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

January 27, 1984

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

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m., January 27, 1984, by the Vice
President of the Board, Mr. Loren L. Wyss, and on roll call the following
answered present:

Mr. John W. Alltucker
Mr. Alvin R. Batiste
Mrs. Harriett J. Flanagan
Mr. Randal D. Gill
Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.

Mr. Louis B. Perry
Mr. James C. Petersen
Miss Linda L. Walling
Mr. Loren L. Wyss

Absent: Mr. Ingalls was out of the state and Mr. Hensley was absent
for business reasons.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor William E. Davis, Secretary Wilma L.
Foster, J. T. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Clarethel
Kahananui, Acting Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; W. T. Lemman, Vice
Chancellor for Administration; Wil Post, Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs;
Clifford Smith, Director of CASEERI; Larry Pierce, Executive Assistant to
the Chancellor; Melinda W. Grier, Compliance Officer; Holly Zanville, Assistant
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Susan Weeks, Coordinator of Planning
Studies; J. Richard Pizzo, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services; Joe
Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor for Personnel Services; Davis Quenzer,
Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Fiscal Policies; James Lockwood,
Assistant to Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Kay Juran, Assistant
Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs; Thomas Berkey, Associate Budget
Director; Kenneth Jones, Assistant to Vice Chancellor for Administration;
Loren Stubbert, Assistant Budget Director; Tim Marsh, Information Director.

Oregon State University--President Robert MacVicar; T. D. Parsons, Vice
President for Administration; Robert Barr, Dean of Education, OSU/WOSC;
D. S. Fullerton, Faculty Senate President.

University of Oregon--President Paul Olum; Richard J. Hill, Provost;
Shirley J. Menaker, Dean of the Graduate School; Paul S. Holbo, Vice
Provost; Wayne Kuriliski, Vice President for University Relations; Dan
Williams, Vice President for Administration; Richard Hersh, Vice President
for Research; Gerald Bogen, Professor, DEPM.

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

Portland State University--President Joseph Blumel; Margaret J. Dobson,
Vice President for Academic Affairs; J. K. Harris, Budget Director; R. N.
Edgington, Vice President for Finance and Administration.

Eastern Oregon State College--President David Gilbert; James C. Lundy,
Dean of Administration; James Hottois, Dean of Academic Affairs.

Oregon Institute of Technology--President Larry J. Blake; William W. Smith,
Dean of Academic Affairs; John H. Smith, Dean of Administration.

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, Dean of Administration.

Others--Sherry Oeser, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Jetta Siegel, Executive Secretary, Oregon Conference, American Association of University Professors; T. K. Olson, Executive Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Robert Chandler, Commissioner, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Dale E. Hess, Staff Member, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on December 16, 1983, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Perry, Petersen, Walling, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

J. I. Hunderup, Retirement

The Chancellor said he presented the first item in his report with mixed emotions because it was the announced retirement on December 31, 1984, of Mr. J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning. He said Mr. Hunderup had rendered long and very dedicated, outstanding, and distinguished service to the State System. The Chancellor indicated that Mr. Hunderup had been with the State System since 1952 and had taught at Oregon State University prior to that time.

The Chancellor recommended that the Board accept Mr. Hunderup's announcement of his retirement.

The Board approved the Chancellor's recommendation with regret. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Perry, Petersen, Walling, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

R. Chandler, W. Kurlinski, Introduced

Mr. Wyss introduced and welcomed Mr. Robert Chandler, a member of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, and Dr. Terry Olson, Executive Director of the Commission.

He also recognized Mr. Wayne Kurlinski, Vice President for University Relations at the University of Oregon. Mr. Kurlinski was attending his first Board meeting.

Faculty Excellence Awards

The Chancellor said the 1983 Legislature had appropriated $200,000 to help the State System retain high quality faculty in Oregon as a contribution to the state's economy and to the academic and teaching enterprise. The Legislature realized that these funds were not a substitute for the needed salary increases and that competitive faculty salaries were a goal of the Board, the Governor, and the Legislature. Efforts were expected to continue in the next Legislative Session to improve the overall faculty salaries as well as the staff salaries in the System.

The funds which were appropriated are being used for faculty excellence awards to provide continuing salary supplements for a small number of faculty whose employment in the State System would benefit the state in the years to come. These funds are not for distinguished service per se, because there are so many distinguished faculty on all of the campuses who would be deserving of that recognition.

The nominations for the awards were made by the presidents of the State System institutions after conferring with their people internally. A selection committee composed of Mr. Hensley, Mr. Batiste, and Mrs. Flanagan reviewed the nominations and selected two groups of faculty for the awards. The Committee was prepared to present the selections to the Board for approval.

The Chancellor said there were twelve awards of $5,000 each recognizing excellence in research and scholarship and five awards of $2,500 recognizing excellence in teaching. These will be salary supplements which will be built into permanent salary adjustments for the recipients. The awards were effective September 1, 1983, and would impact the salary for both years of the biennium.
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A small amount of money has been retained for discretionary use in an emergency situation for the remainder of the biennium.

The Chancellor requested Mr. Batiste and Mrs. Flanagan to present the names of the individuals to the Board for approval.

Mr. Batiste said the large number of excellent nominees made the task of recommending the recipients of the awards most difficult. The committee was aware that there were many more faculty members who were making significant research and teaching contributions in program areas of importance to the economic recovery of the state and the missions of their institutions. He said many of these faculty members were in the mid-salary range and did not receive salary supplements from grants, contracts, or other sources. The Legislative Faculty Excellence Awards permit the State System to give significant permanent salary increases to only a small number of faculty members who are representative of the many who have made, and will continue to make important contributions.

Mr. Batiste then read the following names of the individuals who were recommended for awards of $5,000.

**Faculty Excellence Awards for Research and Scholarship**

James W. Ayres, Professor of Pharmaceutical Science, Oregon State University  
John A. Baross, Associate Professor of Oceanography, Oregon State University  
Michael J. Ellis, Professor Physical Education, University of Oregon  
Robert R. Harmon, Associate Professor of Marketing, Portland State University  
Barbara H. Iglewski, Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, Oregon Health Sciences University  
William M. Kantor, Professor of Mathematics, University of Oregon  
Spero M. Manson, Associate Professor, Institute on Aging, Portland State University  
Brian W. Matthews, Professor of Physics and Director of the Institute of Molecular Biology, University of Oregon  
Dallice I. Mills, Associate Professor of Botany, Oregon State University  
William E. Sandine, Professor of Microbiology and Food Science, Oregon State University  
Pavel K. Smejtek, Professor of Physics, Portland State University  
Richard M. Steers, Professor of Management, University of Oregon

Mrs. Flanagan said it had been very gratifying and exciting to become more aware of the distinguished faculty in the State System, the research that they are doing, their scholarly endeavors at the national and international level, and their excellence in teaching. She then read the following names of the individuals who were recommended for the $2,500 awards.

**Faculty Excellence Awards for Teaching**

Lawson Fusao Inada, Professor of English, Southern Oregon State College  
John W. Lund, Professor of Civil Engineering Technology, Oregon Institute of Technology  
Douglas Spear, Professor of Political Science, Eastern Oregon State College  
Gene A. Springer, Professor of Physics, Southern Oregon State College  
Bonnie J. Young, Assistant Dean, Western Oregon State College

Mr. Wyss expressed the Board's congratulations to the recipients and extended appreciation to the Legislature for providing the funds and allowing the Board to be involved in the search and awards.

The Board approved the nominees as recommended by the committee, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Perry, Petersen, Walling, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.
The Chancellor stated that IMD 1.020 provides that the State Board of Higher Education approve the establishment of positions of Vice President at the institutions and appointments of Vice Presidents, among others.

He said President Olum recommended that the position of Vice President for Research be established at the University of Oregon effective February 1, 1984. The incumbent will be responsible for the management of research proposals, grants and contracts, research institutes and centers; will encourage the development of research in new areas, especially interdisciplinary; and will act as the research liaison with government, industry, and professional organizations. These responsibilities will cover four major and overlapping functions: (1) research support, (2) support of faculty scholarship, (3) corporate liaison, and (4) economic development.

President Olum also recommended that Dr. Richard Hersh, now Associate Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, be appointed as Vice President for Research effective February 1, 1984, at an annual salary of $52,500.

The Chancellor concurred and recommended that the Board approve the establishment of the position and the appointment of Dr. Hersh as Vice President for Research as recommended.

Mr. Perry asked whether there was some liaison relationship between this position and that of the Director of CASEERI. The Chancellor indicated there was coordination. He explained that President Olum considered the research component so important that a full-time position should be devoted to the coordination of research activities, both externally and internally, and including cooperation with CASEERI and others. There would also be a dean of graduate studies to coordinate those activities, including the monitoring of the graduate programs and the selection of graduate assistants. The budgetary impact of changing the position of Dr. Hersh from Associate Provost to the level of Vice President would be approximately $3,000 to $4,000, and there also would be a small salary differential for the dean of graduate studies. The same people would be in the same positions, but there would be a different emphasis and some salary improvement.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Perry, Petersen, Walling, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

The Chancellor said Senate Bill 356 provided for the establishment of a basic research fund in the State Treasury to be administered by the State Board of Higher Education according to policies and procedures adopted by the Board. The bill provided the authorization, but no funds. However, this overt expression of support and recognition for the research efforts of the institutions was appreciated. The bill provides that the Board establish a Council for Research Policy recommendations to give consideration to:

(a) The promotion of basic research of the highest caliber within our public universities;
(b) The identification of areas of inquiry which should be supported so as to recognize both the intrinsic value and extrinsic economic value of basic research;
(c) The capacity of each university to decide where basic research moneys could best be spent within that university;
(d) Administrative and accounting requirements which place upon the university receiving moneys from the fund a minimum burden sufficient to guarantee an appropriate degree of public accountability; and
(e) Methods of assuring nondiscriminatory access to the fund.
The Chancellor described various methods used in other states to deal with the problem of research support. He also commended research projects in the State System, particularly those involving coordinated efforts of more than one institution. He also indicated that a new record had been set in the State System during the past year with receipt of $114 million in grants and contracts for research and services. This is significant money and is a very desirable and worthwhile investment. The Chancellor said there is an opportunity with the concentration of universities in this state and the interaction which is occurring to have a research corridor of the first magnitude. This would be a real asset to the state. Even some modest investments at this time would bring forth some great results.

