MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE
STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION HELD
DECEMBER 18, 1987

MINUTES APPROVED

CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

Reports from Presidents
Minority Student Enrollment Initiative: A Progress Report
Presidential Scholarships
Oregon First-Time Freshman Enrollment: A Summary

Athletic Proposal, PSU

Review of Presidential Search Process

Request for Authorization To Establish a Center for Occupational Disease Research, OHSU

Request for Authorization To Establish Instructional Program in Molecular & Cellular Biology, OHSU

Report on Foreign Language Study in the OSSHE

Amendments to QAR 580-50-027, Affirmative Action Goals

Approval of Schematic Design for Remodel of Outpatient Clinic, OHSU

Approval of Schematic Design for Radiation Therapy Remodel, 4C, UHS, OHSU

Dedicate Classroom/Lab Building as Purvine Hall, OIT

Emergency board Request, Agricultural Experiment Station & Cooperative Extension Service

Desired Characteristics for Evaluating Candidates, Presidential Search, OHSU
SUMMARY OF FACILITIES DIVISION ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION:

- Accessibility for Handicapped, UO
- Architecture & Allied Arts Additions & Alterations, UO
- Architecture & Allied Arts Additions & Alterations, UO
- Hayward Field Improvements, UO
- Hayward Field Improvements, UO
- Food Toxicology & Nutrition Lab (Water Chiller System), OSU
- Johnson Hall ECMs EBP/IP, UO
- UHS, 11th Floor, CT Scanner II Remodel, OHSU
- Outpatient Clinic, Ear, Nose & throat Clinic Renovation Project, OHSU
- Physical Plant Building Mechanical Upgrade #1, OHSU
- UHS, 13A & 14A Pediatric Isolation, Air-Conditioning Upgrade, OHSU
- Classroom/Laboratory Building Furnishings, OIT
- Street Improvements, EOSC
- Langton Hall & Women's Building Refinish Floors, OSU
- Pole Building West of Magruder Hall, OSU
- Target Range Reroofing, OSU
- Schneider Museum of Art, SOSC
- Fine Arts Building Reroofing Project, UO
- Department of Psychiatry Consolidation, UHN, OHSU
- Mackenzie Hall Northwest Roof, Reroofing Project, OHSU
- UHN, Helistop Installation, SW Wing Roof, OHSU

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS
- Endowed Chairs
- Semester Conversion

PRESIDENT'S REPORT
- Next Meeting Dates

ADJOURNMENT
A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Room 338, Smith Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 10:50 a.m., December 18, 1987, by the President of the Board, Mr. James C. Petersen, and on roll call the following answered present:

- Mr. Robert R. Adams
- Mr. Michael W. Hermens
- Mr. John W. Alltucker
- Mrs. Janet S. Nelson
- Miss Kasey K. Brooks
- Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.
- Mr. Mark S. Dobson
- Mrs. Arlene D. Schnitzer
- Mr. Richard F. Hensley
- Mrs. James C. Petersen

Absent: Mr. Chao was absent for business reasons.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities—Chancellor William E. Davis; Secretary Wilma Foster; W. T. Lemman, Executive Vice Chancellor; Lawrence Pierce, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Wil Post, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; W. C. Nelson, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Policies; R. S. Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Information Systems Division; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer; Jerry Casby, Assistant Attorney General; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Ray Hoops, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; J. R. Pizzo, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Peter Hughes, Director, Internal Audit; Roger Olsen, Director, OCATE; James Payne, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Virginia Boushey, Assistant to Executive Vice Chancellor; Kay Juran, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications; Kimberly Carnegie, Public Affairs Assistant; Pat Wignes, Assistant Board Secretary.

Oregon State University—President John Byrne; Graham Spanier, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Ed Coate, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Roy Arnold, Dean, College of Agricultural Sciences; Sally Malueg, President, Faculty Senate; Gary Tiedeman, Vice President, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate.
University of Oregon—President Paul Olum; Richard J. Hill, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration; Barry Siegel, Professor.

Oregon Health Sciences University—Interim President David Witter; Bob Koler, Interim Vice President, Academic Administration; Bob Williams, Assistant to the President; Arthur C. Brown, Professor; Bruce Magun, Professor; Ralph Tuomi, Assistant Vice President, Facilities Management; Lois Davis, Assistant to the President; Mary McFarland, Associate Dean, School of Nursing.

Portland State University—President Natale A. Sicuro; Roger Edginton, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Frank Martino, Provost; Oma Blankenship, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representative.

Eastern Oregon State College—President David Gilbert; James Lundy, Dean of Administration; James Hottois, Dean of Academic Affairs; Richard Stenard, Dean of Student Affairs.

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

Southern Oregon State College—President Joseph Cox; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration.

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

Others—Susan Morse, Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Tom McClellan, Budget Analyst, Executive Department; Jerry Turnbaugh, Manager, Tektronix; Joyce Cohen, State Senator, District 13; Liz VanLeeuwen, State Representative, District 37; George VanLeeuwen, Halsey; Julie Hammerstad, State Representative, District 27; Mike Holland, Commissioner of Community Colleges; Bryan Moore, Vice President, External Affairs, Graduate Teaching Fellows Federation, University of Oregon; Bob Mumford, President, Associated Students, Oregon State University; Timothy Regan, University Affairs Coordinator, Associated Students, University of Oregon.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on November 13 and 18, 1987, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Nelson was absent from the meeting at this time.

The Chancellor indicated that the presidents would report to the Board on activities at their institutions as the first item in his report. He requested President Meyers to begin the presentations.
President Meyers said forensics and volleyball were both competitive teams on the Western Oregon State College campus. He said both teams have new coaches this year and introduced Dr. Eileen Kingsley, the new coach in forensics, and Ms. Judy Lovre, the new volleyball coach.

He stated that Dr. Kingsley came to Western from the University of Southern California where she completed a doctorate in interdisciplinary communications. She has taught or coached various debate teams and public-speaking events at several institutions. Her forensics team had a very productive season, placing first and third in competition in several categories.

Coach Lovre came to Western from an impressive ten-year coaching career at Corvallis high school that included a record of 261 wins to 44 losses, four state volleyball championships, and nine consecutive Valley League titles. This fall, the team won 54 and lost 9 games. The team finished second in the loser’s bracket at the NAIA national volleyball championship tournament. In her first season, she was named District II coach of the year.

President Meyers indicated that Deanna Jones, a Western Oregon State College student, was the only NAIA player to be named an All-American and also an Academic All-American. She is also a presidential scholar and named the Conference’s most valuable player and district all-tournament team member.

President Meyers closed his presentation with a final examination in keeping with the Christmas and final examination week season.

President Byrne emphasized the land-grant philosophy in his presentation, indicating this philosophy and the ability to express it was what made Oregon State University unique. The land-grant philosophy is critical to the State of Oregon and also to the rest of the world. He cited specific examples throughout the world, from assistance to fishermen in Oman on the preservation of their catch to instruction in English for foreign students and family members. He also distributed statistics with respect to the programs in other countries and student exchanges.

President Byrne said Oregon State University was involved heavily with international development programs, with about one-third in Corvallis and two-thirds in other countries throughout the world. Funding comes primarily from the U. S. Agency for International Development.

Recognizing the importance of the international activities led to a reorganization of administration earlier this year to account for this and place additional emphasis on it. The responsibility for international activities has been vested in the vice president for research, graduate studies, and international studies.
President Byrne said most people were aware of the philosophy and concept within the State of Oregon. It is frequently forgotten, however, that Oregon State University was extending the land-grant philosophy to people who truly need assistance in countries that are attempting to develop their standard of living. Oregon State University can play a role in helping them to develop their education, research, and private sector. It creates a network of friends, not just for Oregon State University, but for the State System of Higher Education and the people of Oregon. This network also can be used by state government and by the private sector in Oregon.

President Gilbert described a special computer network established by Eastern Oregon State College to provide library services throughout its ten-county service area. In response to a need by the eastern Oregon medical community, Eastern Oregon State College pioneered a process called Simultaneous Remote Searching (SRS), using a circuit developed in Arizona. This electronic searching device allows a remote user to phone the library at the College and, from a remote location, negotiate a reference interview with the librarian and witness the search as the material is retrieved from the data base. The information retrieved is transmitted to the campus while the remote site sees a copy of the search. The user is encouraged to participate to help refine the search as it progresses.

With support from the Library Services Construction Act and the Fred Meyer Charitable Trust, this capability has been expanded recently well beyond the medical community. Computers have been placed in local libraries and hospitals throughout eastern Oregon, including those on the campuses of the two eastern Oregon community colleges. Most of the sites are equipped with telex capacity. Once an article is identified in the search, a copy can be transmitted to the end user by electronically accessing a world-wide, inter-library loan network. Consequently, a user can go to a small local library, conduct a search, and within a few hours have a copy of the needed material.

President Gilbert indicated a very important new resource had been added to this capacity in that Eastern Oregon State College had become a NASA affiliate industrial application center. Users can tap new data bases with information on emerging technologies not yet published. In fact, they can be linked with individual experts from NASA field centers, federal laboratories, and with cooperating universities and industries.

President Sicuro cited the following activities of importance at Portland State University:

1. In the area of international programs, the Scandinavian Studies cluster continues to receive long-term community support and is the principal beneficiary of the recent "Scanfest" community celebration.
2. A former student of acting at PSU, now starring in commercial television, returned to campus to help launch the 1987 summer festival theater company season.

3. With the June commencement, the institution reached 50,000 real graduates, in addition to about 350,000 to 400,000 alumni.

4. There are now 72 corporate associates supporting the school of business administration, not only financially but in many other ways, and by getting the mission of the school out into the community.

5. Portland State, through the International Trade Institute, co-hosted with a number of governmental and commercial organizations, a visit to Oregon of all six ambassadors of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. These nations represent an important bloc of potential trade and cultural exchange with Oregon.

6. A project to prepare middle school mathematics teachers has received continued funding for 1988. This project, sponsored by the National Science Foundation, has already met with considerable success and enjoys high national regard.

7. The School of Engineering and Applied Science has received $130,000 of equipment from Tektronix. It will enhance instruction in artificial intelligence and communications for engineers and computer scientists.

8. The Murdock Foundation awarded $150,000 to the Department of Chemistry to be applied to the purchase of nuclear magnetic resonance equipment. This equipment will provide state-of-the-art analytical capability for use in research and teaching.

9. Geology students were treated to an exciting field experience last summer in eastern Wyoming when they helped recover the fossil remains of a triceratops.

10. Professor Basil Dmytryshyn has recently published a book entitled, "The Soviet Union and the Middle East."

11. The first draft of the PSU Plan for the 90s will be ready to distribute to all of the institution's constituencies in early January.

