate Research Center.

No new resources or reallocation of resources within the institution are required to offer the program. Enrollment is expected to gradually increase from the five students currently enrolled to perhaps ten.
Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Board authorize the University to modify requirements for doctoral studies in linguistics, and to award the Ph.D. degree in linguistics to students completing the modified program of study as described in the University of Oregon proposal, effective 1983-84.

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Carpenter stated the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs had considered the recommendation on the previous day. The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Mr. Ingalls asked for a definition of linguistics and information concerning the cost. Mrs. Kahananui and Dr. Hill explained that the program was in place. The recommendation represents a name change rather than added costs. It is a matter of offering students in the program the appropriate degree and professional identification.

Dr. Talm Givon, Professor of Linguistics, said linguistics is the study of human language. It involves studying many different languages in order to find something like a common denominator. It seeks to determine what makes a human language in terms of structural sound systems, structural grammar, structural lexicons, in terms of communicative interaction. In the broader sense it involves the process of human concepts for communication and information processing and is viewed within the general framework of human culture.

Mrs. Carpenter said the program is very interdisciplinary in nature in terms of the cooperation and participation of other departments. In response to a question from Mr. Alltucker about whether the interdisciplinary cooperation and coordination was firmly in place, Mrs. Carpenter said she was very sure that it was. Dr. Hill indicated that these relationships were built on a common interest in the study of complex problems and for that reason were very strong.

Dr. Hill indicated that growth would be contained within the resources already allocated for this purpose.

Mr. Wyss noted that questions concerning cost and cooperation had been asked during the Committee discussion and the Committee was satisfied the interdisciplinary cooperation had occurred. With respect to cost, if the program proves to be successful, it might cost more eventually, but the return on the investment should be quite high.

Mr. Alltucker then asked whether it was something the Board really wanted to do and whether it was part of the overall plan.

The Chancellor responded that the development of linguistics is an essential element of the future. It relates directly to the development of high priorities in high technology as well as to priorities for expanding culture and communicative skills.

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

Center for Study of Work, Economy, and Community, UO

Staff Report to the Board

In accordance with IMD 2.001(1), the University of Oregon requests authorization to establish an interdisciplinary unit in its Graduate School to be known as the Center for Study of Work, Economy, and Community. The University of Oregon request, in format prescribed by the Board, is presented on pp. 5-7 of the document distributed for the Board meeting on January 28, 1983.
Purpose of the Center would be to facilitate interdisciplinary research and training related to work and work organizations, labor force and labor market, the economy, and the linkages between work, the economy, and community.

The University of Oregon has developed strength in these areas of inquiry, primarily in its department of sociology, but also in other areas of the social sciences, its interdisciplinary master's degree program in industrial relations, and in the programs of the Labor Education and Research Center.

Research in area of work, economy, and the community already undertaken by University faculty through departmental structures has received national and international recognition. Funding for these projects has come from the National Science Foundation, National Institute of Mental Health, National Endowment for the Humanities, American Sociological Association, and other sources. It is anticipated that identification of the Center will provide focus for the substantial faculty interest and resources in this area, which will substantially enhance the ability of the University to obtain grant funds for an expanded program of basic and applied research on problems of critical importance to our state and nation.

The University has provided a small amount of support (approximately $1,200) from the instructional budget of the College of Arts and Sciences for start-up supplies, services, and student wages for the Center. No additional allocation of state funds is contemplated; the Center's budget would be entirely dependent upon its ability to obtain non-state funds in the form of gifts, grants, and contracts.

It should be noted that, under policies of the Board, centers and institutes such as the one proposed may exist unfunded for some period of time, but their continued existence eventually depends upon their success in obtaining non-state funds. Policies of the Board adopted May 25, 1977, specify that the institutions review centers and institutes that remain unfunded for a period of two consecutive years to determine whether they should be retained, modified, or discontinued. This situation is not expected to occur for the Center being proposed. The University of Oregon's record of research in this area to date leads it to believe the Center would attract the non-state funding necessary to become a major educational resource for the University and for the state.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

The Board's staff recommended that the University of Oregon be authorized to establish a Center for the Study of Work, Economy, and Community, as proposed, with the provision that funding for the Center is to be obtained from non-state sources.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mrs. Carpenter indicated the Committee on Instruction, Research and Public Service Programs had considered the request the previous afternoon and had recommended approval.

Dr. Richard Hill said the organization of institutes in interdisciplinary areas has been a most successful structural strategy for the University of Oregon, both in developing areas of exciting intellectual activity and in obtaining significant outside support. This strategy is being used in the field of work, economy, and community at a time when efforts are being made to diversify the economy of the state. It recognizes the impact such diversification would have on the communities of the state and nation, the composition of the work force, the demands for certain types of training, and other related issues. It is a particularly appropriate time to move in this direction, and the institution is fortunate in having faculty with past experience in research in these fields and with a willingness to act cooperatively.
Dr. Steven Deutsch, Professor of Sociology and Labor Education, said the thrust of the research center would be the interdisciplinary research on problems concerning work and the community and the acquisition of non-state funding for research.

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

Mr. Ingalls indicated he had requested a list of program requests which had been deferred during the period of financial stringency. The list had been distributed at the Instruction Committee meeting the previous day. He said the Board would consider the list and a brief explanation of the programs at the next Board meeting.

