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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN LEVI'S,
COLLEGE CENTER, WESTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE,
MONMOUTH, OREGON

May 15, 1987

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Levi's, College Center, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m., May 15, 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. Mark S. Dodson
Mr. Richard F. Hensley

Mr. Michael W. Hermens
Mrs. Janet S. Nelson
Mr. Louis B. Perry
Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.
Mr. James C. Petersen

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor William E. Davis; Secretary Wilma L. Foster; Lawrence C. Pierce, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Wil Post, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Policies; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; W. C. Neland, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Kay Juran, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Virginia Boushey, Assistant to Executive Vice Chancellor; Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer; R. S. Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administration and Planning Services; James Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Roger Olsen, Director, OCATE; Ray Hoops, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; James Payne, Assistant in Student Services, Academic Affairs; Gary Christensen, Director, School Relations, Academic Affairs; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications, Public Affairs; Kimberly Carnegie, Secretary, Public Affairs.

Oregon State University--President John V. Byrne; L. Edwin Coate, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Graham Spanier, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Stefan Bloomfield, Assistant to the President; Sally Malueg, President, Faculty Senate; Thurston Doler, President-Elect, Faculty Senate; Caroline Kerl, Legal Advisor; Robert Barr, Dean, OSU-WOSC School of Education.
University of Oregon--President Paul Olum; Richard J. Hill, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President for Administration.

Oregon Health Sciences University--James Walker, Interim Vice President, Finance and Administration; David Witter, Director, University Hospital; Ralph Tuomi, Assistant Vice President, Facilities Management; Bob Williams, Assistant to the President.

Portland State University--President Natale Sicuro; Roger Edgington, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Michael Reardon, Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs; Orcilia Forbes, Vice President, Student Affairs.

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

Oregon Institute of Technology--John Smith, Dean of Administration; Chris Eismann, Dean of Academic Affairs.

Southern Oregon State College--Interim President Ernest E. Ettlich; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration.

Western Oregon State College--President Richard S. Meyers; Bill Neifert, Dean of Administration; Bill Cowart, Provost; Gary Huxford, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Representative; Xavier Romano, Director, Minority Student Services.

Others--Whitney Bates, President, and Jetta Siegel, Executive Secretary, Oregon Conference, American Association of University Professors; Wendy Woods, Researcher, Oregon Student Lobby; Sandy Ellis, President, Oregon Education Association; Bob Palmateer, Associate Director, and Mona Hedges, Instructional Services Manager, Marion County High School Equivalency Program; Herb Cawthorne, President and Chief Executive Office, Urban League of Portland; Minority students representing Western Oregon State College: Cheri Williams, Philippi Grandjean, Emelda Lopez, and Tim Seidle; T. K. Olson, Executive Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on April 17, 1987, and the special meeting held on April 24, 1987, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Altucker, Chao, Crowell, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

The Chancellor said the hearings had been completed with the subcommittee on education of the Ways and Means Committee. He indicated the subcommittee's recommendation with respect to the budget was approved by the full Ways and Means Committee without negative comment.
The Chancellor said he had been very impressed with the impact of the upfront investment made in the Centers of Excellence and the high productivity of these funds in terms of the expanded activity in grants and research. He requested President Byrne to report to the Board on grant activity applications and the improvements in research grants received to date.

President Byrne said the research office at Oregon State University prepared monthly reports on proposals submitted and grants received. The compilation for the 1986 calendar year showed that in terms of proposals submitted during 1986, as compared with 1985, there was an increase from $158.2 million to $201.8 million, an increase in requests of about 24.6%. This reflected a rather substantial effort on the part of faculty in generating proposals.

Of greater significance and interest, perhaps, was the activity with regard to grants received. There was an increase from $57.9 million in 1985 to $84.9 million in 1986 in dollars actually received, an increase of 46.7%. If the grants received in 1986 are compared to those received in 1983, the funding has almost doubled.

The Chancellor said reports had been received earlier from the other three universities. The increased grant activity is a very significant development, and the individual effort on the part of faculty members is appreciated.

The Chancellor requested Dr. Richard Perry to report on the Total Information System developments. He said he had assured the Legislature that the Board would be advised of each step in the process. Similar reports will be made regularly.

Dr. Perry said this was the first of a series of periodic progress reports the Board will receive over the following three to five years pertaining to the acquisition and installation of what is commonly known as the Oregon State System of Higher Education Total Information System Project (TIS). The Project will result in the replacement of the existing disjointed, labor intensive, non-integrated, and antiquated administrative systems which process payroll, personnel, budget, financial, and student information (admissions, registration, grading, financial aid, etc.). The new integrated administrative system will provide automated online student registration on all campuses and eliminate many of the manual procedures currently associated with accounts receivable and accounts payable. All of the data used in the system will be collected at the various campuses and transmitted electronically either to data bases on the campuses or to a central data base, or to a combination thereof depending upon the architecture selected. In addition, existing separate voice and data communications system networks will be replaced by integrated switching equipment which will permit the transmission of both voice and data simultaneously either by buried lines or via microwave.
Planning for the project began in 1980. Since that time, over 300 persons have been, and will continue to be, involved in the planning and the evaluation of the products and services proposed by the various applications software, hardware, and communications vendors.

The products to be purchased, including vendor services required for installation, are estimated to cost $22 million. This cost will be financed by the vendors. Inasmuch as the current annual cost of administrative computing and telecommunications approximates $15 million, it is expected that this cash flow will fund the total cost of the TIS through installment payments made over a period of six to ten years.

The current status of each part of the project—communications, application systems software and data processing hardware—is presented below.

Communications Services. A request for proposals (RFP) for telecommunications consulting services was released to some 60 communications consultants on December 11, 1986. The RFP invited vendors to propose services to meet the Oregon State System of Higher Education's needs in five areas: (1) data collection and analysis; (2) conceptual system design; (3) equipment RFP development; (4) equipment vendor selection; and (5) installation. Twelve responses were received by the closing date on January 14, 1987. An interinstitutional evaluation committee identified three finalists: Western Telecommunications Consultants (Los Angeles); JTM Associates (Atlanta); and Peat, Marwick, Mitchell/Compass Consulting Group (Seattle). Representatives of these firms were invited to give presentations and answer questions at interview sessions held in Eugene March 2 and 3. The TIS Executive Steering Committee, comprised of eight institution vice presidents, recommended that OSSHE enter into a contract with JTM Associates. Institution telecommunications staff are currently locating and collecting the usage statistics needed in connection with the first step of this phase of the TIS project.

Application Systems Software. An RFP for administrative applications software was released February 23, 1987. Four companies responded by the closing date on April 13, 1987: (1) Control Data Corporation (proposed two alternatives); (2) Higher Education Systems Services/Moss Roscher Associates; (3) Information Associates (two alternatives); and (4) Systems and Computer Technology Corporation (two alternatives). An interinstitutional evaluation committee has completed its initial review. On April 27, letters were sent to all four respondents requesting clarification of key points in each proposal. Responses to those letters were received May 12. Any vendors whose responses do not meet the minimum mandatory requirements will be notified of their
inability to qualify. Those vendors which are found to meet the minimum mandatory requirements, based on responses to the RFP and the April 27 letter, will be required to make on-site, on-line presentations of their systems to allow the Oregon State System of Higher Education reviewers to evaluate how well each company provides the desirable features identified in the RFP. In addition to the interinstitutional RFP Committee (33 members), 252 institution and Board's Office staff have been invited to participate in the reviews.

Data Processing Hardware. The April 27 letters to the four application software vendors required each to provide a detailed list of the hardware necessary to operate its software. An invitation for bids (IFB) for the data processing hardware to support the application software proposed has been prepared. Those specific listings for software options which meet mandatories will be included in the IFB. An invitation will be released to the general data processing vendor community by May 18. Responses will be due June 12.

The Chancellor invited Dr. T. K. Olson, Executive Director of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, to present information assembled by the Commission with respect to enrollment studies and projections. Copies of the draft report were distributed and are on file in the Board's Office.

Dr. Olson said the overall postsecondary enrollments were going up at the present time after having previously declined during the past decade. This is true even though the Oregon population has remained about the same. The elementary and secondary age groups are expected to increase in the next decade while the traditional college age group in Oregon will decline, but at a rate substantially less than the national average. A slight steady increase is anticipated in public school enrollments.

Dr. Olson indicated that 40% of last year's high school graduates enrolled in Oregon colleges, with 18% of the graduates entering State System institutions. The number of students enrolled in independent colleges was down 13% from the previous year, so the loss in terms of first-year enrollment directly from high school was vastly disproportionate in the independent colleges. This is a matter of considerable concern to them. Dr. Olson said Oregon's postsecondary enrollment was currently about 15% below its theoretical peak, which is the sum of the peak enrollments at each of the postsecondary institutions in Oregon.

The programs in postsecondary institutions which are academically and professionally oriented are continuing to increase, and the strictly vocational enrollments at the community colleges and other institutions continue to show a percentage decline.
Mr. Hensley referred to the close comparison in the percentages of the students entering State System colleges and universities and those going to the community colleges. He asked what percentage of the latter were expected to transfer to State System institutions.

Dr. Olson said approximately 30% of the graduates from the State System transferred from a community college and that percentage has remained fairly constant in recent years.

Mr. Chao inquired as to the reason for the decline in enrollment at the private institutions. Dr. Olson said the independent colleges believed it was a combination of increasing tuition rates to meet costs and the fact that the gap between the public and private tuition rates was becoming larger. This puts them at a competitive disadvantage. The private institutions are concerned also about the availability of student financial aid at both the state and federal levels. They believe these issues need to be addressed in some significant way in terms of public policies, and the Commission has been requested to assist them in preparing for the 1989 Legislature a different kind of student financial aid program than the one they have supported in the past.

Mr. Chao said he would be interested in receiving information about Oregon students leaving the state because of tuition differentials. Dr. Olson said the only survey the Commission had done was for the top 5% of the graduating class. A survey could be designed to obtain this information, but it is not presently available.

At the request of the Chancellor, Dr. Olson also reviewed the draft of a study done by the Commission on "Faculty Turnover and Faculty Compensation in Oregon's Comprehensive Universities." A copy of the draft report is on file in the Board's Office and copies have been distributed to the Board. The findings and recommendations in the report are shown below:

Findings

1. Voluntary resignations constitute a relatively minor proportion of faculty separations, but many Oregon faculty receive huge salary increases by moving to a new institution or assuming a post in academic administration, government, or industry.