President Sicuro said he was very pleased to report some of the exciting and productive activities at Portland State University that were outside of athletics.
The Chancellor presented a progress report on the minority student enrollment initiative.

In May 1987, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education authorized tuition and fee waivers for fully-qualified first-time freshmen from three underrepresented-minority groups: Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans. At that time, members of these minority groups enrolled in State System schools at a rate about half that of the general student population.

Students are eligible for these tuition and fee waivers, worth about $1,500 annually, for up to five years if they earn at least 36 academic credits annually and make satisfactory progress toward a degree.

The State Board's goal is to double the number of the first-time freshman underrepresented-minority students who enroll in State System schools from 145 in 1986 to 290 in Fall 1989. The enrollment initiative, also intended to add cultural diversity on the eight campuses, will include efforts to improve campus services to minority students.

These are highlights of the attached progress report:

- In its first year, the minority initiative granted waivers of tuition and fees to 166 Black, Hispanic and Native-American first-time freshmen from Oregon. (The number is greater than the 146 originally authorized because typically more awards are initially granted with the expectation that not all recipients will actually enroll.)

- Enrollment of these underrepresented-minority freshmen from the Oregon high school Class of 1987 increased 46 percent to 212 students in Fall 1987 from 145 students enrolled in Fall 1986 from the state's high school Class of 1986. Among both Oregon and out-of-state students, the increase was 28 percent.

- Percentages of underrepresented-minority Oregon high school graduates enrolling on State System campuses increased for all three groups: For Blacks, from 9 percent to 13 percent; for Hispanics, from 10 percent to 13 percent; for Native Americans, from 6 percent to 8 percent.

- Expressed in percentages, enrollments of Oregon underrepresented-minority first-time freshmen increased the most at Eastern Oregon State College (400 percent), University of Oregon (121 percent) and Portland State University (63 percent). Expressed numerically, enrollments increased the most at University of Oregon (35) and Portland State University (26).
Mr. Richardson commented that the minority student enrollment initiative was a very significant achievement by the State System. However, he reminded Board members that was just one phase for achieving the Board's ultimate goal to improve the number of underrepresented minorities. This is the recruitment phase and attention should now be directed to assure the appropriate retention and support systems are in place to make the program successful in the future.

The Chancellor indicated that the presidential scholarships were privately-funded scholarships, each worth $1,000, based on merit. In the State System, just under $500,000 is being raised each year for these scholarships. This year, 141 new scholarships were awarded to incoming freshmen by the institutions, and 302 were continued. He said he was delighted with the progress on these scholarships.

At the same time that the numbers of Oregon high school graduates have been falling, the numbers of Oregon first-time freshmen enrolling in Oregon's state-supported colleges and universities has been rising. Highlights:

- Fall term enrollment of first-time freshmen from Oregon's high school graduating Class of 1987 was up just over 11 percent over those enrolled four years before from the Class of 1983. During the same period, the number of Oregon high school graduates decreased by just over 3 percent.

- First-time freshman enrollment of Oregon high school graduates from the Class of 1987 rose 7.3 percent over those enrolled the prior year from the Oregon high school Class of 1986.

- The percentage of each year's Oregon high school graduates enrolling in State System schools has increased 2.4 percentage points, from 16.5 percent of the Class of 1983 to 18.9 percent of the Class of 1987.

The Board met as a Committee of the Whole on December 17, 1987, for the purpose of discussing the Portland State University athletic proposal. Mr. Petersen acknowledged at the beginning of the meeting the communications received by Board members and the considerable amount of information and data available to them. He complimented President Sicuro on the completeness of the presentation and the inclusion of arguments both for and against the proposal. He also thanked the members of the Delkin Committee, the Portland State University Advisory Board, the Athletic Advisory Board, and President Sicuro's staff for the many hours spent in developing the proposal and related information.
Mr. Petersen said the first hour would be devoted to presentation of the proposal by President Sicuro. This would be followed by public testimony, and the final hour would be devoted to Board consideration of the proposal and testimony.

President Sicuro described the developments leading to the recommendations and presented the four options to the Committee of the Whole for its consideration. All of the material is on file in the Board's Office in a report entitled, "Future of Athletics at Portland State University," dated December 1987. He then recommended that the Board accept the Advisory Board's recommendation and move to Division I-AA football, and Division I in all other sports, including restoring men's basketball. He explained the rationale and financial implications involved as set forth in the report.

Mr. Fred Delkin, Chairman of the Future of Athletics report, presented the recommendation of the committee and reviewed its findings as set forth in the full report.

President Sicuro then introduced other members of the panel who were appearing in support of the proposal. They were: Mr. Earl Wantland, President of the Portland State University Advisory Board; Mr. John Wykoff, President of the Viking Athletic Association; Ms. Dorothea Lensch, a member of the PSU Advisory Board; Ms. Mary Gordon, Chairman of the Faculty Senate's University Athletic Board; Dr. Jon Mandaville, Chairman of the Portland State University Advisory Council; and Ms. Laura Mosier, sports editor of The Vanguard. The speakers indicated the support from various constituencies, the financial implications and potential support, community interest in the proposal; the question of faculty support, maintenance of academic standards of excellence, and the timing.

Board members asked several questions of panel members for further clarification of their remarks. Mr. Hensley inquired what assurances President Sicuro could provide that Portland State would not exceed the deficits projected in the report.

President Sicuro said any projection of figures is a judgment call but he was fairly confident that playing the proposed schedule would enable the institution to generate the receipts projected through a multi-dimensional, revenue-producing package. Mr. Hensley then asked what President Sicuro's recommendation to the Board would be at the end of each year if the program were to exceed the projected losses. President Sicuro indicated that at the end of the second year he would probably recommend that football be dropped.
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Board members asked several questions with respect to the financial plan, revenue estimates, income projections, and anticipated attendance. Miss Brooks expressed concern that private donations and proceeds from attendance might not be achieved if the teams were not as successful at a more competitive level after having had excellent success at the lower level. Mr. Wykoff said he expected the teams to compete well in the Big Sky Conference because Portland State University competes well now with Big Sky teams even though it has fewer scholarships. However, the concern certainly would be valid if there were several losing years.

Mr. Dodson referred to a letter from Mayor Clark and City Commissioner Lindberg which indicated a lack of support for the proposal. Mr. Wykoff and Mr. Petersen both mentioned a further clarification of Mayor Clark's letter. In essence, the mayor was not against a very successful sports program but he questioned whether the institution could raise the money in the community to support an expanded program.

Board members then asked additional questions concerning participation, budgets, scholarships, financing, revenue projections, facilities, and scheduling.

Mr. Petersen referred to problems with boosters and fan clubs relative to the pressures to win and keep winning. Even though Oregon has not had a history of such problems, he asked how President Sicuro would propose to keep boosters under control in terms of these pressures.

President Sicuro said it was his intention to continue to have the Faculty Athletic Association remain as part of the Portland State University Foundation and not operate independently of that, as well as the alumni board. This is a primary control to prevent problems such as those which have occurred in some institutions. He assured the Board he would not let these problems occur.

The Chancellor asked several questions concerning expenses, the level of scholarships, recruitment, and the application procedure. He said, if the Board were to approve the request, it would be, in essence, a conditional approval predicated upon the demonstrated results over a two-year trial period before the decision would be finalized. He asked if this were a fair assessment, and President Sicuro responded that it was.

Mr. Alltucker inquired about the net effect if the conditional approval were granted and adequate funding was not forthcoming.

The Chancellor said the situation would be very similar to the present program except that basketball would have been added as
well as one or two scholarships for women's volleyball and basketball. He said an independent audit of the intercollegiate athletic program finances had been completed for Oregon State University and the University of Oregon. The audit for Portland State University is in progress. The presidents of the State System's NAIA institutions have requested similar audits for their institutions, so very precise financial accounting will be available over the next two or three years.

The Committee then received testimony from 15 speakers in favor of the proposal and nine who opposed it. Those favoring the proposal mentioned the value of athletics to the participants, the educational program available for athletes, student support and the results of opinion surveys, the academic and athletic potential of the institution, anticipated attendance, the value of athletics to the local economy, the importance to the women's athletic program of a shift to Division I, and the city's pride in Portland State University. Those opposed mentioned the proposed increase in incidental fees, the excessive optimism with respect to enrollment and attendance, the interference of fund-raising for athletics with fund-raising for academic programs, concern about the impact of upgrading athletics on academic standards and the erosion of academic standards, alumni involvement in decision-making, the limited faculty role in the decision process for this proposal, a preference for expanding academic programs as opposed to athletics, the appropriation of incidental fee monies for athletics in the past without student consent, and the lack of evidence with respect to any benefits from moving to Division I.

During the course of the presentations, there was some disagreement with statements implying that automatically a fine athletic program equates with a decrease in scholastic performance and that excellence in both athletics and academics would be incompatible.

In supporting the proposal, Representative Tom Mason said the decision should be placed in a context of the direction in which Portland State University and the City of Portland are going. He said he viewed the request as not just an upgrade in athletics but as an upgrade in Portland State University as part of the process of moving the institution along and toward the status of comprehensive research university.

In response to a question concerning the graduation rate for athletes, it was indicated the rate was approximately the same as for the general student population. There was also further discussion of the concerns expressed in the presentations about the level of the student incidental fees.
Mr. Petersen indicated that discussion by Board members would be appropriate and requested them to direct their comments to the first option proposed by President Sicuro with a view to modifying that or including any safeguards which might be necessary as a result of the discussion.

Mr. Petersen said he had entered the meeting with reservations about the move to Division I. However, he said he had heard no serious comments from those who objected to option one. He had heard what happened in the past but did not believe it was relevant to the future at this point. There is new leadership, new vision, and new enthusiasm at Portland State University. He indicated he had been persuaded particularly by Mr. Wantland’s and Mr. Wykoff’s optimism with respect to the very great potential for public and corporate support. Mr. Petersen said the recommendations were appropriate that the Board review the matter prior to Portland State’s taking the actual step in two years, but the institution should be permitted to make application.

Mr. Petersen indicated he was persuaded by the argument it was essential to make a decision immediately because of the comments with regard to recruiting and the future of the athletes already enrolled and the employment of coaches. He was also persuaded by the faculty athletic representative who spoke very forcefully to the arguments regarding academic standards and excellence, but not by the philosophy that athletics detract from the academic atmosphere. He supported a recommendation to the Board in favor of President Sicuro’s option I.

Miss Brooks expressed two concerns—the first with the financial plan and the firmness of private contributions, and the second that student fees would not be burdened severely by the move.