Mr. Wyss inquired how the Council would function. The Chancellor said the group would meet frequently and would discuss ways to interact and coordinate. Proposals would be suggested and the Council would prioritize the proposals and, if funds were available, provide advice on the allocation for specific investments.

Expenditures from the fund would be in the form of grants for a specific time period which might extend beyond the biennium in which the expenditure was made. There is no money in the fund, but it is necessary to be prepared to administer the program in anticipation of an appropriation next biennium.

The Staff has proposed the appointment of a Council consisting of four administrators and four scientists. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will serve as staff to the Council, and the Council will elect its own chairman. The following nominations, for membership on the Council, have been made by the presidents of the institutions:

Council for Research Policy Recommendation

**Administrators**

Dr. Jim F. Heath, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Portland State University  
Dr. Richard Hersh, Vice President for Research, University of Oregon  
Dr. George H. Keller, Dean of Research, Oregon State University  
Dr. Leonard Laster, President, Oregon Health Sciences University

**Scientists**

Dr. John W. Kendall, Professor of Medicine, Dean of School of Medicine, Oregon Health Sciences University (endocrinology)  
Dr. Joseph W. Nibler, Professor of Chemistry, Oregon State University (chemical physics)  
Dr. Pavel K. Smejtek, Professor of Physics, Portland State University (environmental science)  
Dr. Marjorie Woollacott, Associate Professor of Physical Education, University of Oregon (neurosciences)

The Chancellor said it was very important to get this particular committee established. He commented that there has been very little direct support of either basic or applied research other than in the traditional areas of agriculture, forestry, and oceanography by virtue of the matching of land grant or sea grant funds from the federal government.

Mr. Harms said it was an excellent technique to create this committee at the highest level and reflects the emphasis placed on this activity by the System, the institutions, and the presidents of the institutions.

Board members commended the cooperation which has been occurring between the universities and the private and public sector in the southern Willamette Valley.

The Chancellor recommended that the Board affirm the establishment of the Research Council and the suggested appointments. Dr. Clifford Smith will be working with the Council in terms of staff coordination.
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The Board approved the recommendations as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Perry, Petersen, Walling, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Dr. Pierce said the report of the planning activities of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission included 47 recommendations for education in Oregon. He described some of the proposals and the impact in terms of cost and policies. He noted that some of the recommendations affecting the State System were policies that were already in place, particularly those dealing with the three-tier admissions system and the elimination of state-supported remedial courses in the State System.

Dr. Pierce said all of the recommendations have been reviewed carefully by an advisory committee of the Coordinating Commission of which the State System and faculty groups are a part. Many suggestions which might have been made regarding the recommendations have already been made by the advisory committee. The Chancellor will be speaking to the Commission on his response to the specific recommendations of the task forces and addressing some of the specific items that affect the State System. A draft of a proposed resolution was distributed. It commended the task forces for their work and encouraged the Commission to address some of the major policy issues affecting education in Oregon and, subsequently, those issues about goals and objectives in Oregon.

The Chancellor said during the strategic planning, many of these questions had been asked, answers were received, and responses formulated. However, he said he still heard questions about whether the State System was educating too many students, whether there were too many institutions, or whether the State System should concentrate on an academic and economic elite in its institutions. The responses to these questions varied. The Chancellor said if it were determined that the State System should only be educating 40,000 students, then the details should be developed for eliminating 10,000 students by becoming more selective, or through other policies which would accomplish that objective.

The Chancellor commented that he did not believe the biggest problem in Oregon was the coordination between various segments of education or the overlaps that could not be negotiated among the public schools, the community colleges and the state universities. Those relationships are excellent and the channels of communication are open, with a willingness on the part of all parties to work together. The major problems revolve around funding and the systems of funding rather than government, governance, or structure. With that in mind, the Chancellor said he agreed with the outline and the questions which have followed because these were basic questions that have to be answered before beginning to restructure or build a structure or reorganize to meet specific goals.

Mr. Perry said he did not think the Educational Coordinating Commission needed a resolution from the Board to do what it felt it must do and probably the shortness of time precluded some of the answers being discussed. However, he moved the adoption of the resolution so that it could be discussed.

Mr. Batiste seconded the motion. He said it was his understanding the task forces addressed certain sub-issues which eventually would be used by the Commission to deal with the goals and objectives. He asked Dr. Pierce whether it was correct that the resolution was saying that many of those sub-issues did not go to the heart of the goals and objectives statements that, on review, he felt should have been addressed or would be addressed subsequently.

Dr. Pierce replied that the three task forces dealt with broad issues of educational policy--finance, delivery, coordination, and the needs for education. Under those titles, all of these questions could have been addressed. The reaction of the staff was that many of them were not addressed directly and that if the Coordinating Commission is to serve a useful purpose in preparing
this report for the Legislature, these important questions need to be considered. Whether the Oregon Institute of Technology should be in Klamath Falls or Portland, which was one of the recommendations, is less important than to consider the need for engineering education. The Commission should consider whether Oregon is providing adequate opportunities in some critical areas of education for its citizens and is it providing adequate support for research to keep Oregon competitive with other states in the diversification of its economy. There are some major kinds of educational priority issues that need to be considered, and the staff believes the Commission should focus on these issues rather than specific program recommendations within the educational segments.

Mr. Petersen asked whether if the resolution represented the Board's official response to the recommendation, should it not include, for example, the question of Oregon Institute of Technology. A lack of comment might be construed as some sort of approval in the official response. He suggested that it might be premature to itemize a list at this point and it might be preferable for the Chancellor to speak to the Commission. He said he was concerned about access and that issue should be addressed specifically.

Dr. Pierce said there were 47 recommendations, many of which were addressed by the advisory committee. The Chancellor would be commenting specifically on a number of the recommendations when he testified before the Commission. It would be useful for the Board to be on record as being fully supportive of the effort of developing a statement of goals and objectives and encouraging the Commission to focus on some of the issues with which the Board and the State System have been struggling for the past few years.

Mr. Alltucker said he was troubled by the concept. He said as chairman of the Board's planning committee he had read all of the reports but the Commission was not the only group in Oregon making major studies and suggestions on the future course of education in the state. He mentioned some of the other studies and indicated he was aware of those reports. Each makes a contribution and contains at least one or two thoughts which should be incorporated in the final report. He said the Commission should be commended for doing a tremendous job in a very short time. The Board should now consider the Commission's recommendations along with the best of all of the various other studies. Mr. Alltucker said he would be opposed to having anything official or unofficial that was critical of what the task forces and the Commission had done or stated that anything was left out. He said he would prefer to congratulate the Commission on an excellent job done in a short period of time and to indicate that the Commission and the Board would work out the details over the next few months.

The Chancellor said the resolution had not been intended as a criticism although he would be in disagreement with the report in several respects. These points are ones which should be discussed at the appropriate time. He said he was prepared to comment in detail on the recommendations and in some instances to supply information or correct information with which the staff did not agree. The Chancellor said the questions raised were ones which he had been asked repeatedly and which had been asked during the State System's planning process last year. He indicated that he agreed the question should be whether a polytechnic type of engineering training was desirable in the Portland area, whether there was a demand, and, if so, how the need could be met most expeditiously and the services delivered by the state. Another question might be whether more graduate degree programs or doctoral programs were needed in the field of electrical engineering in the state. Once those questions have been answered, it is possible to discuss the alternatives for providing the necessary programs.

The Chancellor also indicated that at the present time two-thirds of the students in the State System are admitted under selective admission requirements. Enrollments at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and the Oregon Health Sciences University, which is a 100% selective process, are based on selective admission requirements. The entering freshmen at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University during the past year
had an average entering grade-point average above 3.24. This means that two-thirds of the students already are admitted under very rigorous admissions requirements. The citizens of the state must determine if they want to raise the entrance requirements even higher and eliminate another 10,000 students and consider what impact this would have on access. He said the report did not focus on these types of issues but stated that entrance requirements should be more restrictive. The Chancellor said he wanted to know why.

Mr. Alltucker said his style of communication would be to resolve the issues directly with the Commission rather than by adopting the proposed resolution which might give the impression of a difference of opinion where there was none. The Board and the Commission are equally determined to have high quality education at the lowest possible cost. The Commission has made a major contribution in a relatively short time, but there are a number of other groups in the state doing the same thing at the same time.

The Chancellor indicated that the same questions would be asked of other groups.

Mr. Batiste suggested that the report should be accepted as a staff report rather than as a resolution. He said the points raised were a statement of fact which could be accepted as a staff report and the Chancellor then could respond in his meeting with the advisory committee and in other meetings.

Mr. Harms said he was inclined to agree. The recommendations and the format in which they have been placed resulted in a very much more useful job than he had anticipated would be possible in the time allotted. He said he was impressed by the reports, although questions remained. The staffs of the Commission and the Board should direct these questions to each other. The Commission's report has already raised points which the Board will have to consider. He said the Board may not agree with the conclusions reached in the report, but the Commission was a recommending body rather than an action body. He said the draft resolution should be accepted as a staff report, and the task forces commended for doing an outstanding job.

Mr. Petersen said perhaps it would be premature to take a position and it might be preferable for the staffs to engage in dialogue and raise the questions as part of the process.

Mr. Wyss said the discussion seemed to be reaching the conclusion that the proposed resolution was the reaction of the Board's staff to the recommendations and the Board still needed a draft resolution congratulating the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission on their efforts so far.

Mr. Petersen pointed out that the Board's planning committee should be involved in this activity and would continue to be involved.

Mr. Alltucker moved that the staff report be accepted and the Board adopt a revised resolution commending the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission for doing an outstanding job in record time, expressing thanks and congratulations, and indicating that the Board would be talking to the Commission further. The precise wording of the revised resolution would be considered later in the meeting.

The Board approved the motion, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Perry, Petersen, Walling, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Later in the meeting, Dr. Pierce presented the following wording of a revised resolution: "We commend the task forces appointed by the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission to help develop a statement of goals and objectives for education in Oregon and for completing their excellent report so promptly. The State Board will carefully consider the recommendations of the task forces and will assist the Coordinating Commission in completing its assigned planning task."
Mr. Harms said the statement was appropriate but more important than the specific wording of the resolution was the consensus of the Board that it was impressed with the work of those task forces and the time in which it was accomplished. The task forces were comprised of distinguished citizens who worked hard on a difficult assignment and developed some rational suggestions and conclusions. There may be differing conclusions, but the staff should confer in reaching an ultimate recommendation of the Coordinating Commission about which matters should have further consideration.