2. Significant escalation in starting salaries is taking place for disciplines in the professions and other fields that can command high salaries in business or industry.

3. The gap between salaries paid to faculty in disciplines which have primarily "academic value" and disciplines which have market value is rapidly widening.
4. Oregon institutions continue to recruit high quality faculty from prestigious institutions by concentrating on entry level positions and paying competitive starting salaries.

5. Many veteran faculty with long years of service have received low annual salary increases, resulting in senior faculty receiving the same or only slightly more compensation than the entry level rate.

6. Many faculty resignations in Oregon universities are a natural product of academic life and clearly unavoidable.

7. Business and industry appear to be able and willing to pay whatever is necessary to recruit desirable faculty. This places the state at an extreme disadvantage, and reasonably higher salaries probably will not significantly reduce this movement.

Recommendations

1. Special "catch up" salary increases should be targeted at the instructional and research faculty.

2. Improve the professional perquisites and working conditions of Oregon faculty.

3. Establish a special emergency reserve in the Chancellor's Office to be used to retain key faculty members who have received generous offers.

4. Provide state employees with the option of accepting either the 6% PERS retirement benefit or receiving the equivalent in direct salary.

Dr. Olson said the Board was to be commended for the minority student enrollment initiative. However, there is an additional long-term project which should be considered, not only by the Board, but jointly across the state. He said the Commission had examined the high school graduating class of 1975 to determine what happened to it over the following ten years. One of the most disturbing findings in the study was the enormous gap between those who were of low social and economic status in being able to achieve a baccalaureate degree during that time period as contrasted with those who started out with substantially better economic and social conditions. He said the vast majority of people in this state who are poor are not people of minority status. These persons are also grossly underrepresented in terms of achieving baccalaureate degrees. Dr. Olson said this was not a very acceptable value in terms of society and efforts should be made over the next several years to develop an appropriate strategy to change the situation.
Mr. Chao concurred that this was a major problem that reached into the very early years. He said it would take a great deal of energy and substantial resources to effect a change. It would be very difficult to do, but the effort should be made.

Dr. Olson said it would be essential for the effort to be a comprehensive exercise involving many agencies and organizations.

Staff Report to the Committee

Preamble

The State Board of Higher Education is committed to providing higher educational opportunities for all segments of Oregon society. Its Administrative Rules require each institutional president to establish affirmative action goals and procedures. In its Strategic Plan for 1987-93, the Board adopted the following guiding principle regarding the need for cultural diversity on State System campuses.

Commitment to Cultural Diversity. Educated men and women must be prepared to succeed in an increasingly heterogeneous environment. The State System is committed to strive for diversity in its campuses' student bodies and faculty.

The Minority Student Enrollment Initiative is being proposed to achieve the goal of a more diverse student body in Oregon's eight public colleges and universities.

The program establishes temporary measures to correct historical underrepresentation of certain racial/ethnic minorities. Specifically, while approximately 16% of Oregon's white high school graduates enroll in State System institutions, only 8-9% of the Black, Hispanic, and Native-American students graduating from Oregon high schools enroll in the State System institutions fall term following graduation.

Current recruitment efforts have increased the number of underrepresented minority students on our campuses. Nevertheless, stronger measures are needed that give students an incentive to take the high school courses required for college admission, complete high school, and enroll in college. This initiative, by creating such an incentive, should help eliminate underrepresentation and counteract a national trend of decreasing participation by racial/ethnic minorities in higher education.

The awarding of a limited number of tuition waivers for fully qualified minority students will encourage them to attend Oregon colleges and universities. The retention of those students will improve as the minority student communities on the campuses grow.
A diverse student population benefits Oregon in many ways. It creates an environment on campus that is essential for a truly excellent postsecondary education. It strengthens Oregon's economy by expanding the pool of highly educated citizens entering the work force. It promotes social and political stability by fostering better understanding among members of our increasingly multicultural society.

Although this program will only be available for students from underrepresented groups, it will not reduce the admissions or financial aid opportunities of other students. Furthermore, the program may be expanded to include any protected classes that become underrepresented in the future.

The mere absence of discrimination cannot always overcome the effects of past discrimination. When a state has a compelling reason to diversify the student population and uses methods that do not adversely affect the general population, it may consider racial and ethnic characteristics in its affirmative efforts to provide equal access to higher educational opportunities.

In summary, the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative is designed to improve Oregon's higher educational programs by ensuring that students from all segments of Oregon society are more equally represented on State System campuses.

The Proposal

The goal of the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative is to double the enrollment of new freshmen, underrepresented minority students (145 in 1986) to 290 by Fall 1989. Concurrently, all institutional student services and academic support programs would be directed to make every effort to improve the retention of these students once enrolled.

The Minority Student Enrollment Initiative has two components:

1. Better and more intensive recruitment efforts, and

2. Special financial incentives and support through a waiver of mandatory fees required for enrollment. Currently, all mandatory fees total approximately $1,500.

First, extra and special recruitment efforts would be undertaken systemwide and by each institution to identify, contact, and encourage qualified underrepresented minority students in Oregon to attend a state college or university.
Second, a waiver of mandatory fees for enrollment (about $1,500) would be awarded to 146 Black, Hispanic, and Native-American students enrolling as first-time freshmen who are Oregon residents and meet all regular admission requirements. Waivers would be awarded on a competitive basis by a committee on each State System campus. The award would be renewed annually for up to five years (or a maximum of 15 regular academic terms) as long as the student completes 36 credit hours of course work with a 2.00 GPA each academic year and makes normal progress toward an undergraduate degree. Applications for the awards would be solicited through recruitment activities and from schools, appropriate agencies, and organizations.

A total of 146 fee waivers would be allocated systemwide each academic year of the biennium as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Approximate Fee Waiver Amount</th>
<th>Approximate Totals (1 Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td>$219,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected program cost for 1987-1989 biennium: $569,400.00.

If an institution does not fully use its annual allocation by June 1, the remaining allocations would become available to other State System institutions until all allocations are utilized. (Because this program is being considered late in the academic year, institutions would have until August 14, 1987, to fill their quotas for the Fall 1987 class.)

Summary

The Minority Student Enrollment Initiative would immediately and realistically address the need in Oregon to provide a more representative pattern of enrollment by all segments of the population in Oregon's state colleges and universities. The State System is confident that the benefits of this effort will also stimulate the enrollment of underrepresented minority students in other postsecondary institutions in Oregon. Lastly, and in addition, the State System will pursue vigorously other programs that enhance the college enrollment and success of underrepresented minority students.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommends the Board approve the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative, effective for the Fall 1987 entering class.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Chancellor said Mr. Richardson, chairman of the Committee on Minority Affairs, had arranged several meetings with various groups to discuss the concept for the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative. The meetings were with the leadership and representatives of the various minority communities in Portland and from other parts of the state, and with minority leadership in the Legislature. There was unanimous and enthusiastic response to the concept. Some suggestions were received which have been incorporated in the draft before the Committee.

The Chancellor indicated a preamble had been attached to the document to delineate more specifically the targets and goals. The program is not intended to be simply another financial aid program. The goals are to encourage and motivate students to complete high school, to take the college preparatory courses, and to reward those students by providing tuition and fee waivers which may be renewed, contingent upon continued good scholarship. He said the program puts a tremendous emphasis on preparation, hard work, and high achievement. The students will be identified when they reach the campuses and will be requested to make observations on the orientation programs and support services for minority students, to identify special problems that may arise, and to make suggestions for improvement of the program.

Students also will be encouraged to return to the middle schools and high schools in their home communities and throughout the state to talk to other minority students and encourage them to enroll. The long-range, overall goal is to improve the representation of those groups which are underrepresented on the campuses at a particular time in the belief that it is in the best interests of the state and the institutions to have representative students from all classifications and parts of society enrolled in the state's higher education institutions. The Chancellor said it was important on each of the campuses to build a critical mass of minority students so that when minority students are recruited they have the support of people from their own group and background in addition to the support of the total institution.

The Chancellor indicated the program would be designed and operated in such a way it would not take funds from existing financial aid sources.
Mr. Petersen requested Mr. Richardson to comment on the proposed initiative.

Mr. Richardson complimented the members of his staff for an excellent job in drafting a very good initiative. He said he believed that with the adoption of this initiative, along with implementation of other strategies at the various institutions in the State System, the Board would be very successful in increasing the enrollment and retention of minorities.

Dr. Pierce emphasized that the Board in its Administrative Rules and Strategic Plan had established a firm policy of increasing the enrollment of underrepresented minorities. This initiative is another part of a long-term strategy to do that by providing tuition waivers for fully qualified underrepresented minority students to attend college. It is a high school-based program to encourage and provide incentives for high school students to remain in school and take the subject matter that will enable them to enroll and succeed at State System colleges and universities. The program has been reviewed by a number of groups around the state and has been discussed with the Academic Council, deans of students, and other groups on the campuses.

Dr. Pierce indicated there has been strong support for this program from the campuses and in the state as a whole, although some would like to see the program expanded to include students from community colleges or with General Educational Development (GED) degrees. There has been debate on the actual structure of the initiative. Dr. Pierce said because the proposal was a highly targeted program, one targeted toward high school graduates and the incentive to complete high school, he believed it would be an effective program in accomplishing the goal of higher enrollment of these students. If the Board were to approve the initiative, the staff would move very quickly to make sure that as many students as possible could enroll this fall under the terms of the program. A special admission application will be mailed within a week to all minority students that have been identified through the high school survey. The applications also will go to the high schools of the state and the State System institutions.

Dr. Pierce said the staff would be meeting immediately with campus representatives to get the recruitment program ready to administer the initiative and to consider the support services which will be necessary on the campuses to ensure that these students have a good chance of succeeding once they are enrolled.

Mr. Petersen requested Dr. Pierce to comment on discussions with the Attorney General's Office with respect to issues of reverse discrimination and establishing quotas.
Dr. Pierce responded that the preamble attempted to clarify these matters. It is clear in law that it is acceptable to establish temporary measures to correct historic underrepresentations of certain groups of society, and this program has been developed to do so. The program will benefit all students on the campuses. It will benefit the state and is legally defensible.

Mr. Perry inquired about the definition of underrepresentation and, if the program proves successful, at what point would it diminish.