Mr. Richardson concurred in the financial concerns but expressed support for the proposal as being beneficial to Portland State University.

Mr. Dodson and Mr. Hermens expressed some doubt about the financial program if fans did not attend as projected. Mr. Hermens said he would support the proposal unless the move would cost the students money.

Mr. Petersen said it was his understanding there was a commitment on the part of President Sicuro and the Delkin Committee that student fees would not be increased to support athletics. The proposal is on a two-year trial basis after which there would be an opportunity to reevaluate.
Mr. Adams said he could support the Division I option contingent upon an annual review, and with an interim report in six months, in regard to private contributions and how the forecasted figures compare with the actual amounts. In addition, Portland State should be sure in its public relations that it talks a lot about the academic areas of the school. There are many good things which should be emphasized and Portland State should be sensitive to that.

Mrs. Nelson said she would support the proposal because she did agree there were benefits for enhancing the visibility of the institution and for economic advancement in the whole Portland area.

Mr. Alltucker said he believed any activity allowed on a college campus should contribute to the fundamental purpose of the institution. With that in mind, there is no place for athletic mercenaries on any campus in Oregon. However, properly supervised, intercollegiate athletics can make major contribution to the purpose of the State System. It is important in a democracy that people with dissimilar backgrounds, histories, and experiences, and with very divergent personal agendas learn to work together for mutual benefit. Properly managed sports programs are one of the most effective ways to teach these important lessons.

Mr. Alltucker said he was also aware of the potential problems when the coaches and community are asked to raise their own money. He said he would feel more comfortable if the state were to fund athletics. He indicated he would vote in favor of the proposal with the caveat that the Board has a responsibility to define very clearly in the next few months what it expects from intercollegiate athletics in the future.

Mrs. Schnitzer concurred in the previous statements by Board members and those testifying with respect to financial monitoring, assurances of improved academic offerings, and review after six months.

Mr. Hensley said he also had a number of reservations that represented warning lights of which the Board should be aware. However, it is also important to face the challenge of the institution and the confidence the Board has placed in its leader. He said it was his understanding the president would support the Board’s decision. He stated he would support Option I with very firm and positive checkpoints to make sure what has been said could be audited.
The Committee approved a motion by Mr. Richardson, seconded by Mr. Hermens, to instruct the Chancellor to prepare a recommenda-
tion for Board consideration which would support the proposal of Portland State University to move to Option 1, with the inclusion of the other information suggested by Board members and those who testified.

Mr. Dodson raised the question of the centers of excellence and whether the proposed action to support Option 1 and the move to Division I would eclipse those centers. He commented that any communication from the Board must be very, very clear that it had not lost its focus.

The Chancellor pointed out that this was private money sought specifically for athletics and was not a choice between academic programs and athletics in terms of priorities.

Mr. Petersen then thanked the members of the Delkin Committee and those who participated in the discussion.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Petersen said that after two hours of testimony and con-
siderable discussion in regard to the proposal for the future of athletics at the institution, the Board directed the Chancellor to prepare a recommendation. He then requested President Sicuro to summarize briefly the proposal he had presented as his first option the previous evening.

President Sicuro said that after months of study, the Delkin Com-
mittee had presented to the advisory board a recommendation that Portland State University move to Division I-AA in football, restore men's basketball, and move to Division I in all other sports. He recommended approval of that proposal. In effect, it will allow Portland State University, within a two-year period, to have a trial period for raising funds and enthusiasm toward the Division I-AA inaugural date. By NCAA rules, that date must be two years after application has been made. He indicated that if the motion to permit Portland State to proceed were adopted, application would be made by June 30, 1988. Basketball would be restored as quickly as it was legally and financially feasible, and the entire program would be moved to Division I.

Mr. Petersen then read the following recommendation prepared by the Chancellor in accordance with the guidelines established by the Committee of the Whole the previous meeting:

That Portland State University be authorized to petition the NCAA not later than June 1, 1988, for a change in Division membership, to be followed by the necessary steps to move to
compliance with the NCAA requirements for Division I-AA for football and Division I for all other sports, including the restoration of men's basketball. Participation in the new Division would be effective September 1, 1990, assuming all NCAA requirements have been met and the new status approved by that body.

In the reorganization of the Portland State University athletic program to comply with NCAA Division I criteria, the University is directed to adhere to the fiscal guidelines submitted to the Board on December 14, 1987. Reports on revenues generated through gifts, grants, and other sources shall be reported to the Board in June and December of each year through 1990. Further, in compliance with NCAA and Board policy, an annual audit of the intercollegiate athletic program shall be conducted by the Board's Division of Internal Audit and reported to the Board in December of each year. Continued movement toward compliance with NCAA Division I criteria shall be contingent upon a sound fiscal plan and base. If the forecast revenues do not materialize as projected, the Board shall review the overall status of the athletic program and make such modifications as may be necessary or discontinue the program.

In accordance with its current policy on intercollegiate athletics, the Board shall continue to monitor the Portland State University program to assure compliance with the educational objectives of the institution and NCAA and Board policies and guidelines.

It was moved by Mr. Hensley and seconded by Mr. Hermens that the above recommendation be approved.

Miss Brooks moved to amend the recommendation to include in the first sentence of the second paragraph after "December 14, 1987." a sentence saying, "It is the understanding of the Board that the proposed move to Division I-AA is not predicated on any increase in student incidental fees." The motion was seconded.

It was suggested that the words "per student" be included for clarification, and this addition was accepted. President Sicuro urged the Board not to put a lid on the dollar figure because it would be telling the incidental fee committee what it should do. Mr. Petersen pointed out this amendment was a very crucial element to the support and might have influenced the recommendation.

President Sicuro inquired whether, in effect, the Board would be indicating what number of dollars should be raised or generated by the incidental fee committee.
Miss Brooks explained that it was not her intention to put a cap on the incidental fee in terms of any dollar amount. She wanted it understood by the Board that the move was not predicated on any increase in the student incidental fee. President Sicuro indicated that would be acceptable.

The Board approved the amendment, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Hensley, Hemmens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

Mrs. Nelson commented that in allowing Portland State University to explore the opportunity to join Division I-AA of the NCAA, most likely in the Big Sky Conference, the Board should send a very clear message that its main priority at Portland State was the pursuit of academic opportunity and excellence. She said she would not be interested in supporting any program that was not fiscally responsible and not aimed at eliminating the existing budget deficit over a period of years. She questioned whether this was expressed strongly enough in the recommendation.

Mr. Hensley inquired whether the internal accounting practices and procedures were consistent with the financial report presented in the proposal so that figures received in subsequent reports would be comparable. President Sicuro assured him that subsequent reports would relate to the financial report in the request and would be accompanied by any necessary explanation.

Mr. Dodson referred to the statement in the recommendation that if the forecasted revenues did not materialize as projected, the Board might discontinue the program. He asked whether that meant that the Board would be prepared to discontinue the program if the projected revenues were not received.

The Chancellor responded that the Board might choose to do something else, such as the things proposed in some of the other options. He stated that, in preparing the recommendation, he had attempted to reflect the Committee discussion that if financial support was not forthcoming and the program was going further into debt rather than moving toward a fiscal balance, the Board would reevaluate and make the necessary changes.

President Petersen pointed out that the recommendation places the responsibility and accountability with President Sicuro to insure the conditions are met before actually entering into Division I-AA in football and Division I in other sports. Accountability also rests with the Board to make sure the recommendation is adhered to and there is a successful program.
Mr. Richardson inquired whether it would be appropriate for the Board to draft a resolution with respect to its position on athletics as it relates to the academic side of the institution.

Mr. Petersen explained that such a policy was developed several years ago and modified approximately three years ago. It deals with the idea of academic excellence and student athletics, the issues of normal progress, and the purpose of athletics. He said the Oregon State System was one of the first systems to adopt such a far-reaching policy in its institutions. He suggested it perhaps should be reviewed within the next few months and asked Mr. Lemman to review the policy briefly for the Board.

Mrs. Nelson moved that the recommendation be amended to insert immediately ahead of the final paragraph the following statement: "The Board reaffirms that its main priority at Portland State University will continue to be the pursuit of academic opportunities and excellence." Mr. Adams seconded the motion.

In response to a question from Mr. Hensley, President Sicuro said academic excellence and opportunity would be included in PSU’s Plan for the 90s. He concurred with Mrs. Nelson and Mr. Adams that it would be very helpful to the entire community to include this kind of statement in the Board’s motion.

Mr. Alltucker said his support of the motion was contingent upon a review of the Board’s present policies. He said the present policies, including NCAA policies, permit wide-ranging interpretations and many misunderstandings and it was incumbent upon the Board to make a clear statement of its priorities and what it expected. It was agreed the review would be placed on the agenda for the Committee on Instruction at an early date.

The Board then approved Mrs. Nelson’s amendment, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

The Board approved the main motion, as amended. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Hensley, Hermens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: Director Dodson.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Dodson said he had voted against the proposal because of his concern the Board would be facing an even more difficult decision a year from now. He indicated, however, he was supportive of the decision and would do everything possible to make sure he was wrong in his concern. He commented that he would make a deal with all of the community members who
said that academics were more important than sports but they were certainly supportive of the sports program. He said he would be very supportive of the Vikings if they would be supportive of the centers for academic excellence when he solicited contributions for them.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Presidential Search Process was asked to review the Board’s policy on presidential searches and to present its recommended revisions to the Board at its November 1987 meeting. In order to permit additional review by various faculty groups, this report is being presented at the December meeting, a month behind schedule.

The Board’s policy on presidential searches was adopted by the Board in March 1986. Since that time, two presidents have been selected using the process, and a third search is currently underway. At the time the new process was adopted, the Board agreed to review the process after it had been used several times. The purpose of this review, therefore, is to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current process and to recommend changes that will enable the Board to fulfill its commitment to selecting the strongest presidents for State System institutions.

In carrying out its charge, the ad hoc committee reviewed reports from members of the search committees at Portland State University and Southern Oregon State College. Written comments were solicited and received from many individuals and groups. A public hearing was held on October 21, 1987, in Corvallis on the search process at which time the committee received testimony from seventeen individuals. Finally, the Board’s staff reviewed the proposals in this memorandum with the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and representatives of other faculty organizations.

Most of the concerns about the Board’s presidential search process were raised initially by the Oregon chapter of the American Association of University Professors. A review of the AAUP document and comments from other interested individuals and groups can be summarized by a set of questions about the search process:

a. What is the role of the search committee?

b. How many faculty should be on the search committee?

c. Who should select the search committee members and the head of the search committee?

d. Should the search committee only consider candidates who can be tenured in one of the institution’s academic departments?
e. How long should the search committee keep the names of candidates confidential?

f. Should the search committee rank its recommendations?

