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Meeting #544

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Gold Room, Arnold Dining Hall, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m., January 16, 1987, by the President of the Board, Mr. James C. Petersen, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert R. Adams
Mr. John W. Alltucker
Mr. Gene Chao
Mr. F. David Crowell
Mr. Richard F. Hensley
Mr. Michael W. Hermens

Mrs. Janet S. Nelson
Mr. Louis B. Perry
Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.
Miss Mildred A. Schwab
Mr. James C. Petersen

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor William E. Davis; Secretary Wilma L. Foster; W. T. Lemman, Executive Vice Chancellor; Lawrence C. Pierce, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Wil Post, Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Policies; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; W. C. Neland, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; James Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Virginia Boushey, Assistant to Executive Vice Chancellor; Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer; J. Richard Pizzo, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services, Academic Affairs; Kay Juran, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Roger Olsen, Director, OCATE; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications, Public Affairs; Kimberly Carnegie, Secretary, Public Affairs.

Oregon State University--President John Byrne; Graham Spanier, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; L. Edwin Coate, Vice President for Finance and Administration; J. R. Davis, Director of Special Programs; Gary Tiedeman, Chairman, Sociology Department; Sally Malueg, President, Faculty Senate; Richard Ohvall, Dean, College of Pharmacy; George H. Constantine, Associate Dean, College of Pharmacy; Douglass Stennett, Associate Professor, College of Pharmacy.
University of Oregon--President Paul Olum; Richard J. Hill, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President for Administration.

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Leonard Laster; Peter Wollstein, Interim Vice President, Finance and Administration.

Portland State University--Margaret J. Dobson, Executive Vice President; Roger Edgington, Vice President for Finance and Administration.

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

Oregon Institute of Technology--John H. Smith, Dean of Administration.

Southern Oregon State College--Interim President Ernest E. Etlich; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration; Sheldon Rio, Interim Dean, Academic Affairs.

Western Oregon State College--President Richard Meyers; Bill Cowart, Provost; Bill Neifert, Dean of Administration.

Others--Sherry Oeser, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Nick Van Vleet, President, Associated Students, Oregon State University; T. K. Olson, Executive Director, and Bernard Saalfeld, Staff Member, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Whitney Bates, President, Oregon Conference, American Association of University Professors.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular session held on December 19, 1986, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, Schwab, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

Introduction

For the past six years, State System institutions and the State Board have discussed the early semester issue. In November, the Board's President received the following resolution from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate:

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate recommends that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education come to a timely decision concerning the quarter-semester issue; that such
decision whatever it be, place the matter at rest for the foreseeable future; and that if the decision is to change to the semester system that the change take effect in the academic year 1989-90.

The minutes of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate meeting explained that "the object of the resolution is to demonstrate to the Board that a continual discussion of the proposal leads to a certain amount of pedagogical turmoil in terms of curricular changes. If we are going to move to a new system we prefer to do it as quickly as possible. The resolution is in no way designed to make a statement of support for either system."

The Board reviewed the arguments for an early semester system at its retreat on November 20, 1986, and directed the staff to prepare a proposal to adopt an early semester calendar effective 1989-90. The Board further directed the staff to discuss the proposal with the Academic Council in December and then present it to the Board's Committee on Instruction and the Board in January 1987.

Review of Board Actions

The State System has operated under a quarter system since it was established in 1932. This system includes three quarters of ten weeks in the regular term, with a variable-length term in the summer, usually amounting to an eight-week session. The fall quarter begins in late September and the Spring term ends around the middle of June.

A common calendar for the System was explicitly called for in March 1972 when the University of Oregon was authorized to move its Law School to an early semester schedule. In granting such authorization the Board said:

The University will not be permitted to move unilaterally toward adoption of the semester calendar for the institution as a whole. Any such movement must be a part of a statewide adoption of the semester calendar, including the institutions of the State System and the community colleges.

In October 1980, the Board changed its policy on a common academic calendar. It stated that it would consider an institutional request for a different academic calendar if the institution could demonstrate that the proposed calendar: would provide as many days of instruction as the System's traditional three-term academic-year calendar, was in the educational best interest of the institution's students, was cost effective, and would not create insurmountable transfer problems.
In September 1982, the Board voted 5 to 3 to retain the 1980 policy on considering individual requests for a change of academic calendar.

The last action of the Board came on April 22, 1983, when the Board defeated -- on a tie vote -- a request by the University of Oregon for authorization to move to a semester calendar in 1985-86. A primary concern at the time was whether such a change should be made by a single institution or the entire system.

The early semester question was discussed again at the Board's retreat in 1984 and most recently at the Board's retreat in November 1986.

National Trends

During the last fifteen years, an increasing number of higher education institutions across the country have adopted an early semester calendar. The early semester calendar typically has two fifteen-week regular terms followed by a summer session operated either as one or two terms. The first semester begins around Labor Day and the second semester ends around the middle of May.

As of 1986-87, 54% of higher education institutions in the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers study reported having an early system calendar, 25% a quarter system calendar. The remaining 21% have another calendar, such as the 4-1-4 calendar. It is estimated that over 65% of the college students in the United States are currently enrolled in early semester programs.

The arguments for the early semester calendar are well known:

- The quality of instruction and research is improved by the longer exposure to each subject. More emphasis is given to the depth of the curriculum than to its breadth. Students have more time to focus on library research and writing projects, an increasingly more important component of the national effort to improve undergraduate education.

- The amount of effective instructional time is increased by eliminating one registration period, one dead week, and one examination's week.

- Administrative costs are reduced by eliminating a registration and examination cycle.

- Student costs are reduced by eliminating one round of book purchases.
Student transfers and scholarly communications are improved by bringing the State System's academic calendar into conformity with the majority of higher education institutions in the United States.

The early semester calendar gives students a better chance of finding summer employment.

It gives faculty members more time for course preparation between terms and for professional scholarship and research.

The advantages claimed for the quarter system cluster around its flexibility:

- Students experience more courses and faculty members.
- Non-traditional students can enter and leave higher education programs more frequently.
- The later starting date allows some students to keep working in agricultural and tourist jobs in September.

Institutional Perspectives

In general, the Oregon State System of Higher Education faculty members and students are divided on the issue. This is not only true in Oregon but in almost every place where institutions have changed academic calendars.

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, which was asked to study the calendar issue after the Board's 1983 tie vote, has not taken a position on the matter. It concluded that the academic calendar is primarily an institutional rather than a system concern.

