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ADJOURNMENT
A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Oregon Room, College Center, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 1:15 p.m., April 21, 1989, by the President of the Board, Mr. Richard F. Hensley, and on roll call the following answered present:

- Mr. John W. Alltucker
- Mr. Bob Bailey
- Miss Kasey K. Brooks
- Mr. Mark S. Dodson
- Mr. Gary Johnston
- Mr. Rob Miller
- Ms. Janice J. Wilson
- Mr. Richard F. Hensley

Absent: Director Bruggere was out of the state. Directors Adams and Richardson were present for the Committee of the Whole meeting, but had other commitments for the afternoon.

Centralized Activities—Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Secretary Wilma Foster; W. T. Lemmon, Executive Vice Chancellor; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCAPE; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Ray Jurans, Acting Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; R. S. Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Information Systems Services; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services; George Perstein, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Jim Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; Steve Katz, Controller; Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services, Academic Affairs; James Payne, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Curricular Affairs; Virginia Thompson and Gary Blythe, Assistants to the Executive Vice Chancellor; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications.

Oregon State University—President John Byrne; Graham Spanier, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Laura Rice-Sayre, Faculty Associate to the Provost; Gary Tiedeman, President, Faculty Senate.

University of Oregon—President Paul Olum; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration; Norman Wessells, Provost; Larry Large, Vice President, Public Affairs.
Oregon Health Sciences University—President Peter Kohler; David Witter, Vice President, Administration; Robert Koler, Interim Vice President, Academic Affairs.

Portland State University—Interim President R. N. Edgington; Frank Martino, Provost; Gary E. Powell, Acting Vice President, Finance and Administration; Nancy Tang, President, IFS; Oma Blankenship, Member, IFS.

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

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

Southern Oregon State College—President Joseph Cox; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration; Stephen Reno, Dean of Academic Affairs; Gary Prickett, Dean of Development and College Relations; Robert McCoy, President, Association of Oregon Faculty.

Western Oregon State College—President Richard Meyers; Bill Neffert, Dean of Administration; Bill Cowart, Provost; Sherry Perry, Budget Officer; Gary D. Jensen, Director, Library; Jim Arnold, Director, Student Support Services.

Others—Susan Shepherd, Research Assistant, Oregon Student Lobby; John Westine, Research Coordinator, and Bernie Saalfeld, Policy Analyst, Office of Educational Policy and Planning; Mike Holland, Commissioner, Office of Community Colleges; Don Shore, Oregon Education Association; Paul Evans, City Councilor, Monmouth; Kym Hurst, Senate Chair, ASWOSC; Shannon Shaffer, Board Member, Oregon Student Lobby; Two business students from WOSC.

MINUTES
APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on March 17, 1989, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Appreciation to WOSC

Mr. Hensley thanked President Meyers and the faculty, staff, and students for a very enjoyable and informative visit to Western Oregon State College. He said it was always a pleasure to see the beautiful grounds at this time of year and to visit classrooms and see some of the innovative and unusual things being done at the institution. He particularly cited the impact of the videotape on the rural education program.

CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

The Chancellor concurred in the comments by Mr. Hensley and said President Meyers should be very proud of the atmosphere of solidarity and of the accomplishments during his tenure.
The Chancellor said the implications of the present legislative activities had been discussed during the meeting of the Committee of the Whole. Although the outcome of legislative deliberations will not be known for some weeks, it will have very significant implications for higher education. He indicated it was important to make people understand the choices that are being made and that those choices would extend far into the future for Oregon.

The Chancellor reported that President Olum was proceeding to name a language laboratory in honor of Mr. Osamitsu Yamada, who helped create the laboratory. In addition, a plaque will designate one of the elevators in Chapman Hall in honor of Mr. John Hocken III, who was a strong advocate of equal access. He was a wheelchair victim owing to muscular dystrophy and the plaque will mark his efforts on behalf of handicapped students. Mr. Hocken died in September 1987.

President Olum also requested Board approval to name the Athletic Center at Autzen Stadium the Casanova Athletic Center in honor of Leonard J. Casanova. Although this request represents an exception in naming the facility for a living person, the Chancellor said the request seems justified in view of Mr. Casanova's role in its creation.

President Olum sought Board approval to designate Science IV-B as George Streisinger Hall in memory of a former faculty member and founding member of the Institute of Molecular Biology.

Upon recommendation of the Chancellor, the Board approved the names for the Athletic Center and Science IV-B. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

The Chancellor announced that the Presidential Search Committee for Portland State University would be named at the May Board meeting. He said the intent was to be in the final stages of the search process by next March at the same time the Governor's Commission on Higher Education in the Portland Metropolitan Area is expected to complete its work.

The Chancellor said it was his pleasure to recommend formally the appointment of Dr. Myles Brand, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Ohio State University, as the fourteenth president of the University of Oregon. The appointment would be effective July 1, 1989, at an annual salary rate of $100,000 plus $13,000 per year for expenses incident to the position.

Mr. Miller moved that the Board approve the recommendation. At the request of Mr. Hensley, Mr. Miller presented the report and recommendation of the Search Committee to the Committee of the Whole and the discussion and recommendation of the Committee of the Whole.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee of the Whole

Mr. Miller thanked the members of the Search Committee and all who had assisted in the search. He thanked the Chancellor and the Board for their cooperation in providing flexibility in the interview and evaluation process which allowed a great deal of confidentiality and an extremely thorough evaluation of the candidates. He then introduced Dr. Myles Brand and moved that the Committee recommend he be appointed to the position of President of the University of Oregon at a salary to be agreed upon by the Chancellor, the President of the Board, and Dr. Brand.

The Committee approved the motion, and Mr. Hensley invited Dr. Brand to comment during the Committee session so that he could make afternoon plane connections to return to Ohio.

Dr. Brand said he was absolutely ecstatic about being chosen for the position and thanked the Board and the Search Committee for their confidence in him and their professionalism during the search. He said he was aware of the high quality, outstanding faculty, and unusual potential of the University of Oregon long before anyone had suggested he become a candidate. He said the University of Oregon’s national reputation is outstanding and the institution might even be appreciated more outside the state than within Oregon.

Dr. Brand stated the University of Oregon had been well served by President Olum and it was time now to build on that strong foundation and continue its qualitative development. He said he intended, as president, to work closely with the faculty, students, and staff to strengthen the instructional, research, and service missions of the institution. He said he was confident that by working together it would be possible to build a truly great university.

Outside of the campus, Dr. Brand said he wanted to be part of the Chancellor’s team in helping to demonstrate how public higher education could make Oregon more competitive, lead to a stronger economy, and contribute to the quality of life. The University’s current strengths, combined with measurable increases in public support, could lead to an institution that would pay enormous dividends in the lives of every Oregon citizen.

In conclusion, Dr. Brand said he would be leaving Ohio State with mixed feelings because working with the people there had been one of the great experiences of his life. The fact he had chosen to make the move was a testimony to the potential of the University of Oregon, to the magnetism of the State of Oregon, and to the wonderful livability of Eugene. He said he and Mrs. Brand looked forward to becoming Oregonians and to a very bright future.
Mr. Hensley said Mr. Miller had provided extraordinary leadership during the search process and thanked all those who participated. He said he was particularly impressed by the cooperation and the attitude about maintaining the confidentiality of all of the candidates whom the committee reviewed.

Mr. Hensley indicated there had been some questions related to the process and stated the Board felt the necessary requirements were met for determining the complete analytical information about prospective finalists while at the same time preserving their confidentiality during the final stages of the search. The method used for the first time in the State System had the full agreement of the Search Committee, the Chancellor, the Board, and the finalists who were under consideration. Mr. Hensley said he had been extremely pleased to see the overwhelming expression of confidence in Dr. Brand's credentials by the campus screening committee, the vice presidents and constituent groups, and the Chancellor.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the appointment of Dr. Brand as presented in the recommendations of the Chancellor and the Committee of the Whole. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Admission Policy for 1990-91

Staff Report to the Committee

Background

Each year, in the spring, the Board reviews admissions requirements for the term beginning some eighteen months hence. At the Board's February 29, 1987, meeting, the Board decided that beginning with admission requirements for the 1988-89 academic year, admission policy for a given year would be approved and announced in February of the prior calendar year in order to provide sufficient time to high school and community college students, counselors, and parents to be informed of changes in OSSHE institutions' admissions policies.

Admission requirements are reviewed annually by the System's campuses, and proposed changes are forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs for review. All proposed changes are also reviewed
by the Academic Council. The review focuses upon the appropriateness of the proposed changes, particularly the extent to which the changes result in admissions requirements that:

- provide minimum standards students need to succeed in college-level work at the campus
- maximize access to students, particularly students from Oregon
- provide provision for admission of students who might not meet minimum standards but who provide evidence that they are college able.