Each of these questions will be discussed, followed by the committee’s recommendation.

The Role of the Search Committee

Underlying much of the debate about the presidential search process are different perceptions about the role of the search committee. Suggestions that faculty should constitute a majority of the search committee and that the Board should give "primacy to faculty opinion" in the selection of a president imply that the search committee is both a search and selection committee.

The Board’s current policy separates those two functions. The Board, representing the public interest in higher education, retains sole responsibility for the selection of institutional presidents. The search committee is supposed to assist the Board in making a selection by searching for candidates who would be an effective president. The question then is what kind of a committee and process will enable the Board to select the very best person for the job of institutional president.

The Number of Faculty on the Search Committee

The Board’s 1986 policy provides for a single 9 member search committee composed of three Board members, three faculty, one student, one administrator, and one community member. The search committee was kept small for reasons of efficiency and confidentiality. Many of the comments on the search process suggest that the committee should be enlarged and include more faculty members. A larger committee, it is argued, would be more representative of campus constituencies and would provide more people to do the considerable amount of work required of the search committee. Opinions differed on whether Board members should constitute a significant part of the search committee. Recent candidates and presidents support the Board’s substantial participation on the search committee. The AAUP suggested having only one Board member on the committee, but indicated at the public hearing that it did not object to having more Board members on the search committee.

Recommendation: The search committee should be enlarged to 11 members composed of four faculty members, three Board members, one administrator, one student, one community member, and one alumni representative.
The Selection of Search Committee Members and Chair

Under the Board’s policy, members of the search committee and the committee chair are appointed by the Chancellor, and the search committee presents its recommendations to the Chancellor. The Chancellor asks the appropriate groups on campus to nominate candidates for the search committee. In most cases, the Chancellor selects those who are the preferred representatives of the campus groups. Alternate nominations are requested to ensure that women and minorities are adequately represented on the search committee. The search committee is intentionally established as an administrative committee, selected and reporting to the Chancellor.

The reason for this committee selection procedure is to ensure that the names of candidates can be kept confidential during the search process. The promise of confidentiality is thought to be necessary to attract candidates who currently hold high administrative positions at other institutions. Because of the public’s interest in presidential searches, the Board is requesting an Attorney General’s opinion as to whether meetings of presidential search committees are exempt from the open meetings law.

No one objected to having a Board member serve as the chair of the search committee.

Recommendation: The Board should retain its current procedures for the selection of search committee members and committee chair.

Academic Tenure of Candidates

Several groups have asked that institutions be permitted to require academic tenure for presidential candidates. The principle is that faculty would be more supportive of a president who has met the academic standards for tenure in a department of the college or university.

In most cases, a person selected as president will have sufficient academic experience to qualify for tenure in an academic department of the institution. Typically, such a person is appointed president and, at that time or shortly thereafter, receives a tenure offer from the appropriate academic department. There may be circumstances, however, in which a highly qualified candidate has spent most of his or her life in administration or has had experience in an academic field not found on a specific campus. It may be unwise to summarily exclude those people from consideration.
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Recommendation: Search committees may indicate that credentials for academic tenure are highly desirable but the statement of qualifications may not preclude candidates without such credentials if they have other attributes which would make them outstanding institutional presidents.

Confidentiality During the Screening Process

The Board's current policy keeps the names of prospective candidates confidential until the day before the Board interviews the finalists. Semifinalists may be interviewed by telephone, be visited by a subcommittee, or be invited to the Oregon campus for meetings with the search committee and a 14-member campus screening committee. During campus visits by candidates at Portland State University and Southern Oregon State College, semifinalists met most of the principal campus leaders and also representatives from the community. The important point is that these meetings were held privately and were not reported in the press.

Several people suggested that finalists should be invited back to campus for public meetings with a variety of campus groups. As one person said:

Meetings between a presidential candidate and faculty groups are an absolute essential part of any reasonable search process. Candidates and faculty alike should not be kept in the dark about potential conflicts about educational and research policies; nor should they be denied the chance of discovering a mutually satisfactory harmony of interests. Moreover, candidates must be made aware of problems unique to the individual institution, and faculty must be able to probe a candidate's reactions to and approach to solving the problems.

The issue here is one of balancing the need to guarantee candidates confidentiality in order to keep them in the process and the desirability of having candidates meet a broad cross section of the campus community.

Recommendation: The search committee shall keep the names of candidates confidential until a day or two before finalists are interviewed by the Board. In order to provide adequate exposure of candidates to the campus community and enable candidates to meet campus leaders, semifinalists shall be invited to the campus for private meetings with the search committee, the campus screening committee, and other individuals or groups designated by the search committee. Finalists will be interviewed by the Chancellor prior to their interview with the Board. Faculty
members will be given an opportunity to meet and ask questions of the finalists between the time the names of the finalists are announced and the Board interview. Finalists may also ask to meet with other campus and community representatives at the time of their Board interview.

**Ranking Search Committee Nominations**

The current process requires the search committee to recommend 3 to 5 finalists to the Chancellor. The Chancellor then interviews the finalists. After the Board has interviewed the finalists the Chancellor may provide an independent evaluation of the candidates.

The AAUP recommended that the search committee present its ranking of the finalists directly to the Board. It argued that the committee’s ranking would provide additional information to the Board on the preference of the committee and other campus groups that have given their evaluations to the search committee.

By ranking candidates, the search committee would, in effect, become a selection committee. The Board would be put in the position of affirming or changing the recommendation of the search committee. Furthermore, the effectiveness of a new president may be weakened if it became known that he or she was selected by the Board but was not the preferred candidate of the search committee. Finally, candidates might withdraw from consideration if they found out they were not the preferred candidate of the search committee.

The Board’s three members on the search committee should be able to convey the search committee’s views on the finalists to the entire Board making it unnecessary for the search committee to rank the finalists.

**Recommendation:** The search committee shall continue to recommend three to five unranked candidates to the Chancellor. The search committee’s recommendation should be accompanied by a detailed report on the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate, especially in terms of the desired qualifications for the position. The report may also include summaries of the evaluations of other groups, such as the campus screening committee. These evaluations should not rank candidates but again describe how well or how poorly the candidates measure up to the qualifications established by the search committee.

Mr. Petersen indicated five people had requested an opportunity to make comments on the presidential search process and requested Dr. Barry Siegel, Chairman of an Interinstitutional Faculty Committee on the Presidential Search Process, to present testimony.
Dr. Siegel distributed copies of his remarks. A copy is on file in the Board’s Office. He indicated the American Association of University Professors was in profound disagreement with some of the recommendations in the Ad Hoc Committee report and was asking the Board to delay adopting the report pending thorough examination of those objections.

He indicated approval of the inclusion of an additional faculty member to the committee but said a second added faculty member would be desirable to lighten the load and provide a broader representation. He expressed agreement with affirmative action concerns but said it was difficult to balance affirmative action considerations with obtaining the strongest possible faculty members on the committee.

Mr. Petersen commented that the Board had made it very clear to campus committees that out of the faculty selection, women and minorities should be represented in the search process. The Board would not be willing to sacrifice those considerations to give faculty the sole responsibility for picking committee members. There was some discussion of the relative merits of these two positions.

Dr. Siegel also emphasized the desirability of having campus opinion with respect to the candidates communicated directly to the Board. He also felt the time allowed for campus visits or interviews, once the names were announced, was inadequate.

Both Mr. Hensley and Mrs. Nelson stated the committee in the Southern Oregon State College search had been briefed thoroughly on affirmative action matters at each stage of the search. The 200 applications were reduced to 90 vitae, all of which were read by every member of the committee. Mr. Dodson indicated this was true also in the present search at the Oregon Health Sciences University.

Mr. Timothy Regan, University Affairs Coordinator for the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, urged the Board to delay its decision on the presidential search process and send a delegation of its members to Eugene to discuss the process with student and faculty leaders. He emphasized the importance of the selection to students.

Mr. Gary H. Tiedeman, Vice President of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, distributed a copy of his remarks. A copy is on file in the Board’s Office. He addressed the importance of open faculty meetings with finalists at least one or two weeks prior to final selection and interaction with a broad cross-section of the campus community.
Mr. Bob Mumford, President of the Associated Students of Oregon State University, said he was concerned with the composition of the search committee. He questioned the need for three Board members on an eleven-member committee and suggested the desirability of more equal representation from other concerned bodies.

Mr. Mumford cited a statement in a letter dated April 24, 1968, by former Chancellor Roy Lumallie in which he said it had been agreed that the search committee should have equal representation among students, faculty, and administrators. The statement went on to say, "I believe that equal student involvement represented by the makeup of this search committee constitutes an appropriate relationship among students, faculty, and administrators and indicates a desirable trend in higher education. It will be my intention to continue to involve students in presidential search committees as a means of attaining an effective student voice and identification of qualified leadership." Mr. Mumford requested the Board to consider equal representation of faculty, students, and administration on presidential search committees.

Dr. Pierce pointed out that the issue of student representation had changed somewhat since 1968. There are now two students on the Board who participate in the actual selection of presidents of institutions. Mr. Mumford said his concern in that regard was that the students on the Board might not be from the institution for which a president was being selected. Students from the institution being affected should have equal representation on the search committee.

Mr. Bryan Moore, Vice President for External Affairs of the Graduate Teaching Fellows Federation at the University of Oregon, said that organization would agree with many of the statements made during the presentations. He urged that there be adequate time for an effective evaluation process of the academic credentials of the candidates and that a balanced composition on the committee include greater input from faculty and students. The classified staff and graduate teaching fellows have no representation. He supported the request to have the Board send a delegation to the University of Oregon to meet with various sectors and report those discussions to the Board before a final decision was reached.

Dr. Pierce suggested that the decision be delayed for a month to allow additional time to meet with faculty groups and others to clarify these issues. He indicated there was no pending search at the present time which would require the process to be in place immediately.
After a brief discussion of the suggestion to delay the decision, it was agreed the ad hoc committee on the presidential search process would be reconvened for the purpose of having further dialogue with faculty and students, not necessarily limited to the University of Oregon.

Staff Report to the Committee

The Board’s Office of Academic Affairs is forwarding a request from Oregon Health Sciences University for the consideration of the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, and the Board. Oregon Health Sciences University requests final authorization to establish the Center for Occupational Disease Research.

The CODR proposal is being submitted for final approval as requested by the Board. The legislation which created the CODR outlined a procedure for establishing the Center. The president of Oregon Health Sciences University was directed to prepare and submit a plan which described the Center’s mission, operational design, facilities and equipment, and the proposed budget. The plan was to be prepared and presented by an advisory committee. The Board reviewed a preliminary version of the plan on December 19, 1986.