The Board then adopted the above resolution as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Batiste, Flanagan, Gill, Harms, Walling, and Wyss. Those voting no: None. Directors Perry and Petersen were absent from the meeting at this time.

The Chancellor indicated Dr. Robert Barr, Dean of the OSU-WOSC School of Education, had been asked to describe the activities of the school since the merger of the programs at the two institutions.

Dr. Barr said the merger had attracted a good deal of attention, both within the state and nationally. He said a front page article on the merger had appeared in the Chronicle of Higher Education and he had been invited to present a paper on the subject at the Association of Teacher Educators in New Orleans and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education in San Antonio. The accrediting agencies have been intrigued by the merger and also somewhat confused by it.

The merger has been beneficial by increasing faculty morale and providing new program components that result in increasing new program combinations. This has been helpful to students and also in developing formal proposals for external funding.

Dean Barr said while the merger is not absolutely completed, the programs are indeed merged with a single dean and three assistant deans having responsibilities across both campuses. There is a single head of departments and single departmental leadership across both campuses. There are a number of coordinated offices where previously there were two offices. There is now a coordination of job placement activities that crosses both sites and a coordinated field placement and supervision of student teachers. Although there is not a single continuing education office, there are negotiated agreements between the two campuses to allow participation in off-campus activities of the Division of Continuing Education. A single basic skills examination is coordinated on the two campuses, and a number of important functions are now accomplished through a coordinated effort rather than in two independent offices on two campuses 20 miles apart. The budgets have been reordered and there are some system accounts across both campuses with a single set of fiscal procedures. There are still two budgets, and the dean reports to two presidents. The good will of President MacVicar and President Meyers has made this an amiable and productive relationship, although it is time-consuming and sometimes frustrating. Dr. Barr said that if it had not been for these two outstanding presidents, the enterprise perhaps would have been doomed from the beginning.

Dr. Barr said student procedures have been combined so that students can be admitted to either campus through a single admissions procedure and be admitted to the School of Education through a single administrative procedure. They may register once, pay one set of fees, but take courses on either or both campuses simultaneously. There is now a substantial movement of faculty between the two campuses. Budget reductions had left both campuses without essential faculty positions, but by utilizing the remaining faculty of both programs as a merged unit, it has been possible not only to maintain the program but to improve program quality. Many of the faculty members at Western Oregon State College have been approved for doctoral participation. For the first time in the history of Western Oregon State College, a number of faculty members are serving on doctoral committees and teaching some doctoral level classes. Student movement between the two campuses is eliminated to the extent possible by careful needs assessment. By identifying where students need a class, the faculty member can be moved rather than the students.
Dean Barr said it had been assumed that one of the most difficult tasks would be the matter of faculty governance because it would be necessary to articulate with two faculty senates on two campuses which were completely independent, and at Western Oregon State College there was a collective bargaining unit. He said he was delighted to report that a draft of faculty bylaws would be before the faculty for review on February 28 and he anticipated it would be approved with only minor revisions.

He said while the merger had not been without problems and had required an incredible amount of time and effort, it was largely completed.

Dean Barr indicated that a very detailed memorandum of agreement had been developed with the Teaching Research Division which had proved to be a superb relationship. He described some of the assistance which had been received from the Teaching Research Division.

Dean Barr said the next goal was to begin an ambitious program review, redesign, and redevelopment designed to place the school at the cutting edge of teacher education in the United States. The staff is in the process of developing a program of quality assurance designed to be almost a consumer guarantee promising constituents that people who finish the program will have sufficient quality in certain areas that they can be hired with great assurance. This, too, has attracted some national attention. The quality assurance program is being developed with the assistance of teachers, administrators, and other leaders in the mid-Willamette valley.

Dean Barr concluded by saying that with more ambitious screening processes and with a program of quality assurance, it is expected that the merged teacher education program will develop into one of the truly great programs in the country.

Mr. Petersen said he found it very exciting that the merged program had worked out so well. The institutions in the State System need to work together. Another example of cooperation is the nursing program at Eastern Oregon State College which is connected with the Oregon Health Sciences University. It is difficult to accomplish, but the results are very beneficial, both for students and from the fiscal standpoint.

Dean Barr said the school had absorbed on the two programs a little more than $250,000 in base budget reductions. This money was not saved through the merger, but it was because of the merger that it was possible to continue programs at their present level and still absorb that kind of base budget reduction. In addition, there are many specific items of fiscal savings in the coordination of offices across two campuses, by sharing appointments and eliminating some positions.

Mr. Petersen said the Board should instruct its staff to look for other opportunities to develop cooperative programs. He said Dean Barr's leadership had made the merger work and indicated that it was very much appreciated. Mr. Perry and Mr. Alltucker joined in commending Dean Barr for his excellent leadership.

In responding to a question concerning enrollment, Dean Barr reported that enrollment increased slightly on both campuses although enrollments nationally in teacher education continue to decrease. The main areas of enrollment increases have been in science and mathematics education.

Mr. Wyss expressed the Board's appreciation to President Olum, his staff and faculty for an excellent presentation during the Board's visit to the University of Oregon campus.
Staff Report to the Board

At its July 22, 1983, meeting, the Board approved 1983-84 institutional budget allocations. In addition, the Board was provided with a tentative allocation for 1984-85 applying the 1983-84 parameters, which were to recognize enrollment shifts and the need for reallocation of resources in the direction indicated by the Budget Allocation System Model. Although the 1983-84 reallocation was not of the magnitude suggested in the BAS Model, the Board did decide upon varying levels of reduction, giving weight to enrollment changes as well as the need for reallocation of resources among the institutions. The budget reductions at the University of Oregon and Portland State University amounted to 1.25% of their base, Western Oregon State College experienced a reduction of 3.75% of its base and at Southern Oregon State College a .75% base reduction was approved. The Oregon Health Sciences University was reduced 1.35% of its base and Eastern Oregon State College was not reduced because of the program stabilization funding policy. Oregon Institute of Technology was granted an 8% increase in its base to fund its enrollment growth, and Oregon State University was not reduced because of its relatively low funding level in relation to the other institutions as indicated by the BAS Model.

The staff also presented to the Board in July a tentative 1984-85 budget allocation using the BAS Model as a compass to indicate the relative funding levels of the various institutions as well as enrollment shifts, and recommended that the budget reductions required in 1984-85 be equalized at 2.5% of the base budget for all institutions scheduled for a budget reduction related to projected enrollment declines. Oregon State University was exempt from the reductions because of its poorer relative position to the other institutions in the BAS Model. Eastern Oregon State College was under program stabilization and Oregon Institute of Technology was projected to have no enrollment growth in 1984-85 beyond the 1983-84 levels and thus the recommendation was for neither a gain or loss in funds. The recommendation for the Oregon Health Sciences University was also for neither a gain or loss in funds.

The staff did not request Board action on the 1984-85 budget allocation as presented at the July 22 meeting. It was understood that when revised enrollment estimates for 1984-85 could be available (giving effect to Fall 1983 experience), the 1984-85 allocation recommendations would be presented to the Board for approval.

Final Fall 1983 enrollments are now known and revised projections have been made for 1984-85. The recommended budget allocation plan for Education and General Services for 1984-85 is detailed on Table IV.

The change in the staff recommendation from that presented in July is limited to the allocation of the $3,429,884 budget reduction which was labeled as an adjustment for budgeted enrollment declines in the Legislatively approved 1983-1985 Biennial Budget. Fall 1983 experience has revealed a shift in enrollment trends among the institutions from that originally projected for 1984-85. Table I summarizes the enrollment experience of the past several years and the revised enrollment projections for 1983-84 and 1984-85. The University of Oregon is still projected to lose enrollments in 1984-85 below both the level budgeted and actually experienced in 1983-84, although at a smaller rate of decline than was earlier forecast. Oregon State University is experiencing a greater decline in enrollments from that originally projected. The remaining four-year institutions are all expected to enroll more students in 1984-85 than were budgeted and actually enrolled in 1983-84.
Table II displays the July 22, 1983, tentative allocations of the $3,429,884 budget reduction for 1984-85. In addition, the Chancellor's Recommended Allocation for 1984-85 is presented—a different allocation of the $3,429,884 reduction, primarily reflecting changes in enrollments. The difference in 3-term FTE between that originally budgeted and the revised projections for 1984-85 is also shown.

**Table II**

Proposed Allocation of $3,429,884 budget reduction for 1984-85:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>7/22/83 Allocation</th>
<th>Chancellor's Recommended Allocation</th>
<th>Change in 3-Term FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>$(1,533,837)</td>
<td>$(1,083,837)</td>
<td>$ 450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(885,000)</td>
<td>(885,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>(1,015,650)</td>
<td>(875,650)</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon State College</td>
<td>(262,207)</td>
<td>(152,207)</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td>(343,190)</td>
<td>(113,190)</td>
<td>230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health Sciences University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(190,000)</td>
<td>(190,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Activities/Board</td>
<td>(275,000)</td>
<td>(275,000)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$(3,429,884)</td>
<td>$(3,429,884)</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chancellor met with each institution president and institution staff members to discuss the allocation recommendations contained in this agenda item. These meetings revealed that each institution has a plan for meeting the budget reductions. Furthermore, it is clear that these reductions will severely stretch the ability of each institution to maintain viable and quality programs. However, the State System institutions expect to meet these challenges without jeopardizing student access and educational quality in 1984-85.

The 1984-85 recommended budget reduction for Oregon State University ($885,000) will not alter its relative position in the BAS Model. OSU was funded at approximately 74.4% of the BAS Model in the tentative allocation for 1984-85. This recommended budget reduction maintains OSU's relative position at 74.4%.

The partial funding for enrollment growth at the remaining institutions is because of a lack of funds. The University of Oregon and Southern Oregon State College are at or near the systemwide average in the BAS Model and thus are provided enrollment growth funding at approximately two-thirds of the resident fees by student level. OIT, the only institution with a positive funding change, is provided additional funding at approximately one-half of the resident fee for undergraduate students. Portland State University and Western Oregon State College remain in a better relative position of funding (as measured by the BAS Model) even after the adjustments for enrollment change and thus are provided funding for their enrollment growth at approximately 40 percent of the resident fees by level.
Eastern Oregon State College was originally funded at a program stabilization level and thus its FTE enrollment increase merely helps to close the gap between the funded and actual enrollment level. Therefore, additional funding is not recommended for the increased enrollments.