A recent telephone survey of academic deans and vice presidents again produced divided results. Eastern Oregon State College and the University of Oregon strongly favor the early semester system. The faculty at Portland State University lean toward the change, but President Sicuro opposes it. Oregon State University and Western Oregon State College are lukewarm about the change but would acquiesce if the change were made systemwide. Southern Oregon State College and the Oregon Institute of Technology favor retaining the quarter system. The Oregon Health Sciences University already operates on a twelve-month calendar and would not be affected by a change.
The Review Process

Since the discussion at the Board's retreat, conversion to an early semester system has been discussed by the Academic Council, the Presidents Council, and briefly, by the community college presidents. In each group opinions vary from open support to reluctant acceptance. There is relatively little opposition to the early semester calendar; most of the concerns center on problems of conversion. The questions most frequently raised are the following:

1. Have we considered all of the implications of changing to an early semester system? Shouldn't we spend more time discussing these implications before making a decision?

2. Is two and a half years enough time to make the change?

3. Who will pay the costs of conversion? Should faculty and/or campus administrators be given extra pay for the extra work that will be required?

4. How much coordination should take place among the campuses in designing the new semester curriculum?

5. How should the transition be coordinated?

In general, staff believes that most of these questions have been satisfactorily addressed. There are many ramifications of a change to an early semester system. We have not addressed them all, but we are not alone in facing them. Many institutions have made the change and administrators who have been through the process say that the problems are manageable.

Two and a half years seems to be an adequate time to make the change. Most of the work will take place during the two summer sessions in 1987 and 1988. Institutions could take longer to make the change, but again, those who have been through a conversion say that two years is adequate.

Conversion to an early semester calendar will require faculty to reorganize courses and administrators to change registration, personnel, and other administrative systems. Someone will have to be appointed on each campus to work with the Chancellor's Office to resolve systemwide issues. All of these activities will be time consuming, and a case can be made that resources be found to provide at least summer stipends for the campus coordinators who have to work with the Chancellor's Office.
Campuses should be given considerable discretion in how they reorganize their curricula. We probably need to agree on beginning and ending dates of each term and have some general understanding about course numbers and general education requirements. We will also have to work closely with the community colleges to protect (and hopefully improve) current articulation agreements.

The Office of Academic Affairs will oversee the conversion to the early semester system. The major work, however, will occur on each campus. The Chancellor's Office will do what it can to facilitate the changes and make sure that there is adequate coordination between campuses and with other higher education institutions in the state.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the entire State System adopt an early semester academic calendar effective Fall Term 1989.

To facilitate the conversion to an early semester calendar, the staff recommends the following steps be followed:

1. The major responsibility for the conversion to an early semester calendar should be delegated to each campus.

2. The chairperson of each Campus Conversion Committee should be a member of an Interinstitutional Committee on Semester Conversion. This interinstitutional committee, to be chaired by the Office of Academic Affairs, should resolve issues needing systemwide coordination. Working with the Academic Council, the interinstitutional committee should establish guidelines for the semester conversion. Representatives of the public schools and community colleges should be asked to meet with the interinstitutional committee when issues involving those groups are being discussed.

3. A strong effort should be made to coordinate the conversion to a semester calendar with the implementation of a new student information system and the new foreign language requirement.

4. The Board's Committee on Instruction should be kept apprised of the progress and problems encountered in converting to a semester calendar.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

At the request of Mr. Hensley, Dr. Pierce summarized the staff report. He said the change to the semester system had been discussed on many occasions and it was an important educational decision. The proposed action would be an opportunity for the Board to take an action that would substantially improve education for Oregon students and the Oregon institutions of higher education.

The Chancellor said he had long favored the semester system and had been in two institutions that had converted from the quarter to the semester system. Throughout the nation, 60% of the institutions and most of the major universities have returned to the semester system. He said the economies of time and educational effort were obvious because there would be one less startup and one less examination period during the year. There would be more hours in which to organize the course. The professor and students would have an opportunity to know each other better. He indicated the proposal still provided flexibility for short courses and exceptions would be made as they are now. He said the State System was in the midst of major reform in several different areas. It is hoped it will be possible to bring to a culmination a policy decision on the Total Information System. There have been long-term efforts in terms of standardizing, reviewing, and reorganizing the general lower-division requirements for baccalaureate degrees and trying to find some consistency within the seven institutions in order to articulate better the transfer of students from the community colleges and other institutions. He said one of the greatest benefits from the change probably would be the opportunity for the seven institutions in the State System concerned with baccalaureate degrees to review, analyze, and restructure the existing curriculum with particular emphasis on those courses that make up the general requirements on the lower-division level, to develop policy for those general requirements, and to analyze and distribute the workload among faculty. All of these things coming together at the same time would mark the greatest educational reform in higher education since the establishment of the State System. He said the change can have some very exciting results and will involve a lot of planning, a lot of activity, and a lot of consultation. The leadership is available within the faculty and the student body to do this effectively and well. The Chancellor said he was enthusiastic about the proposal because the State System had a real opportunity in the implementation of the change to the semester system.

Mr. Hensley then invited the presidents of the institutions to comment on the proposal.
President Gilbert said there had been extensive discussions on the campus of Eastern Oregon State College during the past two or three years. Comments were solicited from faculty, students, and staff. These discussions culminated in a vote in the College Assembly which overwhelmingly favored the early semester system.

Dr. Margaret Dobson, Executive Vice President, said the situation at Portland State University was very similar. The educational policies committee was assigned an in-depth study of the semester system proposal and reported to the president that there was strong support for the shift. Student opinion is mixed. There are some concerns at Portland State University relative to the timing of the shift in consort with the Total Information System and relative to the costs for changing to the semester system. It is recognized there will be savings, and the benefits appear to outweigh the disadvantages. There are also concerns about the articulation with community colleges and private institutions and with the transfer programs.

In response to a question concerning discussions with community college presidents in the Portland area about their willingness to work on a semester system, Dr. Dobson said Portland State University had the personal support of the community college presidents in the Portland metropolitan area.

President Byrne said his experience before coming to Oregon State University had been under the semester system and his first task as a faculty member at Oregon State had been to divide the course materials into three pieces rather than two. It did not seem to make any difference how the course was divided.

President Byrne said there were a number of questions which should be addressed and a basic question is whether they should be addressed before or after the decision is made to go to the semester system. One involves the timing for making the transfer, and it should be assessed in a realistic fashion. The impact on the accreditation of professional programs must be considered in terms of whether new accreditation will be required. The cost must be considered together with the source for the necessary resources. President Byrne said Oregon State University could accept whatever decision was made. He indicated also that it had been his intention since becoming president to review the entire educational program of the institution and revise it as appropriate.
President Meyers distributed a compilation of the pros and cons related to the semester versus the quarter systems. The faculty at Western Oregon State College was involved in a discussion of this issue. By a very slim majority, it voted to retain the quarter system. He said personally he supported the semester system. It is a better administrative unit to have fewer registrations, and there is an opportunity for more in-depth study in some of the academic disciplines. He urged that sufficient time be allowed for implementing the change to permit an orderly transition and to obtain the necessary accreditations, particularly in teacher education.