Dr. Pierce said the proposal was a temporary initiative. Presumably, if the representation of these groups reached the same level as non-minority enrollment and was consistent, the program would be reviewed to determine whether it was still necessary or if some other groups were underrepresented. The definition of underrepresentation used in this initiative is the proportion of the graduating classes from high school that attend the State System institutions. Currently, the proportion of white students is 16% of the graduating classes while the percentage of Black, Hispanic, and Native American graduates is about 8%. If one or more of these groups reached 16%, the program would be reviewed.

Mr. Chao mentioned that the Oriental group was not underrepresented so it was not included at this time in the program.

Mr. Perry said he had noticed that a lot of institutions were engaged in this kind of an effort and asked whether the competitive factor had been considered in establishing the goals. He said he would be reluctant to set goals which could not be achieved.

The Chancellor said there would be a competitive factor because of intensive recruiting of outstanding students by institutions in other states and by wealthy private schools. One of the purposes of the initiative would be to expand within the high schools the pool of minority students who have completed the college requirements with the necessary grade point and to do this by motivating students to make early choices and get into the college track curriculum. The financial assistance they would need in order to attend would be provided by having a scholarship which they, in effect, could earn. He said it is not anticipated the first year or two would show much difference, but there should be a significant change as the pool gets larger in the high schools.

Dr. Pierce said approximately 800 students had been identified in the three groups who met all the requirements for admission to State System institutions and would be eligible for the 146 tuition waivers available.
Mrs. Nelson asked how the quotas had been determined, and Dr. Pierce replied that doubling the enrollment of underrepresented groups to bring them to the same percentage as the non-minority groups required 146 waivers. This number was then distributed on the basis of the approximate populations of the institutions. It was roughly equivalent to the size of the institution and its ability to handle additional students.

Mrs. Nelson commented that perhaps some of the smaller institutions might serve the minority population well because of the small class size and the small campus situations. She asked whether there was enough flexibility to accommodate people.

Dr. Pierce said these were reasonable targets for the institutions. Changes could be accommodated as the experiences of the institutions in enrolling students were reviewed. In response to further questions, Dr. Pierce indicated each institution would recruit students and establish committees to select the students from the applicants to that college or university.

Mr. Petersen said Mr. Bob Palmateer, Associate Director of the Marion County High School Equivalency Program, and Ms. Mona Hedges, Instructional Services Manager for that program, had requested an opportunity to comment.

Mr. Palmateer said the clientele served by the High School Equivalency Program had left school without a high school diploma. Most are from minorities and face a demanding, harsh life that is too often limited in the opportunity to escape from the reality of their temporal, seasonal farm work employment. They enter with a variety of skill levels, and many have proven they are capable of succeeding at college work.

Ms. Hedges said the creation of a number of reserved slots resulting in tuition waivers for minority students at Oregon's institutions of higher education represented a positive, important policy decision. She said she was concerned that some capable and needy students would be denied participation in the program because they have received a GED degree instead of a regular high school diploma. Students who drop out of school are more likely to be economically disadvantaged than their counterparts who remain in high school. Although many drop out because of academic problems, many also leave for other reasons and may have very high skill levels. She then described one particular student who had succeeded in college work and noted that 56% of this year's graduates have the equivalent of a 2.75 GPA or better on the GED test. She said minority dropouts can return to school with a new seriousness and a new dedication. She urged that these funds be made available for GED graduates as well as regular high school graduates.
Mr. Palmateer pointed out that the single largest concentration of Hispanics was located in the rural areas of the Willamette Valley.

Dr. Pierce said relatively few GED students are admitted to State System institutions each year but they are accepted as part of the regular admission standards. He said they could be included in the program and slots added for GED students. He commented that Western Oregon State College had been quite successful in recruiting Hispanic students from the mid-Willamette Valley area, some of them through the GED program.

Mr. Richardson said he was pleased to have this issue brought to the Board's attention. He said he would support altering the language in the initiative to cover Oregon resident students who met the admissions requirements passed by the Board effective in 1987-88. He asked what impact this would make on the program.

Dr. Pierce said the intent had been to have a highly targeted program to encourage students at a young age to make the decision to remain in school and complete the subject matter requirements. Opening the program to the GED alternative would dilute the message and incentive somewhat. For that reason, the decision was made not to have the program apply to the GED students.

Mr. Chao said the fundamental objective was to have more of a balance and representation of minorities. He said he thought from a financial point of view, given the information about numbers and the potential impact, he would favor including the GED students but not expanding the program to include them.

Mr. Richardson said he supported that suggestion. He said he would like the program to be very successful and have it reach as large a group as possible, still working within the guidelines outlined in the initiative. It would be important to emphasize that it was best for students to complete high school, but there are extenuating circumstances which cause an exodus from the normal system.

Mr. Adams indicated he favored the program but suggested there might be some practical limitations on the number of tuition and fee waivers which the Board could grant in the future.

Mr. Chao said he did not think the number of slots should be expanded but the Board should consider adding this set of people to the pool. The objective should be to get the best representation of minorities by seeking the absolute best students within that representation who can be attracted into this program.
Mr. Adams said his statement had referred to the total program rather than to the particular discussion with respect to the GED students.

In response to the comment by Mr. Adams, the Chancellor said the added expenditure would be accommodated by underrealized income on the assumption that if these same students paid tuition, the State System would be losing that income through the proposed waivers. The students will not increase the instructional cost at the institutions because they will be distributed within the total student body over a period of four or five years. This proposal certainly is within reasonable bounds. The difference it will make in the lives of the students, as well as the benefits to the institutions in terms of having more diverse representation on the campuses, and ultimately the benefits to the state, are worth the very modest investment. He said he appreciated the comment on including the GED students and believed this could be incorporated into the language without altering the main thrust of the program.

Mr. Dodson asked whether the $1,500 waiver would be in addition to other scholarship or financial aid the students might receive, or in place of it.

Dr. Pierce said the students would be eligible for other financial aid. For students who have a need greater than the $1,500 the waiver would provide, the waiver would offset any loan requirement these students would carry as part of their financial aid package. So for any student, it would be a benefit to accept the waiver as a grant rather than a loan requirement.

Mr. Dodson asked how many of those in the pool of 800 would be eligible for other financial aid. Dr. Pierce said the staff had estimated that over 90% of the students in this category would be eligible for need, so to that extent it was a need-based program. It is based on merit criteria, but because those students all primarily fall into the need category, it will be a need program.

Mr. Alltucker said there may be some misconception on the intent of this program, which is to attract the interest of high school students and their families at the entrance level. If the students take the proper courses and meet regular entrance requirements, the initiative will assist in the economic impact. The initiative is an incentive but not a financial grant.

Mr. Perry moved that the Committee recommend to the Board approval of the staff recommendation, with the understanding that the consideration would be given to the request to include the GED student population within the scope of the program and that flexibility would be maintained in the event changes should become necessary. Mr. Chao seconded the motion.
Mr. Hensley said he wanted to make sure that the program was a success because of the uniqueness of it and the opportunities which it afforded. He proposed the following addition to the motion: "The staff shall develop a report on the effectiveness of this program and submit this report to the Board four years from the inauguration of the program to determine how the program is working and to evaluate what changes, if any, should be made to improve the program. In addition, a brief yearly report and update shall be submitted to the Board for its information." Mr. Perry and Mr. Chao concurred in the addition to their motion.

Mr. Alltucker said one additional element was discussed and should be included in the overall report. It related to the anticipated substantial recruiting effort and increased contact with high school counselors throughout the state to make sure these young people and their families have the opportunity to know the program is available and to encourage them to apply for it.

Dr. Pierce indicated this informational effort was included in the proposal itself in referring to an extra and special recruiting effort that would be undertaken systemwide and at each institution to identify, contact, and encourage qualified, underrepresented minority students to attend college.

The Committee approved the motion by Mr. Perry with the addition of the language proposed by Mr. Hensley.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Richardson presented the report and recommendation of the Committee of the Whole. He indicated that Governor Goldschmidt had stated early in January his desire to have the Board address the issue of underrepresented minority enrollments in the State System. Based on his desires and the goals already identified in the Board's Strategic Plan, a minority student enrollment initiative was drafted. The goal of the initiative was to double the enrollment of new freshmen from underrepresented minority students by Fall 1989. Concurrently, all institutional student services and academic support programs would be directed to make every effort to improve retention of those students once they were enrolled. He then described the components of the initiative as presented in the proposal. He moved that the Board approve the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole as stated in the Committee discussion, and the motion was seconded.
Mr. Herb Cawthorne, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Urban League of Portland, indicated he fully supported the proposal. He said he had talked with a number of individuals from various ethnic backgrounds in the metropolitan community and elsewhere in the state. He said he also had talked with some members of the legislative contingent and believed they had found the proposal to be a very positive, constructive step towards diversification of the student bodies within the various institutions.

Mr. Cawthorne stated that he and the Chancellor had a very friendly, thorough, and enlightening exchange the previous week in which they discussed the proposal and various related issues. They discussed three additional elements. The first was the need to provide support for students when they enter because often there are environmental problems that are very strange to them and insensitivities that are not intended or planned but strike at their sense of comfort and dignity. These circumstances have a bad effect on students during that first year of adjustment. He said he would hope, as the program develops, the Board would entertain proposals from its respective presidents regarding academic, tutorial, and counselling support for that first year in order to insure that the investment made in these students would prove most positive and most productive.

A second item explored with the Chancellor was a means by which the presidents and vice presidents at the institutions would undertake an honest measure of the cultural and ethnic environment and try to determine what could be done to learn how to get along with one another, how to appreciate differences, and how to recognize the value of each individual.

A third element of discussion was the involvement of communities throughout the state. In order for young people to be fully prepared to take advantage of this opportunity, there must be greater support within the communities to assist students in after-school tutoring, travelling to the institutions to learn about the environment, and in doing the pre-college work. Mr. Cawthorne said those three elements were discussed as being crucially important to the success of this particular program and he believed the Chancellor understood them very well.

In addition, Mr. Cawthorne urged the Board to look extremely carefully at its affirmative action program for faculty and staff. He also said he had discussed with the Chancellor the fact that the administrative structure of the State System, by way of example, must reflect an adequate mixture of the diversity that exists in society. The Chancellor stated it always had been, and would continue to be, his policy to find the best-qualified people, at the same time recognizing the importance of the range and diversity which is required for his leadership.
Mr. Cawthorne said the common statement that the best minority doctorates were too expensive and could not be attracted to the State System should not be accepted. If the competition is difficult, Oregon must meet that competition.