Staff Analysis

The Board is being asked to review and approve admission standards effective for 1990-91. The request is being provided at a date later than customary because of a special circumstance presented to the Board with respect to enrollment management needs (see subsequent item).

The admission requirements requested for 1990-91 are reviewed in "Attachment A: Admission Requirements Effective 1990-91, Oregon State System of Higher Education." Table A reviews the major requirements systemwide pertinent to freshman admission and transfer admission.

The following listing provides the proposed admissions changes that would go into effect for 1990-91. Four institutions are requesting changes for 1990-91: the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University, and Oregon Institute of Technology.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

1. Increase in Transfer Student Admission Requirements

   a. Increase the college grade point average requirement from 2.00 to 2.25 for resident students and from 2.25 to 2.50 for nonresident students.

   b. Increase required quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work from 30 to 36.

   c. Students not eligible for admission to UO upon graduation from high school must have completed two terms of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121, and College Algebra (Math 101) with a grade of C- or better in each of the required courses.
d. Special preference and consideration will be given to applicants with a 2.00 or better GPA and an Associate of Arts degree from an Oregon community college and to applicants with 45 or more credit hours.

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

1. Freshman Admission
   a. Discontinue use of the SAT-Test of Standard Written English as an admission requirement.

2. Transfer Admission
   a. Increase grade point average requirement from 2.00 to 2.25 for residents and from 2.25 to 2.50 for nonresidents.
   b. Increase required quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work from 30 to 36.
   c. Special preference and consideration will be given to applicants with a 2.00 or better GPA and an Associate of Arts degree from Oregon community colleges.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

1. Freshman Admission
   a. Increase the high school grade point average required for freshman admission from 2.50 to 2.75 for both residents and nonresidents.

2. Transfer Admission
   a. Increase the college grade point average required for admission from 2.00 to 2.25 for residents and from 2.25 to 2.50 for non-residents.
   b. Increase required quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work from 30 to 36.
   c. Special preference and consideration will be given to applicants with a 2.00 or better GPA and an Associate of Arts degree from Oregon community colleges.
OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

1. Freshmen Admission
   a. Increase the high school grade point average required for freshman admission from 2.25 to 2.50.
   b. Increase GED scores required for freshman admission from 45 to 50 for the average standard score and 40 to 45 for the minimum score on each of the five GED sub-tests.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the 1989-90 admission policy be continued for the 1990-91 academic year with the specific changes requested in the requirements and policy at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University, and Oregon Institute of Technology.
TABLE A
ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS AS PROPOSED FOR 1990-91 ACADEMIC YEAR
(Changes from 1989-90 Requirements Parenthetically Noted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>FOSC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRESHMAN ADMISSION: () (Residents and Nonresidents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.50) (2.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Requirements: 14 Units () (4-English, 3-Math, 2-Science, 3-Social Studies, 2-Elective)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT/ACT Scores</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of Standard Written English Score of 30 or Above</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFER ADMISSION: ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA Residents</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.00) (2.00) (2.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.25) (2.25) (2.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Consideration for Applicants with 2.00+ GPA and AA Degree from Oregon Community Colleges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum College Hours Required</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) (30) (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants Not Eligible Upon HS Graduation Meet Specified Course Requirements</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\) *Courses Required: Two writing courses beginning with WR 121 and Math 101 (College Algebra) with grade of C- or better.

April 21, 1989
ATTACHMENT A

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS EFFECTIVE 1990-91
OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

OREGON RESIDENT STUDENTS

FRESHMAN ADMISSION

To be admitted to freshman standing\(^1\) resident students need to fulfill each of the requirements (or alternatives) as specified in 1 through 4 below:

1. High School Graduation
   a. Public high school graduates must have been graduated from a standard or accredited high school. Private high school graduates must have been graduated from an accredited high school.
   b. Nongraduates to be admitted must have:
      - a minimum score of 40 (45, OIT) on each of the five subtests of the Test of General Educational Development (GED);
      - an average score for the five tests of 58 (UO, OSU, SOSC), 55 (WOSC), 51 (EDSC), 50 (OIT), 46 (PSU).
   c. Graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools must have:
      - a minimum score of 970 SAT or 22 ACT (UO, OSU) or 890 SAT or 20 ACT (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC);
      - an average 410 or above (1,230 total) on three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and a third of the student's choice); or meet the summer qualifying alternative (4b).

2. Admission Tests
   a. Must submit scores of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or American College Test (ACT);
   b. Achievement tests are required for applicants who are graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools;

\(^1\)Students with any college credit note Section 2. of Transfer Admission requirements.
c. Test scores are:
   • used an alternative means of meeting the GPA requirement;
   • As the admission policy for graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools;
   • In selectively admitting qualified applicants;
   • For advising and guidance purposes; and
   • As noted directly below:
      - To enroll at UO, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT-Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT English subtest.
      - To enroll at SOSC, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT-Test of Standard Written English or 15 ACT-English or take Writing 40 at an extra fee.

3. Subject Requirements. Must satisfactorily complete fourteen (one year equal to one unit) of college preparatory work in the following subject areas:
   a. English (4 units). Shall include the study of the English language, literature, speaking and listening, and writing, with emphasis on and frequent practice in writing expository prose during all four years.
   b. Mathematics (3 units). Shall include first year algebra and two additional years of college preparatory mathematics selected from geometry (deductive or descriptive), advanced topics in algebra, trigonometry, analytical geometry, finite mathematics, advanced applications, calculus, probability and statistics, or courses that integrate topics from two or more of these areas. (One unit is highly recommended in the senior year. Algebra and geometry taken prior to the ninth grade will be accepted.)
   c. Science (2 units). Shall include a year each in two fields of college preparatory science such as biology, chemistry, physics, or earth and physical science, one recommended as a laboratory science.
   d. Social Studies (3 units). Shall include one year of U.S. history, one year of global studies (world history, geography, etc.), and one year of a social studies elective (government strongly recommended).
   e. Other College Preparatory (2 units). May be foreign language (highly recommended), computer science, fine and performing arts, or other college preparatory electives including advanced-level vocational-technical courses. (Units need not be in same subject.)
f. Alternatives to the Subject Requirements (any one of the following):

- Score an average of 410 or above (1,230 total) on three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and a third of the student's choice).

- Take make-up course work (high school or college-level) for specific subject requirements missed in high school and achieve a passing grade. (One three hour college-level, term course is equal to one unit of high school work.)

- Earn a minimum of 2.00 GPA in 12 hours (OSU) or 9 hours (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of prescribed summer session college-level work at the respective campus for OSU and PSU, or at any accredited college for EOSC, OIT, SOSC, and WOSC.

4. Grade Point Average Requirement

a. To be admitted, students must have a grade point average in all graded subjects taken towards graduation in four years of high school of 3.00 (UO), 2.75 (OSU, PSU), 2.50 (OIT, SOSC, WOSC), 2.50 (EOSC, except 2.00 for students from Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Union, Wallowa, Wheeler, and noncommunity college portions of Baker and Malheur counties).

b. Alternatives to the GPA Requirement (either of the following):

- SAT or ACT scores and high school grades to predict a 2.00 college GPA (UO, OSU); 890 SAT or 20 ACT (PSU, OIT); 890 SAT or 20 ACT or 2.00 predicted college GPA (EOSC, SOSC, WOSC).

- Earn a minimum of 2.00 GPA in 12 hours (OSU) or 9 hours (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of prescribed summer session college-level work at the respective campus for OSU and PSU, or at any accredited college for EOSC, OIT, SOSC, and WOSC.

TRANSFER ADMISSION

1. To be admitted as a transfer student, resident applicants must have:

   University of Oregon:

   - a minimum GPA of 2.25 or better in 36 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work;

   - applicants not eligible for admission upon graduation from high school must complete two terms of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121, and College Algebra (Math 101) with a grade of C- or better in each of the required courses.
Oregon State University, Portland State University

- a minimum GPA of 2.25 or better in 36 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work.

Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology, Southern Oregon State College, Western Oregon State College:

- a minimum GPA of 2.00 or better in 24 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work.

2. All Transfer Applicants. Students who have accumulated 12 or more quarter credit hours of college-level work, but fewer than 36 (OSU, PSU, UO) or 24 (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) must meet freshman admission requirements and have a 2.25 (OSU, PSU, UO) or a 2.00 (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) or better GPA in all college work attempted.