Table III provides the Board a mechanism for comparing the effects of three different allocation alternatives on institutional relationships to the funding which will be provided by the BAS Model. The first set of numbers shows the result if the July 22 recommendations regarding the allocation of the $3.4 million cut were compared to what the Model would provide based upon the original enrollment forecast. The second set of numbers shows the effect of continuing the July 22 allocation recommendation, but using the Model driven by revised enrollment forecasts. The third set of numbers displays the current recommendation for allocating budget reductions compared to the dollars which would be provided by the Model using revised enrollment projections. The analysis indicates that each institution is still moving toward the BAS Model in the Chancellor's Recommended Budget Allocation for 1984-85. Institutions above the systemwide average in the July 22, 1983, recommendations are still above the average in the revised recommendations. However, the revised allocations proposed by the Chancellor prevent an institution from improving its relative position when measured against the BAS Model at the expense of another.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>6,259</td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>5,283</td>
<td>14,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 1980-81</td>
<td>5,238</td>
<td>5,177</td>
<td>5,084</td>
<td>15,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1983-84</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>5,064</td>
<td>15,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1985-86</td>
<td>5,177</td>
<td>5,064</td>
<td>5,064</td>
<td>15,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>7,463</td>
<td>7,072</td>
<td>6,466</td>
<td>16,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 1980-81</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td>6,086</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>18,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1983-84</td>
<td>6,409</td>
<td>6,086</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>18,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1985-86</td>
<td>6,086</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>18,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>4,234</td>
<td>3,664</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>11,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 1980-81</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>9,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1983-84</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>9,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1985-86</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>9,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>3,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 1980-81</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>2,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1983-84</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>2,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1985-86</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>2,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>2,337</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>6,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 1980-81</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>5,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1983-84</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>5,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1985-86</td>
<td>1,925</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>5,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>2,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 1980-81</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1983-84</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1985-86</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 1980-81</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1983-84</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1985-86</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Institution Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>22,597</td>
<td>20,943</td>
<td>18,996</td>
<td>62,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 1980-81</td>
<td>18,435</td>
<td>18,435</td>
<td>18,435</td>
<td>55,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised 1983-84</td>
<td>18,435</td>
<td>18,435</td>
<td>18,435</td>
<td>55,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 1985-86</td>
<td>18,435</td>
<td>18,435</td>
<td>18,435</td>
<td>55,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Health Sciences University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dentistry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate **</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technician</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nursing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacc.-Portland</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacc.-La Grande**</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Nurse</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OHSU</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The reduction of 23 students is the result of a reclassification of Dental Non-Degree Graduate Students to Dental Residents-in-Training which are not counted as FTE students for enrollment reporting. The new classification is similar to Medical Residents-in-Training.

** The budgeted figures for 1983-84 and 1984-85 mistakenly reported enrollments in the baccalaureate La Grande program by counting both the student credit hours generated by OHSU faculty teaching courses at EOSC and the student credit hours generated by EOSC faculty teaching general education courses to nursing students at EOSC. The corrected figures displayed in the columns labelled actual 1982-83, revised 1983-84, and revised 1984-85 display only the student FTE resulting from the credit hours generated by OHSU faculty teaching nursing courses at EOSC.
Table III
Comparison of Enrollment Adjustment Proposals
Revised Enrollments
1984-85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Original Enrollments/ July 22 Recommendations</th>
<th>Revised Enrollments/ July 22 Recommendations</th>
<th>Revised Enrollments/ Chancellor Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted Budget/ Adj. BAS % 7 Inst. Average</td>
<td>Adjusted Budget/ Adj. BAS % 7 Inst. Average</td>
<td>Adjusted Budget/ Adj. BAS % 7 Inst. Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$(1,533,837) 81.97 101.75</td>
<td>$(1,533,837) 79.56 101.06</td>
<td>$(1,083,837) 80.21 101.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>-0- 74.38 92.33</td>
<td>-0- 75.44 95.84</td>
<td>(885,000) 74.35 94.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>(1,015,650) 85.36 105.96</td>
<td>(1,015,650) 83.22 105.72</td>
<td>(875,650) 83.53 106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>(262,207) 89.19 110.71</td>
<td>(262,207) 82.80 105.18</td>
<td>(152,207) 83.76 106.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>(343,190) 85.98 106.73</td>
<td>(343,190) 79.48 100.97</td>
<td>(113,190) 80.95 102.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>-0- 85.15 105.70</td>
<td>-0- 81.16 103.10</td>
<td>-0- 81.16 103.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>-0- 80.76 100.25</td>
<td>-0- 73.74 93.68</td>
<td>145,000 74.77 94.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Institutions</td>
<td>80.56 100.00</td>
<td>78.72 100.00</td>
<td>78.80 100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>(190,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>(275,000)</td>
<td>(275,000)</td>
<td>(275,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$(3,429,884)</td>
<td>$(3,429,884)</td>
<td>$(3,429,884)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>PSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1982-83 Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to Base:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Funding of Salaries and Other Payroll Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inflation Adjustments</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Service Credits)</td>
<td>1,512,656</td>
<td>1,406,820</td>
<td>974,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building-UCM</td>
<td>49,228</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Staffing</td>
<td>1,472,297</td>
<td>1,357,820</td>
<td>974,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Programs</td>
<td>497,325</td>
<td>473,738</td>
<td>365,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Economic Development (Memo)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter. Trade &amp; Commerce</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>90,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>110,937</td>
<td>100,719</td>
<td>90,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Salary Supplement</em></td>
<td>110,937</td>
<td>100,719</td>
<td>90,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Enroll./Model Adjustment</em></td>
<td>(760,442)</td>
<td>(503,043)</td>
<td>(398,746)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1983-84 Board Approved Allocation</strong></td>
<td>68,363,616</td>
<td>79,236,400</td>
<td>43,521,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change From 1982-83</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to 1983-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Recommended Allocation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building-UCM</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Enroll./Model Adjustment</em></td>
<td>(1,083,337)</td>
<td>(385,000)</td>
<td>(875,650)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments for Inflation</td>
<td>1,070,746</td>
<td>1,419,821</td>
<td>685,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change from 1983-84</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>.68%</td>
<td>.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$172,792 has been reserved in the Emergency Board for the Water Bureau Building if PSU acquires it in 1984-85.
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Wyss commented that in some instances the enrollments were changed dramatically. He referred specifically to the graduate program in dentistry, the baccalaureate degree in nursing (especially at La Grande), and the graduate program in nursing.

Mr. Lemman indicated these were controlled enrollments. The Chancellor explained that the decision had been made three years ago to reduce enrollments by 20% each in medicine and dentistry and 25% in nursing. The figures shown represent an accumulation of three years of that trend, and enrollments will continue to decrease under these restrictive policies. President Laster was asked to comment further.

President Laster said that as a result of the first major cuts shared with the other institutions, the Oregon Health Sciences University made significant cuts in the undergraduate enrollments in medicine, nursing, and dentistry in order to maintain a faculty-student ratio that even then would be below the norm. The institution took the budget reductions related to those drops in income from tuition. These reductions are additional cuts based on an interpretation of a drop in enrollment based on projections. However, since the institution had never been a part of the enrollment-driven plan of the Department of Higher Education, it had never been important to establish base numbers in this area. The decrease includes a change in status for residents in dentistry from the category of anticipated income-producing students to that of residents. They are no longer listed as students in the same manner that medical residents have not been listed as students. This then appears as a drop in enrollment.

Dr. McGill said the budget figure of graduate students in dentistry showed 28 for 1983-84. The revised figure indicates 5. This is merely a change in the definition and counting. Certain students, such as dentists who have returned for a certificate in a particular specialty, and are the equivalent of the medical residents, are no longer counted as students. There was virtually no tuition loss in counting them in this way because most or all of the tuition has been waived. The other group which changes was the baccalaureate nursing students in La Grande.

Mr. Lemman explained that the figures now represent the FTE of the people who take the course work through the nursing school and the FTE of the coursework taken at La Grande. There is a division of the course work along those lines rather than showing all of the FTE as attributable to nursing.

The Chancellor commented that the staff could explain the details of how all of these figures were calculated for each of the institutions. However, the fact remains that there is a shared adjustment to the base budget of $3.4 million which was not based on enrollments or anything else but was simply an adjustment to meet the budget. The figures presented are the staff’s best judgment of how to share the reductions in order to do the least harm to the State System and to carry out the existing programs. He indicated that all of the institutions were having problems in meeting the reductions.

Mr. Petersen said the statistical information should be accurate and there appeared to be different comparisons used in the report. These should be corrected because people make judgments on the data.

Mr. Lemman agreed that there should be a footnote to clarify the changes. He said there was actually a double counting of the FTE in 1983-84 in that the distinction was not made between Eastern Oregon State College and Oregon Health Sciences University students.

Mr. Wyss said if the enrollment credit or enrollment costs were shifted from one institution to another, that would transfer some of the support between institutions. He asked whether the people who have lost FTE or the people who are required to carry more students without additional support dollars would be the losers in the transfer.
President Laster said that to the degree that this cut was being rationalized on the basis of enrollment, the inclusion of the Oregon Health Sciences University was a change in policy. If it is a meaningful inclusion, then the institution has a substantial amount of work to do. He pointed out that it is difficult to fathom the number of nurses enrolled in nursing because they enter and leave and have varying patterns of behaviour. He said the policy of tying into enrollment-driven budgeting is a new one and would need to be worked out for the future. He said that he understood that a cut was required and had to be allocated to the institutions. He said it was important for the state to know some of the opportunities that were being lost.

The Chancellor said this was not an enrollment-driven budget and if it were, the figures would be very different. It has been influenced by some shift in enrollment from what was predicted last summer and what actually occurred in the fall enrollment. There were actually some significant enrollment shifts and the budget allocations represent some minor shifts from the recommendations made for the allocations and cuts to be made last year. He indicated that the theoretical model of how the funds might be allocated on a formula type of funding had been presented to the Board. This formula funding moved away from an appropriation by FTE or a calculation by FTE or credit hours. As the Board saw at that time, even to achieve equity under that system would have required dramatic shifts and massive reallocations within the State System so a partial step was taken. The reallocations before the Board are another partial step. He indicated that it might be desirable for the Board to schedule a time when the presidents could describe the adjustments that were required.