President Olum said the faculty at the University of Oregon had expressed strong support for the semester system over the quarter system. Those who favored the semester system were divided with respect to the early or traditional semester system. He said there were a number of reasons for the semester system but the primary reason was the academic one in order to permit instruction at some reasonable level of intellectual depth and to have the opportunity to write papers and do something of some substance. This cannot be accomplished under the quarter system in many instances. The division of the subject matter can be made in either case, but the opportunity to get the whole class together and teach at some sufficient level of depth of understanding is better in the semester system.

President Ettlich said faculty and students at Southern Oregon State College do not support going to the early semester plan although they would move quickly and expeditiously to the early semester if that should be the choice of the Board. There was some concern on the part of the three community colleges in the region that they had not been consulted adequately. One of the presidents was strongly supportive of the shift and two questioned it. Dr. Ettlich said the change would facilitate student and faculty exchanges with other institutions since the majority of the schools are on the semester basis. He said the value of the calendar change was not in the mechanics of the calendar but in the curricular reform, and he urged the Board not to hurry the implementation to the point where the curricular reform could not take place. He said he would hope there would be time for the departmental faculties to consider thoroughly and carefully the state of their professions and design curricula that reflect the current state of their professions and the students' needs.

Dr. Ettlich pointed out the change was not an isolated action and should be coordinated with the implementation of the Total Information System. He suggested that the change be made in the fall of 1990 rather than in 1989, noting that the 1990 implementation would require completion of the entire curricular review, the catalogue, and the course schedule by the fall of 1989.
This suggestion was not intended as delay but as an opportunity to accomplish a series of items that would require that amount of time. He concluded by saying there was an opportunity in the calendar change to make curricular reforms and to be able to say to the citizens of Oregon that the State System had looked at each course and curriculum in the undergraduate programs and the institutions were offering contemporary and excellent programs.

Dr. John Smith, Dean of Administration, said studies had been made pertaining to the semester system through the faculty and student senates at Oregon Institute of Technology. Both groups indicated by a clear majority a preference for the quarter system. The rationale for these two independent decisions really deals with the very strictly structured type of curricula in the technology courses. The quarter system provides an easier opportunity for students who get out of phase in a technology program to get back in again. There is also greater flexibility for students in scheduling electives under the quarter system.

Mr. Mike Holland, Executive Director of the Office of Community College Services in the Department of Education, said the community college presidents would prefer that the issue be deferred until there had been an opportunity for them to fashion a more substantive response on the implications of the change. They are particularly concerned with the impact of losing one point of access in an academic year for nontraditional students. He indicated that if the decision were made by the Board to move toward a semester system, the community colleges would endeavor to make that change and the transition as effective as possible. He said he recognized the difficulties confronting the State System because opinion was divided on this issue in both the State System and the community colleges.

Ms. Sherry Oeser, Executive Director of the Oregon Student Lobby, said its board had chosen unanimously to support the quarter system and to oppose the change because access to higher education is much greater in the quarter than in the semester system. This is particularly beneficial for nontraditional students who must enter and leave higher education more frequently than traditional students during an academic year. She said a study published a few years ago showed that the student withdrawal rate was lower in a quarter system.

Mr. Nick Van Vleet, President of the Associated Students of Oregon State University, said there were good arguments on both sides of this issue and said he would comment on access to education, quality of education, in-depth study, and cost to students. He said changing to the semester system limits availability by one term and reduces access. The quarter
system better suits the needs of nontraditional students to enter and leave higher education at different times. He said he was not convinced the semester system would allow more in-depth study of subjects but it probably would tend to give students more time to procrastinate. He said it was his opinion the quarter system also allowed for in-depth study. With respect to cost, a 1984 study showed that progress toward a degree was faster and the withdrawal rate lower under the quarter system. These two factors equate to dollars for students. The employment opportunities which would be lost also affect student costs. Mr. Van Vleet indicated that loss of the four weeks of work in the fall would mean for him a loss in yearly income of approximately $1,200 because he has been employed by a canning company for five summers. Under the semester system, he would have to return to school during the height of the corn season. Many students do work in agriculture in Oregon, and the cycle of that industry is definitely more compatible with the quarter system.

Dr. T. K. Olson, Executive Director of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, requested that if the Board approved the concept of moving to the semester system, it be referred to the Commission with a request that the Commission report quickly to the Board on a review of the intersegmental consequences with the independent and community college sectors. In this way the Board would be informed and advised about some of the consequences which could then influence its decision in terms of timing or other factors. He indicated it would be possible for the Commission to respond within two months if that were the Board's request.

Dr. Sheldon Rio, Interim Dean of Academic Affairs at Southern Oregon State College, requested an opportunity to comment as an individual on the proposal. He cited cooperative arrangements and necessary consultations with professional organizations and urged that implementation of the plan occur no earlier than 1990.

Mr. Hensley then requested Dr. Pierce to explain the staff recommendations in detail.

Dr. Pierce said he would address three issues which had been raised during the discussion—the timing of the implementation, the position of the community colleges, and the question of access to the State System. He said the proposal had been discussed at length with the academic vice presidents and deans and opinion was divided in that group as to how early the semester system could be implemented. The Academic Council suggested that there was no real reason everyone had to move at the same time and that it might be possible to say that the conversion would be effective in the fall of 1989 at the earliest,
but no later than the fall of 1990. That would provide flexibility to accommodate the concerns expressed with respect to timing. He said he believed that if the decision were made to implement the change, it probably would be better to do it earlier rather than later. People who have made this conversion in the past indicate that two years is adequate time to make the change.

In regard to the delay requested by the community colleges, Dr. Pierce said the early semester had been discussed with community colleges for at least five years. They have taken polls of their faculty and indicated previously they would be willing to work with the State System on the change and might indeed adopt their own semester calendar. The community colleges operate independently and one or several could move to the semester system with the Department of Higher Education. The new presidents favor the semester plan and would urge their boards to conform to the calendar adopted by the State System.

Dr. Pierce said most students do enter fall term and the number entering in winter or spring terms is relatively small. The most important issues in terms of access, particularly in the community colleges, and increasingly in the urban institutions, is access through flexible schedules for nontraditional students through block courses, weekend programs, and other innovations that do not conform to either the quarter or semester systems.

Dr. Pierce then reviewed the recommendations, noting the modification in the effective date proposed by the Academic Council so that implementation would be effective at the earliest in the fall of 1989, but no later than the fall of 1990.