Mr. Cawthorne concluded with a comment on the social economic atmosphere of many citizens of Oregon. They live in conditions which impede their growth as elementary and secondary students. As a major formulator of thought and opinion, higher education representatives should design something as a means by which leadership can be provided to help legislators, politicians, and public officials to understand more thoroughly the relationship between the poor social and economic conditions and the drain on the state's ability to come back.

Mr. Petersen thanked Mr. Cawthorne for his comments and said he sensed there was a real opportunity for the Board to work with him in the development of this program and others which he had outlined. He told Mr. Cawthorne access to the Board was always available to him for his comments.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alttucker, Chao, Crowell, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

President Meyers said Western Oregon State College had had an Asian and Pacific Basin initiative on campus for the past several years. Major areas of study in international studies and international business were part of this initiative with exchange agreements for faculty and students between Western Oregon State College and foreign colleges and universities.

President Meyers then introduced three visiting professors who were on the campus during the past year. Professor Leon Liu came to Western as a result of the Board's official visit to Fujian Province in China last year. He is chairman of the Division of Foreign Languages at Fujian Agricultural College. He has been teaching Chinese language and culture at Western.

Three distinguished Fulbright professors from Mahidol University in Thailand were at Western during the past year. Two were present at the meeting. President Meyers said Dr. Chalong Boonwananta is chairman of the Department of Education at Mahidol University and has served as an elementary school principal. He has been continuing his research on a comparative study of modernization and education for young people while working in the school of education at Western. Dr. Poonpit Amatyakul has a doctor of medicine degree and did further graduate work in communication disorders at Temple University. He is also a music specialist and has been teaching a course on ethnomusicology in Southeast Asian music while at Western.
President Meyers said a second part of his report was in response to a request from the Board to feature something on the campus that was of extreme value and connected to the mission of the institution. He indicated the presentation from Western was entitled, "Minority Student: No Longer a Vision--a Reality." Mr. Xavier Romano, Director of Minority Student Affairs, led the discussion.

Mr. Romano said he had come to Western two years ago to begin a minority student services program. The program has been highly successful. It has been done without any federal funds as a result of hard work and because of the students who participate.

Mr. Romano said the growth of the program had been spectacular, approximately 123%. Students are recruited only in Oregon. It uses one-on-one advising only. He indicated a multicultural student union has been formed and is a program geared to the real world, dealing with real issues which are relevant to producing tomorrow's leaders.

The minority student services program has been developed without creating an entire new network simply by bridging existing programs and getting the most out of campus resources. He then requested the individual students to explain what was special about the program.

Miss Cheri Williams, a freshman from Philomath, said she was a Native American Indian and had come from a small town and a small high school. She said it was important to her to have the faculty know her on a daily basis because she had been concerned about just getting lost in the crowd. She said the faculty and administration at Western had been great and had put all her fears to rest.

She said she felt they were truly concerned with the questions and problems of students and she could not imagine being happier anywhere else.

Mr. Philippe Grandjean, a freshman from Gresham, said he was Hispanic. The friendly people and being a part of the multicultural student union were what made Western special to him. He mentioned that Mr. Romano had been very supportive to him during his freshman year and it had really helped to make that year successful. Being part of the multicultural student union feels like being a part of a family which can be of help when needed. Mr. Grandjean said he considered himself a part of the college and what is going on at all times. As a result, he had the feeling he could help to make changes that might make the college better for minorities in the future.
Miss Emelda Lopez, a freshman from Hawaii, said the comments about having a personal relationship with faculty and administrators was very true. Students have an opportunity to be leaders, and the students make a difference in the activities at Western.

Mr. Tim Seidle, a senior from Philadelphia, stated he had attended Western previously and then left school. When he returned, he found changes which led him to stay and maintain his education at the institution. The commitment of President Meyers to make Western an all-around school in terms of educational experience and the creation of the multicultural student union were factors influencing that decision. He mentioned the desire and commitment of the faculty and administration to assist minorities in maintaining their education, developing their potential, and participating in leadership activities. As a result, minorities are less intimidated when they reach the working world and can participate fully in the responsibilities of their chosen endeavors.

Mr. Seidle said the minorities need a way to get past the fear that results from the feelings of intimidation they have with respect to educational institutions. Financial assistance is fine, but having an organization in place, such as the one at Western, is extremely helpful. The attitude at Western encourages freedom for minorities to express themselves. With that freedom comes responsibility, and minorities are learning that responsibility at Western.

Mr. Romano emphasized that the multicultural student union, as opposed to separate student unions for the various minorities, serves as a training ground for what students will encounter in the real world. He said the program at Western was very special but sometimes not typical. It emphasizes a family and community attitude.

In response to questions concerning membership in the multicultural student union and its role in recruiting, Mr. Romano said there was an active membership of 45-60 and he regularly used students in his recruitment trips. They can better articulate the attitudes, atmosphere and changes at the institution.

R. A. Stenard, The Chancellor indicated that after a nationwide search for the Appointment as Dean of Students, EOSC had requested approval of the appointment of Dr. Richard A. Stenard to that position. The Chancellor recommended that the Board approve the appointment, effective July 1, 1987, at an annual salary rate of $52,600.
The Board approved the recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Mr. Crowell was absent from the meeting at this time.

**Staff Report to the Board**

At the April 17, 1987, meeting of the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, the Executive Vice Chancellor presented suggested minimum components of a grievance procedure for consideration and future action by the Board. In light of the requirements that will result if Senate Bill 619 becomes law, the staff believes that the Board would be well advised to adopt an Administrative Rule specifying grievance procedure elements to be followed by all System institutions rather than merely articulating the minimum components of a grievance procedure.

Senate Bill 619 would require the State Board of Higher Education to adopt a rule specifying certain guidelines for institution grievance procedures. The bill has been passed by the Senate and referred to the House.

The staff further proposed that the grievance procedure rule be adopted immediately as a temporary rule with the understanding that after proper notice and public hearing the rule will be brought before the Board in June as a proposed permanent rule. The notice of intent to adopt a permanent rule will appear in the May 15 issue of the Secretary of State's Administrative Rule Bulletin. The public hearing for the permanent rule is scheduled for May 28, 1987, at 10 a.m.

At the hearing on Senate Bill 619 held before the Senate Labor Committee, the committee members expressed displeasure that the Board's staff had yet to present an Administrative Rule on grievance procedures to the Board for approval. Some faculty groups have also indicated disappointment that a grievance procedure rule has yet to be adopted.

The immediate adoption of this rule would indicate to the Legislative Assembly a good faith effort to comply with the wishes of the 1985 Assembly as expressed in SB 542, which was subsequently vetoed by Governor Atiyeh. Of equal importance is the need to have a rule on grievance procedures in place before the end of this academic year as an indication of Board intent to address the concerns of faculty regarding the adequacy of existing grievance procedures and to specify to the institutions the guidelines for responding to faculty grievances.
The proposed rule has been circulated to the institutions, faculty organizations and other interested persons for review and comment. Virginia Boushey, Assistant to the Executive Vice Chancellor, will report on comments received prior to the Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that the Board adopt a temporary rule on grievance procedures after holding an informal hearing to receive comments from interested persons. The staff recommended the following rule language:

Grievance Procedures

580-21-050 (1) The institutions shall adopt, in consultation with faculty advisory committees including female and minority faculty and representatives of certified bargaining units, if any, appropriate grievance procedures, in accordance with the rule making procedures of the Administrative Procedures Act. The grievance procedures shall apply to all unclassified academic employes with faculty rank.

(2) "Grievance" means a complaint by an academic employe that the employe was wronged in connection with reappointment, compensation, tenure, promotion, or other conditions of employment. "Other conditions of employment" shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, violations of academic freedom, discriminatory employment practices and nondiscriminatory employment practices and laws, rules, policies and procedures under which the institution operates. The adopted procedures shall not lessen any employe rights under existing institutional grievance procedures.

(3) The rules shall:

(a) Set out the details of a grievance procedure appropriate to the institution;

(b) Include both informal and formal steps. The formal steps shall include an appropriate administrator, a faculty committee (at the option of the grievant), and the institution president. However a grievance may be resolved at any step. In a formal grievance, all complaints, responses, and decisions must be in writing;

(c) Establish for each time limits within which a grievance must be filed and which will permit timely resolution of issues. Informal grievances shall receive a response within 15 calendar days. In no instance shall the length of time between the presentation of the written grievance and the Board's decision be more than 150 days, unless agreed to by the grievant. In the event a decision is not made at any level within the designated time limit, the grievance shall be forwarded to the next step;
(d) Provide for a hearing, at the option of the grievant, by a faculty committee selected by the faculty at the institution.

(4) The institution may elect not to proceed with a grievance if the grievant also seeks resolution in another forum.

(5) The institution shall adopt rules of procedure for the faculty committee which allow for:
   (a) A meaningful opportunity for the grievant to be heard;
   (b) An opportunity for each party to present evidence argument, and rebuttal;
   (c) The right to representation for each party at that party's expense;
   (d) A hearing open to the public at the option of the grievant to the extent allowed by law;
   (e) Written conclusions, based only upon evidence presented at the hearing; and
   (f) Access by each party to a complete record of the hearing.

(6) The faculty committee shall make recommendations regarding the disposition of the grievance.

(7) Unless the grievance is resolved at a lower level, the president of the institution, or a designee of the president, shall review the recommendations of the faculty committee, if any, and the president shall issue a decision.

(8) If the president rejects or modifies the recommendations of the faculty hearing committee, the reasons shall be stated in writing, and a copy provided to the grievant.

(9) The grievant may appeal the decision of the president to the Board. The Board shall adopt rules for hearing appealed cases and may delegate the case to a hearings officer. In either case, the appeal shall be heard and a decision reached by the Board within 60 days. Board review shall be limited to a review of alleged errors by the institution with respect to procedure, adherence to Administrative Rules or applicable law.

(10) Where collective bargaining agreements or Administrative Rules exist at an institution in which grievance procedures are specified and such procedures exceed the standards in this rule, such agreements or Administrative Rules shall control.

(11) After consultation with the appropriate faculty committees and approval of the Chancellor's Office, each institution shall adopt its rules by June 1, 1988.