The Board gave Oregon Health Sciences University authorization to proceed with development of the Center on a conditional basis. The president of Oregon Health Sciences University was asked to prepare a more detailed organizational and programmatic plan for the Center for Occupational Disease Research and submit it to the Board for final review and approval. The release of state funds appropriated for the Center would be forthcoming following the Board’s final approval of this plan.

As requested by the Board, Oregon Health Sciences University has prepared this detailed implementation plan including an organizational structure, alternative growth patterns and facility needs, and pro forma operating and capital budgets.

After reviewing the previous plan, the Board requested that the following questions be addressed before final approval be given for the Center:

1. Is the proposed research program compatible with the research objectives outlined in the legislation?

2. Does the Advisory Committee support the research plan?
3. How would the estimated $4.5 million actually be spent in 1987-89?

4. How would the Center be organized at the Oregon Health Sciences University?

5. What are the facility and equipment requirements of the Center and how will they be financed?

The plan being submitted for final Board approval for the OODR addresses each of these questions. The OHSU Task Force appointed in February 1986 by President Laster performed an extensive review of local and national occupational disease research. They found the occupational disease research field when approached at the basic disease mechanism level through molecular biology, offers a significant opportunity to Oregon employees and employers. This dovetails with the research objectives of the legislation creating the Center and the objectives, functions, and activities of the Center as outlined on pages 3-6 of this plan. The plan is on file in the Board's Office.

The alternative annual expenses and staff recruitment are outlined in Exhibit Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 8. The facility and equipment needs of Center staff are based on the projected size of the OODR at maturity and experience gained in the implementation of the Institute for Advanced Biomedical Research. These requirements are presented in Exhibit Nos. 7 and 9.

The OODR will be organized by administrative and scientific functional areas. To carry out the scientific functions, the Center will utilize three teams headed by a lead scientist with national prominence. The administrative and scientific groupings and reporting relationships of the Center are outlined in Exhibit 10.

The plan being presented to the Board is a phased plan designed to respond to the multiple and changing occupational disease research needs of Oregon. The plan outlines the steps for a mature Center after five years of growth that will be an integral part of Oregon Health Sciences University and the state.

Resources To Activate the Center

Approximately $160,174 in funding will be needed to initiate and equip the Center for Occupational Disease Research the at Oregon Health Sciences University. The funds would be used to cover administrative salaries ($27,500), OPE ($8,800), services and supplies ($100,349), space rental ($9,450), and general and administration expenses ($14,075).
Center staff is projected to be 65-70 FTE at maturity. Based upon average salaries of similar positions in the Oregon State System of Higher Education, the Center’s staff at maturity will cost an estimated $2.3 million annually.

The Center’s services and supplies are projected to cost an estimated $.5 million annually when maturity is achieved. Based on the projected size of the Center at maturity, it is projected that 29,000+ square feet will be needed. The facility planned to house the Center is projected to cost $6 million. It is also projected that equipment will cost approximately $1.95 million.

The source of funds for the CODR have been specifically identified. The Legislature appropriated $250,000 in 1985 for the development of the previous and attached plans. It is estimated that the Workers’ Compensation Division will allocate $2.25+ million annually to the Center as called for in HB 2290. It is planned that gifts, grants and donations to minimally match that amount will be acquired annually. Financing for the $6 million facility will be from two sources; $3 million in capital reserves from unspent state funds via the HB 2290 appropriation accumulated during the Center’s initial years and the residual from issuance of a capital construction bond. The funding requirements of the Center projects to an annual operating budget at maturity of $4+ million. Sources for this will be:

1. HB 2290 start-up funding of $750,000;
2. HB 2290 annual appropriation of $2,250,000;
3. A planned capital construction bond issue for $3,000,000; and
4. Annual gifts and grants of $550,000 to $2,175,000.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board’s staff recommended that the Board authorize the Oregon Health Sciences University to establish the Center for Occupational Disease Research effective Fall Term, 1987.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Pierce and Dr. Payne presented the staff report and recommendation. President Witter and other staff from the institution described some of the history leading to the proposal and the need for occupational disease research. They also explained the organizational plan and research possibilities for the program.
In response to a question from Mr. Hensley, Dr. Pierce stated that it would be an operational issue for the institution with respect to whether space and funding could be identified to meet the schedule outlined in alternative one or whether it would be necessary to defer full growth of the center approximately 18 months as proposed in alternative two.

There was additional discussion of funding sources with respect to funds available from the Workers Compensation Department and those to be raised from gifts and grants.

Dr. Arthur Brown, Professor of Physiology in the Schools of Medicine and Dentistry, said there were four general areas in which this would be relevant to workers in Oregon. They would benefit by the scientific findings, as would workers nationally, on causes and treatment of occupationally-induced disease. It will attract faculty who can act as consultants to the primary care physicians, and perhaps provide secondary and tertiary care themselves. It will attract residents and public health workers for training as similar programs have in other areas. In addition, one of the qualifications for the director is that it be a person interested in medical and health sciences education in order to be able to participate in training programs to upgrade professional qualifications to provide specialized training.

Mr. Alltucker said he understood the most rapidly growing occupational health problem in Oregon was the mental health problem, particularly that involving occupational stress. He inquired whether there was a possibility this could be included in the proposed program. Dr. Brown responded this would not be the initial focus.

Mr. Hensley requested Senator Joyce Cohen to comment on the future of the program and the ongoing funding for it.

Senator Cohen commented first on the matter of occupational stress, noting that the Legislature had narrowed the definition of stress in the workplace. Further, it was determined in the beginning stages of the advisory committee that stress research was an entirely different range of research. It was believed better progress could be made in more organic research and in occupational training research.

Senator Cohen said the Legislature had left the funding intact in the 1987 session. Even though the program was not underway, the planning was on schedule. She indicated she believed the Legislature was committed and would continue the funding, commenting that it was important to several of Oregon’s major industries.
She said she was encouraged by the report before the Committee and thought the Board would have a fully operational center at the end of five years. With minor amendments to make sure that community outreach and education to the medical community were part of the program, there would be a real impact to workers who are having problems over the next few years.

Mr. Hensley indicated he had discussed with President Witter the inclusion of a condition that the Board receive an annual review, especially during the developmental stage, on the progress of the proposed program. President Witter had no objections to this condition. Mr. Hensley said he had also discussed with Mr. Neland and Mr. Witter a provision that the facility be a multi-purpose facility so that it could be used for other purposes if future legislation did not provide the funding for the proposed program. They felt there would be no problem with this suggestion.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the understanding that the Board would receive an annual review on the progress of the development of the center. The condition with respect to a multi-purpose type building was deferred until the plans for the facility are reviewed.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Alltucker presented the Committee report and recommendation.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Herrmens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Directors Adams and Hensley were absent from the meeting at this time.

Staff Report to the Committee

The Board's Office of Academic Affairs is forwarding a request from the Oregon Health Sciences University for the consideration of the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs and the Board. The Oregon Health Sciences University requests authorization to initiate a graduate level instructional program in molecular and cellular biology.

The proposed program will be an interdisciplinary graduate program leading to a Ph.D. The program does not involve the awarding of a new degree. It builds on existing degree programs by coordinating and enhancing the knowledge and research training of Oregon Health Sciences University students in molecular medicine.
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The program’s focus and area of specialization will be molecular and cellular biology, with an emphasis on human disease. The primary objective of the program will be the fostering of molecular and cellular biology education through course work and research laboratory experiences, disseminating information relevant to molecular and cellular biology, and promoting the scientific interactions of students, faculty and researchers interested in these fields of study.

Resources To Offer the Program

This instructional program will be initiated with external funds provided by the Ciba-Geigy Corporation. No new state funds are budgeted for the program. There will be no need to add faculty or library resources or facilities in order to initiate this program.

It is projected that $94,000 will be needed in each of the first four years to cover the cost of support personnel ($4,000), fellowships ($80,000) and speakers for a seminar program ($10,000). A quarter-time secretary will be needed to carry out the administrative secretarial duties related to the program.

Program Review

The proposed program has been reviewed by the Board’s staff and the Academic Council. Molecular and cellular biology are fields of study which are growing rapidly in scope and in relevance to human medicine. The proposers of this program have consulted with the faculty of the current graduate programs in molecular and cellular biology at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. The biology faculty at Portland State University were also consulted. Each has expressed their support for this program.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board’s staff recommended that the Board authorize the Oregon Health Sciences University to initiate a new instructional program in Molecular and Cellular Biology, effective in Fall Term, 1987-88.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Richardson presented the report and recommendation of the Committee.
The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Hermens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Directors Adams and Hensley were absent from the meeting at this time.

The Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs received a "Report on Foreign Language Study in the Oregon State System." A copy of the report is on file in the Board's Office. The Committee discussed the report at length.

Dr. Pierce summarized the report and the Committee discussion and recommendation. He indicated the Board had considered a two-year foreign language admissions requirement in 1982 when it was considering admission requirements for State System institutions. At that time, it was discovered the high schools were unprepared to provide the necessary instruction to implement that admission requirement. The question was considered again in 1985, and the Board decided in its Strategic Plan for 1987-1993 to include a foreign language graduation requirement for students receiving baccalaureate degrees in State System institutions. The proposal was to implement a one-year requirement with the class entering in 1989 and a two-year requirement with the class entering in 1991.

It was recognized that implementing a curricular change of this magnitude would create a variety of problems on the campuses. An interinstitutional foreign language committee was appointed to address the issues that would be involved with the addition of a foreign language graduation requirement. The committee was comprised of faculty members from foreign language departments as well as administrators in colleges of arts and sciences that would be affected most directly by a change of this magnitude.

Dr. Pierce reported that representatives from the committee had discussed with the Committee on Instruction some of the major issues from the report. It dealt with the issue of delaying the implementation of the program one year so it would be coincident with the move to the semester system. There are also financial reasons for delay. The preparation of teachers for both high schools and colleges was addressed in terms of meeting the increasing demand for foreign language instruction.

Dr. Pierce said the Committee recommended the Board: (1) accept the report, (2) defer action on the implementation plan until the February meeting, (3) initiate conversation through the Department of Education concerning the feasibility of a cooperative plan between the public schools and higher education, and (4) the development of a detailed budget proposal.
The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Hermens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Directors Adams and Hensley were absent from the meeting at this time.