A suggested procedure was recommended for the conversion and would provide that the major responsibility should be delegated to each campus. The calendars adopted at each institution should be flexible to meet the curricular requirements at that campus. One institution might start a day or two earlier or later than another institution, and testing schedules might be somewhat different. These details would be developed through the establishment of a campus conversion committee, and the chairman of that committee would be a member of an interinstitutional committee that would try to deal with the problems that must be addressed at the System level. Guidelines must be developed to assist the committees in the conversion efforts.

Dr. Pierce also noted the statement in the recommendations referring to coordination with community colleges, the new Student Information System, and the new foreign language requirement. Finally, the recommendations proposed that the Committee on Instruction be kept apprised of developments and assist in resolving any of the particular problems that occur.
The Chancellor said he had been persuaded by the discussion that the recommendation pertaining to the timing should be changed to 1990 and that the System should move as a whole. He indicated this was a time for important academic reform and he agreed that it would be desirable to coordinate this conversion with other factors such as the new foreign language requirement, teacher education changes, and the Total Information System.

The Chancellor suggested that semesters could be divided into two sections in some instances so that there would be adequate access to meet the needs of a particular institution or program. He said he had not seen the 1984 report mentioned during the discussion but his personal experience was that there were fewer dropouts in a semester system than in a quarter system.

He said the criticism with respect to the opportunity for input in the decision was difficult to understand because the matter had been on the Board’s agenda repeatedly since 1982. He said he believed the faculty at least was agreed on a recommendation that some decision should be made. If the Board were to approve the recommendations, he suggested the possibility of announcing that intention and providing an opportunity for rebuttal or comment on the proposed action within the next meeting or two of the Board.

Dr. Pierce said he had not understood Dr. Olson to propose that the Board delay a decision until the Commission had responded. Rather, the Commission would like to review the Board’s decision and advise the Board of any intersegmental impacts it might have. He said he would urge the Board to reach a decision because this would be followed by extensive consultation with many segments once the process of conversion began.

Mr. Hensley said he would consider that to be part of step four of the recommended procedure. The Committee on Instruction would accept the Commission’s comments within the next two months. He said if the Committee and the Board approved the recommendations, it would be understood that the State System would move forward with the recommendations, permitting the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission to comment in an advisory capacity within the next two months.

Mr. Hensley then invited Board members from the Finance Committee to comment on the proposal since the recommendation to the Board would be a recommendation from the Instruction Committee.
Mr. Chao said he had been a student under both the quarter and semester systems and believed his preference would be for the early semester system, based on his experiences as a student. As a Board member and businessman, he said the realities indicated that State System should shift to the early semester system because it far outweighed the other options. Finally, as a member of society in general, he said the institutions exist to educate people and instill a sense of value and quality. He said there is an alarming trend toward short results and he believed the Board should avoid dropping into the economic side of the issue and becoming a system of training schools. It should emphasize educating people. For that reason, he supported the early semester plan.

Mr. Adams indicated he preferred the semester system and believed that it was important to move fairly quickly on this issue. However, he said he would prefer some delay in order to get answers with respect to the effect on the accreditation changes and processes of converting between the two systems and to receive some estimates of the cost of the change and the savings which would accrue from going to the semester system.

Mr. Richardson indicated he had similar questions with respect to the costs and the savings.

Dr. Pierce said many institutions have made the conversion but there was no way to get a good estimate of the savings because changes take place in the conversion which affect the cost relationships. He said there was clearly a saving in the elimination of one cycle of registration and record-keeping. Some institutions have implemented a mid-semester grading cycle which has added to the costs. He said the registrar at the University of Oregon had stated that the substantial cost savings in the administrative side of the institution would amortize the conversion costs in about 2.5 years through the savings in administrative processing. However, the cost factor is a small consideration in comparison to the academic arguments for or against the conversion.

In response to the accreditation question, Dr. Pierce said it was his understanding most programs do not have to be accredited simply because of the conversion from the quarter to the semester system because that is not defined as substantial curricular change in the sense of the accreditation agencies. There might be some cases, such as in education perhaps, where accreditation would have to be renegotiated.
The Chancellor concurred with respect to accreditation. In commenting on the costs of conversion, he said it was part of the expectation in the workload of faculty that they participate in curriculum planning for their department. Consequently, there should be no added costs for the administrative planning. There would be some procedural costs but not for the actual academic planning for the conversion.

Mr. Crowell said he supported the early semester system but had some concerns that would cause him to favor a delay in the decision. He would like further information on potential conflicts between scheduling research and scheduling instruction time because this issue had been raised at the Faculty Senate meeting during the visitation.

Mr. Crowell said his second concern was the impact on students because the primary employment opportunities for students in Oregon yield substantial income for students during September.

Mr. Hermens concurred. He said Mr. Crowell was really talking about economic access for students. He indicated that loss of one registration period at Eastern Oregon State College would eliminate 320-350 student hours of work. That fact, coupled with the other summer employment opportunities which would no longer be possible for students, made the conversion to the semester system unacceptable to him.

Mr. Perry moved that the Committee recommend to the Board approval of the staff recommendations with the modification in the effective date from 1989 to 1990, as proposed by the Chancellor. Mrs. Nelson seconded the motion, with the understanding that some curricular flexibility would be allowed at individual institutions.

Mr. Alltucker said it appeared from the discussion that the semester system provided an opportunity to teach more about fewer subjects. In his opinion, he said this would fail to meet the objectives set forth in the long-range plan. He said the quarter system allows 50% more opportunity to introduce students at least to a conceptual understanding about more subjects. In seeking to accomplish the objectives in the long-range plan of graduating a person who is really educated rather than merely trained, it will be essential to keep the quarter system because of the additional opportunity to teach. He said it was the responsibility of the Board to decide what portion of the undergraduate time should be spent in the liberal arts, humanities, and social sciences and give the campuses some guidance so that they can be innovative within those general broad concepts of percentage of time. He said he was unalterably opposed to taking this step, which he viewed as out of sequence with the long-range plan. He said he wanted to delay the decision until there had been a discussion of the fundamental central
issue of the conversion. That issue is whether the State System should graduate persons who know more about fewer subjects or ones who have a fundamental conceptual understanding of the principles involved in more subjects. Mr. Alltucker said he would anticipate the latter choice would be the decision which would be reached.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the motion by Mr. Perry and seconded by Mrs. Nelson. Mr. Hermens was opposed.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Hensley presented the Committee recommendation that the Board approve the staff recommendations with the modification in the first sentence to change the effective date from 1989 to 1990. It was moved and seconded that the Committee recommendation be approved, and Mr. Hensley indicated if there were no further comments, the issue was open for discussion by the Board.