FIVE PERCENT SPECIAL ADMISSION

1. Institutions are authorized to admit a quota of freshmen totaling no more than five percent of the institution's first-time freshmen class for the previous academic year as exceptions to the stated admission requirements. To qualify for five percent special admission, applicants are considered on a case-by-case basis.
NONRESIDENT STUDENTS

FRESHMAN ADMISSION

To be admitted to freshman standing\(^2\), nonresident students need to fulfill each of the requirements (or alternatives) as specified in 1 through 4 below:

1. **High School Graduation**
   
a. Public high school graduates must have been graduated from a standard or accredited high school. Private high school graduates must have been graduated from an accredited high school.

b. Nongraduates to be admitted must have:
   
   - a minimum score of 40 (45, OIT) on each of the five subtests of the Test of General Educational Development (GED);
   
   - an average score for the five tests of 58 (UO, OSU, SOSC), 55 (WOSC), 51 (BOSC), 50 (OIT), 46 (PSU).

c. Graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools must have:
   
   - a minimum score of 970 SAT or 22 ACT (UO, OSU) or 890 SAT or 20 ACT (PSU, BOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC);
   
   - an average of 410 or above (1,230 total) on three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and a third of the student's choice); or meet the prescribed summer session admission alternative.

2. **Admission Tests**
   
a. Must submit scores of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or American College Test (ACT);

b. Achievement tests are required for applicants who are graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools;

   c. Test scores are:
      
      - used as an alternative means of meeting the GPA requirement;

      - As the admission policy for graduates of nonstandard and unaccredited high schools;

\(^2\)Students with any college credit note Section 2. of Nonresident Transfer Admission requirements.
In selectively admitting qualified applicants;

For advising and guidance purposes; and

As noted directly below:

- To enroll at UO, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT-Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English subtest.

- To enroll at SOSC, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT-TSWE or 15 on the ACT-English or take Writing 40 at an extra fee.

3. Subject Requirements. Must satisfactorily complete fourteen units (one year equal to one unit) of college preparatory work in the following subject areas:

a. English (4 units). Shall include the study of the English language, literature, speaking and listening, and writing, with emphasis on and frequent practice in writing expository prose during all four years.

b. Mathematics (3 units). Shall include first year algebra and two additional years of college preparatory mathematics selected from geometry (deductive or descriptive), advanced topics in algebra, trigonometry, analytical geometry, finite mathematics, advanced applications, calculus, probability and statistics, or courses that integrate topics from two or more of these areas. (One unit is highly recommended in the senior year. Algebra and geometry taken prior to the ninth grade will be accepted.)

c. Science (2 units). Shall include a year each in two fields of college preparatory science such as biology, chemistry, physics, or earth and physical science, one recommended as a laboratory science.

d. Social Studies (3 units). Shall include one year of U.S. history, one year of global studies (world history, geography, etc.), and one year of a social studies elective (government strongly recommended).

e. Other College Preparatory (2 units). May be foreign language (highly recommended), computer science, fine and performing arts, or other college preparatory electives including advanced-level vocational-technical courses. (Units need not be in same subject.)

f. Alternatives to the Subject Requirements (any of the following):

- Score an average of 410 or above (1,230 total) on three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and a third of the student's choice).
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- Take make-up course work (high school or college-level) for specific subject requirements missed in high school and achieve a passing grade. (One three hour college-level, term course is equal to one unit of high school work.)

- Earn a minimum of 2.00 GPA in 12 hours (OSU) or 9 hours (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of prescribed summer session college-level work at the respective campus for OSU and PSU, or at any accredited college for EOSC, OIT, SOSC, and WOSC.

4. Grade Point Average Requirement

a. To be admitted, nonresident students must have a grade point average in all graded subjects taken towards graduation in four years of high school of 3.00 (UO), 2.75 (OSU, PSU), and 2.50 (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC).

b. Alternatives to the GPA Requirement (either of the following):

- SAT or ACT scores and high school grades to predict a 2.00 college GPA (UO, OSU); 890 SAT or 20 ACT (PSU, OIT); 890 SAT or 20 ACT or 2.00 predicted college GPA (EOSC, SOSC, WOSC).

- Earn a minimum of 2.00 GPA in 12 hours (OSU) or 9 hours (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of prescribed summer session college-level work at the respective campus for OSU and PSU, or at any accredited college for EOSC, OIT, SOSC, and WOSC.

TRANSFER ADMISSION

1. To be admitted as a transfer student, nonresident applicants must have:

University of Oregon:

- a minimum 2.50 GPA or better in 36 quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work;

- applicants not eligible for admission to UO upon graduation from high school must complete two terms of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121, and College Algebra (Math 101) with a grade of C- or better in each of the required courses.

Oregon State University, Portland State University:

- a minimum 2.50 GPA or better in 36 quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work.
Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology, Southern Oregon State College, Western Oregon State College:

- a minimum 2.00 GPA or better in 24 quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work.

2. All Transfer Applicants. Students who have accumulated 12 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work, but fewer than 36 (OSU, PSU, UO) or 24 (BOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) must meet the freshman admission requirements and have a 2.50 (UO, PSU) or 2.25 (OSU) or 2.00 (BOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) in all college work attempted.

FIVE PERCENT SPECIAL ADMISSION

1. Institutions are authorized to admit a quota of freshmen totaling no more than five percent of the institution's first-time freshman class for the previous academic year as exceptions to the stated admission requirements. To qualify for five percent special admission, applicants are considered on a case-by-case basis.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Zarville stated that the Board adopts admission standards each spring which go into effect eighteen months later. Four institutions have proposed changes this year for the fall of 1990, and those requests are shown in the staff report.

The Chancellor indicated there were three specific proposals before the Board which were related to enrollment. The first on admission requirements deals with specific changes on individual campuses for inclusion in the institutional catalogues. The second is a general grant of authority to the institutions to be selective in admissions and goes beyond the particular steps in the first document. The third issue is the presentation of a general approach to enrollment management for the biennium. He said the proposals were interrelated but should be discussed as separate issues.

In the discussion of the admission policy for 1990–91, Mr. Adams asked for a further explanation of the apparent differences of opinion among the institutions as to the value of the Test of Standard Written English in the SAT test.

Mr. Gary Christensen said the Test of Standard Written English had been developed as a placement tool several years ago and used in the context of admissions. At that time, Oregon State University and the University of Oregon decided a minimum score of 30 would be used for admission under the admission requirements. Subsequently, Oregon State University has developed a freshman composition program that indicates to that institution the Test of Standard Written English is no longer needed for admission purposes, although it will still be used in the placement context. Southern Oregon State College requires a score of 30 on the test for admission, but students scoring below that may be admitted by signing an agreement to take a remedial writing course at their own expense.

Mr. Hensley asked whether the admission requirements had been modeled after those of other states, and Mr. Christensen indicated they were more historical than reflective of those in other states. Oregon was in the forefront in adopting subject requirements in 1985, but similar actions have been taken by many states throughout the country since that time.

In response to a question concerning public understanding of the admission policy, Mr. Christensen said it was a difficult task to communicate the admission requirements clearly and effectively to those concerned. The requirements do and should vary to meet different institutional needs. A number of documents and publications explaining the admission requirements are distributed
widely throughout the state. The general understanding of the admission policy for the State System is very good at the present time. However, the proposals before the Committee and the Board reflect a period of change and will necessitate increased efforts to disseminate the information. Mr. Christensen said the selective admission authorization particularly would require a very special intensive effort to define what those selective admission policies will be for the remainder of this year, with admission in Fall 1989, and those for Fall 1990 and beyond.

Mr. Bailey requested further comment on the meaning of special consideration for applicants from Oregon community colleges with a 2.0 gpa.

Mr. Christensen said a block transfer agreement had recently been completed with the community colleges. The agreement states that community college students who have completed the Associate of Arts degree would automatically satisfy the lower-division general education requirements of all State System campuses. When the three universities moved from a 2.0 to 2.25 gpa for transfer students, the community colleges were concerned about the continuance of access they felt community college students ought to have, particularly the block transfer students. The universities agreed to look at admission of Oregon community college students under the selective admission authority and give preference to those with an Associate of Arts degree and a 2.0 gpa and above. This is not a problem at the colleges because they still have a 2.0 gpa for admission. Mr. Christensen emphasized that all of the institutions intended to do everything possible within the selective admission authority to assure access for Oregonians from either high schools or community colleges.

Mr. Hensley asked whether the 5% admission policy had changed and whether all the institutions were using the full 5% authority.

Mr. Christensen replied that the policy had not changed and that in a general context the 5% special admission policy was used to capacity throughout the State System.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation with respect to this section of the policy. Some of the comments in the subsequent policy issues on selective admission authority and the enrollment management policy also relate to the issues raised during consideration of the admission requirements.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.
Selective Admission Authority for 1989 and Thereafter

Staff Report to the Committee

Background

The present level of admission and enrollment growth at the State System's colleges and universities seriously threaten the academic quality of the system's educational mission. "Bigger is not necessarily better." Neither current facilities or funding are capable of supporting both increased enrollment and improved academic quality. The time to act in better managing enrollment growth is now.