Mr. Wyss proposed that there be a discussion of the whole matter of bringing programs forward for Board consideration, how the institutions develop programs within the overall mission structure, and how the institutions see the priorities in developing those programs.

It would be helpful to have an explanation of the entire curricular procedure, including a discussion of the approvals for certificate programs and the delegation of responsibility for approval of courses and different kinds of programs. The presidents of the institutions also should be included in the discussion.

Summary of October 22, 1982, Board Action

On October 22, 1982, the Board approved Systemwide intercollegiate athletics policy and subsequent amendments thereto which reflected Board actions and discussion on August 7, 1981, March 25-26, 1982, September 13, 1982, and October 22, 1982. The Board also rescinded action taken on July 23, 1982, to approve tentatively the seven-institution athletic codes of ethics and approved a Systemwide standard code of ethics for inclusion in the Systemwide policy.

During the discussion, the Board asked that the staff return to the December 1982 meeting with suggested further amendments pertaining to course carrying loads and progress toward and attainment of the baccalaureate degree. The Board also requested that the policy be placed in the hands of all student athletes.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board approve the amendments identified by the bracketed [deleted] and underlined (added) sections of the policy as presented below.

The staff recommended amendments represent implementation of the suggestions made by the Board at its October 22, 1982, meeting and further attempts to clarify policy previously approved.

Section 8 - Policy for Intercollegiate Athletics

8.001 Role of Athletics in a College or University

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

(1) Contribute to the instructional programs by providing highly competitive opportunities for those students who excel in the various athletic activities.

(2) Enable the institutions to prepare graduates to serve the schools and colleges as athletic coaches, physical education teachers, athletic trainers, and athletic program administrators.
(3) Provide students, alumni, and other members of the public with spectator satisfaction and with an opportunity to identify with their institutions outside the classroom and laboratories.

(4) Enable the institutions to involve the public, not otherwise related to the institutions, in support of our colleges and universities.

(5) Provide opportunities for a few students, especially in football, basketball, and baseball, to prepare for careers in professional sports.

8.006 Categories of Intercollegiate Athletic Activities

For the purposes of establishing financial policy and determining equality of opportunity, two categories of intercollegiate athletic activities are established. They are:

(1) Major revenue-producing athletic activities.

(2) All other athletic activities.

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

Equality of Opportunity

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

If the institution identifies any athletic activity as major revenue-producing, it must also identify at least one such activity for men and one for women even though one of the activities may not satisfy the definition of major-revenue producing.

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

8.016 Financing

(1) Major Revenue-Producing Athletic Activities

Major revenue-producing athletic activities are those which, by definition, are estimated to be self-supporting from gate receipts, television and radio income, conference income, contributions, and other revenues generated through the operation of those activities. Any incidental fees used to support major revenue-producing athletic activities will be deemed to be for the purpose of financing student admissions. No state tax funds, appropriated for education and general purposes, are to be used either for operating or capital expenditures, except as provided in (3) below. "Operating expenses" include both salaries and applicable physical plant costs.

(2) Other Athletic Activities

Other athletic activities are to be financed from student incidental fees, gate receipts, and contributions. State funds appropriated for education and general purposes may be used only to fund the salaries of coaches at the state colleges and Oregon Institute of Technology.
(3) Proportionate Financing of Joint Use Facilities

State funds are used and may continue to be used[...however,] for physical plant and other operating costs applicable to spaces within athletic facilities which are utilized for educational and general purposes, such as lectures, convocations, physical education activity classes, concerts, and commencement exercises.

(4) Resources for Capital Construction and Improvements

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

8.021 Levels of Competition

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

8.026 Cost Containment

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

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

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

8.031 Academic Progress and Degree Attainment

The presidents of institutions having intercollegiate athletics programs are instructed to establish policies and procedures that commit student athletes, counselors, coaches, and athletic program administrators to pursuing the dual student athlete goals of maintaining normal progress toward completion of the baccalaureate degree and attainment thereof usually in not more than five years after the date of initial registration. Such policies shall require:

(1) Minimum academic term carrying loads of 12 hours during seasons of competition, in prescribed courses leading to a baccalaureate degree selected by the student athlete; and compliance with normal progress rules established by the institution; and

(2) Development and use of continuing academic progress monitoring systems which, when necessary, activate appropriate corrective measures by the student athlete, counselor, coaches, and athletic program administrator.

(3) Each institution president to submit annually to the Board a report on the success of student athletes in pursuing the goals of academic progress and degree attainment.
Code of Ethics

Each institution offering a program of intercollegiate athletics shall comply with the following code of ethics. Violation of the code of ethics shall be considered an adequate basis for sanctions for cause.

(1) Purpose

The purpose of this code of ethics is to prescribe standards of conduct for student athletes participating in the intercollegiate athletic programs of the institution, coaches, intercollegiate athletic administrators, and other personnel associated with intercollegiate athletics. It is also the purpose of this code of ethics to identify the responsibilities of coaches, intercollegiate athletic administrators, and other personnel in the institution's department of intercollegiate athletics.