In response to a question at the conclusion of the budget presentation, the Chancellor and Mr. Lemman indicated that all of the presidents were desperately unhappy and no one was very pleased with the reallocations which were being recommended.

Mr. Petersen said he was sure that every institution could generate a strong argument against the proposed budget but the Board should rely on its staff at this point in terms of the recommendations. The budget reductions were a reality and the proposal is moving toward the model which the Board had established.

Mr. Batiste said it would be helpful to have a clear record from each institution of the impact of these cuts. The Chancellor indicated that institutions had been asked to submit a specific plan for adjusting to the budget and most have been received. It is intended to report to the Board and the Legislature exactly where the cuts were made. He said Table III showed how adjustments were being made toward the percentage average of seven institutions. The Oregon Health Sciences University is a different type of institution and was not included in the seven institutions. The biggest problem is that the percentage is so low that it is inadequate for all of them. These facts will be presented to the Legislature.

Mr. Lemman indicated that there had been some discussion with the Academic Council of the productivity ratios that were being proposed for the model and consensus had been reached. This will enable the staff to move rather rapidly toward completion of the refinement of the model.

Mr. Wyss asked for a further explanation of the 78.8% described as the adjusted budget divided by the adjusted budget allocation system. Mr. Quenzer said the budget allocation system contains comparative data from a number of institutions on a number of different categories. The 78.8% indicates that the State System is at about 80% of where it should be in terms of these comparative institutions.

Mr. Alltucker asked whether the concerns expressed about the budget allocation system in terms of the mechanics of the program had been resolved. The Chancellor said there probably never would be complete agreement but every effort was being made to reach a very close consensus.
Mr. Lemman said initially the institutions were in favor of the concept. The disputes and dissatisfactions were with some of the ratios or productivity numbers. The staff and the institutions either have reached, or are in the process of reaching, a final resolution on these areas of dissatisfaction.

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

Staff Report to the Board

The general fund appropriation for Higher Education adopted during the 1983 session of the State Legislature included $230,000 "to provide solid funding for an International Trade and Commerce Institute to be located at Portland State University (PSU) where it will draw upon and coordinate efforts from the entire State System of Higher Education and the region." The budget note accompanying the appropriation further specified, "It is expected that an advisory committee will be appointed by the president of PSU in consultation with Chancellor Davis, bringing together a group of knowledgeable and practical leaders in trade and commerce who will direct the Institute into the most useful and productive activities possible in furtherance of international trade and commerce for our area."

Portland State University reports that development of the Institute is well underway under the direction of Philip R. Bogue, of the President's staff, who is serving as acting director during this formative period.

The advisory committee has been appointed and has held several meetings. Space has been assigned the Institute on the ground floor of the Ondine, directly across from the University Bookstore. This space is easily accessible to the public with adequate public parking just across the street. Negotiations are underway for the space to be shared with the Portland office of The International Trade Administration, U. S. Department of Commerce.

A nationwide search for a permanent director has been initiated, on criteria developed by the advisory committee. It is expected that the permanent director will be selected and in place this spring.

Progress has been made on the expansion of Portland State University's curricular offerings related to the Institute's activities, specifically, the development of baccalaureate degree programs in international trade in the school of business Administration and International studies in the college of liberal arts and science.

It has been determined that the Institute will concentrate in its early stages on Pacific Rim countries. This will require some expansion of programs and course offerings in Far Eastern languages and area studies. Budgeting for faculty additions in Asian studies and foreign trade to implement program expansion is a high priority of the Institute as it seeks nonstate funds to supplement base funding provided by the Legislative appropriation.

Plans are underway for an expanded program of short courses and seminars designed to carry out the mission of the Institute in the furtherance of international trade and commerce.

The first research project of the Institute, being developed with the cooperation of the staff of the Port of Portland, will concern international tourism. Another major research project, concerned with development of export markets for finished products of the forest products industry, is in discussion stages.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The Board's Staff believes the plans and organization of the Institute are responsive to the Board's procedures for establishment of centers and institutes, as adopted November 25, 1975. It was recommended that the Board authorize establishment of the International Trade and Commerce Institute as described.
Board Discussion and Action

President Blumel said the staff report accurately reflected the status of development of the International Trade Institute at Portland State University. He said the acting director was in Washington, D.C., discussing with the Congressional delegation and others supplementary funding for the Institute. The director also was interviewing candidates for the position of permanent director of the Institute and conferring with people in the International Trade Administration of the Department of Commerce relative to the proposed move of the Portland Office to the Portland State University campus. This move would have great program benefits related to the operation of the Institute. For many years, there has been very close cooperation with that office in the conduct of a variety of seminars and workshops, and that office makes extensive use of student interns. In addition, the move would provide access to major information sources through the TELEX system of that office and the access it provides to embassies around the world.

President Blumel said the activities up to this point involve three areas: (1) The planning for the conduct of extended and expanded seminars and workshops, non-credit, for the business community; (2) the planning and development of academic programs for the institute; and (3) negotiating with major organizations for the conduct of some significant research activities. He indicated the membership of the advisory board required by the instructions in the Budget Note.

In response to a question concerning funds from other sources, Dr. Blumel reported that he did not anticipate any problem with the level of funding that is currently projected, although he could not report specifically on the sources at this time.

Mr. Wyss said it was his recollection that this particular program would be a Systemwide offering even though it was located on the Portland State University Campus with connections through that institution.

President Blumel stated that this had certainly been the intention but there had not been sufficient time for the full development of those programs.

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

Staff Report to the Board

The late Malinda M. Roubinek bequeathed to the Oregon Health Sciences University one-fifth of her estate residue "to be used for eye research and for disease control research." The Oregon Health Sciences University received $20,464.60 from the Roubinek estate and seeks authorization from the Oregon State Board of Higher Education to divide evenly the bequest in order to permit administration of $10,232.30 by the Department of Ophthalmology of the School of Medicine with the remaining $10,232.30 to be placed in a University gift account to advance disease control research.

It is the opinion of University administrators that this proposed division of the funds will serve to satisfy best the intention of the deceased in providing support to these two areas of medicine.

As a result of providing the bequest, the monies will be available as current funds for use in advancing eye research and disease control research. The type of research contemplated will be served more effectively by expending the funds over a shorter period of time than that envisioned in the traditional quasi-endowment method of management whereby interest income is made available over a period of many years.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

IMD 6.140(6) provides that an individual donation or gift in excess of $20,000 is to be treated as a quasi-endowment. With the permission of the Board, such a gift may be treated as a Current Restricted Fund. Under the circumstances of the bequest, President Laster recommended, and the Chancellor concurred, that the Roubinek bequest be designated as a Current Restricted Fund.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

Working through the Oregon State University Foundation, the OSU Beaver Club has sponsored a major fund drive to finance various improvements to Gill Coliseum on the campus in Corvallis, including the net addition of approximately 2,200 seats for spectators at basketball games and other events. Arrangements were made by the sponsors for the professional services of Settecase Smith Doss, Architects, Salem, in the design and cost estimating of the proposed additions and alterations to the building. It is expected that the working drawings and specifications for major portions of the project will be donated to the Board and that Board and institutional officials will be responsible for bidding and contract administration.

Tentatively, the program anticipates that the work would be divided into two principal phases. The first, which is scheduled for completion prior to the 1984-85 basketball season, would include several significant alterations and revisions, such as upgrading the lighting, floor covering, walls and ceilings of the main entrance foyer and corridors, improving the restrooms and concession areas on the main floor, substituting new folding bleacher sections for the present roll-away sections, extending the four corner balconies at the lower balcony level to provide some additional seats, and installing a fire sprinkling system mandated by the fire marshal. By stacking the folding bleacher seats at the perimeter walls, the spaces under the lower balconies on the north and south sides would provide two all-purpose rooms that could be subdivided for group meeting events. These rooms, like the corridor modifications, would be designed with new floor covering, lighting and improved ventilation, etc. By eliminating the existing ticket booths, the main entrance to the building would be modified to provide a more spacious entry and to allow for generous trophy display.

It is expected that the purchase of the new main floor and first balcony (corner) seating would be contracted directly by the Foundation and/or the Beaver Club with the assignment of the contract to the Board as a gift to the University. It is also expected that a separate bid invitation and contract award would be made for the fire suppressing and fire alarm systems throughout the building, including the basement, as required by the State Fire Marshal.

The estimated total expenditure requirements for the Phase I alterations and revisions are approximately $1,667,400. Of this amount, about $326,124 relates to items such as architectural design fees and the seating for the main floor and first balcony which are to be processed directly by the sponsoring organizations.

Phase II, involving the construction of new concrete balconies, corridors and stairwells at the east and west sides of the building, would be programmed for the following year. The estimated expenditure requirements for this phase, including the related fire suppressing and alarm systems for the additions, total approximately $1,502,500. This work would begin in February 1985 and be scheduled for completion prior to the 1985-86 basketball season. It would add seating for about 1,700 spectators at the upper level.
All funding for the proposed work would be provided by the OSU Beaver Club through the Oregon State University Foundation.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the schematic design phase of planning completed by Architects Settecase Smith Doss for the proposed additions and alterations to Gill Coliseum at Oregon State University be approved and that the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning be authorized to accept the construction documents for the project, solicit bids and award contracts for Phases I and II thereof subject to the prior concurrence of the State Emergency Board within tentative expenditure limitations of approximately $1,341,276 and $1,533,780, respectively, as soon as gift funds are received. These amounts exclude items for which disbursements would be handled directly by the sponsoring organizations (principally design fees and seating purchases).

Board Discussion and Action

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

Dr. T. K. Olson, Executive Director of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, said the task forces had made their reports to the Commission. The reports were presented to the advisory committee which had issued its report to the Commission in writing. There will be an oral presentation by the advisory committee, and the Chancellor and President Blake, as well as others, are expected to avail themselves of the opportunity to appear at that time.

Dr. Olson indicated that some of the items on the list which the Board had considered earlier in the meeting were ones that the Commission would consider to be important ones still to be addressed by any staff response to the Commission. He said he thought other items on the list had been addressed by the task forces, but the Board's staff had disagreed with the responses.

Dr. Olson indicated that the staff of the Commission would present a draft of goals and objectives to the Commission in the spring. It will include from the reports of the task forces those things which logically can be grouped into concerns which are of statewide interest. He indicated that there will be a single report in September rather than two separate reports in May and November covering the two segments of education. A final draft will be prepared after the spring presentation and will be sent to the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education and to other interested groups. The Commission anticipates holding a series of forums around the state in which to solicit reactions. The responses will be reviewed and appropriate amendments made to the document. The report will then be submitted to the Legislature as required in the Budget Note.