Staff Analysis

In order to better manage enrollments in State System colleges and universities, effective for fall 1989, staff requests the Board approve selective admission authority for all State System institutions. Currently, the University of Oregon is the only institution that has been granted selective admission authority by the Board. Staff also proposes that the selective admission authority extend to both freshman and transfer admission.

A selective admission policy means that simply qualifying for admission does not guarantee admission to a student. Institutions would "selectively admit" a limited number of students from a total pool of qualified applicants.

The practice of selective admission would enable institutions to take into account a broad array of factors in admitting the number of students they can best accommodate within the limits of their academic and financial resources and enrollment goals. Those factors would include (but would not be limited to):

- regular admission requirements and alternatives for each campus;
- special admission considerations;
- the competitive quality of academic and personal characteristics such as:
  - high school and college grade point averages;
  - college aptitude and achievement test scores;
  - academic courses taken in high school and college;
  - number of college credit hours earned;
  - exceptional abilities and talents;
  - community service;
  - underrepresentation in college or particular academic programs and professions;
  - individual educational goals;
- special attention and preference to maintaining and improving access for the citizens of Oregon.
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Each year the institutions would, in concert with the Chancellor’s Office, determine enrollment goals and corridors and define their selective admission standards and procedures. The institutional selective admission policies and practices would be developed with, and approved by, the Chancellor’s Office for each academic year. On at least an annual basis, the Chancellor would report to the Board on the selective admission policies implemented by the campuses, as well as the admission and enrollment policies that have been implemented.

In order to assist the Chancellor’s Office and campuses in revising admission and enrollment policies, the Academic Council will be asked to establish an advisory committee composed of officials from each of the campuses. The purpose of the committee will be to analyze, evaluate, and develop admission and enrollment policies. The committee’s charge will be to develop recommendations for implementing an academic and enrollment management plan that:

- provides the best possible balance of academic quality and educational opportunity within the system;
- optimizes the expenditure of our financial and instructional resources;
- more effectively integrates institution, System, intersegmental, and statewide priorities and needs.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that selective admission authority be approved for all State System institutions effective immediately for admission to 1989-90 academic year and thereafter.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

At the conclusion of the discussion of admission requirements, Mr. Alltucker indicated he would like some discussion on the advisability of uniform requirements for institutions that have similar missions. He suggested that raising or lowering entrance requirements between individual institutions might lead to competition between them and he would like to understand the consequences of that decision. He commented that the Board’s intent was to grant the institutions the maximum amount of individual freedom to make their own choices. They are not expected to have exactly the same requirements. Some overall guidance from the Board might be necessary, with maximum flexibility permitted within those general guidelines.

The Chancellor said Mr. Alltucker’s concern illustrated the fact the three documents were part of a total policy. The first document deals with a process that is beginning to change. The third document proposes movement in the direction of placing enrollment
caps on the various institutions. The second document gives the campuses authority to be selective in their admissions through the development of admission policies that will select students who fit their missions. Each of those policies will be a little different because they will reflect different areas of emphasis on the various campuses. The enrollment ceiling will control the process at this point.

The Chancellor said the three documents introduced a different kind of process which establishes the framework within which the institutions will work. In effect, the enrollment ceilings are set, and the policies are developed to produce student bodies which fit the missions of the individual institutions.

The Chancellor emphasized the general absolute commitment by his staff and the presidents of the institutions to the proposition that the goal of increasing minority enrollment and access for underserved populations in no way would be abridged by any of the proposed actions. At least initially, it is anticipated it will be possible to accommodate most first-time freshmen from Oregon high schools and transfers from community colleges as in the past.

Mr. Alltucker listed the following questions and concerns which he wished to have addressed during the consideration of the proposals: (1) The relationship between access and quality; (2) the optimum percentage of out-of-state students at each campus, and which might vary among the institutions; (3) percentage of foreign students; (4) relationship and percentage of undergraduates versus graduates, which also probably would differ among institutions; (5) the effect on minorities and underprivileged, which was mentioned earlier; and (6) whether it would be better if the size of the student body on some campuses were not reduced.

With respect to access versus quality, the Chancellor said there should be a balance of goals expressed in the State System as a whole. Different parts of the System and different parts of the program on individual campuses will have different purposes which should be sought at a very high level of quality. The choice is not simply one of access versus quality because more than one quality is involved. The principle must be to do well whatever is done and not to do those things which cannot be done well. This is the reason for attempting to relate budget considerations, program development, and enrollment into a single policy.

In commenting on percentages affecting the student mix, the Chancellor stated it would be a mistake to embargo out-of-state or foreign students because they represent an important part of the educational process. Their presence benefits Oregon students and many times results in attracting to Oregon very desirable future citizens. It is probable, however, there will be some reduction
in the mix of out-of-state students in the next biennium. One of the problems in American higher education, and certainly in Oregon, is to increase the cosmopolitan sense of students so that they can understand, interact, and compete with many different kinds of people.

The Chancellor said the graduate-undergraduate relationship had a different set of factors. Doctoral education is driven largely by research. The size of the doctoral-level activities will not be driven by state funding. It will depend on how competitive the institutions are in attracting federal funding and other grant funds. The enrollment proposals really relate to undergraduate and professional school enrollment rather than enrollment at the levels that accompany externally funded research.

The Chancellor stated the numbers and percentages in the enrollment management proposal were pretty clear and were developed out of a rational process. There might be minor adjustments. The challenge is to construct selective admission processes which will serve a lot of different purposes. This is a complicated process, and some adjustments inevitably will be required.

Mr. Miller inquired about the communication which had taken place with the community colleges in view of the fact they would be affected by the decisions. The Chancellor indicated it was too early in the process to have completed adequate communication.

Mr. Mike Holland, Commissioner for the Office of Community College Services, said he and the Chancellor had discussed several issues, including the one before the Committee. Mr. Holland said the Chancellor would be invited to a meeting with community college presidents and representatives from the Office of Community College Services for further conversations on many issues. The community colleges understand the Board is responsible to determine how its admission policy fits with its ability to tailor the mission of the State System.

Mr. Holland stated that the decisions resulting from the Board's decision should be addressed by the Legislature in terms of community college funding and the state's responsibility to see that everything fits into an integrated package to provide educational opportunities to the citizens of Oregon.

Mr. Hensley noted that the Board’s admission policy could have a ripple effect on community colleges and asked whether there was general uniformity in community college curricula designed to meet the general education requirements of State System institutions. In addition, were there ways in which the Board could assist in resolving any problems which might exist.
Mr. Holland said there was enough similarity in the approach of the community colleges to providing lower-division collegiate instruction to provide a pattern to integrate with the State System and coordinate discussions. The block transfer program will be very beneficial. The interests of the two segments are the same, and there is enough similarity in the lower-division collegiate programs to begin conversations and make them successful.

Mr. Alltucker asked Mr. Holland whether he believed increasing the entrance standards at the state's four-year institutions would be a significant motivation for the community colleges to increase their emphasis upon lower-division standards in order to prepare more students to move directly into upper-division work.

Mr. Holland replied that an important element in adopting policy was the value of the completion of the associate of arts degree as a favorable consideration in admissions decisions. At the present time, relatively few community college students complete a formal associate of arts degree program. If the chances for admission to State System institutions of their choice are significantly improved by completing the program, there is a reason for completing the degree and remaining at the community college for a full two years. Students then have that much more formal experience before entering the four-year institutions. This factor, in addition to the enrollment caps, might drive more students to the community colleges. He said he would expect a bulge in the enrollment patterns of the lower-division portion of community college programs as a consequence of adoption of the State System's proposed policy. He said this probably was not a bad thing but it would have consequences for the community colleges in terms of resources.

The Chancellor commented that the problem may be short-term as far as general access. The demographics show that the population at the age level leaving high school will be starting downward in the near future. He also stated the proposed policy changes were not likely to affect many first-time freshmen graduating from Oregon high schools. The main impact will be on people in other categories. There is an increase in the number of older students returning which would need to be measured against the number of high school graduates.

Mr. Richardson said one of his concerns had been the possible adverse impact that this type of policy might tend to have on minority, special, or disadvantaged students. He said that he had discussed these concerns with the Chancellor and because of his position on these issues was confident that any problems in the area of admissions could be avoided. However, the State System will have about 3,000 students in these categories who will be competing with, in theory, a higher level of student. He said he would like to have some discussion of present or planned efforts to ensure these individuals will still succeed in the State System because the pressure to achieve will be much greater.
President Olum said Mr. Richardson had raised a real problem. Admissions will not be affected, but the question is whether such students will be disadvantaged in competition with other students as a result of the generally higher standard of admissions and programs. He stated the University of Oregon was determined this would not happen. A program of minority education has been created for exactly that purpose to give students the extra work they need. The minority program is devoted entirely to academic support. President Olum said there was an obligation for the institution to see that these students were helped if there were any disadvantage in the beginning. Most of them, however, are good students who may not have done well for many other reasons in the secondary schools. If necessary, the minority education program must be expanded to be sure students who enter under these circumstances are given help.