(2) Designation of Institution Officers

The institution president shall assign in writing to the director of athletics the responsibility for implementing the provisions of this policy, except that the Faculty Athletic Representative shall retain the sole prerogative for determining the athletic eligibility of student athletes participating in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution.

(3) Directives

(a) The intercollegiate athletic program of the institution shall reflect high standards of scholarship, sportsmanship, fair play, integrity, and concern for the individual.

(b) The intercollegiate athletic program of the institution shall be conducted in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the alliances and/or conferences of which the institution is a member, and the rules, policies, and directives of the Board of Higher Education and institution.

(c) Student athletes participating in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution shall be required to:

(i) maintain such academic standards as established by the institution for all students.

(ii) comply with the eligibility requirements of the institution as a prerequisite for participation in its intercollegiate athletic program.

(iii) demonstrate high standards of sportsmanship and fair play, while participating in an intercollegiate athletic program of the institution.

(iv) refrain from participation in an intercollegiate athletic program of the institution when existing injuries and/or physical impairments would jeopardize the student athlete's health and welfare; and

(v) deport themselves in a manner which brings credit to themselves, their teammates, and the institution.
(d) A head coach of an intercollegiate athletic program is required to maintain such discipline as necessary to assure that student athletes and coaches in that sport maintain high standards of sportsmanship, fair play, and integrity; encourage high standards of scholarship for student athletes; establish and maintain high standards regarding the welfare of student athletes; and adhere to the principles of nondiscrimination.

(e) Coaches in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution are required to maintain high standards of sportsmanship, fair play, and professional integrity; encourage high standards of scholarship for student athletes; and adhere to principles of nondiscrimination.

(f) Each individual performing administrative, promotional, public relations, or related functions in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution is required to demonstrate high standards of professional conduct; encourage high standards of sportsmanship, fair play, professional integrity and scholarship; establish high standards regarding the welfare of student athletes; and adhere to the principles of nondiscrimination.

(g) The following is proscribed conduct for each head coach, assistant coach, and individual performing administrative, promotional, public relations, or related functions in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution:

(i) using the position with the institution to obtain financial gain, other than official institution salary or reimbursement of expenses and honoraria from either institution or non-institution sources, unless prior approval is obtained from the institution president.

(ii) using the position with the institution to obtain financial gain for any member of the household or for any business with which the employee or any member of the employee's household is associated.

(iii) engaging in any outside activity which substantially interferes with the employee's responsibilities in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution.

(iv) accepting any employment outside the institution involving time or honorarium without the prior approval of the institution president.

(v) accepting gifts, as defined in ORS 244.020(5), from any source including, but not limited to, professional sports organizations, private businesses, or athletic "boosters."

(vi) receiving, or influencing directly or indirectly, awards of prizes of value from any institution-operated or affiliated promotional activity associated with the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution.
(vii) using institution buildings, facilities, services, or grounds for personal or private gain, without the prior written authorization of the institution president.

(viii) using, or permitting the use of the name of the institution or any emblem of the institution in commercial or personal promotional activities, except by the prior written authorization of the institution president.

(ix) violating the constitution and bylaws of an alliance or conference in which the institution holds membership, particularly those provisions pertaining to recruiting of student athletes, financial aid for student athletes, eligibility of student athletes, and extra benefits for student athletes.

(x) engaging in, encouraging, or permitting the physical or mental abuse or harassment of student athletes.

(xi) permitting student athletes who have not been certified for competition by a medical physician prior to a sports season to participate in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution.

(xii) permitting, requiring, or encouraging a student athlete who is injured, or otherwise physically or mentally impaired, to participate in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution without authorization from a physician or authorized athletic trainer.

(xiii) permitting, encouraging, or engaging in abuse or harassment of game officials, game opponents, or spectators while participating in an intercollegiate athletic program of the institution.

(xiv) encouraging, aiding, or abetting, including acts of omission, any individual, including non-institution persons, to engage in conduct proscribed by the alliance or conference in which the institution holds membership and the administrative rules, policies, and internal management directives of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education and the institution.

(h) Any coach, head coach, or individual performing administrative, promotional, public relations, or related functions in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution should strive to be perceived as an ethical leader, and, therefore, should avoid the appearance as well as the fact of impropriety.

(i) Waivers

The institution president retains the sole prerogative and authority for authorizing exceptions in writing to the provisions contained herein.
(j) **Compliance and Sanctions for Violations**

Individuals violating the provisions of this code of ethics may be subject to sanctions for cause.

For student athletes participating in the intercollegiate athletic program of the institution who violate the provisions contained herein, the sanctions for cause may include loss of eligibility for a period of time prescribed by the institution Faculty Athletic Representative. Sanctions in addition to loss of eligibility may be imposed by the institution pursuant to the provisions of the student conduct code of the institution.

For coaches or for intercollegiate athletic administrators, sanctions for cause include but are not limited to oral or written reprimand, suspension with pay, suspension without pay, or termination, as determined by the institution president.