Dr. Olson expressed appreciation for the extraordinary effort that the Board's staff had made to be in contact with the staff of the Commission. He said collectively it should be possible to develop different perspectives that would enhance the quality of the nature of educational services.

Miss Walling said she supported the Commission's decision to treat education as a whole.

Approval of Crippled Children's Division Request to Emergency Board, OHSU

Staff Report to the Board

The 1983 Legislative Assembly approved the contracting out of certain services for the Health Division of the Department of Human Resources. Subsequently, the Health Division and the Crippled Children's Division have been negotiating a contract whereby the Crippled Children's Division will provide certain of these services which are relevant to the Crippled Children's Division's areas of expertise. The areas in which the Crippled
Children's Division will be providing service deal with metabolic disorders and the development of hearing conservation programs and the treatment of the Health Division clients who are diagnosed to be suffering from hearing impairments.

The Crippled Children's Division budget is financed from three major sources of revenue: the State General Fund, patient fees, and grants and contracts, all placed under expenditure limitation by the Legislature. This request to the Emergency Board is to seek an expenditure limitation increase in the Other Funds (grants and contracts) portion of the budget.

The following is a summary of the services to be provided by the Crippled Children's Division and the budget necessary to provide those services to be financed by the contract with the Health Division of the Department of Human Resources:

1. **Newborn Education**—the development, implementation and monitoring of a statewide program to increase the level of understanding and awareness of parents, the public, and health care providers to encourage the testing of all newborns for PKU and other metabolic disorders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1983-84</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>Biennial Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Amount</strong></td>
<td>$22,399</td>
<td>$30,601</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff FTE</strong></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Metabolic Lab**—the maintenance, supervision, and delivery of special laboratory services essential in the diagnosis, management, and treatment of patients with genetic errors in metabolism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1983-84</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>Biennial Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Amount</strong></td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff FTE</strong></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Metabolic Formula Program**—the purchase and the dispensing of milk substitute diet formula products to patients who have been diagnosed as having metabolic disorders that respond to treatment involving special diet products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1983-84</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>Biennial Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Amount</strong></td>
<td>$34,750</td>
<td>$40,250</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff FTE</strong></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Hearing Conservation Program**—the providing of information, standards, and guidance in the development of hearing conservation programs for Oregon school children, including the conduct of an annual workshop on hearing conservation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1983-84</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>Biennial Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Amount</strong></td>
<td>$66,750</td>
<td>$57,363</td>
<td>$124,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff FTE</strong></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The request to the State Emergency Board will be to increase the Other Fund limitation for the Crippled Children's Division by $287,113 under Section 2(3), Chapter 382, Oregon Laws 1983, so that these services can be provided to the Health Division of the Department of Human Resources.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Crippled Children's Division of the Oregon Health Sciences University be authorized to request of the State Emergency Board an increase of $287,113 in the expenditure limitation for Other Funds, in 1983-1985, so that it will be able to enter into a contract with the Health Division of the Department of Human Resources to provide services dealing with metabolic disorders and the development of hearing conservation programs and treatment of hearing impairments for clients of the Health Division.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendations of officials of Oregon State University, arrangements were made with Brown and Caldwell, Engineers, Eugene, through a supplement to the agreement of August 4, 1981, to provide for assistance in conducting an energy audit and completing a technical assistance study for Langton Hall and the Women's Building on the campus in Corvallis. These studies may be submitted to the Oregon Department of Energy for a grant.

Compensation for the professional services of the Engineers and for reimbursement of related expenses for this additional work will be based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $29,900.

Funds for the energy audits and the technical assistance studies are being provided from institutional resources pending receipt of grant funds.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendations of officials of the University of Oregon, and in accordance with the provisions of OAR 580-50-020, arrangements were made with Balzhiser/Hubbard & Associates, consulting engineers, Eugene, for professional services relating to the proposed replacement of a chiller in the central heating and power plant on the campus in Eugene.

Compensation for the professional services of the Engineers and for reimbursement of related expenses for this work will be based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $17,700.

The planning costs for the proposed chiller replacement are being financed from institutional resources.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Based upon the recommendations of officials of the University of Oregon, and in accordance with the provisions of OAR 580-50-020, arrangements were made with EMC Engineers, Inc., Eugene, for professional services relating to feasibility studies, the preparation of drawings, specifications, cost estimates, and other related mechanical and electrical engineering services applicable to minor maintenance, repair and capital improvement projects on the campus in Eugene.
Compensation for the professional services of the Engineers and for reimbursement of related expenses will be based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $10,000 for the calendar year 1984.

Funds required for these services will be provided from institutional resources.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board accepted the report as presented.

**Staff Report to the Board**

Based upon the recommendations of officials of the University of Oregon, and in accordance with the provisions of OAR 580-50-020, arrangements were made with Balzhiser/Hubbard & Associates, Engineers, Eugene, for professional services relating to conducting studies and preparing reports and financial assistance applications for federal-sponsor energy conservation and management programs.

Compensation for the professional services of the Engineers and for reimbursement of related expenses for these services will be based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $46,000 during the calendar year 1984.

Funds for the consulting services are being provided from balances available to the institution.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board accepted the report as presented.

**Staff Report to the Board**

Based upon the recommendation of officials of the Oregon Health Sciences University, arrangements were made with James D. Graham & Associates, Inc., Portland, through a supplement to their consulting services agreement of October 23, 1978, to provide assistance in the design, bidding and contract administration of the proposed replacement of incandescent lighting with fluorescent lighting within University Hospital South on the campus in Portland.

The estimated direct construction costs for this energy conservation project are approximately $95,000, and the estimated total costs of the project are $121,123. Of this latter amount, $60,561 is expected to be provided by the Department of Energy through the Institutional Buildings Grants program. Expenditure authorization was granted by the State Emergency Board on December 9, 1983, as a component of the 1981-1983 Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects.

Compensation for the professional services of the Engineers and for the reimbursement of related expenses for this additional work will be based upon time and materials, not to exceed a maximum of $7,200.

The planning costs for the proposed lighting replacement project are being financed from resources available to the institution, including the energy grant and matching state funds allocated from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of W. Alan Gold, Consulting Engineer, Portland, for the Medical Research Building Fume Hood Isolation Project on the campus of the Oregon Health Sciences University, were accepted on behalf of the Board. Four bids were received for the work on November 22, 1983, ranging from a low of $151,579 to a high of $210,394. These amounts include three additive alternates which were exercised. Inasmuch as the low bid was within the direct construction cost allowance, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs -
   Markman, Inc., Portland  $151,579
   Professional services fees  15,000
   Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs  38,421
   Contingencies  15,000

Total  $220,000

The estimated total expenditure requirements of $220,000 are $30,000 less than the pre-bid budget reported previously.

In accordance with the design development phase of planning which the Board reviewed and approved on July 22, 1983, the work of the contract includes removing many of the existing fume hoods within the Medical Research Building from the main exhaust system and providing individual exhaust fans located on the roof of the building. This involves connecting the hoods to new exhaust ducts and extending these ducts into the corridor and up through core-drilled holes in the prestressed floor slabs. After the ducts are installed, shaft walls will be constructed around the ducts.

The total expenditure requirements for this project are to be financed from building use credits available to the institution. These resources have been accumulated from indirect cost allowances on instructional and research contracts and grants.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OHSU Medical Research Building Fume Hood Isolation

Engineer - W. Alan Gold, Consulting Engineer, Portland

Board's priority - Part of No. 2 in 1983-1985 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Emergency Board action on August 23, 1983

Estimated total project costs  $220,000
Estimated total direct construction costs  $151,579
Scheduled completion - April 1984

Tentative financing plan:
   Building use credits  $220,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Report of Bids and Contract Award for Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects (Emergency Department Radiology Services), 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 Chilless Nielsen, Portland, for the University Hospital North, Emergency Room Radiology Area Renovation at the Oregon Health Sciences University, were accepted on behalf of the Board. Eight bids were received for the work on November 17, 1983, ranging from a low of $80,140 to a high of $98,423. These amounts include two additive alternates which were exercised. Inasmuch as the low bid was within the direct construction cost allowance, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs</td>
<td>$80,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCartney-Johnson General/Contractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>12,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$116,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimated total expenditure requirements of $116,000 are $4,000 less than the pre-bid budget reported previously.

In accordance with the schematic design phase of planning which the Board reviewed and approved on December 10-11, 1981, and the design development phase of planning reported to the Board on October 21, 1983, the work of the contract includes remodeling and enlarging the existing radiology facilities of the Emergency Department involving an area of about 610 square feet within University Hospital North.

All of the expenditures are to be financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution with debt service to be provided from patient fees. The work is part of the 1981-1983 program for Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects, and specific expenditure authorization was granted by the State Emergency Board on April 30, 1982, and August 23, 1983.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - OHSU Hospital and Clinic Rehabilitation and Alterations Projects (Emergency Department Radiology Services)

Architects - Chilless Nielsen, Portland

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) $116,000

Estimated direct construction costs (this portion only) $80,140

Estimated area to be remodeled - 610 square feet

Scheduled completion - March 1984

Tentative financing plan:
- Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings $116,000

Board Discussion and Action

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

On June 24, 1983, the Board approved the schematic design phase of planning for the Tennis Courts Cover, Rehabilitation and Expansion project on the campus of Portland State University, prepared with the assistance of Architects Yost-Grube-Hall, P.C., Portland. The acceptance of the design development phase of planning for the work was reported to the Board on September 23, 1983.

Based upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the construction documents phase of planning has been accepted on behalf of the Board. Inasmuch as the State Emergency Board granted expenditure authorization on December 9, 1983, the project has been advertised for a bid opening early in February 1984.

The description of the work of this project remains essentially as described to the Board in the June 24 and September 23, 1983, minutes. The four existing tennis courts on the roof of the Health and Physical Education Building would be rebuilt with a safe and playable surface, with new roof covering and lighting, and additional courts would be constructed at grade level adjacent to Shattuck Hall.