Mr. Adams said he agreed with the goals expressed by Mr. Alltucker but believed they could be accomplished within the semester system.

Mr. Perry commented that higher education nationally was moving in this direction and that fact was something of a testimony in itself to the benefits of the early semester system. He said also that having two or three courses with different titles from a curriculum preparation standpoint would not indicate necessarily that anything more or less was being done in terms of covering subjects or material.

Mr. Hensley said if the concerns were about academic program and quality and the values mentioned by Mr. Chao, he believed the semester system afforded better opportunities than the quarter system. He said it was his opinion the semester system gave students a better chance to adapt to college life and the learning process and that academic training would be easier.

Mr. Alltucker said the question he raised was whether a student becomes a more well-rounded, better-educated person, and one who is better able to live effectively in society, if that student has one five-unit course in philosophy, for example, and can learn philosophy in depth, or has a three-unit course in philosophy and a three-unit course in exposition communications. He said he believed students were better off with a conceptual understanding of the principles involved in more subjects rather than an in-depth exposure to only one or two courses.
Mr. Petersen said the strongest argument in favor of the early semester system would be the improvement of undergraduate education. The opportunities in a semester system for doing research, writing, library study, and an in-depth treatment of the subject far outweigh the other positive aspects of the early semester system. He said he was also sympathetic to the other side of the issue dealing with the questions of employment and access.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Chao, Hensley, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: Directors Alltucker, Hermens, and Schwab. Director Crowell abstained.

Mr. Petersen requested the staff to begin the process toward implementation of the early semester system, to report to the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission the action of the Board together with a time line for its review of intersegmental issues, and to report to the Committee on Instruction as information develops with respect to the conversion.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

The Chancellor requested Dr. Pierce to announce a new appointment to the staff of the Office of Academic Affairs.

R. Hoops, Appointment as Associate VC for Academic Affairs

Dr. Pierce introduced Dr. Ray Hoops who would be joining the staff as Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on March 1, 1987. He is a graduate of Purdue University in speech pathology and audiology and has held research and teaching positions at the University of Michigan and Wayne State University, Dr. Hoops has been a dean at Northern Iowa University, provost at North Dakota State University, and president at South Dakota State University. In addition, Dr. Hoops has had extensive experience in Washington, D.C., in the area of education and also experience teaching and working overseas, particularly in Southeast Asia.

The Chancellor said Dr. Hoops had an MBA degree and experience in the schools of business which would be helpful in coordinating the curricula in the colleges of business.

Report on Governor's Budget Recommendations

The Chancellor indicated that Mr. Lemman would be providing more detailed information with respect to Governor Goldschmidt's budget recommendations to the Legislature. He said there had been a slight misinterpretation of his comments in a meeting the Chancellor had with the editorial board of the Salem Statesman-Journal. The Chancellor said it was reported that he favored across-the-board faculty salary increases and opposed selective merit increases. He said this was not his position. He stated he was a strong advocate of the distribution made last biennium in which half of the salary increases were allocated for across-the-board adjustments and
half were allocated on the basis of the academic marketplace in the respective disciplines and on merit. The Chancellor said the misinterpretation came in his statement that it was not possible to address only the salaries of the most prestigious and most senior of the professors and ignore the salary needs at all other levels. He had stated it was essential to have quality at all levels.

The Chancellor said the Governor's salary recommendation consisted of $11 million for a two-plus-two salary consideration for all state employees and an additional $10 million for merit increases. This totals $21 million, and the request to the Governor was for $47 million. The $47 million request was based on projections that the average annual salary increases in higher education over the last 10 years have been 6%. Therefore, it would take a 6% adjustment in each year of the biennium to keep the faculty salaries in the State System institutions at the current position in salary comparisons as related to the national marketplace. The 6% increase in each year would require $37 million, and the additional amount in the budget request would allow 2% per year for salaries to help offset those years in which State System faculty had no salary increases while faculty in other states were moving ahead at 6% per year. Unless the 6% salary increases are achieved, the State System will fall farther behind in the relative salaries nationally than it is at the present time. Any amount beyond the $37 million would provide some improvement. He emphasized that faculty salary increases were the Board's first priority.

The Chancellor said that beyond the salary adjustments, the only other new money in the Governor's recommended budget was $4 million, of which $3 million was to be used as matching funds with private industry to establish endowed chairs and $1 million would be used as incentives to attract new research for the new faculty members. No capital outlay improvements were recommended other than the continuation of the $11 million commitment to the completion of buildings started under the lottery funds. Requests for the centers of excellence, deferred maintenance, equipment replacement, BAS adjustments, library automation, and other specific amounts were not included in the Governor's recommended budget. He said the recommended budget would expand the higher education budget from its current base to the new base by about 9-10%.

Mr. Lemman said the Chancellor had summarized the budget recommendations rather completely but he would add that the Executive Department and the Governor had decided to recommend full funding of the base of the Department of Higher Education. The earlier analysis by the Executive Department had resulted in
the recommendation of substantial reductions in that base. He said there were several base budget decision packages which were not approved because they were lottery dollars and the Department of Higher Education only received lottery dollars for the continuation of present capital projects.

The base adjustments were also short in terms of corridor enrollment funding by the amount of $2.65 million attributable to the increases in enrollment at the first year of the biennium at Western Oregon State College and the University of Oregon. Those were not placed in the Governor's recommended budget on the grounds that those institutions have not yet been outside their corridor for two years. There is some hope the decision may be reconsidered and at least a portion of the request would be restored.

Mr. Lemman said the recommended budget did include funds for other base budget decision packages such as the authority to spend increased indirect cost funds attributable to research and some relief in the shortfall of federal funds at the Agricultural Experiment Station, the Cooperative Extension Service and the Crippled Children's Division. Approval was received for capital construction items to be financed from auxiliary enterprise funds.

The Chancellor said he was concerned about repeated assertions that the investment of lottery funds in higher education facilities and the centers of excellence were not real economic development. He pointed out that since the approval by the Legislature in July 1985, the State System has invested approximately $30 million in centers of excellence and these facilities. This has generated better than $110 million of matching funds for facilities, new contracts and grants for services, and private gifts and donations, including substantial gifts of equipment. The Chancellor said he considered this to be an immediate impact on the economy of the state and that it would have a continued long-term impact because many of the grants would be recurring.

He said that, with the Board's support, he would press for continued reaffirmation for funding of the Centers of Excellence so that these projects could be brought to full fruition in the fields of high technology, electrical engineering, computer science, and molecular biology at the several institutions, along with the emphasis on international trade and development.