President Edgington stated the effect of these procedures on minority students had been reviewed at Portland State University. He said he thought that, with the federal programs available at Portland State and the potential between 2.5 and 2.75, it would be possible to ensure that no potential minority student would be disadvantaged from the policy. He said Portland State was totally committed that the enrollment target would not have an impact on any minority student.

Mr. Hensley said he and Mr. Richardson had similar concerns that by raising the standard of students admitted there would also be a higher standard of teaching perhaps. He asked about measures to motivate individuals in these special categories, maintain their self-confidence, and retain them at the institutions.

Mr. Edgington responded that a minority recruiting office had been established and it would be important to increase the tutorial effort and contact with some of those students. Some have the perception they cannot make it through with the standards which have been established. Mr. Edgington said he was convinced it would be possible to respond to the hopes, dreams, and aspirations these students have. He indicated the policy would have an impact on part-time students who have not declared for admission.

President Byrne said the problem was really a retention issue and one that Oregon State University had addressed heavily during the last several years. Retention has improved at Oregon State. An educational opportunities program available to all educationally disadvantaged students has been very effective in the retention of students. A new advising center has been instituted for those students who have not committed to a major and are not automatically under the advising programs in the colleges and departments. He commented that much of the education that takes place in a university is student to student. As the educational quality of the student body improves, it benefits those who may be at the lower end of the spectrum as well.
President Gilbert said he supported the concerns expressed by the Board. Eastern Oregon State College has an additional issue in that its minority student support has been provided from federal grant funds. One of the major grants is over at the end of the present academic year. A reapplication has been submitted with the hope of being able to continue that level of support and even expand it. Otherwise, President Gilbert said the institution would do the best it could with resources available.

Mr. Richardson asked whether the report Mr. Christensen planned to present in June would track the enrollments under the 5% special enrollments.

Mr. Christensen said it would be included to the extent the data permitted. He clarified that the minority enrollment initiative involved a better effort to recruit more minority students, the majority of whom were well qualified for college. The minority award program was designed to seek academically meritorious minority students throughout the State of Oregon. The report will deal primarily with that program. It will also include information on the activity under the 5% admission program, which includes not just minority students but all students who appear to have great potential for college. There is an obligation under this program to provide support to the degree needed by the individuals. There are limited resources so it is important to admit people very carefully on an individual basis under the 5% program. At the request of Mr. Johnston, Mr. Christensen said he would include a brief outline of some of the support systems in place at the present time.

Mr. Hensley said Mr. Paul Evans, a student at Western Oregon State College and a City Councilman in Mornmouth, had requested the opportunity to comment on the proposed policy.

Mr. Evans said he opposed the enrollment cap at Western Oregon State College because Mornmouth was different by choice than any other city in Oregon. Its main employer, industry, and pride is the campus of Western Oregon State College. He distributed a sheet illustrating the fiscal impact of the four regional colleges in their respective communities. It showed the population and the ratio of institutional building values to total assessed value in the communities of Mornmouth, Ashland, La Grande, and Klamath Falls.

Mr. Evans stated the community and the college had planned and acted upon the projections of a working town and gown relationship. This has resulted in new development and an excitement in the community. The work, effort and sacrifice will mean very little when rewarded with an enrollment cap that shuts the door of opportunity. He then described some of the unique features and accomplishments which made Western Oregon State College a special place.
Mr. Evans agreed quality was important and stated that Western had quality and was a college with much to offer. Quality education is not books, class sizes, or location. It is about people and learning from each other. He asked that the Board not accept defeat because of numbers on a budget but rather lead the way in a creative effort.

Board members questioned the comparability of the data for the four communities. However, Mr. Alltucker said Mr. Evans had made the point that the policy and its impact on Western Oregon State College was one of the major issues in Mormonut. He added the problem was a bigger issue than that.

Mr. Hensley indicated the Board had seen the growth of the institution during its visit the previous day, had talked with students, and discussed the issue with President Meyers during the exit interview. The Board is very aware of the problem. He mentioned the Chancellor had stated there was some flexibility in the proposal and might well be a means to deal with a short-term situation. Mr. Hensley said the Board members were advocates for higher education. Their motive is not to limit the number of students or their opportunities but to maximize them. The proposals are a management tool to maintain quality as related to resources. He thanked Mr. Evans for his comments and assured him the Board was aware of these issues.

The Chancellor said the policies were not dealing with decisions of the Board, the Chancellor’s Office, or the System of Higher Education. It is a situation in which the citizens of Oregon have spoken through their elected representatives and may or may not have reached the wrong conclusion. Nevertheless, it is the responsibility of those who serve the people of the state to carry out their wishes. It is also their responsibility to present the consequences of what must be done as clearly as possible, state the options, clarify the policy choices, and when the decision is made accept the consequences.

The Committee then returned to the specific consideration of the selective admission authority.

Dr. Zanville said that in light of the need for the campuses to manage better their enrollments, the staff was recommending that all of the institutions be given selective admission authority. This would mean that simply qualifying for admission would not guarantee admission for students but the institutions would use a number of factors in considering the admission of students. The staff is also requesting that a new committee be formed to talk about the issues raised by Mr. Alltucker.
Mr. Hensley asked whether the Board would have an opportunity to review the selective admission plans as they were developed, and Dr. Zanville said the intention of the committee structure would be to bring information to the Board on a periodic basis with respect to what was happening on each of the campuses.

Mr. Johnston said he agreed with the policy in the report but wanted to make sure the minimum requirements were used for a pool resource and not increased for the selective enrollment purposes in order to avoid making the difficult choices.

The Chancellor said that was a very important point. He said in his view the campuses must take the responsibility of using these numbers to establish pools. The odds may decrease for a student as the gpa and other objective measurements go down within that pool. Difficult qualitative decisions must be made. He indicated the intent was not to establish a particular number above which all applicants would be admitted and below which they would be rejected.

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.


Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

Although the State System has experienced significant enrollment growth during the past four years, it has not heretofore needed to consider an enrollment management plan. Due to budget limitations for the 1989-1991 biennium, however, all campuses are facing a situation in which enrollment must be stabilized or reduced. The state General Fund appropriations for higher education are insufficient, even if the appropriations are at the level recommended by the Governor, to meet the goals of achieving competitive faculty salaries and adequate support for instructional programs at the institutions. Currently, for example, program support is between 66% and 70% of that of comparable institutions nationally. Likewise, faculty salaries at Oregon State University, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon fall among the bottom 30% of public doctoral-granting universities nationally. To continue underfunding the institutions for existing and forecasted enrollments threatens serious
harm to the quality and reputation of Oregon public higher education. It is in this circumstance that the Chancellor proposes that institutions no longer enroll students for whom the State System will receive no General Fund appropriation; thus the need for an enrollment management policy.

Controlling enrollment will sustain or improve quality by not spreading available dollars over more or more students. Without enrollment limits, all seven campuses are expected to experience larger enrollments in fall 1989 than were accommodated in 1988, and already inadequate resources would be spread even further.

The Proposal

It is proposed that current (1988-89) enrollment levels be reduced approximately 1,475 3-term FTE students (2,000-2,500 headcount, depending on the number of part-time students reduced) during the 1989-1991 biennium. This represents a 3% reduction in students from the 1988-89 level.

A target (funded) enrollment level is recommended for each institution. The recommended targets were selected in the following manner:

1. Using actual enrollment for 1988-89, each institution's actual funding was compared with the BAS Model. (Note: The BAS Model measures an institution's funding against a standard of comparable institutions.) This comparison revealed that institutions were either greatly over-enrolled, or underfunded. Funding at the colleges is as low as 66% of BAS Model and at the universities as low as 70%.

2. The goal for 1989-1991 is to improve funding for Oregon institutions beyond 75% of the BAS Model. To achieve this funding goal would have required the approval of the Board's original budget request to the Governor. This funding goal can not be met with the budget currently being considered by the 1989 Legislative Assembly, even including amounts recommended by the Governor not currently approved by Ways and Means. Without additional funding, the only method available to achieve the per capita funding goal is to reduce enrollment below the 1988-89 levels. The recommended enrollment targets represent that enrollment which can be financed with the resources expected to be available for 1989-1991 at or near the funding goals for the colleges and universities. In most instances, the enrollment target is the current Corridor Midpoint. However, the enrollment targets for Western and Southern Oregon State College were lowered below their current Corridor Midpoints because resources are insufficient to fund them equitably at the higher midpoints.
The Oregon Health Science University is excluded from this proposal because it established enrollment limits by program several years ago. The institution is also funded somewhat differently from the others.