Amendments to OAR 580-50-027, Affirmative Action Goals

Mr. Dodson reported that the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant had discussed the proposed amendments and heard additional testimony. As a result, a number of changes were made in the proposed amendments. The Committee members believed the changes were significant enough to have the proposed amendments redrafted and circulated to the Board for a subsequent meeting. The revised amendments are expected to be presented at the January 1988 Board meeting.

Approval of Schematic Design for Remodel of Outpatient Clinic, OHSU

Staff Report to the Committee

An element of the 1987-1989 Hospital and Clinics Rehabilitation and Alterations capital project is the remodel of the first floor of the Outpatient Clinic. Phase I of this project element would provide a new east entry and a covered walk connection to the patient parking structure currently under construction.

There is currently no public entry to the Outpatient Clinic on the east side of the building. With development of the patient parking structure on the east, it is expected Clinic patients increasingly will require access on the east.

A second phase of this project will improve substantially patient and staff circulation at the entry level. Phase II work is not a part of this request.

The east entry and covered walkway connection carries a direct construction estimate of $230,000 and a total budget of $386,000. It will be financed from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds to be repaid from hospital and clinic revenues.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board accept the schematic design for Phase I improvements to the Outpatient Clinic, OHSU, within a project budget of $386,000 from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds; that the project architect be authorized to proceed with preparation of final design and contract documents; that the project be advertised, bid and a contract awarded, subject to the authorization of the State Emergency Board for expenditure authority.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations as presented.
Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Schnitzer presented the report and recommendation of the Committee.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Herrmens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Directors Adams and Hensley were absent from the meeting at this time.

Approval of Schematic Design for Radiation Therapy Remodel, 4C, UHS, OHSU

Staff Report to the Committee

The U. S. Veterans Administration has made several purchases of radiation therapy equipment for installation within University Hospital South, Oregon Health Sciences University, for the Department of Radiation Therapy. To prepare adequate facilities for the equipment, substantial remodeling is required on Floor 4C of University Hospital South. The schematic design of the required remodeling, which is a part of the 1987-1989 program of Hospital and Clinics Rehabilitation and Alterations, is available for review and approval.

The equipment acquired by the Veterans Administration includes a linear accelerator, a simulator, and an orthovoltage machine. These acquisitions will serve to replace or upgrade existing equipment.

The work of the project will occur within the present facilities of the Department of Radiation Therapy and will primarily involve structural, mechanical and electrical changes necessary to accept and operate the new equipment.

The project carries a direct construction estimate of $535,000 and a total budget of $760,000. Funds will come from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds to be repaid from hospital and clinic revenues.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board accept the schematic design for the remodel of the Department of Radiation Therapy, 4C, UHS, in order to accept and operate radiation therapy equipment provided by the U. S. Veterans Administration, within a project budget of $760,000 from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds; that the project architect be authorized to complete design and preparation of contract documents, advertise and bid the work; and that staff be authorized to enter into contracts for the work, subject to the authorization of the State Emergency Board for expenditure of funds.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Members of the Committee asked several questions concerning funding, benefits received in joint enterprises of this type, costs for architectural services, and subsequent reports for comparison with the original Board approvals.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Schnitzer presented the report and recommendation from the Committee.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Hermens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Directors Adams and Hensley were absent from the meeting at this time.

Staff Report to the Committee

President Blake, on behalf of the Oregon Institute of Technology community, has recommended that the soon-to-be-completed classroom/laboratory building at Oregon Institute of Technology be dedicated as Purvine Hall in honor of former president, Winston D. Purvine.

Dr. Purvine was the founding director of the institution, which began as the Oregon Vocational School in 1947; was renamed the Oregon Technical Institute; and became a member of the Oregon State System of Higher Education 1960, with Dr. Purvine named as its first president in 1961. The Institute was renamed to its present Oregon Institute of Technology by the 1973 Legislative Assembly. Dr. Purvine's service as chief administrator of the institution, in its various forms, spanned 29 years.

Some of the major milestones in his career include regional accreditation as a two-year institution in 1962, and the first four-year accredited degree program in 1967. Between those events he played an instrumental role in securing state funding in 1964 to build a new award-winning campus in its present location in north Klamath Falls.

Dr. Purvine was graduated from Albany College in 1933. He received an honorary LL.D from Lewis and Clark College in 1960 and was awarded Oregon Institute of Technology's first honorary doctorate in humane letters in 1987. Dr. Purvine was born February 8, 1912, in Independence. He maintains a residence in Klamath Falls.
Because of the unbroken years of foresight and strong leadership provided by Winston D. Purvine to bring Oregon Institute of Technology from a two-year vocational school to a leading polytechnic college, Dr. Blake believes the naming of this newest addition to the OIT campus as Purvine Hall more than complies with the Board's requirement of "unusually meritorious cause" for the naming of a facility for a living person.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board approve of the dedication of the new classroom/laboratory building as Purvine Hall in honor of the first president of the Oregon Institute of Technology.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

Miss Brooks presented the Committee report and recommendation.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Hermens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Directors Adams and Hensley were absent from the meeting at this time.

Emergency Board Request, Agricultural Experiment Station & Cooperative Extension Service

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

The 1987 Ways and Means Committee, in approving the budget for higher education, included the following Budget Note:

"Following selection of a new Dean of Agriculture and a new Experiment Station Director, Oregon State University is instructed to review agricultural programs and to establish priorities for research and future marketing of commodities. Oregon State University is to report to the appropriate legislative review agency."

In July 1987, the Board the Oregon State University Agricultural Experiment Station to seek from the August 1987 Emergency Board $500,000 to be matched with private gifts to finance a Wheat Research Endowed Chair. The Emergency Board approved that request, and currently, Dr. Warren E. Krostad, professor in wheat breeding and genetics, has been named the first recipient of the Wheat
Research Endowed Chair. Oregon State University, on behalf of the Experiment Station and the Cooperative Extension Service, is requesting authorization from the Board of Higher Education to seek a further request for funds from the January 28, 1988, Emergency Board in order to comply fully with the Budget Note. Furthermore, Oregon State University will be reporting to the Emergency Board in January on the status of the programs funded to date by the Legislature, as well as the future priorities for research and marketing.

Progress Reports

Oregon State University will report to the January Emergency Board on the progress of the following programs funded by the Legislature.

1) Wheat Research Endowed Chair (August 1987 Emergency Board)
2) Eastern Filbert Blight (1987 Legislature)
3) Seafood Marketing (1987 Legislature)

In summary the report will indicate the status of hiring staff, and that research has begun in all three programs. For a more complete discussion, see the attachment to this agenda item.

January Emergency Board Request

Oregon State University has identified three areas as the major priorities for Emergency Board funding in 1988-89 to enhance its efforts in research and marketing of commodities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine Branch Experiment Station</td>
<td>$270,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Extension Specialist</td>
<td>52,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Lab at Hermiston Field Station</td>
<td>220,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$543,477</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marine Branch Experiment Station

The following are rationale for establishing a Marine Branch Experiment Station located in part at the Hatfield Marine Science Center and the Astoria Seafoods Laboratory. (For a more complete discussion of this request, see the attachment to this agenda item.)

1) The diets of United States citizens are changing to include greater amounts and varieties of fresh and processed fish.
2) Many different species of fish and shellfish which exist in Oregon's coastal waters have a large potential for consumption in the United States and foreign markets.

3) A need exists to have improved packaging, refrigeration, storage, and shipping of seafoods.

4) Market feasibility and development efforts need to be increased to identify product potential for Oregon's seafoods.

5) Fresh seafood markets exist and can be expanded in the interior states of the United States.

6) As the coastal marine fishing program expands in Oregon, greater need for fish disease identification and control and water quality improvements will be required.

Sheep Extension Specialist

The following areas have been identified that could assist Oregon's sheep industry to improve the profitability of sheep production, enhance the development of an expanded sheep industry, and increase Oregon's agricultural income. (For a more complete discussion of this request, see the attachment to this agenda item.)

1) Improve the use of existing forage lands and reduce, or minimize, the purchase of expensive supplemental feeds.

2) Develop better sheep management practices.

3) Stagger sheep breeding and feeding programs to improve market timing.

4) Improve genetic development of sheep to attain high quality meat and wool production, with disease resistance, and high reproductive capacity.

Quality Laboratory at Hermiston Research & Extension Center

The Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center provides research on a limited number of irrigated horticultural crops (potatoes, squash, melons, tomatoes, onions) and is ideally suited for conducting research and assisting growers in production and marketing programs for existing and new horticultural crops
of significant market potential. The following objectives would be addressed through this request. (For a more complete discussion of this request, see the attachment to this agenda item.)

1) Develop a small Quality Research Laboratory to evaluate qualities such as ripeness, sugar content, firmness, storability, specific gravities, french fry color, etc. This laboratory would support the production of "high quality" fruits and vegetables, a necessity to allow increased fresh market and processing sales.

2) Develop and provide Integrated Pest Management techniques and practices the for the producers of fruits and vegetables, to reduce costs of production and maintain environmental quality. An extension position would provide rapid response to the demand for diagnosis of diseases and insect problems occurring on new as well as existing crops.

3) Assist in the development of cost effective seasonal conversion of existing area processing facilities for packing, cooling and storing of existing new fruits and vegetables.

The budgeted amounts (plus inflation) for the three programs described above represent the recurring costs for the 1989-1991 biennium which will be included in the budget forwarded to the Governor and Legislature in 1989. However the $29,440 budgeted for capital construction at the Hermiston Research and Extension Center are nonrecurring costs in 1988-89 and will not be included in the 1989-1991 request.

Future Priorities

Oregon State University will report to the January Emergency Board the following priorities for future funding by the Legislature.

1) International Marketing and Trade
2) Experiment Station Maintenance (Capital Repair)
3) Extension Service Initiatives

For a more complete discussion of these future priorities, see the attachment to this agenda item.

Board approval of future priorities, as described in this agenda item, effectively commits the Board to these priorities for the Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service for the 1989-1991 Biennial Budget Request.
EMERGENCY BOARD REPORT & REQUEST

The following material is prepared for presentation to the January 28, 1988 Emergency Board. It reports on progress that the Oregon State University (OSU) College of Agricultural Sciences has made in implementing prior legislative budget notes, requests Emergency Board consideration of key priority items, and reports on future priorities for the College. This is the second report/request pursuant to the following budget note. The first request, "Wheat Research Endowed Chair," was approved by the August 1987 Emergency Board.

"Following selection of a new Dean of Agriculture and a new Experiment Station Director, Oregon State University is instructed to review agricultural programs and to establish priorities for research and future marketing of commodities. Oregon State University is to report to the appropriate legislative review agency."