(12) Each institution shall report annually to the Board beginning July 1989 on the number, basis, and outcome of all formal grievances filed under the rules herein required.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Chancellor reviewed activities since the previous Legislative Session which related to affirmative action and equity issues. In April 1985, the Board adopted a policy requiring each institution to inform initial applicants of factors to be considered in determining initial salary, record in each faculty member's file factors used to determine salary, publish salary increases accompanying promotions in rank, identify and record any special salary stipend in each faculty member's file, advise faculty of the guidelines for merit increases, and conduct a salary equity review every two years. Each institution was required to review all appointments, promotions, and tenure and salary procedures to eliminate any discriminatory bias, and the reviewing bodies included women and minority faculty members. The results of these reviews were reported to the Board early in 1986. Each of the institutions complied and filed with the central office its revised affirmative action/equity policies and the grievance procedure. The policies were reviewed in the central office for compliance with the directives.

The Chancellor indicated that in September 1985, Board members, presidents, and administrative staff from the Chancellor's Office attended a two-day training session on equity/fairness issues and their specific applications to higher education.

In addition, the Board developed an interim grievance procedure to hear any claims of sex discrimination by faculty. The conclusion of the grievance procedure was binding arbitration by an outside panel. Ten grievances were filed through the use of this process. Five resulted in negotiated settlements, and one was appealed to the panel.

The Chancellor said he had evaluated the performance of five institution presidents since 1985, and in each instance, had specifically and intensely inquired of everyone interviewed regarding the president's reputation and performance, both on campus and in the community, on affirmative action and discrimination issues. Each review included 90-150 individuals interviewed. Two presidential searches have been conducted since 1985. A significant emphasis was placed on the past performance record of each applicant regarding affirmative action matters.

In October 1986, the Board's Office staff provided training to all new deans and administrators on prevention of sexual harassment and affirmative action responsibilities. This training was part of an ongoing training program for faculty members and administrators. It will be repeated in some form at the beginning of each academic year.
The Board heard, in December 1986, reports of each president's efforts to correct underrepresentation of women, minorities, and handicapped individuals among the student population and among State System employees.

The Chancellor said in February 1987, in response to faculty concerns, the Chancellor's Office promulgated a draft model grievance procedure of minimum components for a grievance procedure. The institutions and faculty were provided an opportunity to respond with proposed changes. Subsequently, after a further response to faculty concerns, the staff has proposed a systemwide grievance procedure. He said the Board would consider adoption of this procedure as a temporary rule at the Board meeting later in the day, with adoption of a permanent rule anticipated at the Board's June 1987 meeting following compliance with all of the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act.

This action is one of a series of intensive events by the institutions, the central office, and the Board in addressing equity and fairness as they relate to faculty procedures and rules establishing fair and equitable grievance procedures.

The Chancellor then requested Ms. Virginia Boushey to report specifically on the policy proposed by the staff for Committee and Board consideration.

Ms. Boushey said recommended changes to the docket draft of the proposed rule had been prepared and were being circulated to the Board. The changes were based on comments received to date from the Department of Justice, from the institutions, and from faculty groups. She indicated that some of the changes were made in order to be consistent with the legislative bill which has now passed both houses of the Legislature. Other changes were to improve the language and clarify the process or to delete language which had no specific definition or had been removed from the legislative bill.

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

Board Discussion and Action

At the time set for the informal public hearing on the proposed adoption of OAR 580-21-050, Grievance Procedures, as a temporary rule, Mr. Petersen invited those who wished to comment to make their presentations.
Dr. Sally Malueg, Faculty Senate President at Oregon State University indicated her testimony was being given in compliance with action taken by the Oregon State University Faculty Senate which, in a regular meeting on May 7, 1987, by voice vote, chose to support the proposed Administrative Rule in preference to SB 619, with the understanding that, under the circumstances, its choices were limited to these two options.

Without regard to the specific provisions of either the Administrative Rule or the Senate Bill, she said it was the position of the Faculty Senate that some grievance procedure should be in place at each institution. A widely understood procedure or procedures, will function to head off grievances by discouraging decisions that might otherwise promote grievances and settle expeditiously those that do occur.

The reference in the proposed Administrative Rule to informal steps in handling complaints is appreciated because these have been quite successful. In regard to formal grievances, Dr. Malueg said the Faculty Senate supported the concept of having time periods during which certain steps of adjudication of complaints must be handled.

Dr. Malueg said the Faculty Senate was aware of the reservations many have of the wisdom of allowing decisions on conditions of employment, such as those on promotion and tenure, to be grieved. The complexity of the task of writing workable procedures for the grieving of decisions that already have been considered carefully is not to be minimized. However, the presence of grievance procedures is expected to prevent many grievances by promoting the careful handling of potentially grievable matters.

The Faculty Senate is sensitive also to the views of some faculty and staff that procedures which permit affirmative action complaints to be handled without their becoming grievances would be both wise and productive.

A final concern relates to the issue of salary increases, especially merit increases. Since the adjusting of salaries, whether across-the-board or for merit, is less scrutinized and less prescribed by criteria, the Faculty Senate thinks that it may deserve special consideration. An avenue of action which is somewhat more than an informal complaint and less than a grievance would seem to fit this category.

Dr. Malueg said if the temporary rule were adopted, the Faculty Senate would hope and expect that there would be an opportunity for further refinement of its provisions during the subsequent period of its consideration for adoption as a permanent rule.
Dr. Gary Huxford presented testimony for himself and Mr. Erhard Dortmund, members of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate from Western Oregon State College. Their testimony was made on behalf of that organization.

Dr. Huxford indicated that of the two proposals, the proposed Administrative Rule was preferred. However, the grievance process for represented and unrepresented faculty alike is a nest of complexity. To understand it is an arduous experience. He also commented that the Administrative Rule directive calling for a grievance procedure did not make provision for arbitration.

Ms. Jetta Siegel, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Conference of the American Association of University Professors, spoke in support of adoption of the proposed rule. She also distributed a summary of previous actions relating to grievance procedures. She indicated the AAUP had been involved in urging this kind of action since the 1985 Legislative Session. She said, in sensing the need for minimal grievance guidelines for colleges and universities in the State System, the preference has always been that they be developed within the System itself, with input from both faculty and administrators. Until this most recent proposal, she said faculty input had never been solicited and she thanked Ms. Boushey for keeping the faculty involved in the process, explaining her reasons for not agreeing with some of the suggestions and for taking those with which she could agree. She also was very helpful in efforts to develop an acceptable bill with the sponsors of SB 619 and in alleviating some of the controversy concerning the legislation.

Ms. Siegel said she firmly believed that a well-defined grievance process, with built-in time limits and faculty review as set forth in the proposed Administrative Rule, would resolve some of the unfortunate situations and complaints that have occurred in the past.

Dr. Whitney Bates, President of the Oregon Conference of the American Association of University Professors, said the issues addressed in either the Administrative Rule or SB 619 would not be resolved to the satisfaction of everyone regardless of the final decisions. He said the decision-making process should come essentially from within the university, although obviously there must be some outside appeal. He endorsed and urged adoption of the proposed Administrative Rule.

Mr. Petersen then inquired whether staff had any further comments in response to the testimony; there were none.
The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, and adopted the proposed temporary OAR 580-21-050, Grievance Procedures, on roll call vote. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Crowell was absent from the meeting at this time.

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

On March 20, 1987, the Board of Higher Education reviewed and "conditionally adopted" a proposal calling for a fifth-year teacher preparation program for the public colleges and universities under its purview. The proposal called for shifting the preparation of teachers from its current undergraduate program to a graduate program that places more emphasis on subject matter preparation and closely supervised field experiences in school districts.

The Board conditionally adopted the fifth-year program with the stipulation that educators and interested citizens throughout the state have an opportunity to provide comments on the proposal through public hearings and a six-week period for written comments.

Educators and citizens throughout the state were thereafter notified about the public review period. Copies of the proposal and hearing schedule were sent to all school districts and Educational Service District offices in the state, as well as educational agencies and organizations, and colleges and universities. Hearing notices were provided to all area newspapers; press releases were provided to radio and television stations. In all, more than 800 copies of the proposal were sent to agencies and organizations throughout the state.

Public Hearings

Seven public hearings were held at the following times and locations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland Area</td>
<td>April 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford/Ashland Area</td>
<td>April 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem/Corvallis/Albany Area</td>
<td>April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos Bay Area</td>
<td>April 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene/Springfield Area</td>
<td>April 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grande Area</td>
<td>April 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend/Redmond Area</td>
<td>April 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written comments were received by the Chancellor's Office through April 30, 1987. During the six-week period of review, the Chancellor's Office received some 20 letters of comment and telephone calls on the proposal. Numerous comments were received at public hearings, with a breakdown of those testifying and in attendance as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Testifying</th>
<th>In Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland Area</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford/Ashland Area</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem/Corvallis/Albany Area</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos Bay Area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene/Springfield Area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grande Area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend/Redmond Area</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all, the Board of Higher Education heard from more than 200 teachers, administrators, students, and various educational agencies and organizations in the state.

Receiving testimony at the hearings were a member of the Board of Higher Education (serving as the Hearing Officer), a staff member from the Office of Academic Affairs of the Chancellor's Office, and a dean representing one of the colleges of education in the State System.

Listed below are the topics that received the most comment:

1. The need for the extended, fifth-year program.
2. The wisdom of providing a master's degree at the end of the fifth year.
3. The elimination of the undergraduate education major.
4. The utility of a liberal studies major for elementary teachers.
5. The adequacy of a limited number of education courses (12-15 hours) prior to beginning the fifth year.
6. Costs associated with field placements for graduate interns and the use of mentor teachers to serve as supervisors.
7. Use of the National Teacher Examination for subject matter testing.
8. Impacts of the proposal on speciality areas such as special education, vocational education, counseling, and reading endorsements.
9. The wisdom of delaying early practica in school districts the fifth year.
10. The need for better integration of special education with regular education.
11. Costs of the program to students, school districts and institutions.
12. The need to raise standards to teacher education programs --
taking fewer but better qualified students.
13. The adequacy of involvement by various groups in development
of the proposal.

Topics #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 11 received the most comment.
There was virtual consensus on Topic #12 that we should maintain
high standards for admission to teacher education programs and
recruit the best people to the profession.