There was a brief discussion of the value of construction projects in stimulating the building trade and relieving some of the unemployment in the construction industry. The Chancellor said higher education, through its training of people for jobs, the creation of research, and through the services provided, is an important ingredient in the economic development of the state.
Professional Doctorate in Pharmacy, OSU & OHSU

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

Oregon State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University request authorization to offer a joint instructional program leading to a professional doctorate in pharmacy degree (Pharm.D.). The new program would emphasize geriatric and ambulatory care pharmacy services. Students would be admitted to the program after completing the fourth year of the B.S. in pharmacy curriculum or after receiving a B.S. degree in pharmacy after five years. Students who choose to earn the Pharm.D. as the first professional degree would typically complete their first four years in the College of Pharmacy at Oregon State University and their last two years in the School of Medicine at the Oregon Health Sciences University.

This joint request for the Pharm.D. degree follows two changes occurring nationally in the pharmacy profession. The first is the increasing amount of time that pharmacists spend advising patients and physicians about drugs and their effects. The second is the increasing attention given to clinical experience in pharmacy education. The Pharm.D. degree reflects these changes by adding an additional year, principally of clinical training, to the more traditional B.S. in pharmacy curriculum. At the present time, the B.S. degree and the Pharm.D. degree are accepted as entry-level programs for state licensure. This may change, however. The American Pharmaceutical Association has proposed that the six-year Doctor of Pharmacy curriculum become the sole entry-level degree program for the profession.

Program Need

The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) has recently completed a report entitled, "Pharmacy Manpower in the West: An Analysis of Supply and Demand." A copy of this report is being sent to Board members along with the institutions' program request. According to the report, Oregon will need more new pharmacists than are currently being produced in the state. The need for pharmacists can be met by increasing enrollments in pharmacy programs or by hiring new pharmacists from outside the state. Under the most conservative projections, the demand for the graduates of the Pharm.D. program will exceed the expected ten graduates of the program each year.
Program Structure

A description of the proposed program is contained in the proposal submitted by Oregon State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University. The program is patterned after the Pharm.D. Accreditation Standards of the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education.

Program Duplication

The proposed program will not duplicate any other program in the state.

The only other Pharm.D. program in the Northwest is at the University of Washington in Seattle. It is likely that some students from surrounding states will be attracted to this new professional program.

Funding

The Board has requested funds for this program as part of its 1987-89 funding request. The estimated cost of the program during the first four years of operation will be $1,295,784. A detailed budget plan is included in the program proposal.

Staff Findings

The proposed program would provide modern, clinically-based pharmacy education needed to meet changing health care needs of the state and Northwest. The combined resources of Oregon State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University provide an ideal basis for building a strong and high quality Pharm.D. program. The program is well designed. The faculty and library resources at Oregon State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University are adequate to support the program. A program improvement request has been submitted to the Governor as part of the State System's 1987-89 budget request. If the Legislature fails to provide new resources for the program, the institutions may have to delay the start of the program until new resources are appropriated or can be reallocated internally to meet new program requirements. The proposal is the highest new program priority of Oregon State University. A letter from President Laster and the draft program agreement between the two universities provides an adequate basis for a successful cooperative program. Copies are included in the full report which is on file in the Board's Office. Cooperation among State System institutions has been encouraged by the Board. This proposal is a good example of how a new program can be significantly strengthened by combining the strengths and resources of two universities. Support for the new program among pharmacists in the state is exceptionally strong.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University to offer a six-year professional doctorate of pharmacy degree (Pharm.D.) effective Fall 1987.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Pierce presented the request from Oregon State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University to offer a doctorate in pharmacy degree through the two schools. This would be a six-year degree, the first professional degree in pharmacy, and one that is rapidly becoming the standard for professional education in pharmacy. It recognizes major changes in the training of pharmacists with an increasing emphasis on the curricular aspects of pharmacy. Dr. Pierce asked Dean Richard Ohvall of the College of Pharmacy at Oregon State University to describe the request in detail.

Dean Ohvall said the concept of a Pharm.D. degree originated shortly after the end of World War II, probably as a development of the rapid expansion of drug and medical knowledge brought on by the research that originated during the war. There was no immediate movement toward the degree with the exception of two California schools, but the discussions continued. The expansion of drug and medical knowledge made it exceedingly clear that additional time was needed in pharmaceutical education. Dean Ohvall then reviewed the information and material presented in the full report entitled, "Professional Doctorate in Pharmacy at Oregon State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University," a copy of which is on file in the Board's Office.

Mr. Perry asked about the basic reason for requesting a Pharm.D. degree instead of perhaps a Master of Science in Pharmaceutical Science.

Dean Ohvall said a master of science degree would be an academic research degree which would be followed by a Ph.D. degree. The Pharm.D. degree is an advanced professional degree, a practice degree, and not an academic research degree. It would be for specialized practitioners rather than researchers.

Mr. Perry then inquired concerning the employment opportunities in Oregon for pharmacists and was informed that they were excellent.

In response to a further question concerning support from the Oregon Health Sciences University for the proposed program, President Laster indicated that he supported the program fully and without reservations. He explained that there had been
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good relationships with the School of Pharmacy for many years which have been beneficial to both institutions. He said he had discussed the proposal with the president of the University of California at San Francisco and received a very strong endorsement of the idea as a positive move. He stated that the only thing which might be interpreted as a reservation was a statement that if it were to become a competitive choice between the Oregon Health Sciences University's aging program and involvement of the institution in this program in relation to resources, the institution would stay with its first priority in the aging program. He said this should not be interpreted as a lesser endorsement of this involvement.

Mr. Perry said there appeared to be many program enhancements or interests to be presented in this Legislative Session and all of these would cost money. He said he was concerned the State System would not receive everything it would like to have and asked the Chancellor to comment on the question of priority rank for this program, particularly since it would be expensive.

The Chancellor said the concern was apt because, at the present time, the Governor's budget recommendations did not include even the continued funding of the Centers of Excellence which already have been started or funding for a number of other requests. He said it was his assessment that anything the Board approved in terms of new programs must be done through reallocation of existing funds.

Dr. Pierce indicated the staff analysis stated the school and the university might have to delay this proposal or find resources from internal mechanisms to fund the program if the Governor's recommended budget did not include financing or funds were not appropriated by the Legislature.

Mr. Perry asked Dr. Byrne about plans for the program if the Legislature did not provide additional funds for pharmacy. Dr. Byrne said there was no easy answer to the question. It is important to have authority to proceed with the program. If there were no additional funds coming in, it would be necessary to assess what was presently being done in pharmacy and elsewhere in the institution in order to get it started. He said he would expect that every effort would be made to move ahead with the program but the schedule for its full development would be extended over a longer period unless there were additional funds. He said it was an important program and would bring the College of Pharmacy to a level that would be more competitive with other colleges of pharmacy. The institution must move in this direction if it is to maintain a competitive and quality pharmacy program in Oregon. It is one of the top academic priorities.
Mr. Hensley commented on the cost of the program for the first four years of operation and asked Dean Ohvall about the revenue from tuition and fees to offset costs.