Each institution is being requested to manage its enrollment (reduction) during 1989-1991 so as to achieve its target enrollment level by fall 1990. In the context of the Corridor of Enrollment Policy, the target enrollment level becomes the Midpoint; and each institution will have successfully managed at the target if its enrollment is within its Corridor.

The Chancellor will continue to consult with each institution to establish a two-year reduction plan. These plans will take into consideration the need to reduce gradually the number of nonresident undergraduate students over two (or possibly three) years. A gradual reduction is necessary so that an undue financial hardship will not be placed on the institutions that would result from an excessive loss in nonresident tuition revenue.

The following table compares current (1988-89) enrollment with the enrollment target for each institution. The target enrollment is to be achieved by Fall 1990.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1988-89 Enrollment</th>
<th>Target (To be Achieved by Fall 1990)</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>18,541</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Term FTE</td>
<td>15,587</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>15,658</td>
<td>15,352</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Term FTE</td>
<td>13,739</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>16,177</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Term FTE</td>
<td>9,807</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>3,989</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Term FTE</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Term FTE</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Term FTE</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>2,837</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Term FTE</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63,911</td>
<td>61,396</td>
<td>2,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-Term FTE</td>
<td>50,370</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Recommendation

The staff recommended that the Chancellor be authorized to implement an Enrollment Management Policy that would result in each institution’s managing its enrollment in a manner consistent with its Board-approved admissions policy, achieving by Fall 1990 enrollment levels approximating those displayed in the table above.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In presenting the staff report and recommendation, Mr. Lemman said the headcount at Portland State University appeared to be, and was, larger than the reduction in full-time equivalent students. This occurs because the University intends to reduce its full-time equivalent in large measure by limiting the number of non-matriculated or non-admitted students, those who normally are part-time rather than full-time students. This accounts for the larger difference. The non-admitted students would be permitted to enroll after the admitted students and take classes on a space available basis rather than having the same priority as admitted students. He commented also that at Eastern Oregon State College the target enrollment and the funded enrollment for some time had been at 1,500 FTE. They achieved 1,565 in the current year. The target will remain the same, but it is anticipated Eastern may not reduce its enrollment as much as is shown in the above table.

Mr. Lemman said the Chancellor had indicated earlier that these numbers appear to be more precise than they are intended. The funding numbers are precise, but obviously the institutions will not be able to control enrollments exactly to the specified figures. They are approximations, and the institutions will have fulfilled the intent of the policy if they manage their enrollments within their corridors. The intent is to have the enrollment at or below the midpoint rather than at or above.

Mr. Richardson inquired whether placing a limitation on the non-admitted students at Portland State University would create a problem in an urban university with the business community.

Mr. Lemman said it might but the question is which group or groups of students should be given priority in this kind of circumstance. It seems logical to give full-time students priority over those who are taking a single class, particularly to the extent those are casual registrations.

President Edgington said Portland State had approximately 1,250 non-admitted students this year, representing about 340 FTE students. In trying to be responsive to all of the community, it was essential to try to determine who becomes the least disadvantaged. Portland State is trying to accept transfers from the community colleges and new freshmen living in the Portland metropolitan area who primarily would not have any other four-year
institution available to them because of their financial situation. One group is the non-admitted students and another is the transfers from other State System institutions. The non-admitted students are being informed that they cannot preregister. They will be able to register during the add/drop period which follows preregistration. Classes and courses available will be limited and there is a good chance that most of the classes they want will be closed. At that point, many will consider either continuing education or other institutions in the metropolitan area. Some may apply for admission, and it may become necessary to look at other priorities for making reductions.

Mr. Lemman pointed out that businesses who are assisting their employees can afford to put some of these people in continuing education classes which are self-supporting, rather than having them compete with full-time students.

The Chancellor said there is a concern for persons who may be working and trying to polish their skills but who have no degree aspirations. He said Portland State would try to address this problem because it was an important service to the community.

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Delegation of Approval of Routine Items to Chancellor

Staff Report to the Committee

Background

Chapter 351, Oregon Revised Statutes, creates the Department of Higher Education and establishes the State Board of Higher Education to operate and control the Department. The Legislature has delegated broad authority to the Board to manage the Department's property and funds, adopt academic standards and policies, employ both institution and Board's Office staff, and prescribe tuition and fees.

As the State System has established additional institutions and expanded in terms of numbers of students and facilities, the management of the System has become more complex. Over the past 20 years, the Board has increasingly delegated responsibilities for the day-to-day operations to the Chancellor and the institutional presidents. In recent months, the Board has expressed its desire to devote more of its time and energies to broad policy issues and less to routine management issues.
Proposed Strategy

In response to the Board’s request, the staff proposes that the Board delegate authority to the Chancellor to approve or deny certain routine items that currently are brought to the Board for review and approval.

The staff proposes that this delegation shall occur in the following manner:

1. Institutions shall submit proposals which meet the Board’s delegation criteria to the Chancellor.

2. Before acting on the request, the Chancellor may review the matter with others, including appropriate staff, interinstitutional councils, the submitting institution, or other institutions.

3. The decisions which have been made by the Chancellor will be reported to the Board at its next regular meeting.

4. At the discretion of the Chancellor, any matter within the delegated authority of the Chancellor may, nonetheless, be brought to the Board for discussion or decision.

5. Copies of the requests and the Chancellor’s decision shall be kept on file in the Board’s Office.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

To test the procedure and the level of decisions considered for delegation to the Chancellor, the staff recommended that the following be delegated to the Chancellor:

- Institutional requests for changes in program title;

- Institutional requests for renaming or reorganizing existing departments;

- Minor revisions in the format or guidelines the Board has adopted that are used for the review of new instructional programs, or new centers/institutes; and (subsequently deleted for revision)

- Institutional requests for adding or deleting an option to an approved program.
It was further recommended that the Board review the procedure at its June meeting and consider additional subjects for delegation. With approval of the above procedure, the staff would approve the following items:

Items Submitted for Approval
April 21, 1989

1. Eliminate "General Studies" from the title of the following degrees at Southern Oregon State College:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Title</th>
<th>Proposed Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS in General Studies: Humanities</td>
<td>BA/BS in Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS in Gen. Studies: Fine &amp; Perform. Arts</td>
<td>BA/BS in Fine &amp; Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS in General Studies: Social Sciences</td>
<td>BA/BS in Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS in General Studies: Science/Math</td>
<td>BA/BS in Science-Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS in General Studies: Humanities</td>
<td>MA/MS in Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS in Gen. Studies: Fine &amp; Performing Arts</td>
<td>MA/MS in Fine &amp; Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS in General Studies: Social Sciences</td>
<td>MA/MS in Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS in General Studies: Science/Math</td>
<td>MA/MS in Science-Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS in General Studies: Business Education</td>
<td>MA/MS in Business Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Rename the Department of Biochemistry to the Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology within the School of Medicine, Oregon Health Sciences University.

3. Consolidate the Departments of Oral Radiology and Oral Diagnosis into a new Department of Clinic Support Services, Oregon Health Sciences University.

4. Add the following new item to the Guidelines for Requests for Centers/Institutes:

"8. Relationship of the proposed unit to programs at other institutions in the state."
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Adams said he had a problem with the delegation of minor revisions in format or guidelines that the Board had adopted. He said it seemed that should be within the purview of the Board instead of having a report to the Board after approval by staff.

The Chancellor suggested that the staff review the possibility of a general revision of the Board's guidelines to provide a general statement within which the staff would operate on these kinds of decisions. This authority was deleted from the recommendation in accordance with the Chancellor's suggestion.

Mr. Lemman pointed out that deletion of delegation of authority for approval of minor revisions in guidelines would necessitate separate Board approval of Item 4 above which added a new item to the Guidelines for Requests for Centers/Institutes.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the three items remaining in the proposed delegation of authority to the Chancellor and that Item 4 be added to the Board's agenda.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation for delegation of authority to the Chancellor with respect to the three remaining items. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None. With that approval, the staff would then approve the first three items of the list submitted for approval at the April meeting.

The Board then approved the Committee recommendation with respect to Item 4 and authorized adding the new proposed item to the Guidelines for Requests for Centers/Institutes. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Acceptance of Schematic Designs

Staff Report to the Committee

For many years, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education has approved the schematic designs for new buildings and other major capital construction efforts. In some cases (e.g., the Science Complex at the University of Oregon), the designs were given close scrutiny by the Board and were the subject of considerable debate. In most instances, however, the Board's review has focused more on the budgets of the projects and any changes being recommended by the architect or the Board's staff in budget or scope of a project approved earlier.
There does not appear to be any requirement in statute or administrative rule for the Board to review schematic designs. The only reference in any formal document is in the Internal Management Directives where the following mention is made of the Board's role in approving schematics -- (IMD 7.130, in part):

(1) The Executive Vice Chancellor is authorized to:

(a) Review and approve subsequent phases of planning for buildings and other capital construction projects provided there are no material deviations from the schematic design phase of planning or cost estimates previously approved by the Board.