In order to portray the range of testimony received on these
and other aspects of the proposal by issue area, excerpts (some
directly quoted, some paraphrased) were provided in a
supplement to the report. Every effort has been
made in compiling this summary to select testimony that fairly
reflects the range of comments provided by those testifying --
their concerns, questions, and recommendations for revisions.
It should be noted that while many of those testifying spoke on
behalf of themselves, some spoke on behalf of various education
associations and organizations. Where these latter groups have
taken a specific position on an aspect of the proposal, they
have been so identified. (A copy of the supplement is on file in
the Board's Office.)

Revised Proposal

The principal goal of this revised teacher education proposal
remains to attract and prepare highly qualified students to the
teaching profession. We believe that public school teachers in
the 1990's and the twenty-first century should possess the
following attributes:

* a thirst for learning nurtured by a strong liberal arts
  and sciences education;
* mastery of the subject(s) they will teach;
* high quality professional training in effective teaching;
* experience as a student teacher in a variety of public
  school settings.

To prepare teachers with these attributes, the staff has revised
its proposal for an extended teacher education program. (See
the attached chart shown as Supplement A to these minutes,
for a comparison of the original and revised proposals.) The
revised proposal establishes guidelines that the schools of
education should follow in reorganizing teacher education
programs on their respective campuses. These guidelines are
more general than those in the original proposal. This was
done in response to testimony recommending that the schools of
education be allowed to develop diverse and innovative teacher
education programs. This revised proposal also provides more
flexibility in the implementation of new extended teacher education programs. State System institutions have up to two and a half years to present their proposals to the State Board. In these proposals, particular attention will be given to new post-baccalaureate programs designed to attract college graduates who have not previously thought of teaching careers.

The following guidelines are proposed for the State Board's review of teacher education programs in the State System:

1. **Extended Program.** Teacher preparation programs in the State System should be extended to five years to ensure that future teachers are well-educated, possess superior knowledge of the subject(s) they will teach, have strong professional educations, and have adequate practice teaching in school settings.

2. **Academic Major.** All students should be required to complete a baccalaureate degree in a major outside of education.

3. **Education Courses.** Schools of education may offer education minors, concentrations, and courses for students desiring to begin their professional education courses before completing the baccalaureate degree. The undergraduate major in education should be eliminated.

4. **Undergraduate Practicum.** Schools of education should provide student teaching opportunities for undergraduates who are considering careers in teaching.

5. **Programmatic Recommendations from Public Hearings.** In designing teacher education programs, schools of education should consider the following suggestions received at the statewide public hearings:

* New interdisciplinary or liberal studies majors should be available, in addition to traditional majors, for students intending to become elementary teachers.

* Special education courses should be integrated into the teacher education curriculum for all students intending to be regular classroom teachers as well as for those desiring to become special education teachers.

* All teacher education programs should include courses focusing on multiethnic and multicultural education.
6. **Post-baccalaureate Programs.** State System schools of education should establish distinctive, post-baccalaureate programs that encourage and facilitate graduates, who have not taken education courses, to enter the teaching profession. These accelerated graduate teacher education programs should be designed to enable post-baccalaureate students to complete certification requirements in one year. Schools may also want to offer new Master's of Arts in Teaching degrees, which could be completed at, or about, the same time as certification requirements.

7. **Fee Policy.** The State Board should expand its post-baccalaureate fee policy for teachers even though fifth year students could be fulfilling some or all of the requirements for a graduate degree. The State Board should also support other means, such as the Teacher Corps (forgivable loan program) and Mentor Teacher proposals, to assist students in meeting the financial burdens of the extended teacher education programs.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

Because major revisions have been made in this proposal, the Board's staff recommended delaying further action on the proposal until June to permit continued discussion and consideration of these changes. If the Board approves the proposed guidelines for extended teacher education programs in June, each institution would be required to prepare and present to the Board, no later than October 1989, a plan for reorganizing its teacher education program in accordance with the approved guidelines.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

Dr. Pierce reviewed the revised teacher education proposal, including the comparison of the original and revised proposals outlined in the chart shown in Supplement A to these minutes. The guidelines for the institutions to follow in presenting their proposals to the Board have been expanded in the revised proposal to allow room for offering undergraduate courses in education for those students who decide early that they want to become public school teachers. This was especially important in the areas of elementary education and special education where many professionals in the field believed that it would take a longer period of time for professional education than just the fifth year in order to prepare to teach in these areas.
The changes in the proposal at the graduate level would refer more to an extended five-year program where the fifth year would lead to completion of the academic requirements for certification and a major portion of the graduate requirement for the master's degree, but would not end necessarily in a master's degree. This gives the institutions some flexibility in designing the upper-division and graduate-level programs.

Dr. Pierce said he thought many groups now were supporting the revised proposal or liked its flexibility. However, there are concerns about the timing and some would like to have the proposals from the institutions presented by January 1989 so that the 1989 Legislature would know the Board's intent and the proposals could be discussed substantively with the Legislature. He said the teacher and administrative groups want to be certain the schools of education include them in the designs of the programs brought to the Board. They want to be consulted and to participate in the design and implementation of these programs.

Dr. Pierce said it was intended, in the proposal to be brought to the Board in June, to have a very strong statement about the need to include the professional teaching community of Oregon in the design and implementation of the programs at the institutional level.

In response to a question from Mr. Hensley, Dr. Pierce stated the institutions would be required to document the opportunity provided for these groups to participate at the time each institution presented its proposed teacher education program.

Mr. Petersen then invited Ms. Sandy Ellis, President of the Oregon Education Association, to comment on the proposal.

Ms. Ellis said many of the questions which the Oregon Education Association would have would be in connection with the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and how it changes certification with regard to this particular proposal. She said she was very pleased to see there was some extension of the plan back into the undergraduate level, particularly with the ability of field experience.

She said teachers were concerned with the training level at the completion of the fifth year and the impact of the proposal in terms of the salary scale. Teachers usually have a standard certificate at the end of a fifth year. Under the new proposal, it would appear teachers would have a basic certificate after completing the fifth year. The program seems to be asking for more preparation and more work with less results at the end of it.
Ms. Ellis said it would be helpful to integrate some of the programs in special education and remedial work because with mainstreaming, the teachers deal with a variety of kinds of students.

The Chancellor commented on the issue of training and the salary impact. He said it would be possible to plan a five-year program that would combine both a bachelor's and a master of teaching degree. The opposition to that seems to be the view that it would be a cheap master's degree, it would be downgraded, and people would be entering the market at a master's level beginning salary. He said the State System staff needed some clear guidelines because he also was reluctant to have the student pay for a fifth year and receive no financial compensation and have no degree in hand to show for that fifth year. He said he had great reservations about the fifth year counting only partially for a master's degree because in virtually all of the other five-year professional programs the student receives either a double baccalaureate major or a bachelor's with a master's degree. The final proposal should be done in a way which would most benefit teachers and the schools they serve and at the least expense to the student.

Ms. Ellis said she was not interested in lessening the value of the master's degree. She indicated that if the student received the standard certificate, then the fifth year would be worth the added time and cost.

Mr. Dodson said there had been a number of comments on the supply and demand issue that indicated there was a teacher shortage. He asked whether prospective teachers would be lured to other states because of the concern expressed in the comments about the certificate.

Ms. Ellis said she did not think so because Oregon did not have a shortage of teachers. Shortages exist in some areas, but many persons are interested in coming to Oregon. There are some problems in eastern Oregon in the less populated areas in attracting people and getting them to remain. However, it is not likely there will be a severe impact as a result of having a fifth year in terms of people going to another state which requires less.

Both Dr. Pierce and Ms. Ellis expressed an interest in arranging for appropriate communication between staff from the State System and the Oregon Education Association.

Mr. Petersen requested Board members to submit any comments or concerns to Dr. Pierce in writing at least two weeks prior to the June meeting.
Dr. Pierce described briefly the individuals who had been consulted and involved in the development of the plan to date. The deans of education, the academic council, and faculties in the schools of education have participated. In addition faculty members in other disciplines in the arts and sciences were included. Another key group was the Joint Interim Committee on Education, along with Representative Vera Katz, who has had a very strong interest in teacher education reform. The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators and the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission also were consulted.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Hensley indicated the Committee of the Whole had not had an opportunity earlier to act on the staff recommendation. He said that unless there were questions from Board members, he would move that the Board approve the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adams.

The Board approved the motion with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Crowell was absent from the meeting at this time.

**Authorize Dedication of Land to City of Ashland, SOSC**

As a part of the negotiations to bring about the development of the National Forensics Laboratory, U. S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, on the campus of Southern Oregon State College, the City of Ashland agreed to participate in certain infrastructure improvements which would enhance the site of the Forensics Laboratory. A lease of four acres of land in the north campus area of Southern Oregon State College was executed in November 1986.

The improvements proposed by the City, and to be carried out at its expense, include the improvement of Campus Way from East Main Street south approximately 435 feet for a 60-foot paved roadway, terminating in a cul-de-sac. This roadway would provide access to the Forensics Laboratory. A future improvement, which would be dependent on progress for the Northwest Raptor Rehabilitation Corporation facilities, and be sited on adjacent Southern Oregon State College land, would extend Campus Way southeast from the cul-de-sac to intersect with Walker Avenue.
In order for the City of Ashland to proceed, it has requested dedication of the Campus Way right-of-way to the City (an area approximately 60 feet by 380 feet) and an easement for the cul-de-sac. In return the City will carry out the improvement, including utility services, at no cost to Southern Oregon State College, and will maintain Campus Way in perpetuity.

The easement is intended to run for five years. If Campus Way has not been extended within that time, leading to an additional dedication of public access right-of-way, the cul-de-sac would then be dedicated to the City. Dedication is not requested at this time because the proposed extension would involve a different land area than the cul-de-sac would require.