SUMMARY OF REPORT & REQUEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXPRMT. STN.</th>
<th>EXT. SVS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS REPORTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Report on Wheat Research Endowed Chair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Report on Eastern Filbert Blight</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Report on Seafood Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERGENCY BOARD REQUEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Request for Marine Branch Experiment Station</td>
<td>270,505</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Request for Sheep Specialist</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>52,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Request for Quality Lab at Hermiston</td>
<td>161,854</td>
<td>58,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Request</td>
<td>432,359</td>
<td>111,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE PRIORITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>International Marketing &amp; Trade</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Experiment Station Maintenance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Extension Service Initiatives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROGRESS REPORTS:

I. Report on the Wheat Research Endowed Chair

The August 1987 Emergency Board approved establishment of the Wheat Research Endowed Chair. One-half of the endowment principal ($500,000) was funded from the Emergency Fund, and the other one-half ($500,000) from the private sector. The following note was appended to the Emergency Board approval:

"The agency was instructed to return to the appropriate legislative review agency with a report on the proposed use of any earnings from the endowment prior to expenditure. The report should also include the status of the private funds received and the interest earnings available."
We are pleased to report that the private sector has contributed over half of the $500,000 in cash at this time. It is invested through the E. R. Jackman Foundation where it is earning endowment interest. The balance is scheduled to be received over a five-year period. The total cash and pledges from the private sector exceed $500,000.

With several pressing needs in OSU's wheat research program, we plan on using the endowment interest as of July 1, 1988. It will be used in FY 1988-89 to provide additional support to the wheat research program directed by Dr. Warren E. Kronstad, Professor in wheat breeding and genetics, who has been named as the first recipient of the Wheat Research Endowed Chair.

II. Report on the Eastern Filbert Blight
Oregon leads the nation in the production of filberts (hazelnuts). We raise approximately 98% of all filberts grown in the United States today. Filberts are grown on approximately 24,500 acres, and have a farm gate value of about $14,000,000 annually.

In the last two to three years, Oregon has experienced an increased incidence of the disease known as "Eastern Filbert Blight," a fungus that attacks the filbert tree's circulatory system and eventually kills the tree. No viable methods of treating the trees to rid them of the disease are currently available.

The 1987 Legislative Session provided the Agricultural Experiment Station with $150,000 beginning July 1, 1988 to develop and maintain an ongoing research program concentrating on "Eastern Filbert Blight." During the current fiscal year we have adjusted our existing budget and priorities to partially initiate research and extension efforts to combat this disease. We also have obtained additional funds from the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the Oregon Filbert Commission to assist in conducting research on this fungus.

Preliminary research indicates that certain varieties of trees are more disease resistant than others. Procedures have been developed to temporarily reduce the severity of the fungus infection. The $150,000 state appropriation will be invested in a two-pronged approach:

1. Develop and maintain genetic varieties of filbert trees that are either free from or resistant to Eastern Filbert Blight. This is to be done through selection, breeding, and propagation via tissue culture methods.

2. Research the fungus to determine its physical changes, method of introduction into trees, epidemiology (spread), and possible management techniques to minimize the impact of the disease.

III. Report on Seafood Marketing
The 1987 Legislative session provided the Agricultural Experiment Station with $50,000 per year to begin marine science research in the area of seafood marketing. The College is proceeding to hire a full-time Seafood Marketing Economist to be housed at the Hatfield Marine Science Center in Newport.
Research emphasis will be placed on seafoods marketing analysis, market trade and development, and market trends for both domestic and international markets. This research effort will work closely with producers, consumers, other public and private agencies, and cooperate closely with the fisheries development program of the Oregon Department of Agriculture. This position would become a part of the Marine Branch Experiment Station as requested in the following item.

**EMERGENCY BOARD REQUEST:**

**IV. Request for Marine Branch Experiment Station**

Oregon's fisheries and related industries have provided significant contribution to the state's economy for many years. Commercial fisheries, recreational fisheries, and related tourism on Oregon's coast and waterways provide food, employment, and income for Oregon citizens.

The College of Agricultural Sciences, through the campus based departments of Fisheries and Wildlife, Food Science and Technology, Microbiology, Agricultural and Resource Economics, and the Seafoods Laboratory in Astoria, are currently conducting fisheries related research. Oregon State University also operates the Hatfield Marine Science Center at Newport, which conducts cooperative fisheries, aquaculture, and related research programs with federal agencies and other local and state entities.

The Oregon fisheries industry, coastal citizens and legislators have sought to establish a Marine Branch Experiment Station located on the coast, to serve as a focus for marine related research similar to agricultural research which is conducted at the other nine Branch Experiment Stations. The Stations conduct specialized agricultural research of benefit to the local areas and the entire state.

The proposed Marine Branch Experiment Station would have scientists located at the Hatfield Marine Science Center and the Astoria Seafoods Laboratory. Several faculty programs presently budgeted through departments on campus will be shifted to the Marine Branch Experiment Station (Fisheries and Wildlife, Food Science and Technology) to help accomplish the goals of the Marine Branch Station. This represents a refocusing and reallocation of existing programs toward new priorities and directions to encourage further development of Oregon's coastal fisheries and related industries.

**Rationale for establishing the Marine Branch Experiment Station include:**

1. United States citizens diets are changing to include greater amounts and varieties of fresh and processed fish.

2. Many different species of fish and shell fish which exist in Oregon's coastal waters have a large potential for consumption in the United States and foreign markets.

3. A need exists to have improved packaging, refrigeration, storage, and shipping of seafoods.

4. Market feasibility and development efforts need to be increased to identify product potentials for Oregon's seafoods.
5. Fresh seafood markets exist and can be expanded in the interior states of the U.S.

6. As the coastal marine fishing program expands in Oregon, greater needs for fish disease identification and control, and water quality improvements will be required.

As mentioned in "III. Report on Seafood Marketing," the 1987 Legislative Session provided $50,000 per year to the Agricultural Experiment Station to employ a Seafood Marketing research position. This position will be a part of the proposed Marine Branch Experiment Station, and will work closely with new marketing positions in the Oregon Department of Agriculture to accomplish common goals of strengthening Oregon's seafood economy. The following resources are requested to develop the Marine Branch Experiment Station with research conducted at Newport and Astoria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIMENT STATION</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microbiologist/Pathologist</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$37,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Scientist</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>37,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>21,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>49,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$270,505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Agricultural Experiment Station has initiated planning for a Marine Branch Experiment Station. We request $270,505 from the Emergency Fund beginning July 1, 1988 to allow us to establish a single Marine Branch Experiment Station located at the Hatfield Marine Science Center at Newport and the Seafoods Lab at Astoria, to best capitalize on the expertise/strengths of these two laboratories.

V. Request for Sheep Extension Specialist

Oregon is ideally suited for sheep production. Grass seed fields in the Willamette Valley produce early forage for sheep, and abundant hill lands produce excellent native and planted pasture forage for sheep, in addition to timber. Existing forage on private land has the potential to double the current production of sheep, currently estimated at 425,000 head. In 1986 the sale of sheep and lambs amounted to $24,473,000, with receipts from wool amounting to an additional $1,764,000. An annual increase in "farm gate" income of $26,000,000 could be realized from improved use of private lands. Increased use of public lands could further increase the number of sheep and related income.

Several items have been identified that could assist Oregon's sheep industry to improve the profitability of sheep production, to enhance the
development of an expanded sheep industry, and to increase our state's agricultural income:

1. Improve the use of existing forage lands and reduce/minimize the purchase of expensive supplemental feeds.
2. Develop better sheep management practices.
3. Improve the economic control of sheep diseases and predators.
4. Stagger sheep breeding and feeding programs to improve market timing.
5. Improve genetic development of sheep to attain high quality meat and wool production, with disease resistance, and with high reproductive capacity.

The sheep industry and the Extension Service desire to reestablish an Extension Sheep Specialist Program which was lost as a result of 1979-81 biennial budget reductions. The Sheep Specialist would work directly with the sheep industry and through County Extension Agents to assist in providing extension programs in the above areas. The Extension Service has $14,094 and 0.25 FTE available in its existing budget to contribute towards this program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-BOARD REQUEST</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>$28,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>8.910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We therefore request $52,796 from the Emergency Fund to reestablish this Extension Sheep Specialist Program, effective July 1, 1988.

VI. Request for Quality Laboratory at Hermiston

Oregon has one of the most diverse agricultural production systems in the United States. Varied climate and geographical regions, easy access via roads, rails, rivers, and air to and from the port of Portland provides many market opportunities. Significant market potential throughout the western United States, British Columbia, and other Pacific Rim countries exists. The northeastern portion of the state in Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow, and Umatilla counties presents a special opportunity to increase production of high quality horticultural crops.

The Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center located in Umatilla County provides research on a limited number of irrigated horticultural crops, i.e., potatoes, squash, melons, tomatoes, onions, and is ideally suited for conducting research and assisting growers in production and marketing programs for existing and new horticultural crops of significant market potential.
The food industry has expressed interest in expanding or installing new food processing plants for fresh and processed fruits and vegetables, plus specialty items such as popcorn, peanuts, Japanese melons, etc. With such a significant opportunity for agricultural diversification and controlled production of horticultural crops in the Columbia Basin, expansion of research and Extension educational programs at the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center is requested.

We propose to refocus the present programs at the Hermiston Station to maximize their potential for economic development in the area. This will involve combining existing expertise of faculty presently at Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center and at Corvallis. This will be accomplished by an additional Extension Agent, Lab Technician, Research Assistant, and related support. In addition, some support for continued maintenance and operation of these facilities/programs is needed.

The following objectives would be addressed through this request:

1. Develop a small Quality Research Laboratory at the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center, to evaluate qualities such as ripeness, sugar content, firmness, storability, specific gravities, french fry color, etc. This lab will support the production of "high quality" fruits and vegetables; a necessity to allow increased fresh market and processing sales.

2. Develop and provide Integrated Pest Management (IPM) techniques and practices for producers of fruits and vegetables, to reduce costs of production and maintain environmental quality. The extension position would provide rapid response to the demand for diagnosis of diseases and insect problems occurring on new as well as existing crops.

3. Assist in the development of cost effective seasonal conversion of existing area processing facilities for packing, cooling and storing of existing and new fruits and vegetables.