If the Board wished to limit its review and approval to concepts, scopes, and budgets rather than to schematic designs, the Internal Management Directive could be amended to read as follows:

(1) The Executive Vice Chancellor is authorized to:

(a) Review and approve subsequent phases of planning for buildings and other capital construction projects provided there are no material deviations from the [schematic-design-phase-of-planning] concepts, scope of work or cost estimates previously approved by the Board.

Such a change would permit the Board to focus its attention on what a project is to accomplish and how much it is going to cost rather than on how it would look. Obviously, the Board, in its review of a project's scope and budget, could request that it review the schematic design after that phase of the work had been completed. With this IMD change, however, that design would not automatically be reviewed and approved by the Board.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Some members of the Board have asked that the matter of Board approval of schematic designs be considered. Because this is exclusively a matter of how the Board wishes to conduct its business, the staff has no recommendation. However, if the Committee wishes to advance this possibility to the Board for discussion and possible action, the following amendment to IMD 7.130 would seem to accomplish this objective:
7.130 Approval of Plans, Specifications, and Contracts

(1) The Executive Vice Chancellor is authorized to:

(a) Review and approve subsequent phases of planning for buildings and other capital construction projects provided there are no material deviations from the [schematic-design-phase-of-planning] concepts, scope of work or cost estimates previously approved by the Board;

(b) Prepare requests to the Emergency Board for release of funds for projects requiring Emergency Board approval;

(c) Receive bids and award construction contracts for any project for which bids are within project funds.

(2) Appropriate reports shall be made to the Board.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Adams requested Mr. Lemman to review the present method of accepting schematic designs and the persons involved in the process.

Mr. Lemman said the plans are reviewed in the Office of Facilities Planning and then brought to the Board for approval. In the case of major construction, campus committees composed primarily of those who will use the facility are involved in the planning.

The Chancellor said the purpose of the proposal was not to exclude the Board but to make its involvement something more than a perfunctory action. Mr. Lemman added that the intent was to have the Board focus more on approving the scope of the project and the architectural and other concepts involved. The Board would take a much more active role at the beginning of the project when they make sure everyone is locked into the scope and concept. The remainder of the process would flow with the staff.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the amendment to the Internal Management Directives as presented. The amendment will be placed on the Consent Agenda for the May Board meeting.
Sale of Beekman Estate Properties, UO

Staff Report to the Committee

In 1960, several parcels of property in Jacksonville, Oregon, were donated to the State Board of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Oregon. Two parcels have been sold, the most recent being to the City of Jacksonville in October 1988. The properties are part of the Beekman Estate.

Two additional parcels, both located within the city limits of the City of Jacksonville and surplus in terms of helping the University of Oregon to meet its mission, are available for sale by bid. The parcels, both unimproved, have been appraised, and other state agencies have been notified of their availability. It is not anticipated, however, that any state agency will desire to acquire the properties, primarily because their best use would be for single family dwellings. One irregularly-shaped parcel, zoned as Suburban Residential 20 (SR20), consists of 5.62 acres and is located at the intersection of Third, Sterling, and Laurel Streets. City utilities are available from Third Street. Its market value is approximately $41,100. The second parcel, zoned SR20 and also irregularly shaped, consists of 17.26 acres. Although much of the topography has 20% to 40% slope, there are a few good home building sites on top. Ingress and egress are from Lewis Avenue, Oak Street, and Fir Street on the west and Laurelwood Drive on the east and southeast. City utilities are available from Lewis Avenue, Oak and Fir Streets, and Laurelwood Drive. Its market value is approximately $123,600.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It is recommended that the Board authorize the Board’s staff to advertise the properties for sale by bids for a minimum of $41,100 and $123,600 respectively. If sold on contract, the minimum acceptable terms would be 20% down, payable on closing, with the balance payable in equal monthly or annual installments over a period not to exceed twenty (20) years. Payment would include principal and interest. The rate of interest would be comparable to the average lending institution rate in effect at the time the properties are advertised for bid. If an advertised invitation to bid results in no acceptable bid, the staff would proceed to negotiate a sale for cash or on contract for not less than the advertised minimum bid price, terms, and conditions. All of the above procedures are authorized by CRS 273.201, 273.205, 273.211, and 273.216.

If a property is not sold as a result of this initial effort, it will be reappraised, if appropriate, and efforts will continue to sell the property without returning to the Board for additional approval. If after several unsuccessful attempts to sell by bid the Board’s staff receives an offer which is reasonably close to the market value, the property will be sold by bid under authority recognized by Attorney General Opinion No. 7199.
When the property is sold, all of the proceeds will be used to increase "the fund to organize, equip and maintain a professorship in the University of Oregon to be known as the Beekman Professorship of Northwest and Pacific History . . ." as directed in the will of Carrie C. Beekman of October 14, 1947.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Review of Dr. William Little’s Appeal to the Board, PSU

At the October 16, 1987, Board meeting, the Board agreed to hear Dr. William Little’s appeal of former President Sicuro’s decision regarding Dr. Little’s grievance. This matter came before the Board previously. At that time the Board remanded the grievance to Dr. Sicuro for his consideration rather than that of a designee. In the interim, the Board passed a new grievance procedure, OAR 580-21-050. Under the new procedure, the Board’s review of grievance was mandatory, rather than discretionary as it had previously been under OAR 580-21-390. Upon staff recommendation, the Board agreed to accept review of Dr. Little’s grievance in the spirit of the new rule.

A number of procedural problems have delayed this response: Dr. Little objected to the first person designated to hear the grievance, and a second person was named; confusion arose concerning whether the earlier grievance procedure or the current should apply; the hearing officer, Bill Jackson, had some difficulty getting all the information he needed for his review.

Mr. Jackson has completed his review. He reports:

1. Dr. Little grieved that the department did not pay for his business cards. Mr. Jackson believes the Portland State University review of the grievance was adequate and that the department chair, Dr. Millner, acted appropriately in deciding that the department would not pay for faculty business cards.
2. Dr. Little grieved the departmental policy requiring prior authorization for long distance calls. Mr. Jackson notes that the department had a history of unauthorized and excessive long distance charges. He concluded that establishing this policy was within Dr. Millner's authority as department chair. Mr. Jackson could not determine if all faculty members in the department had access to long distance lines before the policy was established to evaluate whether the policy affected Dr. Little disproportionately. If it did not, Mr. Jackson concludes that Dr. Little's grievance is without merit. Staff has asked Portland State officials to respond to this question.

3. Dr. Little grieved that he was denied access to student workstudy funds. Dr. Sicuro responded that the department lacked adequate funds. Mr. Jackson found that Dr. Sicuro's response was not supported by the record which showed unexpended departmental funds left at the end of fiscal years ending 1984, 1985, and 1986.

4. Dr. Little grieved that he was not allowed to use personal funds for student workstudy expenses. Mr. Jackson concluded that Dr. Millner had legitimate reasons for his decision, and that his decision had no adverse effect on Dr. Little.

5. Dr. Little grieved that Dr. Millner did not communicate with him. Mr. Jackson found no evidence of harm to Dr. Little. He recommended that Dr. Little and Dr. Millner hold regular meetings with written agendas, each summarized in a written document, initialed by both Dr. Little and Dr. Millner.

In conclusion, Mr. Jackson found that President Sicuro's response to the grievance was adequate except regarding the use of departmental funds for student workstudy. Mr. Jackson reviewed Dr. Little's grievance for procedural error, inconsistency with applicable law, fair considerations of the facts, and to determine if the President's decision was supported by substantial evidence. Thus, Dr. Little's grievance was considered under the standards from both the former and the current grievance procedures.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that the Board accept Mr. Jackson's conclusions. The staff further recommended that: (1) the Board order Portland State University to ensure that any future decisions regarding Dr. Little's access to student workstudy funds be made in full consideration of the funds available and based on the same criteria used in providing access to other faculty members in his department; (2) the Board urge Portland State to consider further means to improve communication with Dr. Little; and (3) the Board order no further action on this matter.
Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Melinda Grier presented the staff report and recommendation. She indicated Board members had received from Dr. Little's attorney a complaint that he had not had an opportunity to review the report of the hearing officer. She reviewed the procedure normally used in grievance decision appeals. The Board designates a hearing officer and asks that the institution and the grievant respond to that hearing officer. The Board then receives the recommendation of the hearing officer and acts on that recommendation. It has not been the Board's procedure in the past either to take testimony or have input from the parties but rather to rely on the hearing officer's recommendation and choose to accept, reject, or modify it. For that reason, the report was not provided to Dr. Little's attorney before the staff report or the docket item was made to the Board. He did receive a copy of the report, and the docket item as well, as soon as the request was made. The staff did not believe there was any reason for him to have the report earlier because his opportunity to comment was to the hearing officer.