(k) **Contract and Policy Distribution**

This policy for intercollegiate athletics, including the code of ethics, shall be attached to the Notice of Appointment for coaches, athletic administrators, and other personnel associated with the intercollegiate athletics program as well as distributed to and discussed with all student athletes.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Chancellor said he was very pleased with the policy as now presented. Criteria for monitoring academic progress of athletes are now included. He said he knew of no other statewide policy affirming philosophy and attitudes toward athletes in this type of policy and regulations. The Chancellor commended Dr. Richard Perry for his efforts in coordinating the policy recommendations with those in the field of athletics. It was stated the policy is consistent with the most recent NCAA changes. The Chancellor said President MacVicar and President Olum, in their activities with the PAC-10, had taken a strong leading role in influencing the national regulations pertaining to the eligibility of entering freshmen and the more stringent academic regulations which closely follow the entrance requirements being recommended for State System students.

Dr. Perry said the policy is an effort to assure academic responsibility and respectability in the intercollegiate athletics program. It is in response to the Board's request to deal with carrying loads and attainment of the baccalaureate degree.

Dr. Perry then set forth the purposes to be achieved by the proposed policy and Administrative Rule change. They included:

1. A statement of the assumption that in most instances the student athlete would finish the baccalaureate program in five years. There might be exceptions, as there are for other students, but the athlete normally should be able to pursue and finish the degree program in five years.

2. Clarification of the original intent of the policy to permit the use of Education and General Funds to support on a proportionate basis those physical plant and operating costs that are associated with jointly-used athletic facilities as they occur in facilities built with Article XI-F(1) monies.
3. Assurance that the policy is distributed and discussed with student athletes.

4. Clarification of the fact that violations of the Board policy for intercollegiate athletics constitutes grounds for imposing sanctions under OAR 580-22-045.

5. Clarification of the applicability of the Code of Ethics to student athletes.

Dr. Perry said remedial courses would qualify as part of the carrying load if they carry unit credit and are considered as courses prerequisite to courses applicable to the degree. Mechanisms are in place at most of the institutions which identify academic difficulties students may have and the steps that should be taken to rectify those problems.

Dr. Perry commented that he was confident the annual reports of progress toward attainment and the attainment of the degree would reveal, as they have throughout the country, that student athletes perform better in the classroom than the average of the total student population of that institution. If similar successes do prevail in Oregon, the visible record will only enhance the image of the student athletes and the intercollegiate athletic programs in general.

Mr. Batiste expressed concern that the eligibility requirements were not addressed fully. Since that question was not before the Board in the present recommendations, it was suggested that other changes could be proposed and brought to the Board at a later time, if they proved necessary.

Mr. Alltucker asked whether a student who had registered for 12 units and did not go to class would continue to be eligible throughout the entire term. The Chancellor said both NCAA and Conference rules would permit that to happen but it should be intolerable for the coaches to permit it. It could happen because once eligibility has been established for a semester or a period of time, that student is eligible until the next review period. This is also true of any student in the institution.

The Chancellor said the new NCAA ruling specified that a freshman student, in order to have instant eligibility as a freshman, must have had a 2.0 grade-point-average and satisfied the course entrance requirements which are similar to those the Board has under discussion at the present time. A student may be offered an athletic grant who does not meet the requirements, but the individual would not have immediate eligibility. These changes adhere to the conference requirements. He said the proposed amendments would require that the presidents and the institutions record the academic progress of the students and report that to the Board. The PAC-10, in conjunction with the Big-10, was one of the prime movers in the country in the adoption of the new requirements. He said there were significant breakthroughs on academic progress and the State System presidents were extremely active in achieving these changes.

President Olum said the University of Oregon would have no difficulty with these requirements and they were being followed at the present time. However, it is desirable to have them in written form because the NCAA meets annually and makes changes. If the NCAA requirements were weakened, the University of Oregon would prefer these requirements to remain.

President MacVicar said student athletes are required to remain in good standing with the institution. If not, they are terminated and would be ineligible to participate in athletics. Insisting that students make progress toward a degree is a positive step.

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.
Amendment to OAR 580-22-045, Proscribed Conduct

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that OAR 580-22-045 be amended as shown below so that defined proscribed conduct will include violations of the Board's intercollegiate athletics policy, specifically the Code of Ethics, adopted on October 22, 1982.

Proscribed Conduct

580-22-045 Procedures to impose applicable sanctions may be instituted against any person engaging in any of the following proscribed conduct:

1. Obstruction or disruption of teaching, research, administration, disciplinary procedures, or other institutional activities, including the institution's public service functions or other authorized activities on institutionally-owned or controlled property;

2. Obstruction or disruption interfering with freedom of movement, either pedestrian or vehicular, on institutionally-owned or controlled property;

3. Possession or use of fire arms, explosives, dangerous chemicals, or other dangerous weapons or instrumentalities on institutionally-owned or controlled property, in contravention of law or institutional rules;

4. Detention or physical abuse of any person or conduct intended to threaten imminent bodily harm or endanger the health of any person on any institutionally-owned or controlled property;

5. Malicious damage, misuse, or theft of institutional property, or the property of any other person where such property is located on institutionally-owned or controlled property, or, regardless of location, is in the care, custody, or control of an institution;

6. Refusal by any person while on institutional property to comply with an order of the President or appropriate authorized official to leave such premises because of conduct proscribed by this rule when such conduct constitutes a danger to personal safety, property, or educational, or other appropriate institutional activities on such premises;

7. Unauthorized entry to or use of institutional facilities, including buildings and grounds;

8. Illegal use, possession, or distribution of drugs on institutionally-owned or controlled property;

9. Inciting others to engage in any of the conduct or to perform any of the acts prohibited herein. Inciting means that advocacy of proscribed conduct which calls on the person or persons addressed for imminent action, and is coupled with a reasonable apprehension of imminent danger to the functions and purposes of the institution, including the safety of persons, and the protection of its property;

10. Violating the Board's Policy for Intercollegiate Athletics as described in Section 8 of its Internal Management Directives, specifically including the subsection thereof entitled Code of Ethics.