Dean Ohvall said the intent was that the tuition level for these students would be comparable to the tuition currently levied for the doctor of veterinary medicine students. This is at a higher level than the typical undergraduate student tuition, and the revenue would be fairly significant. The financial burden would fall primarily on Oregon State University.

In response to questions concerning cooperative arrangements with the Oregon Health Sciences University, it was indicated the two institutions have had other similar cooperative efforts which worked well.

President Laster discussed the requirements for teaching and research space, indicating that space would be available for the clinical aspects of the proposed program but that other priorities would be higher at the moment for research space at the Oregon Health Sciences University. However, he indicated this was a field in which the institution had intense interest and had a history of cooperation.

Mr. Chuck Gress, Executive Director of the Oregon State Pharmacists Association, said the pharmacist practitioners strongly supported the Pharm.D. degree program because it was needed to improve the education of pharmacists and to strengthen the existing high standards of the College of Pharmacy at Oregon State University. The proposed program would offer Oregon students a quality program to prepare them to meet the changes in health care with regard to pharmaceuticals and drugs. A resolution in support of the proposal was passed unanimously at the organization's state conference in June. The program meets the specialized needs for pharmacists preparing for more sophisticated roles in the profession. He also stated there was an extreme shortage of pharmacists in Oregon in all practices and disciplines. The program is a high priority of the Association for this Legislative Session and it will be working to see that the program is fully funded if it is approved by the Board. In response to a question, Mr. Gress said he understood the conditions attached to approval of the request with respect to its funding.

Dr. Pierce asked Mr. Gress whether there was interest in the private sector to assist the universities in developing this program through either financial resources or exchange of personnel. Mr. Gress said those cooperative relationships already existed through the participation of practitioners in the training and advancement toward licensure of the individual in the educational curriculum. Additional funding would have to be decided by the organization as a group effort.
Mr. Mike Millard, President-elect of the Oregon Society of Hospital Pharmacists, explained that in managed health care, such as hospitals and nursing homes, there is a pharmaceutical component that is relatively imperceptible to the patients who receive that service. The Oregon Society of Hospital Pharmacists is a group of people who represent that kind of practice which occurs primarily in hospitals and institutions. He explained that with the change in focus for the institutions' reimbursements from a cost basis to prospective payment, the pharmacists are now being asked to intervene in partnership with physicians to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the drug therapy. New practitioners are needed for positions as pharmacists in hospitals who have current knowledge, not only in the drug and basic science aspect of the profession, but in the application of drugs in the clinical setting. The proposed degree would train practitioners with this expertise.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation to become effective in the fall of 1987, or when necessary resources are appropriated or internally reallocated, but not later than the fall of 1989.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Adams presented the report and recommendation of the Committee and indicated that the intent of the 1989 date was for the purpose of reviewing the program again if it were not in effect prior to that time.

Mr. Alltucker inquired concerning the demand for graduates from this program. Dean Ohvall said there was a strong demand and that ten to twelve of the baccalaureate graduates go out of state to obtain this education and often accept positions elsewhere. He reviewed the information presented during the Committee discussion.

Mr. Alltucker than asked about the cost per student. It was indicated the cost would be approximately $100,000 per year per student, of which about 20% would be offset by tuition and fees. The remainder would come from General Fund sources.

Mr. Petersen asked whether that figure was regarded as a reasonable and acceptable cost per student. Dean Ohvall said there was no question this was expensive instruction. The instruction is very personnel intensive because it is primarily clinical instruction.

Mr. Perry explained that the Committee was quite concerned about how this program would fit into the overall priorities for funding. For that reason, the program might have to be delayed because of the cost factor in light of the realities of the anticipated legislative funding.
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The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, Schwab, and Petersen. Those voting no: Director Alltucker.

Staff Report to the Committee

Portland State University has requested reconsideration of the decision which shifted its 1987-1989 Capital Construction Request for the project, Student Housing Expansion-Phase II, from the 1987-1989 biennium to 1989-1991. In limiting its total request to approximately $1 million the Board deferred a number of institutional requests to subsequent biennia.

To refresh the Committee and the Board, the Capital Construction Request which was forwarded to the Governor sought $58,085,000 in General Fund and Article XI-G bonding authorization; $415,000 of Education and General projects from Gift and Grant funds; and $42,090,000 of Auxiliary Enterprise projects. The total request submitted was $100,590,000.

The Governor's recommendation which has been prepared for the 1987 Legislative Assembly contains no projects from General Funds. The $415,000 for Education and General plant from Gift/Grant funds has been recommended, together with $35,590,000 of Auxiliary Enterprise projects. During action of the Board in October to approve the patient parking structure and a parking facility within the Eye Center for the Health Sciences University, OHSU officials indicated that construction of these parking elements would permit deferral of its 1987-1989 request for Parking Structure IV, valued at $6.5 million.

The advancing of the Portland State University Student Housing Project, valued at $3,672,000, therefore, can be accommodated within the original Board's request for Auxiliary Enterprise projects of $42,090,000. The amended request would become $39,262,000.

Portland State University's request to restore the project to the 1987-1989 request is based on addressing as early as possible the large waiting list of students requesting on-campus housing (the list currently remains at a constant 900 students) and a need to complete, as soon as possible, obligations encumbered to the City of Portland for numerous site and related improvements required to receive adjacent street vacations and building and conditional use permits. Phase I of this project is under construction, and if approved by the Board and by the Legislature, Phase II construction could begin in the early fall of 1987 for completion and occupancy by Fall Term 1988.

-27-
Two other institutional requests for inclusion in the 1987-1989 Capital Construction program have been received, but are not sufficiently developed for recommendation at this time. It is anticipated that these requests would be brought to the Committee and the Board in February. They are a request from Oregon State University for authority to bond up to $5.3 million for acquisition of an existing apartment complex adjacent to the campus to be used for student family housing; and a request from Western Oregon State College for authority to construct a dormitory to assist with housing WOSC's accelerating enrollments. This project, a 300-bed dormitory, has an estimated cost of $6 million.

If any or all of these requests is approved by the Board it will be necessary to gain the approval of the Executive Department to modify the Governor's recommended budget for construction as well as for bonding limitation.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Committee and the Board approve the amendment of the 1987-1989 Capital Construction Request for Auxiliary Enterprise projects to add Student Housing Expansion—Phase II for Portland State University at an expenditure level of $3,672,000.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Alltucker asked whether there were any other uses of this money at any of the other institutions in 1987.