Southern Oregon State College officials recommend approval of the initial dedication and easement and believe the cost of improvements and the on-going maintenance borne by the City of Ashland are fair exchange for the land area involved, approximately 0.52 acre.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

The staff recommended the Committee and the Board authorize the President and Secretary of the Board, on behalf of Southern Oregon State College, to dedicate to the City of Ashland approximately 0.52 acre, consisting of a 60-foot right-of-way running south approximately 380 feet from East Main Street, in return for which the City of Ashland shall install utilities and improve a roadway to be known as Campus Way; and to authorize the President and Secretary of the Board to execute appropriate documentes for easement to the City of Ashland for public use of an area to be developed into a cul-de-sac as a termination of Campus Way until a determination can be made as to whether Campus Way will be extended to intersect with Walker Avenue or will remain as initially developed. In either event, a further dedication will be required within five years from the date of this dedication. The City of Ashland shall maintain the dedicated lands and improvements at no cost to Southern Oregon State College.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Crowell was absent from the meeting at this time.
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Approval of
Concept of
OIT Portland
Center
Relocating to
Clackamas
County

Staff Report to the Board

The failure to acquire the Callahan Center as a site for the relocation of Oregon Institute of Technology's Portland Center has not ended the possible opportunities available to Oregon Institute of Technology. The Clackamas County Board of Commissioners has proposed using economic development funds available to it to acquire the vacant Harmony Elementary School (25,000 sq.ft.) and five acres of land and allocate its reuse to Clackamas Community College and Oregon Institute of Technology's Portland Center. The acquisition, renovation and site enhancement is estimated at $900,000. An additional $500,000 would be required for furnishings and equipment. The annual costs of operation and maintenance of the facility is estimated at $60,000, with occupancy scheduled for Fall 1988.

Of the $900,000, Clackamas County would provide $600,000; Clackamas Community College would provide $120,000; and the state would provide $180,000, which has been pledged by Governor Goldschmidt.

Clackamas Community College and Oregon Institute of Technology would share the Operating and Maintenance costs on a 50/50 basis. Oregon Institute of Technology's $30,000 share is within its current budget levels. The half-million for furnishings and equipment will be sought as gifts and grants.

The site is adjacent to the Clackamas Town Center shopping mall.

In a second phase, expected within five years, a second school facility, Ickes Middle School and seven acres of land, would be added to the initial site. The costs of Phase II, for acquisition and rehabilitation/renovation is estimated at $2 million to be shared among the County, Clackamas Community College, and the state. The state's share of this cost is estimated at $750,000, sources for which have not been specifically identified. The Ickes Middle School contains 55,000 square feet.

President Blake requests and recommends the Board's endorsement of this concept and authorization to proceed with the additional details of planning and negotiation which are required.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that Oregon Institute of Technology be authorized to proceed with planning and negotiation with Clackamas County and Clackamas Community College toward the acquisition, renovation and occupancy of Harmony Elementary School as a site for Oregon Institute of Technology's Portland Center for the Fall Quarter, 1988.
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Neland said a modified recommendation had been prepared for the Board's consideration as a result of events subsequent to the preparation of the original staff recommendation. He indicated Mr. Hensley was prepared to present the revised recommendation for Board consideration.

Mr. Hensley moved a revised staff recommendation stating that the Board directed Oregon Institute of Technology to proceed with planning and negotiation with Clackamas County and Clackamas Community College toward the acquisition, renovation, and occupancy of Harmony Elementary School as a site for Oregon Institute of Technology's Portland Center for the Fall Quarter 1988. The Board also directed the staff to seek the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission's approval of the new location for Oregon Institute of Technology's Portland Program. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chao.

Mr. Adams asked whether the seven acres of land in the second phase was contiguous to the site. Mr. Neland indicated that it was. He said additional land, which belongs to the Highway Division and is unneeded right-of-way, could be acquired to enlarge the campus at some future time.

In response to a question from Mr. Alltucker, Mr. Neland indicated the Board was not being committed to Phase 2 at the present time.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented by Mr. Hensley, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Crowell was absent from the meeting at this time.

Staff Report to the Board

In granting conditional approval for the submitting of a construction grant request to the National Institutes of Health by the Oregon Health Sciences University to provide funds for completion of electron microscopy and animal care facilities within the pending Eye Center, the Committee and Board, at the April 17, 1987, meeting, requested additional information related to the grant. Authorization to file the grant was given under the condition that if the additional information was not satisfactory, the grant request would be withdrawn.

The questions raised by the Committee concerned primarily two areas: (1) the cost of operating and maintaining the Eye Center, and the funding sources for those costs; and (2) further clarification on the acquisition of the proposed electron microscope.
The funds requested in the grant did not include this equipment item.

To the question of operation and maintenance costs, Oregon Health Sciences University officials have reported that the anticipated annual costs will be $620,268, which would be funded in equal parts from Education and General resources for the instruction and research activities within the Eye Center; and from Auxiliary Enterprise funds through hospital and clinic fees for service for the clinical activities. The project also includes a parking structure of 122,595 gross square feet, which will incur annual Operating and Maintenance costs estimated at $19,652 to be funded through the Oregon Health Sciences University Parking Operations program. The operation and maintenance cost estimates above are reported in 1987-1989 prices, and will be adjusted to 1989-1991 prices when they are included in that biennium's budget request. The facility is scheduled for occupancy in the late summer of 1989.

To the question of the electron microscope which would be installed in the Eye Center, Oregon Health Sciences University officials report that a microscope will be purchased from gift funds, if such funds exceed the amount required to fund the project. The present electron microscope available to ophthalmology is 20 years old and is not optically adequate for current applications. It must be continually recalibrated and suffers numerous breakdowns. Replacement parts are now difficult to obtain. The electron microscopes in the Basic Ophthalmology Center are similarly aging and are not able to handle the ophthalmology workload if that department's equipment is not replaced. The cost of replacement electron microscopes currently range from $60,000-$325,000, depending on type and sophistication.

A Presentation of Capital Construction Items form relating to this grant was included in the docket and is on file in the Board's Office.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that the requested information be acknowledged by the Board, and, if found acceptable, that the actions of the Committee and Board at the April 17, 1987, meeting be ratified without the attendant conditions. Additionally, to reflect current estimates of direct construction costs, as reported by the project architects, it was recommended that the Board approve an increase in the total project budget to $18,200,000, the funding to consist of $11,700,000 from federal grants and private and foundation gifts, and $6,500,000 of Article XI-F(1) bonds. If approved, legislative agreement to this expenditure limitation will be sought during the pending Ways and Means subcommittee hearings on the 1987-1989 Capital Construction Request.
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Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendations as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Crowell was absent from the meeting at this time.

Adjust Budget Limitation
For Patient Parking Structure/Office Tower, OHSU

Staff Report to the Board

In October 1986, the Board approved a budget plan for the Patient Parking Structure/Office Tower for the Oregon Health Sciences University, in the amount of $9,540,000. Subsequently, the State Emergency Board established an expenditure limitation for the Parking Structure at $4,810,000, but deferred the Office Tower to the 1987 Legislative Assembly. Legislative consideration of the Office Tower is scheduled to coincide with the hearings on the 1987-1989 Capital Construction Request.

Subsequent to the October/November meetings cited above, Oregon Health Sciences University officials have retained an architectural consultant to begin design of the parking structure and office tower. Adjusting the design to the site, unforeseen utility problems, and logistical difficulties during construction have resulted in a revised construction cost estimate, necessitating an adjustment in the total project budget from $9,540,000 to $11,325,000.

The additional funds to cover the increase of $1,785,000 in the project budget will come from additional Article XI-F(1) bonds: $1,690,000 attributable to the Parking Structure and $95,000 attributable to the Office Tower.

Because these projects will be considered by the Ways & Means Subcommittee on Capital Construction, probably within the next two weeks, authorization is sought from the Board to request adjustments in the expenditure limitations to reflect the anticipated costs.

A Project Presentation Form was provided with the request and is on file in the Board's Office.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended the Board approve the increase in total project budget for the Patient Parking Structure/Office Tower project for the Oregon Health Sciences University from $9,540,000 to $11,325,000 and authorize the staff to request legislative approval of an increase in the Other Funds expenditure limitation for this project to $11,325,000.
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Board Discussion and Action

In response to a question concerning the reasons for the 20% increase in cost, Mr. Neland said the original estimates were made prior to selection of architects and were based on some analyses of parking structure costs in general. These were essentially for structures on flat land, and the costs are substantially higher for the site of this structure. Mr. Chao asked that future estimates include a cost factor for non-flat sites.

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Crowell was absent from the meeting at this time.

Staff Report to the Board

In order to enable the construction of a new Oregon National Guard Armory in Ashland which would provide certain advantages to Southern Oregon State College, the Board, on May 26, 1978, approved a Southern Oregon State College request that appropriate Board officials be authorized to enter into a 50-year lease (30 years for the first term, with an option for an additional 20 years) with the State of Oregon Department of Military. The lease pertains to approximately 5.31 acres of land located at the northwest corner of the campus just north of the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks.

The original 30-year lease, which became effective on December 1, 1978, and will continue through November 30, 2008, was amended on December 27, 1983, as a result of Board action on December 16, 1983. Such action extended the time period from five years to ten years within which construction must begin following the execution of the lease. Substantial construction, therefore, must be underway by December 1, 1988. Other minor changes included in that Amendment No. 1 reflected the findings of a subsequent land survey and a requirement that the lessee maintain the vacant property in a manner consistent with the college's maintenance program, particularly with respect to aesthetics and fire hazard abatement.

Meanwhile, the Oregon Legislature did not allocate the state's portion of the necessary joint federal/state capital funding until the 1985 Legislative Assembly.

Construction bids are to be received on June 4, 1987, with actual construction now scheduled to begin about mid-June 1987. In early May 1987, Southern Oregon State College officials received notification from the Oregon Military Department that matching federal funds needed for the project would not be
released until the Oregon Military Department files a certified statement through the Oregon Department of Justice that the land is available for federal use for at least 50 years. The justification for this requirement is that the initial ten years of use under the original lease (December 1978 through November 1988) have been negated because construction funds did not become available.

A more recent land survey, conducted jointly by the Oregon Military Department and the College, has resulted in a further revision of the legal description of the land covered by the lease. There is no change in the total number of acres.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the appropriate Board staff be authorized to execute Amendment No. 2 which would extend the option renewal period from 20 years to 30 years and incorporate the revised legal description.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Crowell was absent from the meeting at this time.

Staff Report to the Board

A summary of activities within the Office of Administration's Facilities Division is presented below:

### Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

- **Aerial Mapping Project, UO**
  - An Agreement was negotiated with CH2M Hill, Engineers, Corvallis, for engineering services not to exceed $32,300. Financing will be provided from state funds.

- **Parking Structure, UO**
  - An Agreement was negotiated with Zimmer/Gunsul/Frasca Partnership, Architects, Portland, for architectural services at a cost not to exceed $48,000. Financing will be provided from parking reserve funds.