Staff Report to the Board

Following Board adoption on October 22, 1982, of the Systemwide Policy for Intercollegiate Athletics, including the code of ethics, the Board's staff and the Board's counsel, Assistant Attorney General James J. Casby, Jr.,
concluded that the conduct proscribed by IMD 8.031 had the potential for imposition of sanctions not covered under OAR 580-22-045. Therefore, the staff has recommended that the Board amend OAR 580-22-045 by adding subsection (10) so that the Proscribed Conduct will include violations of the Board's policy on intercollegiate athletics, including specifically the Code of Ethics.

In addition, the recommended amendment would make clear the applicability of the Code of Ethics to student athletes by reason of the reference to OAR 580-22-045 in OAR 580-12-010, recited below for information:

Proscribed Conduct

580-12-010 The Board has proscribed certain conduct as listed in rule 580-22-045. Students engaging in proscribed conduct will be subject to sanctions according to institutional procedures.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board adopt Internal Management Directive 1.031 as follows:

Any change in the name of an institution proposed by an institution shall be submitted to the Board for approval. If approved, the Board will submit the request to the Legislative Assembly.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented and adopted the Internal Management Directive. On roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Petersen, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

At the October 1982 meeting of the Board, Mr. Wyss reported on conversations with the staff concerning management of our Endowment Funds. At the November meeting of the Board, an extensive presentation was made by Mr. Wyss and Mr. Ross Hall, Controller, culminating in a motion adopted by the Board to disemploy the current investment managers and employ Oregon Equity Fund for the management of equity dollars and the Oregon State Treasurer's Office for the management of fixed income dollars (see 1982 minutes, pages 531-533).

At the December meeting of the Board, it was reported that the Oregon Investment Council preferred not to handle Higher Education endowments, and the Controller then presented a proposal to have the Common Fund designated as the manager of our equity dollars. Although the Oregon Investment Council approved the recommendation to employ the Common
Fund as our investment managers, the State Treasurer suggested that we delay implementing the decision until performance information about the Common Fund could be made available from consultants employed by the Oregon Investment Council.

Reports of the consultants have been made and are favorable. Board members Wyss and Perry, together with Mr. Hall and Mr. Lemman, met with the State Treasurer and the Chairman of the Oregon Investment Council and others on February 14 to interview an officer of the Common Fund and to discuss the recommendation further. The State Treasurer and the Chairman of the Oregon Investment Council have expressed satisfaction with the decision, and the motion of the Oregon Investment Council adopted in December to authorize the Board to select the Common Fund as its investment manager stands.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the State Board of Higher Education disemploy its current investment manager, Dodge and Cox, and employ the Common Fund for the management of equity dollars and the Oregon State Treasurer's Office for the management of the fixed income dollars of its endowment funds.

Mr. Wyss reported on his meeting with the Investment Council in which he was asked what the Board's specific reasons were for transferring. He cited the following reasons:

1. The objectives had been changed to be more aggressive since Dodge and Cox were originally employed.

2. The pooling concept, which was something it had been hoped would be gained by going with the Investment Council's pool of investment managers, was employed by the Common Fund. It fitted with the strategy that was being used by the Treasurer's Office and would give some continuity of management in that the Common Fund managers determine which managers they should employ as a group of managers. Presumably, this would engage managers who were most appropriate at any single time during any single market period.

3. There would be a lower overall cost since the State Treasurer would be managing the bond or fixed income holdings.

4. The Common Fund was formed to manage higher education money around the country and its client base is almost all higher education fund oriented.

5. The State System would be one of the Common Fund's largest clients and might be expected to be more important to them than to the prior managers.

Board Discussion and Action

Upon motion by Mr. Wyss, the Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, effective March 31, 1983. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None. Director Petersen was absent from the meeting at this time.

Mrs. Carpenter reported that two industrial contacts had stated the Board was not sufficiently responsive to providing continuing education and had not adapted its programs to the overwhelming desire for additional education to gain information in both technical and cultural fields. After explaining that the Board had no state funding for these courses and they were required to be self-sufficient, Mrs. Carpenter said she was asked whether the Board had made its priorities extremely clear on this issue.
She questioned whether the Board was giving adequate priority to this issue and suggested that the Board consider the data and whether to give continuing education a higher priority.

It was agreed the June Board meeting would be a reasonable time for presentation of a survey of continuing education.

Mr. Harms reported that Mrs. Carpenter, together with her husband, was the recipient of the Watzek Award from Lewis and Clark College. He said in view of her efforts in the area of education he knew the award was well deserved and it merited public recognition.