Mr. Neland replied that the funds to support this facility would come from Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and be retired from revenues generated by rental of the units to Portland State students. There would be no impact on other institutions, except for a minor impact on the commingled bonds. The actual costs would be paid only by Portland State.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board was advised that additional requests might be presented at the February meeting.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, Schwab, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.
Staff Report and Recommendation to the Board

In accordance with Board regulations, the following Board members represented the Board in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas for the graduating classes at the various institutions during the 1985-86 academic year and summer sessions:

- Oregon State University: James C. Petersen
- University of Oregon (including Fall, Winter, Spring, & Summer 1985-86): John W. Alltucker
- University of Oregon Law School: Robert R. Adams
- Portland State University (including Fall, Winter, Spring, & Summer 1985-86): Mildred A. Schwab
- Western Oregon State College: Terrence A. Clark
- Southern Oregon State College: Alvin R. Batiste
- Eastern Oregon State College (including Summer 1986): F. David Crowell and James C. Petersen
- Oregon Institute of Technology: Richard F. Hensley
- Oregon Health Sciences University: Gene Chao

Signed copies of the degree lists are on file in the Board's Office.

It was recommended that the Board confirm the actions of these Board members in approving degrees and diplomas.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, Schwab, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

Sale of Strom Estate Property

On December 1, 1986, the Board's staff opened bids to sell land and a residence located at 7319 S. E. 36th Avenue, Portland. The highest bid of $64,000 was subsequently accepted. The terms of the land sale contract, prepared by the Board's staff, signed by the Board President and Board Secretary, and approved for legal sufficiency by Board counsel, were 20% down with the balance payable in equal monthly principal and interest installments spread evenly over 20 years, with interest at 9.5%. The purchasers took possession January 1, 1987.

The sale was approved by the Board on September 12, 1986, at which time the Board was informed that the property had been appraised at $61,000.
Board staff observed all Oregon statutes in advertising and contracting for the sale of the property.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board accepted the report as presented.

**Lease of Land to Pacific NW Raptor Rehabilitation Corporation, SOSC**

**Staff Report to the Board**

Pursuant to Board approval at its June 20, 1986, meeting and subsequent review at its September 12, 1986, meeting, the Board's contract officer executed a 50-year lease with Pacific Northwest Raptor Rehabilitation Corporation on December 31, 1986. The lease also includes an option to extend the lease for two successive terms of 24 years each. The lease pertains to an area of approximately 14 acres, divided into two contiguous parcels, located adjacent to the properties already leased to the Oregon Department of Military and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Under the terms of the lease, on Parcel A Raptor Corporation will build a natural history museum and provide vehicle parking and related improvements. Parcel B will accommodate parklands, nature trails, and similar habitat exhibits. Numerous educational benefits should accrue to the College, the community, and the region. The lease was reviewed and approved for legal sufficiency by the Board's legal counsel.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board accepted the report as presented.

**ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS**

Mr. Alltucker said greater care should be taken in introducing to the public some of the actions taken by the Board. He referred to the misunderstanding of the action taken by the Board in November with respect to the Board's position on athletics. He said most of the articles assumed that the Board had already recommended state funds to support athletics and this was not the case.

Mr. Perry expressed a concern about what has been happening in higher education and which might be termed cheapening the doctorate through shortening the time and other requirements and through failure to distinguish between professional degrees and research.

Mr. Perry asked if there were any information with respect to the publicity on the Governor's requests for resignations from various boards and commissions.

Mr. Petersen said he had no direct information but it was his feeling the Board of Higher Education would not be asked for resignations.
The statute specifies that a Board member may only be removed for cause. After reading the text of ORS 351.020 and 351.040, Mr. Lemman stated there was nothing that would prohibit a Governor from asking anyone to resign but the Governor could not require a member of the Board of Higher Education to resign unless it was for cause.

Mr. Hermens expressed his appreciation to President Byrne and the staff at Oregon State University for the excellent visitation to that institution.

Mr. Hensley said the Joint Boards Planning Committee had met recently in Salem to discuss progress in planning and strategies for presentations to the subcommittees of the Legislature. He announced the first presentation on planning would be made on the following Monday to the subcommittee on education. Mr. Hensley mentioned that he was very pleased with the cooperation that has developed among the boards.

Mr. Hensley also reported that interviews were scheduled with the semifinalists for the presidency at Southern Oregon State College and the finalists would be interviewed on February 19. He said the ten semifinalists were outstanding individuals and he expected the Board would be impressed with the finalists presented at the February meeting.

Mr. Petersen announced that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on the campus of Southern Oregon State College on February 20. The meeting will be preceded on February 19 by Executive Sessions of the Board for the purpose of interviewing the finalists for the position of President at Southern Oregon State College.

Mr. Petersen also thanked President Byrne, the students, faculty, and staff of Oregon State University for their fine hosting of an excellent visitation.

Mr. Petersen reported that he and the Chancellor and Mr. Lemman had met with Governor Goldschmidt to discuss his budget recommendations. While they were disappointed with the budget sent forward to the Legislature, Mr. Petersen said he was not disappointed in the impression he received in terms of how the Governor feels about higher education. Mr. Petersen stated that he was very encouraged by some of the comments. The Governor indicated he did not disagree with the incremental increase in faculty salaries to bring them up above average, perhaps into the top third of the comparator institutions. The Governor also agreed that a statewide strategy was needed for capital construction for the state as a whole, based on a long-term, long-range strategy for continuing the capital construction needs in the State of Oregon.
The Governor's overall positive feelings about higher education in general were encouraging, and he said he would be making a policy statement on higher education. Mr. Petersen said although the short-term might not be what the Board and staff wanted, he was greatly encouraged by the Governor's long-term feelings about higher education.

J. Davis, Recognition for Outstanding Contribution

The Chancellor said he would like to recognize publicly Dr. Jack Davis for his outstanding contribution and the honor he has brought to the State System of Higher Education. For the past two years, Dr. Davis has served as the elected president of the National Collegiate Athletic Association after being one of the senior faculty representatives for Oregon State University.

During the tenure of Dr. Davis in the NCAA, it established more firmly the role of the presidents' commission in the council's affairs and implemented very effective measures that have had a great impact on the academic progress of athletes and their admission. The organization had the boldness to get into the drug testing concept and began the campaign for elimination of the use of drugs on campus, particularly in the field of intercollegiate athletics.

The Chancellor said from colleagues across the nation he had heard nothing but the highest praise for the integrity of Dr. Davis and his leadership.

ADJOURNMENT The Board meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

James C. Petersen, President
Wilma L. Foster, Secretary