The total project budget of $865,000 was authorized by the Legislature as part of the 1983-1985 capital construction program within Chapter 422, Oregon Laws 1983.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - PSU Tennis Courts Cover, Rehabilitation and Expansion
Architects - Yost-Grube-Hall, P.C., Portland
Board's priority - No. 10 in 1983-1985 (Auxiliary Enterprises)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 422, Oregon Laws 1983

Estimated total project costs $865,000

Estimated direct construction costs:
- Cover and rehabilitation of existing courts on roof of Health and Physical Education Building $714,000
- Construction of six surface courts south of Shattuck Hall 74,000

Subtotal $788,000

Less - Adjustments made through modifications to the drawings and specifications or anticipated by exercising bid alternates (41,007)

Net (direct construction cost allowance) $746,993

Tentative schedule:
- Bidding - February 1984
- Completion - September 1984

Tentative financing plan:
- Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $865,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Donal P. Rounds, AIA, Medford, for the initial phase of the remodeling of the Swedenburg House at Southern Oregon State College, were accepted on behalf of the Board. Three bids were received for the work on December 22, 1983, ranging from a low of $6,320 to a high of $9,692. Inasmuch as the low bid was within the estimate and resources were available for the work, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs:
- Drake's Wallcovering & Painting Service, Medford $6,320
- Reserved for future work $295,860
Subtotal $302,180

Professional services fees $35,355
Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs $15,394
Works of art $3,022
Contingencies $24,174

Total $380,125

In accordance with the schematic design phase of planning which the Board reviewed and approved on December 16, 1983, the initial phase of the work includes removing existing finishes on the interior of the building in preparation for the application of new paint and wall coverings.

Portions of the initial phase of work are to be financed from a grant from the State Historic Preservation Office within the Parks Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation. Matching funds are to be provided from gifts.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - SOSC Swedenburg House Remodel
Architect - Donal P. Rounds, AIA, Medford
Board's priority - No. 30 in 1983-1985 (Educational and General Plant)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 422, Oregon Laws 1983

Estimated total project costs $380,125

Estimated direct construction costs:
- This portion only $6,320
- Reserved for future work $295,860

Scheduled completion (this portion only) - January 31, 1984

Tentative schedule for major remodel:
- Bidding - Spring 1984
- Completion - Fall 1984

Tentative financing plan:
- Federal Jobs Bill grant through State Historic Preservation Office $40,125
- Other gifts and grants 340,000

Total $380,125

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

Report of Appointment of Architects for Recreation Facilities (All-weather Track and Tennis Courts), OIT

Based upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon Institute of Technology, and in accordance with the provisions of OAR 580-50-020, arrangements were made with Athletic Facilities Consultants, Inc., a division of Gordon, Beard, Grimes, Bahls & Domreis, Architects, Portland, for professional services relating to the design and contract administration of proposed Recreation Facilities (All-weather Track and Tennis Courts) on the campus in Klamath Falls. Authorizations for these two projects were approved by the Board and the 1983 Legislature with expenditure limitations of $275,000 for the All-weather Track and $365,000 for the Tennis Courts, including tentative estimates of $220,000 and $295,000, respectively, for the direct construction costs.

Compensation for the professional services of the Architects and for reimbursement of related expenses for this work will be based upon time and materials not to exceed a maximum of $42,553.

Funds for the planning are being provided from balances available for auxiliary enterprises, such as excess sinking fund reserves from commingled student building fees.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Report on Student Housing Fall Term 1983

In further response to the Board’s request in 1967 for an annual report of student housing, a study has been prepared for the Fall Term 1983. Data for the study were obtained from the Auxiliary Enterprise Housing Occupancy Report of the Controller’s Division and from information provided by the staff of Portland State University, reflecting conditions at the close of the fourth week of classes. Data on residence hall capacities and occupancies were obtained for all eight institutions. However, data on family dwelling units were obtained only from Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon State University, Southern Oregon State College, and the University of Oregon.

Residential facilities at Portland State University are leased to Portland Student Services, Inc., a non-profit corporation. Family dwelling units are not owned and operated now by the other institutions within the State System of Higher Education.

The arrangement of the data and the tables within the report are similar to those within the format reviewed and approved by the Board at its April 23, 1982, meeting. The tables for the Fall Term 1983 identify (a) where students live, (b) the capacities and occupancies of residence halls, cooperative houses, permanent housing for students with families, other housing for students with or without families and miscellaneous other housing, and (c) student enrollments analyzed by academic level.

Some of the main features of the Fall Term 1983 report may be summarized as follows:

Where Students Live

1. The eight institutions provided housing accommodations for 10,833 students, or 18.5% of the total headcount enrollment of 58,634 at the end of the fourth week of classes. This 18.5% figure was comprised of 16.1% within single student housing, 1.3% within permanent housing for students with families and 1.1% in other housing. (See Table 1).

2. The number of students living in institutionally-owned housing decreased 268 students, while the Fall Term 1983 headcount enrollment of 58,634 was down 308 from the total of 58,942 for the Fall Term 1982.
3. Of the total headcount enrollment of 58,634 in the Fall Term 1983, 47,801 students (81.5%) were living in private homes, apartments, fraternities, sororities, etc. (See Table I). In the report for Fall Term 1982, the comparable figures were 47,343 and 81.2%, respectively.

4. Table III, Residence Hall Occupancy By Student Class Level, indicates that about half of the spaces are occupied by freshmen (4,881) an increase of 227 over Fall 1982 with smaller numbers in each of the succeeding class levels.

Housing Capacity

5. Institutionally-owned housing facilities could accommodate a total of 13,987 students at the eight institutions with the State System. This total includes a capacity of 12,402 spaces for students in permanent residence halls and cooperative houses. (See Table II).

6. Seven hundred seventy of the 780 family dwelling units which were constructed or acquired specifically to accommodate students were occupied. (See Tables I and II).

7. Of the grand total of 998 family dwelling units that were available on four campuses during the Fall Term 1983, shown in Table II as "Permanent housing for students w/family" and as "Other housing," 518 (51.9%) were constructed within the last twentytwo years. At Oregon State University, the 94 apartments in Orchard Court were completed for occupancy in 1961 and 1963. At the University of Oregon, the 408 apartments in Westmoreland Village were completed for occupancy in 1960 to 1964. At Eastern Oregon State College, 16 apartments were completed for occupancy in 1962. All of these are in good condition.

8. The remaining 480 family dwelling units available consisted primarily of war surplus buildings obtained from the federal government or residences of varying ages and conditions acquired with property within the campus boundaries of the institutions. The war surplus housing, which is in fair to good condition, has varying life expectancies dependent upon the upkeep, condition and future need for such housing. At Eastern Oregon State College, some of these units are scheduled for removal soon. "Other housing" includes miscellaneous dwelling units at Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon State University, Southern Oregon State College, and the University of Oregon which are in fair to excellent condition and will be retained subject to their condition, the need for the land and the use of the structures for housing or other purposes.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Gill asked about the general financial condition of the student housing services with the recent declines in enrollments. Mr. Lemman said most of the housing directors were optimistic about their being able to live within the budgets that are adjusted to meet the current levels of occupancy. All of this information will be provided at the time the board and room charges are presented to the Board. It was also indicated that the facilities are being maintained because there is more flexibility with respect to funding in the case of auxiliary enterprise facilities than there is for the educational and general plan facilities.

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

REPORT ON STUDENT HOUSING FOR FALL TERM 1983

The attached exhibits have been prepared in response to the request of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education for an annual report on student housing, including various categories of housing for students with and without families.* Data for the Fall Term 1983 study were obtained from the Auxiliary Enterprise Housing Occupancy Report by the Controller's Division and from Portland State University, reflecting conditions at the close of the fourth week of classes.

The arrangement of data within the current report is similar to 1982 with most of the data derived from the Controller's Division Report. It includes an analysis of student enrollments, housing capacities and occupancies, as follows:

TABLE

I. Summary Analysis of Where Students Live

II. Summary Analysis of Student Housing Capacities

III. Analysis of Head-Count Enrollment and Residence Hall Occupancy by Student Class Level

### TABLE I
SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF WHERE STUDENTS LIVE
FALL TERM 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancies:</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>Sub-totals</th>
<th>CHSU</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within institutionally owned facilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>5201</td>
<td>4,227</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>10,722</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In residence halls@</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>5201</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>224*</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>8,949</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>9,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperative housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In permanent housing for students w/family</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other housing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>452*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (Headcount enrollment)</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>11,892</td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td>11,973</td>
<td>15,821</td>
<td>2,161</td>
<td>46,644</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>47,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage analysis of occupancies:
Within institutionally owned facilities:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>21.7%</th>
<th>20.7%</th>
<th>26.2%</th>
<th>20.4%</th>
<th>22.6%</th>
<th>4.7%</th>
<th>19.9%</th>
<th>18.7%</th>
<th>8.8%</th>
<th>18.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In residence halls &amp; cooperatives</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In permanent housing for students w/family</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other housing</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within privately owned facilities</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I indicates that during the Fall Term 1983, institutions within the State System provided housing accommodations for 10,833 students, or 18.5 percent of the 58,634 students who were enrolled at the close of the fourth week of classes. This 18.5 percent was comprised of 16.1 percent within residence halls and cooperatives, 1.3 percent in permanent housing primarily for students with families and 1.1 percent within other housing, principally for students with families.

Of the total headcount enrollment of 58,634 students in the Fall Term 1983, 47,801 or 81.5 percent were living in private homes, apartments, fraternities, sororities and private cooperatives. The comparable figure for 1982 was 47,843 or 81.2 percent of the total enrollment of 58,942 that term.

@ Understated at EOSC, WOSC, OSU, SOSC and UO about one percent inasmuch as Resident Assistants are not included.

! Includes 30 in Arbuthnot Hall which is occupied by the Oregon Police Academy.

* For PSU, the 224 occupancies represent residents within the Ondine and the 452 occupancies represent those housed in apartments and sleeping rooms, all institutionally owned facilities leased to Portland Student Services, Inc.
TABLE II

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STUDENT HOUSING CAPACITIES - FALL TERM 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated capacities of institutionally owned facilities:</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence halls</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>4,487</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>576!</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>11,854</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative houses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent housing for students w/family</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other housing for students w/ family or wo/family</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other housing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>4,141</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>13,817</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>13,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total headcount enrollment</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>16,119</td>
<td>4,319</td>
<td>15,478</td>
<td>14,497</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>57,366</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>58,634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of enrollment which could be accommodated within institutionally owned residence halls and cooperatives

36.0% 30.8% 30.2% 33.9% 21.8% 4.0% 20.6% 21.3% 13.4% 21.2%

Occupancy of institutionally owned residence halls and cooperatives

342 520 4,098 823 2,738 224! 537 9,282 111 9,393

Percentage occupancy of rated capacity

85.5% 67.1% 84.2% 56.3% 81.2% 38.9% 96.6% 75.9% 65.3% 75.7%

 Marketable capacities of institutionally owned residence halls and cooperatives

378 696 4,727 1,115* 2,981 288! 544 10,867 170 11,037

Percentage occupancy of marketable capacity

90.5% 74.7% 86.7% 73.8% 91.8% 77.8% 98.7% 85.4% 65.3% 85.1%
Table II indicates that during the Fall Term 1983, there was a rated capacity of 12,402 students within institutionally owned residence halls and cooperative houses.