Mr. Batiste reported that the first hearing of the Joint Committee on High School/College Connection had been held the previous evening and he was looking forward to subsequent meetings. He also indicated he had asked for a report in April on the Committee on High Technology.

On October 22, 1982, the Board approved the schematic design phase of planning which was prepared by Stastny/TCP, PC, Architects (formerly known as Stastny/Graham Architects, P.C.), Portland for the proposed Emergency Room renovations in University Hospital North. It was noted that the work is expected to be accomplished as part of the Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects for which the Board and the 1981 Legislature provided an expenditure authorization in the total amount of $5,480,000.

Based upon the recommendation of institutional officials following the completion of the design development phase of planning, the Board's staff acknowledged the acceptance thereof and 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 alterations remains essentially the same as that outlined in the October 22, 1982, Board minutes. However, the direct construction cost allowance has been increased by $15,700 (from $475,000 to $490,700) to reflect additional expenses for mechanical and electrical components of the project which are only partially offset by a lower estimate for the general work portion. Furthermore, institutional officials advised that budget requirements of $50,300 for furnishings and equipment had been omitted previously inadvertently. With these additions and other minor adjustments for professional service fees, works of art and contingencies, the revised project budget now totals $676,000, or $81,000 more than had been indicated when the schematic design phase of planning was approved.

All of the project costs would 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. The debt service requirements for these bonds would be met from patient fee revenues. No state tax funds would be involved in the project.

Before a construction contract can be awarded, it will be necessary to obtain appropriate expenditure authorization from the State Emergency Board.

RECAPITULATION UPON ACCEPTANCE OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OHSU Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects (University Hospital North, Emergency Room Renovations)

Architects - Stastny/TCP, PC, Architects, Portland

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 539, Oregon Laws 1981
Meeting #498
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Estimated total project cost (this portion only) $676,000
Estimated direct construction cost (this portion only) $490,700

Estimated gross areas:
   Remodeled 6,055 square feet
   New construction 415
   Total 6,470

Tentative schedule:
   Bidding - June 1983
   Completion - December 1983

Tentative financing plan:
   Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings $876,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Hospital and Clinics Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects (Computerized Tomographic Scanner Replacement), OHSU

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Petersen-Kolberg & Associates, P.C., project architects, Wilsonville, for Phase II of alterations to accommodate the replacement of a computerized tomographic scanner with a new model scanner in University Hospital South on the campus of the Oregon Health Sciences University, were accepted on behalf of the Board. Eight bids were received for the work on January 12, 1983, ranging from a low of $95,662 to a high of $136,767. Inasmuch as the bids were considerably below the direct construction cost allowance, a contract award was made to the lowest bidder and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs:
   Phase I - Remodeling for film processor $11,005
   Phase II - Cloyd R. Watt Construction Co., Portland 95,662
   Phase III - Reserved for subsequent contract 28,195
   Subtotal $134,862
   Professional services fees 13,466
   Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs 18,272
   Contingencies 13,400
   Total $180,000

The estimated total expenditure requirements of $180,000, as revised, are $90,000 less than the total of the pre-bid budget reported previously.

In accordance with the schematic design phase of planning which the Board reviewed and approved on May 28, 1982, and the design development phase which was reported to the Board on November 19, 1982, the work of the contract for Phase II includes modifying the space for the new computerized tomographic scanner, the control room, the computer room and a toilet room/dressing room.

All of the expenditures are to be charged against proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bond borrowings obtained 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 RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OHSU Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects (Computerized Tomographic Scanner Replacement)
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)  $180,000
  Phase I - $14,300
  Phase II - 127,600
  Phase III - 38,100

Estimated direct construction costs (this portion only)  $134,862
  Phase I - $11,005
  Phase II - 95,662
  Phase III - 28,195

Scheduled completion for Phase II - May 1983

Tentative financing plan:
  Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings  $180,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Albert Pastine, project architect, Eugene, the work of the prime contractor for the expansion of the existing storm drainage system at the Amazon student housing complex on the campus of the University of Oregon was accepted as of August 24, 1982, subject to the completion of minor unfinished items.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on May 28, 1982:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Kimsey Construction Co., Milwaukie</td>
<td>$92,930.70</td>
<td>$89,800.70</td>
<td>$3,130.00 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>21,360.00</td>
<td>21,360.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>8,709.30</td>
<td>7,349.00</td>
<td>1,360.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,490.30</td>
<td>(4,490.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$123,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$123,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes additional water lines, revision of area drains, and other minor modifications within three approved change orders.

The work of the contract included the installation of a new site drainage system, including area drains, to which gutters and downspouts recently provided on some of the buildings have been connected.