Ms. Grier said Portland State University officials had been asked to comment on Mr. Jackson's questions regarding the long distance access.

President Edgington said he did not believe Dr. Little had been disadvantaged as a result of the telephone policy. The action was within the purview of the department head and was applicable to all members of the department.

Ms. Grier said Mr. Jackson had toiled for a year and a half on this matter trying to deal with a very difficult situation and work out an acceptable solution for all concerned. She urged the Board to thank him for his efforts in a very difficult task.

Mr. Hensley reported he had discussed the matter prior to the Board meeting with Mr. Richardson and President Edgington and understood that Mr. Richardson concurred fully with the staff recommendation on the issue.

The Board approved the staff recommendations as presented, including the expression of appreciation to Mr. Jackson for his work in this very difficult process. The following voted in favor: Directors Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Hensley said he had followed this case very carefully over the lengthy period involved in the process. He said he would encourage the institution to try to follow the recommendation with respect to communication between the individuals in the department.
Sale of Lydia Gerber Estate Property, OHSU

Staff Report to the Board

In December 1985, the Oregon Health Sciences University was notified that it was the beneficiary under the will of the late Lydia Gerber of property at 305 N. 4th Street, St. Helens, Oregon. Mrs. Gerber died in 1949. In her will, she left her son, John S. Cox, a life estate in the St. Helens property. Mr. Cox died on December 7, 1984.

On February 21, 1986, the Board approved a staff request for authority to obtain an appraisal, advertise for bids of not less than the appraised value, sell the property for cash or on contract, and obtain new appraisals, rebid, and readvertise, if necessary, until the property was sold.

An appraisal was obtained, and an attempt was made to sell the property on September 24, 1986, for $24,000 in cash or $26,500 on terms. No bids were received. A new appraisal was recently obtained—in the amount of $19,000. Believing the appraisal was still higher than the amount an interested buyer would offer, the staff then consulted with the Department of Justice to determine whether there was an option to exercise prudent management. The Department of Justice representative answered affirmatively by sending the staff an Attorney General's opinion issued in response to a similar request from the Oregon State Highway Engineering, dated August 19, 1975. Opinion No. 7199 makes it possible for a state agency to sell at less than the appraised value. The property was, therefore, readvertised for sale with a minimum acceptable bid being $15,000 cash. One cash bid was received and accepted on March 10, 1989, from Ms. Sherry L. Sanders of Portland, Oregon. The Board President and Secretary executed a Bargain and Sale Deed which was prepared with the approval of the Board's legal counsel.

Proceeds from the sale will be used in accordance with Mrs. Gerber's will "for the Doernbecher Hospital or some similar charity."

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES DIVISION ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

Staff Report to the Board

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

Award of Construction Contract

On March 16, 1989, Dale Ramsay Construction was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $17,814. Financing is provided from state funds.
Forest Research Laboratory
Structural Rehabilitation
Phase II, OSU

Student Housing
On March 20, 1989, OTRM Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $174,181. Financing is provided from Article XI-F(1) Bonds.

Way Improvements, PSU

Acceptance of Projects

Project #12, Covell Hall B Alterations, OSU
The Electrical and Computer Engineering Building, Related Alterations, Project No. 11, Covell Hall B Alterations Project is complete and was accepted on March 27, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $65,079. Financing was provided from state lottery funds.

PGE/IBP ECOM Implementation, OHSU
The PGE/IBP ECOM Implementation (Dental School Building, Student Activities Building, University Hospital North, Child Development and Rehab Center, CERC-West) project is complete and was accepted on May 28, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $37,591. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution and from investor-owned utility.

PGE/IBP ECOM Implementation, OHSU
The PGE/IBP ECOM Implementation (University Hospital South) project is complete and was accepted on June 14, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $20,750. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution and from investor-owned utility.

PGE/IBP ECOM Implementation, OHSU
The PGE/IBP ECOM Implementation (Baird Hall, Medical Research Building, Physical Plant, Outpatient Clinic/Clinical Laboratory, and Mackenzie Hall) project was accepted on June 21, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $36,988. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution and from investor-owned utility.

PGE/IBP ECOM Implementation, OHSU
The PGE/IBP ECOM Implementation (Residence Hall) project was accepted on June 19, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $14,096.25. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution and from investor-owned utility.

UHS, Angiography Remodel, OHSU
This project is complete and was accepted on June 7, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $270,833. Financing was provided from federal funds.
This project is complete and was accepted on March 20, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $17,794. Financing was provided from gift funds.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Campus Visits

Miss Brooks reported that she and Mr. Bruggere had visited Oregon Institute of Technology the previous week and had a very pleasant visit. They toured the campus and listened to various groups from the campus and community. The primary concern was faculty salaries and the difficulty of recruiting and retaining faculty members at the institution and in the State System. At almost every session, concerns were expressed also about the Legislature and the higher education budget.

Mr. Alltucker indicated he and Mr. Bailey had visited Eastern Oregon State College on April 11 and had an extensive and lively discussion with various campus groups. They were interested in learning what was happening in the Legislature. They also discussed the enrollment cap and wanted to know how it would work.

Report on Nursing Outreach Program

Mr. Adams referred to the proposal for a baccalaureate outreach program in nursing which had been tabled pending accumulation of additional information. Those studies are in progress and a report will be made at a future Board meeting.

Appreciation to UO Search Committee

Mr. Dodson said one of the privileges of serving on a search committee was the opportunity to spend some time with people on the campus. The quality of those on both the campus and the search committee for the University of Oregon presidency was outstanding. That was only matched by the leadership of the committee by Mr. Miller. Mr. Dodson thanked Mr. Miller and all those who participated for an excellent effort.

COMMUNICATIONS

IFS Report

Mr. Hensley invited Nancy O. Tang, President of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, to present the report from the organization’s meeting on April 14 and 15, 1989.

She said the senators expressed concern that House Bill 3038 requiring four-year teacher education programs, had come out of committee. Although the senators have questions and reservations about the five-year programs, all recognized the difficulty of trying to offer parallel programs.

The senators discussed the enrollment caps, legislative actions, and budget concerns. It was pointed out that higher education representatives, including faculty, need to visit with legislators who do not have higher education institutions in their communities.
Information has been assembled and summarized on the tenure relinquishment process on all the campuses. Only one State System institution remains without such a provision for its faculty.

Mr. Roger Bassett, Director of the Office of Educational Policy and Planning, commented on enrollment caps and the need to study student flow sending students to a second or third choice to gain admission. In discussing the organization of his office, he described it as being involved on two levels—first, the broader, multi-sector, system issues; and second, at the Chancellor’s request.

The proposed revision to the Oregon Administrative Rule on timely notice was considered. The senators from the University of Oregon agreed to attend the hearing to express the group’s concerns and questions and to request a delay of one month in approving this change.

Ms. Tang indicated she was completing her two years as president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate and had enjoyed the time spent with the Board.

Mr. Hensley thanked her for all her efforts during her tenure as president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate in trying to improve Board relationships with faculty and increase communication.

Opening of OSU Portland Center

President Byrne invited the Board and all those affiliated with the State System of Higher Education to attend the opening of the OSU Portland Center on May 11, 1989, at 11:00 a.m. The center is designed to enhance the institution’s communication and service to all those in the Portland community. It is also intended to enhance cooperative efforts with Portland State University and the other institutions of higher education in Portland. He noted the University of Oregon center was two blocks to the north, and Oregon State University was looking forward to joining them in the neighborhood and further expressing the full dimension of the State System of Higher Education in the Portland area.

Mr. Hensley indicated Mr. Adams would be the Board’s representative at the opening.

President’s Report

Mr. Hensley announced that the next regular Board meeting would be held on May 19 at Oregon Health Sciences University. It will be preceded by a visit to the institution on the previous day. He asked Board members to reserve both dates on their calendars.

Next Meeting Dates

Appointment of Nominating Committee

Mr. Hensley appointed the nominating committee to recommend a slate of officers to the Board at its June meeting. Mr. Richardson was appointed as chairman, with Ms. Wilson and Mr. Johnston as the other members of the committee.
Meeting #575

Appreciation to Dr. Olum

Mr. Hensley thanked President Olum for his many years of service to the State System and for all of his support during the presidential search process. He said the Board would look forward to his support and cooperation during the transition period.

The Chancellor concurred in those comments, saying President Olum had done a great job and had helped enormously in the process. Leaving the position of president brings a sense of accomplishment and relief, but there is also a sense of melancholy.

BOARD LUNCHEON

The Board met for luncheon between the meeting of the Committee the Whole and the Board meeting. No business was transacted, but some announcements of legislative actions or meetings were made.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Richard F. Hensley, President  Wilma L. Foster, Secretary