- **High Voltage Distribution System Evaluation, PSU**
  - An Agreement was negotiated with Glumac & Associates, Inc., Engineers, Portland, for engineering services at a cost not to exceed $25,000. Financing will be provided from state funds.
Award of Construction Contracts

Batcheller Hall Cornice Restoration & Benton Hall Reroofing & Exterior Repairs, OSU

On April 10, 1987, Dale Ramsay Construction Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $388,443. Financing is provided from state funds.

Cordley Hall Reroofing, West Section, OSU

On April 20, 1987, Umpqua Roofing Co., Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $58,760. Financing is provided from state funds.

Food Toxicology & Nutrition Lab, Building Addition, OSU

On April 20, 1987, K. J. Allen and Associate was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $38,155. Financing is provided from state funds.

Kidder Hall Reroofing--1987, OSU

On April 2, 1987, Acme Roofing Company was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $23,813. Financing is provided from state funds.

Langton Hall Reroofing--1987, OSU

On April 16, 1987, Acme Roofing Company was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $92,764. Financing is provided from state funds.

Plageman Infirmary Reroofing, OSU

On April 2, 1987, Glas Shield Roof Systems was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $17,762. Financing is provided from state funds.

Target Range Reroofing, OSU

On April 16, 1987, Early Roofing Service, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $19,593. Financing is provided from state funds.

Weniger Hall Reroofing--Lower Level Sections A & B, OSU

On April 30, 1987, Leigh's Roof Service, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $54,275. Financing is provided from state funds.

Accessibility for Handicapped (Computer Center), UO

On April 30, 1987, H. J. Burrows Construction Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $79,415. Financing is provided from state funds.
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Amazon Family Housing Roof & Foundation Renovation, UO

On April 20, 1987, Folker Construction was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $77,000. Financing is provided from the housing reserve funds.

Westmoreland Family Housing Exterior Stair Renovation, Phase III, UO

On April 20, 1987, 2G Construction was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $58,272. Financing is provided from the housing reserve funds.

Baird Hall Room 18, Student Health Relocation, OHSU

On April 10, 1987, Ron Construction (Oregon), Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $146,988. Financing is provided from funds available to the institution.

PGE/IBP ECM Implementation (Residence Hall), OHSU

On April 10, 1987, Oregon Electric Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $14,246.25. Financing is from funds available to the institution and from investor-owned utility.

UHN, Helistop Installation, SW Wing Roof, OHSU

On March 20, 1987, Ron Construction (Oregon), Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $49,188. Financing is provided from state funds.

Acceptance of Projects

Project #4: Dearborn Hall Alterations, OSU

The Electrical and Computer Engineering Building--Related Alterations Project #4: Dearborn Hall Alterations is complete and was accepted on March 27, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $65,718. Financing was provided by State Funds (Lottery).

Project #7: Physical Plant Shops Alterations, OSU

The Electrical and Computer Engineering Building--Related Alterations Project #7: Physical Plant Shops Alterations is complete and was accepted on March 27, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $149,725. Financing was provided by State Funds (Lottery).

Project #10: Apperson and Merryfield Halls Alterations, OSU

The Electrical and Computer Engineering Building--Related Alterations Project #10: Apperson and Merryfield Halls Alterations is complete and was accepted on February 27, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $158,069. Financing was provided by State Funds (Lottery).

Grading--Site Utilities, OSU

This project is complete and was accepted on March 26, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $19,237. Financing was provided by State Lottery Funds.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Estimated Total Project Cost</th>
<th>Financing Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's Building Reroofing, OSU</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on March 25, 1987.</td>
<td>$63,958</td>
<td>Financing was from funds available to the institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHS, 11-A1, Ultrasound Remodel Project, OHSU</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on February 27, 1987.</td>
<td>$38,492</td>
<td>Financing was provided from state funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal Wastewater Collection System, OIT</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on April 2, 1987.</td>
<td>$131,659.47</td>
<td>Financing was provided from the Library Building project, housing reserves and institutional project funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education Building Reroofing, OIT</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on April 6, 1987.</td>
<td>$98,327</td>
<td>Financing was provided from Capital Repair Allocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board accepted the report as presented.

**ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS**

**OCATE Report**

Mr. Chao requested Dr. John Owen to report on the activities of OCATE. Dr. Owen said by fall there would be 25 videotapes available on advanced technology programs edited for use by faculty and graduate students. The tapes feature some of the best-known people in the world in their particular fields. Two workshops will be sponsored this spring in computer science and computer engineering.

Dr. Owen said continued cooperation was anticipated among institutions within the State System, private institutions in Oregon, and industry. There has been excellent support from industry and excellent participation by industry in attendance at workshops, conferences, and lectures.

**Progress Report on Minority Initiative**

Mr. Richardson requested that Dr. Pierce advise the ad hoc Committee on Minority Affairs during the next few weeks as to the progress being made on implementation of the minority enrollment initiative.

**Medical Technology Program**

Mr. Perry referred to a letter received about the demise of the medical technology program. He asked whether there had been a response. Mr. Petersen said the matter was under investigation and a response would be made.

**Election of Officers**

Mr. Perry said the nominating committee, in considering the recommendation of a slate of officers for 1987-88, had determined that it would be helpful to have an additional member elected to the Executive Committee.
The Nominating Committee then recommended the following slate of officers for 1987-88: President, James C. Petersen; Vice President, Richard F. Hensley; Members of the Executive Committee--John W. Alltucker, Gene Chao, and Mark S. Dodson.

There being no other nominations, the Board elected the slate of officers as presented. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Perry, Richardson, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Crowell was absent from the meeting at this time.

Mr. Perry indicated that it would be necessary to amend the Bylaws of the Board so that the additional member could be added to the Executive Committee. Mr. Petersen instructed the Secretary to prepare the necessary amendment so that the change in the Executive Committee would be official prior to the beginning of the term of office.

Mr. Alltucker said the Joint Long-Range Planning Committee had met. It unanimously agreed to continue the operation, identified the issues that remained unresolved, and set priorities. The first priority was to outline procedures needed to assure implementation of the plan, because the planning effort will be wasted unless the plan is implemented. The academic community has not been accustomed to having a long-range plan to which all future budget requests and other plans are referred. However, the Joint Planning Committee expects to return to monthly meetings in the fall with the intention of preparing, particularly for higher education, some definition of terms and clarification of language so that everyone will know their proper roles during the next budgeting effort.

Mr. Hensley said the graduation ceremony at Southern Oregon State College would be the first opportunity to welcome Dr. Joseph Cox as the new president at Southern Oregon State College. At this time, Mr. Hensley said he would like to thank Dr. Ettlich for the fine job he had done as the interim president of Southern Oregon State College.

Mr. Petersen thanked President Meyers for the hospitality and the excellent visitation to Western Oregon State College. He said it had been very inspiring and he had also enjoyed the presentation by the students.

Mr. Petersen announced that the July Board meeting had been changed from July 17 to July 24 in order to permit the Chancellor and the presidents to attend the annual meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. The meeting will still be held at Portland State University.
Mr. Petersen requested that Board members submit any comments on the teacher education proposal to Dr. Pierce by June 1 so that there will be time to include them in the docket material for the June meeting.

Mr. Petersen indicated the regular June meeting of the Board would be held on June 19 on the campus of the University of Oregon.

The Secretary read the following letter from Mr. Lars Svanevik, President of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate:

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate wishes me to commend you and the Board, as well as the other involved individuals, on the integrity of the recent presidential search at Southern Oregon State College. We felt that, after a careful study of the steps incorporated in the new procedures, in general, the procedure worked well.

One point of concern was raised by the senators regarding the procedure and I was asked to bring this to your attention. We would encourage that, since finalists are publicly identified eventually, "the Board modify current practices during campus visitations by finalists, to assure opportunity for general faculty interaction."

Our group would be most pleased to work with you, the Board, in exploring this which we feel would strengthen, even more, the presidential search process.

The Board meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

James C. Petersen, President

Wilma L. Foster, Secretary
## MAJOR COMPONENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Education Major</th>
<th>ORIGINAL PROPOSAL</th>
<th>REVISED PROPOSAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eliminate the undergraduate major in education and require a major in an academic area. Include no more than 12-15 hours of undergraduate prerequisites in education.</td>
<td>Require a baccalaureate degree in a major outside of education and eliminate major in education. Permit Schools of Education to offer minors, concentrations, and courses in education for students desiring to begin their professional preparation courses before completing the BA/BS degree. Add new interdisciplinary and liberal studies majors, in addition to traditional majors, for students intending to become elementary teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs</td>
<td>Shift teacher education to graduate level, fifth year, culminating in a Master's degree and initial certificate.</td>
<td>Extend teacher education to five years with a portion of the fifth year comprised of graduate-level courses. Students should complete academic requirements for certification at the end of the fifth year. Graduate coursework could be applied toward Master's degree. Establish new, one-year, accelerated graduate teacher programs for students who decide to become teachers after receiving their baccalaureate degrees. Consider new Master's of Arts and Teaching degree which could be completed at about the same time as certification requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR COMPONENTS</td>
<td>ORIGINAL PROPOSAL</td>
<td>REVISED PROPOSAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Experiences</td>
<td>Expand field experiences during the fifth year program, providing internships under mentor teachers in schools.</td>
<td>Expand student teaching experiences at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and Financial Incentives</td>
<td>Expect enrollment declines with these changes but do not penalize Schools of Education because of declining enrollment at the time they are upgrading their programs.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on Specialty Endorsements</td>
<td>Address specialties that will be impacted by this program, e.g., special education, counseling, etc.</td>
<td>Expand postbaccalaureate fee policy for teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Recruit highly qualified students to teach education programs.</td>
<td>Support Mentor Teacher and Teacher Corps proposals to assist student teachers in extended programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Standards</td>
<td>Implement higher admissions standards to teacher education programs (GPA and CBEST).</td>
<td>Integrate special education courses into five year teacher education programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Institute subject matter testing using the National Teacher Examination.</td>
<td>Add new courses on multiethnic and multicultural education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Eliminate undergraduate major by Fall 1988 and submit new Master's degree programs for Board review by May 1989. Implement new Master's program no later than Fall 1990.</td>
<td>No change. Continue, however, to work with Educational Testing Service to improve these tests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>