This request will allow the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center to improve their response to quality and economic issues in both the production and processing of new and existing crops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXPRMT STATION</th>
<th>EXTENSION SVS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Tech 2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Help</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co. Agent Integrated Pest Mngmnt.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$28,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE</td>
<td>16,292</td>
<td>8,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>44,920</td>
<td>11,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>17,774</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Construction</td>
<td>29,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$161,854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We therefore request $220,176 ($161,854 Experiment Station and $58,322 Extension Service) from the Emergency Fund to establish this Quality Laboratory and Extension Center at the Hermiston Agricultural Research and Extension Center, effective July 1, 1988.
FUTURE PRIORITIES:

VII. International Marketing and Trade
Oregon's location on the Pacific Rim and its ability to provide a multitude of agricultural and forest products, allows it to fill market niches in many foreign counties. Existing markets could be expanded and new markets could be established. Research and Extension staff are needed to provide research in agricultural markets, international trade, and related policy issues, plus educational programs for producers, processors, and marketing groups. In cooperation with the Oregon Department of Agriculture, initial emphasis would be given to those commodities with significant export potential.

VIII. Experiment Station Maintenance
The Agricultural Experiment Station is comprised of 18 subject matter departments located on campus and nine branch experiment stations located throughout the state. These departments and branch stations conduct research related to improving the economies of most of the agricultural commodities produced in Oregon. This research has significant impact on our state's farm gate and value-added income.

Laboratories, greenhouses, animal housing, farm implement and crop storage, and supply and chemical storage, are vitally important to the successful conduct of research, which results in the economic development of Oregon's Agriculture.

Reduced funding at both state and national levels required the Experiment Station to defer maintenance. This was done in lieu of terminating tenured research faculty and on-going research programs. The result is deteriorated facilities and out-dated equipment, that are now unsuitable for up-to-date research.

The Experiment Station is planning to request a program for "Maintenance and Repair of Facilities and Equipment" to begin in the next biennium. These funds will be invested to keep research facilities and equipment at the leading edge of technology.

IX. Extension Service Initiatives
Oregon citizens have identified four major educational goals that they would like the Extension Service to pursue: economic development, human development, resource conservation and management, and leadership development. Within these goals several initiatives have been identified to focus on issues critical to Oregonians. Some initiatives can be implemented within existing Extension budgets, others will require further state investment in Extension and Experiment Station programs.
Priority areas for future budget requests include:

1. Identifying Economic Alternatives - educational programs to focus on new product and market assessment, entrepreneurship.

2. Maintaining and Improving Water Quality and Resource Management - for agriculture, commercial, domestic, and recreational requirements.


4. Multi-County Agents - to serve commercial agriculture and forestry and strengthen research and extension ties by locating agents at research centers.

5. Strengthening Family and Parent Education - to provide preventive education in health related concerns such as nutrition, drug abuse, mental health, and teenage suicide.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant recommend to the Board of Higher Education that Oregon State University on behalf of the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Cooperative Extension Service be authorized to present to the January 1988 Emergency Board a General Fund request of $543,477 to finance the programs outlined above. Furthermore, the staff recommends that Oregon State University be authorized to report the progress on existing programs and present the future priorities for funding as outlined above.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Ed Coate, Vice President for Finance and Administration at Oregon State University, introduced Dr. Roy Arnold, the new dean of agriculture to discuss the request and respond to questions.

Dr. Arnold summarized the material presented in the report to the Committee. In response to questions, Dr. Arnold indicated a move with all of the branch stations toward faculty rank and tenure in an academic department, even though they may be working in a location away from the campus. The sheep extension specialist would be a restoration of that position as a full-time position to assist in addressing the needs of that major industry. He indicated it was a growth area and a significant opportunity in Oregon because of the tremendous forage production. There are a number of areas emerging where there are different management techniques, including some of the reforestation which involves actual grazing for cattle.
Mr. Dodson commented on the important role of items such as this proposal to develop a constituency for higher education in the state. He inquired whether this request might come as a surprise to the Emergency Board. Dr. Arnold responded that the Emergency Board had been advised of this potential request during discussions of the endowed chair in wheat research and have been kept informed in other ways.

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

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Dodson presented the report and recommendation of the Committee.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Hermens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Directors Adams and Hensley were absent from the meeting at this time.

At the regular and recessed sessions of the State Board of Higher Education held on November 13 and 18, 1987, Mr. Dodson presented a proposed list of desired characteristics for evaluating candidates in connection with the search for a president for the Oregon Health Sciences University. Suggestions for minor modifications were made at each of the sessions and have been incorporated in the list presented below for Board approval.

It is recommended that the Board approve the list of characteristics for the guidance of the search committee:

**DESIRED CHARACTERISTICS FOR EVALUATING CANDIDATES**

**Desired Academic Qualifications**

- Graduate education appropriate for a health science or related field, normally the doctorate or equivalent.
- Successful teaching in a health care field and/or clinical experience.
- Research experience.
- A national reputation among health disciplines.
Administrative Experience and Leadership Style

- Successful administrative experience in a health science teaching/research center, health care facility, and/or higher education at the level of Dean or equivalent.

- Ability to work with colleagues as a leader and to stimulate their creativity.

- Respect for and ability to draw on the viewpoints of others.

- Commitment to academic freedom.

- Vision, imagination, and creativity for long-range planning.

- Demonstrated leadership and commitment to excellence in teaching, research, and patient care.

- Demonstrated commitment to health care delivery and preventive medicine.

- Appreciation of the important role of student and faculty governance.

- Ability to encourage debate of controversial issues and to foster open discussion.

- Balanced perspective toward competing institutional needs and resource opportunities.

- Skill in communication and in developing and maintaining university/community relationships.

- Value for collaboration among disciplines and between members of the University community, the State System and the community at large.

- Successful experience in obtaining funding from private and public sources.

- Skill in providing advocacy and leadership in relations with state and federal agencies and legislators.

- Experience in effective budgeting and fiscal responsibility.

- Ability to recruit and retain qualified staff, delegate authority and responsibility, and a commitment to the need for such an administrative style.
Meeting #558

Board Discussion and Action

December 18, 1987

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with
the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Brooks,
Dodson, Hermes, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen.
Those voting no: None. Directors Adams and Hensley were absent
from the meeting at this time.

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES DIVISION ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

Accessibility
for Handicap-capped, UO

Architecture
& Allied Arts
Additions & Alterations, UO

Architecture
& Allied Arts
Additions & Alterations, UO

Hayward Field
Improvements, UO

Hayward Field
Improvements, UO

Food Toxicology
On November 19, 1987, McCall Heating & Professional Boiler Ser-
& Nutrition Lab services Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount
(Water Chiller System), OSU

Johnson Hall
ECMS EPA/IBP, UO

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

An Agreement was negotiated with SRG Partnership, P.C., Archi
tects, Portland, for architectural services not to exceed
$25,901. Financing will be provided from state funds.

An Agreement was negotiated with John Herrick, Engineer, Eugene, for engineering services not to exceed $3,000. Financing will be provided from state funds.

An Agreement was negotiated with BOOR/A Architects, Portland, for architectural services not to exceed $241,537. Financing will be provided from state funds.

An Agreement was negotiated with Stafford Architects, Eugene, for architectural services not to exceed $49,220. Financing will be provided from state funds.

An Agreement was negotiated with Nils Norman Construction Com-
pany for consulting services not to exceed $5,000. Financing will be provided from State Funds.

Award of Construction Contracts

On November 19, 1987, J. K. Guckenberger, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $9,810. Financing will be provided from funds made available to the institution and reimbursement from Bonneville Power Administration.
On November 23, 1987, Rollins & Greene Builders, Inc., were awarded a contract for the Hospital and Clinics Rehabilitation & Alterations (UHS, 11th Floor, CT Scanner II Remodel) Project in the amount of $33,858. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.

On October 23, 1987, Contractors, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $560,400. Financing will be provided from gift and hospital funds.

On November 2, 1987, Fuiten's Plumbing & Heating Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $45,846. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.

On November 20, 1987, Interstate Mechanical, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $31,967. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.

On October 9, 1987, Smith Brothers Office was awarded a contract for Base Bids A & B of this project in the amount of $59,974.75; and Pacific Office Furnishings Division of Pacific Stationery and Printing Co. was awarded a contract for Base Bids C & D of this project in the amount of $71,147. Financing will be provided from state lottery funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on May 22, 1986. The estimated total project cost remains at $87,167.90. Financing was provided from Parking Operations and/or building reserves attributable to Parking.

This project is complete and was accepted on October 13, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $24,197. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $62,592. Financing was provided from state funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on October 28, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $22,254.56. Financing was provided from state funds.
Schneider Museum of Art, SOSC

This project is complete and was accepted on October 7, 1986. The estimated total project cost remains at $351,848. Financing was provided from gifts.

Fine Arts Building Re-roofing Project, UQ

This project is complete and was accepted on November 16, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $83,106. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

Dept. of Psychiatry Consolidation, UHN, OHSU

The Hospital and Clinics Rehabilitation & Alterations (Dept. of Psychiatry Consolidation, UHN) Project was accepted on June 30, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $613,758. Financing was provided from funds available to the hospital.

Mackenzie Hall Northwest Roof, Reroofing Project, OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on March 28, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $41,464. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

UHN, Helistop Installation, SW Wing Roof, OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on July 14, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $67,639. Financing was provided from state funds.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Endowed Chairs

Mr. Alltucker reported that the Committee on Instruction had been provided with guidelines for the Endowed Chairs program of the State System.

Mr. Alltucker said the Committee had reviewed the guidelines and recommended that the Board allow the institutions to start raising funds but that the full Board review and action on the guidelines be deferred to the next meeting.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Brooks, Dodson, Hermens, Nelson, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Directors Adams and Hensley were absent from the meeting at this time.

Mr. Alltucker also reported the Committee on Instruction had listened to a presentation from Representative Liz VanLeeuwen in opposition to the conversion to the semester system. Some of the points had been raised during the earlier considerations of the conversion. He said he believed everyone was in agreement that the members of the legislature felt a need for more data and more
justification of the actions that the Board takes in order to support those actions fully. The request to the Committee was that the full Board suspend all action on the conversion to the semester system until June 30, 1989, and that it take that action at the present Board meeting.

Mr. Alltucker said the Committee did not act on that request. He commented that legislative oversight provides an important check and balance in delivering educational services. Mr. Alltucker said, in his opinion and in this particular instance, the issue is an administrative problem. Legislative oversight should be confined to see whether resources are being wasted or whether the quality of the educational services were being decreased.

Mr. Petersen said he would rely on the judgment of the Committee on Instruction because it had spent almost a year in studying the recommendation. He said he believed suspension would be a disservice to those who have spent a lot of time in implementing the process and noted the proposal had been discussed with many legislators.

Mr. Petersen announced the next Board meeting would be held on January 15, 1988, at Portland State University. He also announced the Board meeting in February had been moved from February 19 to February 17 in order to coincide with a meeting hosted by Governor Goldschmidt for appointed board and commission members scheduled for February 16.

The Board meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.