Exclusive of Portland State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University, the percentage of students who could be housed within institutionally owned residence halls and cooperatives varied from a high of 36.0 percent at Eastern Oregon State College to a low of 20.6 percent at Oregon Institute of Technology.

Age, Condition and Notes on Life Expectancy of Family Dwelling Units

Of the grand total of 998 family dwelling units that were available on four campuses during the Fall Term 1983, shown in the Table as "Permanent housing for students w/family" and "Other housing", 518 (51.9%) were completed within the last twenty-two years. At Oregon State University, the 94 apartments in Orchard Court were completed for occupancy in 1961 and 1963. At the University of Oregon, the 408 apartments in Westmoreland Village were completed for occupancy in 1960 to 1964. At Eastern Oregon State College, 16 apartments were completed for occupancy in 1962. All of these are in good condition.

Other permanent family housing complexes, including 17 units within the old portion of EOCene Court at Eastern Oregon State College and 245 units within the Amazon Apartments at the University of Oregon, are war surplus buildings obtained from the federal government. These have a life expectancy dependent upon upkeep, condition and need for housing.

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

For PSU, the capacity of the Ondine is listed in the permanent residence halls category and the capacities of nine other residential buildings leased to Portland Student Services, Inc., a non-profit corporation, are shown under other housing for students with family or without family.

Understated at EOSC, WOSC, OSU, SOSC and UO about one percent inasmuch as Resident Assistants are not included.

Siskiyou residence hall is being used to provide housing for students in extension short courses.
### TABLE III
ANALYSIS OF HEAD-COUNT ENROLLMENT AND RESIDENCE HALL OCCUPANCY BY STUDENT CLASS LEVEL
FALL TERM 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of students enrolled by class level:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>3,577</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,867</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>10,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>12,146</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>9,688</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>9,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>12,205</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>16,119</td>
<td>4,319</td>
<td>15,478</td>
<td>14,497</td>
<td>2,698</td>
<td>57,366</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>58,634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |      |      |       |       |      |      |      |           |       |        |
| **Total number of students enrolled in Fall Term 1982** | 1,678| 2,478| 16,742| 4,116 | 15,405| 14,449| 2,650| 57,518    | 1,424 | 58,942 |

|                      |      |      |       |       |      |      |      |           |       |        |
| Residence hall occupancy by class level: |      |      |       |       |      |      |      |           |       |        |
| Graduate students   | 2    | 7    | 74    | .3    | 115  | -    | -    | 201       | 6     | 207    |
| Seniors             | 20   | 23   | 351   | 18    | 132  | -    | 29   | 573       | 281   | 601    |
| Juniors             | 58   | 59   | 545   | 91    | 210  | -    | 76   | 1,039     | 251   | 1,064  |
| Sophomores          | 66   | 82   | 984   | 145   | 415  | -    | 117  | 1,809     | 301   | 1,839  |
| Freshmen            | 196  | 319  | 1,754 | 540   | 1,756| -    | 307  | 4,872     | 91    | 4,881  |
| Special             | 60   | 57   | 26    | 110   | -    | 8    | 231  | 13        | 244   |        |
| Not classified       | -    | -    | -     | -     | -    | -    | 224  | -         | -     | 224    |
| **Totals**          | 342  | 520  | 3,765 | 823   | 2,738| 224  | 537  | 8,949     | 111   | 9,060  |

| Residence hall occupancy in Fall Term 1982 | 279 | 459 | 4,114 | 814 | 2,692 | 279 | 542 | 9,179 | 142 | 9,321 |

**Comments on Table III**

Table III has been prepared to analyze the student headcount enrollment in each class level (year of academic standing) living in institutionally owned residence halls. For comparison, summary data are also shown for Fall Term 1982.

© Includes all professional program students normally enrolled following completion of an undergraduate degree.
* Students registered in undergraduate programs including those in Medical Technology, Dental Hygienist and the RN program in nursing.
! Includes students in professional programs.
Mr. Alltucker reported that he and Dr. Pierce had been in touch with the heads of all of the public and private institutions and their staffs. In summarizing their responses to questions, Mr. Alltucker said there were three categories of ideas that seemed to answer the question of what is the purpose of education. The first was to help as many Oregonians as possible to develop their maximum potential. A second concept was to help as many Oregonians as possible to become participating and contributing citizens in the society in which they live. The third was to pass the cultural and collective wisdom of the past to the next generation. These purposes would then lead to the questions of what understandings and skills the graduates should have in order to fulfill these purposes, what sort of institutions and what sort of organizational structures will be required to provide the necessary services, where should the institutions be, and what will be the cost.

In analyzing the first purpose, the responses seemed to equate the national strength with the sum of the strength of the individuals. Consequently, if individuals reach their maximum potential, the purpose is in tune with our society. The second purpose of becoming participating and contributing citizens means that individuals will put in more than they take out of society. At some point they must be prepared to earn a living and to live in their environment. Finally, to pass on the cultural and collective understanding assumes that there is something worthy of continuation. All of this, then, leads to questions about information processing, curriculum, quality, standards, size of institutions, access, and resources. Mr. Alltucker said the information will be compiled in a suitable format for presentation to the Board.

Mr. Wyss reported that the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs had considered two topics. The first was a continuation of the Committee's efforts to reach some recommendations to the Board about how academic computing questions could be handled in the future. The second dealt with the impact of technology on the library system.

In connection with the library report, it was stated that the greatest impact of computers on library systems had been in the administrative area and most of the actual work has been accomplished in compiling a computerized card catalogue of volumes currently available in the State System. It is expected that ways will be found to provide greater access to data and to deliver it between institutions and to scholars and researchers who need the material. The process is very expensive.

Mr. Wyss said the Committee then considered further the impact of computers on all of the institutions. The first group of questions had to do with how to support the baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral programs in computer science. The second group of questions involved the use of computers within disciplines, and the third was how to address the need for all students to have basic computer literacy. There was a final question on what to do about faculties to help them familiarize themselves with the computer so that they can teach in a more effective way.

Mrs. Flanagan said there had been a meeting of the Joint Committee on Teacher Education which was attended by the new committee members. In 1982, the committee issued a report entitled, "Toward Excellence in Oregon Education," which contained recommendations to improve preparation of teachers and administrators, inservice training, school environment, and the coordination of these areas. The individual boards were assigned the responsibilities for implementing these recommendations. The committee has continued to meet and monitor the implementation of the recommendations.

Mrs. Flanagan said a progress report was presented at the most recent meeting. The deans of the schools of education at the University of Oregon and Portland State University made presentations which were very informative on their teacher education programs.

The Committee decided to move away from monitoring the implementation of the recommendations and to establish its own task force to develop suggestions and recommendations for the consideration of the committee. The next meeting will be at Southern Oregon State College in May.
Incidental Fee
Recommendations

Miss Walling reported that the negotiations between the Oregon Student
Lobby and the Chancellor's Office were continuing. The two groups are
preparing recommended processes for the incidental fee recommendation
procedure.

Presidential
Search, OSU

Mr. Wyss requested the Chancellor to report on the status of the presidential
search at Oregon State University. The Chancellor indicated the list of can­
didates had been reduced to the point that interviews will begin in February
and should be concluded by the first week in March. It is expected that
there will be three to six candidates for the Board to interview. The
Chancellor suggested that Board members consider how they would prefer to
schedule the Board interviews with the finalists.

Mr. Wyss said if the search moves according to schedule, it might be desirable
to hold the interviews on the Thursday and Friday of the March Board
meeting.

Mr. Alltucker questioned whether the Board or the Chancellor should make
the choice. He said the statutes require that the Board approve the
selection of a president but do not say that the Board must make the choice.

There was some discussion of this proposal. The Chancellor said he was
very comfortable with the present process in which the candidates were
evaluated on the campus and recommendations made to the search committee
and forwarded to the Chancellor and the Board. He said at the time of the
Board interviews, he would be willing to submit his evaluation along with
any appropriate recommendations. He said the Board is ultimately responsible
for the selection and this is a way of sharing the evaluation and recommendations
with the Board.

Mr. Harms commented that another consideration is that potential presidents
have been used to working with a Board of Regents and the interview
process is an opportunity for them to meet the only Board they will have.

OREGONIAN
Editorial

Mr. Harms referred to the editorial in the Oregonian which stated that the
advertising campaign of the University of Oregon threatened the cooperation
designed to avoid undue duplication. He said while many things have
threatened a unified, cooperative approach to the governance and administration
of higher education in Oregon as a System, he did not consider the
800-Be-A-Duck advertising series to be one of the serious threats to that
as the editorial seemed to suggest. The advertisements are sponsored by
the University of Oregon Foundation and are not paid for by the University
of Oregon or with public funds. He indicated that all of the programs
which he had seen related to areas of excellence and advised of advantages
at the University of Oregon. The campaign appeared to be aimed at trying
to keep students in Oregon who might otherwise go out of state. They
were an innovative and informative marketing approach to enrollment declines.
If public information on the strength and virtues of an institution is viewed
as destructively divisive, certainly that criticism could be leveled at the
major portion of the alumni and foundation activities at all of the institutions.

Mr. Alltucker said if these activities at the University of Oregon encouraged
some of the other groups to inform the citizens of their activities, it would
be beneficial.

Next Meeting

Mr. Wyss said the next regular Board meeting would be held February 24, 1984,
on the campus of the University of Oregon. There was some discussion of an
appropriate time to have a presentation on engineering education in the
Portland area. It was tentatively agreed that there would be a Committee of
the Whole meeting on the Thursday evening before the Board meeting:
However, the staff was instructed to confer with the persons concerned
and to schedule the Committee presentation appropriately.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

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