The work was 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 storm sewer improvements within the Amazon complex were financed from proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bond borrowings obtained under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution. No state tax funds were involved in this project.
RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UO Housing Improvements (Amazon Housing Storm Sewer)

Architect - Albert Pastine, Eugene

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

Estimated total project costs (this portion only) $123,000.00
Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $92,930.70

Financing plan:
Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings $123,000.00

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and the project architect, Jon Kahananui, the work of the prime contractor for the Laboratory Waste Management Facility on the campus at the University of Oregon was accepted on behalf of the Board as of January 31, 1983, subject to the completion of minor punchlist items. The work was inspected by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on April 23, 1982:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 1/31/83</th>
<th>Original Budget 4/23/82</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Robert C. Bowser dba AB Associates, Eugene</td>
<td>$218,133.00</td>
<td>$213,263.00</td>
<td>$4,870.00 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional service fees (net of consultants' design charges)</td>
<td>4,216.60</td>
<td>3,651.00</td>
<td>565.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art</td>
<td>2,133.00</td>
<td>2,133.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous Physical Plant costs</td>
<td>9,118.86</td>
<td>5,609.46</td>
<td>3,509.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,531.00</td>
<td>(8,531.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$233,601.46</td>
<td>$233,187.46</td>
<td>$414.00 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes adding floor drain, revising storm subdrainage system, routing natural gas supply line, and other minor modifications within ten approved change orders.

(2) Painting of the exterior of the adjacent Solvent Storage building at a cost of $414 was funded separately from resources available to the institution for building maintenance and alterations.

The work of the contract consisted of providing approximately 1,407 square feet of space for managing laboratory wastes generated within the University's science complex. Of this area, about 1,267 square feet was of new construction as an addition extending northward from the Science East Wing, and the remaining 140 square feet was provided through the remodeling of the ground floor lobby of the East Wing.
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The expenditures for this project (other than the painting of the Solvent Storage building) were charged against the General Fund appropriations and Article XI-G bond proceeds allocated from amounts authorized for these purposes by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975; Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977; and Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UO Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase II (Laboratory Waste Management Facility)

Architect - Physical Plant Department under supervision of Jonathan K. Kahananui, Staff Architect, assisted by Marquess Engineering Co., consultants, Eugene

Board's priority - Portion of No. 1 in 1975-1977 (Educational and General Plant)
  Portion of No. 1 in 1977-1979 (Educational and General Plant)
  Portion of No. 1 in 1979-1981 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorizations -  
  Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975
  Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977
  Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979

Estimated total project costs (this portion only, excluding the painting of the Solvent Storage building) $233,187.46

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $218,133.00

Estimated area:
  New construction - 1,267 square feet
  Remodel - 140 square feet

Financing plan:

General Fund appropriations:
  Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977 $ 45,256.32
  Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979 1,523.65 $ 46,779.97

Article XI-G Bonds:
  Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975 $104,312.31
  Chapter 560, Oregon Laws 1977 57,095.18
  Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979 25,000.00 186,407.49
  Total $233,187.46

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Unthank, Seder, Poticha, project architects, Eugene, the work of the prime contractor for the modifications for accessibility for the handicapped within Friendly and Fenton Halls on the campus of the University of Oregon in Eugene was accepted on behalf of the Board as of February 1, 1983, subject to the completion of minor unfinished items. The work was inspected by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.
A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on October 22, 1982:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct construction costs -</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. G. Luper, Eugene</td>
<td>56,479</td>
<td>52,499</td>
<td>3,980 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional services fees</strong></td>
<td>13,160</td>
<td>15,882</td>
<td>(2,722)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</strong></td>
<td>10,361</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>3,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingencies</strong></td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>(5,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes providing and installing new flooring, relocating steam and condensate lines which were uncovered by demolition of a partition, providing additional chair carrier support, and other minor modifications within two approved change orders.

The work of the contract included the installation of a chair lift within an existing hoistway and modifications to the west entrances and first floor restrooms of Friendly Hall; and in Fenton Hall, the work included only the installation of a wheelchair lift in the main stairwell.

All project expenditures were financed from state funds authorized by Chapter 511, Oregon Laws 1979, for accessibility for the handicapped.

**RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE**

**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) $80,000

Estimated total direct construction costs (this portion only) $56,479

Financing: Article XI-G bond proceeds $80,000

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board received the report as presented.

**Staff Report to the Board**

On June 25, 1982, the Board was advised that contract awards had been made to Patterson Plumbing Co., Inc., Medford, in the amount of $31,710 for energy-conservation related work in Snell Hall and the Residence Hall at Oregon Institute of Technology, and to Western Mechanical, Inc., Medford, for similar improvements costing $15,320 within the Semon Hall Addition.

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the acceptance of the contractors' work was acknowledged as of January 24, 1983, following their inspection and that of The Amundson Associates, P.C., Architects, and their engineering consultants. Prior to acceptance, an increase of $2,993 was incorporated in a change order to the contract with Patterson Plumbing Co., Inc., for the addition of pipe covering on the geothermal supply lines and for certain other revisions in the piping, so the final contract amount with that firm was adjusted to $34,703.
Funds for the work were allocated from a federal energy grant and the matching General Fund appropriation plus auxiliary enterprise resources of approximately $14,250 allocated for a portion of the cost of the work undertaken within the Residence Hall.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board received the report as presented.

**Staff Report to the Board**

On November 19, 1982, the Board approved a staff recommendation to advertise for sale by bid at a minimum price of $22,560 the 40.25 acre parcel of unimproved land located near Eagle Point, Oregon. Three bids were received on December 15, 1982. A land sale contract was awarded to the highest bidder who offered $23,670. The terms were $8,670 down at closing, monthly payments of $200.31 for 10 years, and interest calculated at 10.25% per annum. Both the Board president and secretary have executed the land sale contract and deed.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board received the report as presented.

**Staff Report to the Board**

Budgeted amount for Reserve for Physical Plant Rehabilitation and Minor Capital Outlay during 1982-83 (as reported to the Board on July 23, 1982) $82,380

Add - Balance carried forward from 1981-82 reserve 15,487

Total $97,867

Less - Allocation authorized by the Chancellor for Central Hall Basement Alterations, SOSC (supplement) 4,000

Balance as of February 11, 1983 $93,867

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board received the report as presented.

Mr. Ingalls reported that he had attended meetings of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission and the State Board of Education. He also conducted the hearing held in Salem on the Strategic Plan. He asked Mr. Wyss to report on the hearing which he had attended in Astoria.

Mr. Wyss said the Astoria meeting had been interesting because there were no time limitations on the speakers and this resulted in a different texture in the content of the comments than is obtained when people are restricted to presenting their best ideas in three to five minutes. The focus of the comments in Astoria was on connections of higher education with vocational and community college education. The individuals were quite supportive, particularly in view of the distance of Astoria from any of the State System campuses.

The President announced interviews for two positions would be scheduled in conjunction with the next Board meeting and would take most of the preceding Thursday. The Board meeting will be on Friday, March 25 at Portland State University.

The April Board meeting has been changed from Portland to Monmouth and will be preceded by a visitation to Western Oregon State College.
W. M. Douglass, At the request of Mr. Ingalls, Mrs. Carpenter read the following certificate of recognition honoring W. M. "Jack" Douglass:

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION
HONORING
W. M. "JACK" DOUGLASS

The members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education wish to express their warm appreciation for a job well done to W. M. "Jack" Douglass. He has retired after serving 34 years in the Oregon State System of Higher Education with his major assignment being that of Dean of Administration at Oregon Institute of Technology.

He entered employment in 1949 as accountant and auditor at Oregon State University. He served as Assistant Business Manager at the University of Oregon for two years and was Business Manager at Oregon Institute of Technology until 1956 when he became Dean of Administration, a post he held until 1982. He still continues to serve the Oregon State System of Higher Education as the Interim President of Oregon Institute of Technology until March 1, 1983.

Jack Douglass has served with the Oregon State System of Higher Education, and particularly Oregon Institute of Technology, with untiring dedication and unswerving loyalty. He has been an administrative mainstay during OIT's development through the years. He has the unique experience not only of helping to manage the transition of Oregon Institute of Technology from the Board of Education to the Oregon State System of Higher Education, but also of helping to manage the planning, construction, and occupying of an entire new campus.

He has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues at Oregon Institute of Technology and at the other State System colleges and universities. He is well-known for his level-headed approach to the complex tasks of institutional management.

As advisor to all of the presidents at Oregon Institute of Technology, and finally as Interim President, Mr. Douglass will be sorely missed. His administrative strength has been an asset through the years.

We extend to Jack Douglass our sincere appreciation for his service to education in the State of Oregon, and we wish him good health and success in the years still ahead.

The above resolution was adopted, with the following voting in favor:
Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Carpenter, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Weatherford, Wyss, and Ingalls. Those voting no: None. Director Petersen was absent from the meeting at this time.

Mr. Ingalls invited President Laster to share some comments on the Oregon Health Sciences University. President Laster said a plan describing a vision of the future of the Oregon Health Sciences University had been shared with various individuals and groups and should be shared with the Board. He commented that he agreed with the earlier comments about the incalculable damage of talking about closure of institutions. These proposals have been responsible for faculty departures. Rather than discussing closure of institutions, the value of all of the institutions to the people of Oregon should be stressed.

Dr. Laster said the education given at the Oregon Health Sciences University is based on the need to care for patients because physicians, nurses, and dentists cannot be trained without patient care. Research also is an essential component in producing people who can continue to learn and not deteriorate in the quality of service they provide.
He described short-term goals of fostering existing academic programs and strengthening patient care and hospital programs. The intermediate goals involve an assessment of graduates' performance and appropriate program modification, interinstitutional coherence, and regional responsibility. The long-term goals involve an improvement of basic, clinical, and applied science, delivery systems, and cost containment. It would include endowed chairs for researchers of high calibre. Efforts would be made to secure foundation support. A final element in the vision for the future is the availability of information systems to cope with the volume of available literature.

Mr. Harms asked how President Laster would respond to the charge that the institution had not sought to cope with the state's economic crisis but had merely cut back in the hope of holding on until times improved.

President Laster said it would be inappropriate criticism. In response to the budget reduction, priorities were reviewed and eliminations were proposed of programs which were intrinsically very valuable and well-run but were not in keeping with the priorities of the institution. Legislative subcommittees ignored those recommendations and restored on their own some of the lower priority programs. In addition, the size of the entering classes reluctantly have been reduced at a time when a larger supply of high quality applicants is available. It was a very difficult judgment, but it was considered necessary in order to maintain the quality of offerings in relation to the faculty-student ratios.

Dr. Laster said the goal was to preserve the highest possible quality with diminished resources.

ADJOURNMENT The Board meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Robert C. Ingalls, President
Wilma L. Foster, Secretary