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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN THE GYMNASIUM,
STUDENT ACTIVITIES BUILDING, OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY,
PORTLAND, OREGON

May 19, 1989

Meeting #576

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held
in the Gymnasium, Student Activities Building, Oregon Health
Sciences University, Portland, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m., May 19, 1989, by
the President of the Board, Mr. Richard F. Hensley, and on roll
call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert R. Adams
Mr. John W. Alltucker
Mr. Bob Bailey
Miss Kasey K. Brooks
Mr. Tom Bruggere
Mr. Mark S. Dodson

Mr. Gary Johnston
Mr. Rob Miller
Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.
Ms. Janice J. Wilson
Mr. Richard F. Hensley

Absent: None.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities—Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Secretary
Wilma Foster; W. T. Lemman, Executive Vice Chancellor; John Owen,
Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor,
Academic Affairs; Kay Juran, Acting Vice Chancellor, Public
Affairs; George Fernsteiner, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facili-
ties Division; Steve Katz, Controller; Jim Mattis, Assistant
Attorney General; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor for
Fiscal Policies; Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor for
Student Services, and James Payne, Assistant Vice Chancellor for
Curricular Affairs, Academic Affairs; Roger Olsen, Assistant Vice
Chancellor, OCATE; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services; Bar-
bara Barrie, Personnel Officer; Gary Esget, Assistant to the
Executive Vice Chancellor; Virginia Thompson, Executive Assistant
to the Chancellor; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications; Pat
Wignes, Assistant Board Secretary.

Oregon State University—President John Byrne; Graham Spanier,
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Ed Coate, Vice
President, Finance and Administration.

University of Oregon—President Paul Olum; President-elect Myles
Brand; 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; Ralph Tuomi, Assistant Vice President, Facilities Management; Gary Chiodo and Michael Garland, Associate Professors, Public Health Department; Caroline M. White, Professor, Community Health Care Systems; Kathleen Park, Assistant to Assistant Vice President, Facilities Management.

Portland State University—Interim President R. N. Edgington; Frank Martino, Provost; Gary Powell, Acting Vice President, finance and Administration.

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

Oregon Institute of Technology—President Larry Blake; John Smith, Dean of Administration.

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

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

Others—Rich Davidson, Chairman, OHSU Homestead Association; Susan Tolle, Visiting Scholar, University of Chicago; Doris Bowman, Oregon Education Association; Jetta Siegel, Executive Secretary, Oregon Conference, AAUP; Linda Parshall, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on April 21, 1989, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Bruggere, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Richardson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Appreciation to OHSU

Mr. Hensley thanked President Kohler and his staff for their hospitality and the interesting and informative presentations during the Board’s visit to the Oregon Health Sciences University the previous day. He indicated the Board members had been impressed with the quality of the faculty and students and had appreciated the opportunity to discuss with both groups their views of the institution.
The Chancellor reported that President Kohler had recommended the appointment of Dr. Lesley M. Hallick, Associate Professor of Microbiology and Immunology, as Vice President for Academic Affairs at the Oregon Health Sciences University. He said she was the top-rated candidate among five finalists in a national search. She has an impressive background which includes the doctorate from the University of Wisconsin at Madison and service on many important committees and councils at the Oregon Health Sciences University. She also will be the first woman vice president at the institution.

The Chancellor recommended that the Board approve the appointment of Dr. Lesley M. Hallick as Vice President for Academic Affairs at an annual salary rate of $83,000.

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

The Chancellor commented on the long-range planning process which was under way at the Oregon Health Sciences University, saying the product of that planning would be exciting, ambitious, far-reaching, purposeful, highly achievable, and in a fundamental sense very practical. It is practical because the plan is concentrating on the revenues and resources Oregon Health Sciences University itself can generate to implement its own long-term development. The plan does not propose to rely on state funds for extensive parts of that development. While that is not an unusual set of circumstances with major academic health centers in the United States, it seems to be a wise direction in which the planning is proceeding.

The issue of indigent care emerged in some detail during the visit in terms of the extent to which indigent care costs are impairing the whole financial processes of the hospital and, therefore, by implication, the institution itself. This is a national problem in that society has not made provision for adequately financing indigent health care. It is particularly noticeable in academic health centers. Oregon is part of that national experience because the system by which indigent health care has been financed over the years is breaking down, and the state has not found adequate ways to finance that care. At the same time, it is important to meet the responsibility to provide that care.
The Chancellor announced the appointment of individuals to the Presidential Search Committee to seek a new president for Portland State University:

Board Members—Mr. Tom Bruggere, chairman of the committee; Ms. Janice Wilson, and Mr. George Richardson.

Faculty—Dr. Lee Casperson, Professor of Electrical Engineering; Dr. John Cooper, Professor of English; Dr. Walt Ellis, Professor of Public Administration; and Dr. Mary Kinnick, Associate Professor of Education.

University Administration—Dr. Wilma Sheridan, Dean of the School of Fine and Performing Arts.

Student Representative—Ms. Annette Mathews, 1988-89 president of the Associated Students of Portland State University.

Community Representatives, including alumni—Mr. Roger L. Breezley of Portland, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of U.S. Bancorp and a member of the Portland State University Advisory Committee; Mr. Ron Herndon, Portland.

The Chancellor said Mr. Armando Laguardia, the University’s affirmative action officer, and Ms. Barbara Barrie, the Board’s Assistant Affirmative Action officer, would assist the committee. A committee coordinator will be named in the near future. The Chancellor indicated he would also attend meetings on an ex officio basis.

Mr. Bruggere expects to call an organizational meeting of the committee in the near future, at which time the Chancellor would give the committee its charge. The committee is expected to complete its work next March, concurrent with the initial reports of the Portland Metropolitan Area Study commission.

The Chancellor stated the budget which would come to higher education if the spending limit were to remain in place would have very far-reaching and, in his opinion, negative implications for the State System of Higher Education. It would require facing some very difficult decisions, probably resulting in a further down-sizing of the System. He said he was hopeful the Legislature would decide to raise the spending limit, at least in the case of higher education, but it was very important that the appropriation for higher education be beyond the budget contained within the spending limit. The Chancellor requested Mr. Lemmon to report on SB 618 which involved faculty equity issues and on HB 3038 requiring four-year teacher training programs leading to entry-level certification with a baccalaureate degree.
Mr. Lemman reported that SB 618 related to the 1987 Legislative Assembly which asked the State System to undertake a study of faculty salaries, particularly dealing with how initial salaries were set, the effect of the initial salary upon equity issues, and the administration of salary increases and its effect upon equity issues. The study was to result in recommendations with respect to these matters. He said the report would be presented to the House Education Committee next week.

Mr. Lemman said the principal findings in the report with respect to some of the equity issues reveal that salaries by rank and by discipline are within the equitable ranges between men and women. However, it is necessary to consider an individual's time of service in a particular rank for that to be true. Women generally received a higher percentage increase than did male faculty members between 1986-87 and 1987-88, although the dollar amount was typically less because women faculty members were at lower ranks than were men in general. On the other hand, the number of women in higher ranks has been increasing steadily. There will be further reports and recommendations to the Board following the discussion with the Education Committee of the House.

HB 3038 would require any public institution offering a teacher training program to offer a four-year teacher training program which would lead to the entry-level certificate with a baccalaureate degree. The effective date of that legislation would be 1991. If HB 3038 were adopted, the Board would have to consider whether the State System could afford to have five-year and four-year programs at all institutions. This would not appear to be possible, and alternatives are being considered. The Chancellor has been conferring with the institutional presidents, the chief academic officers of the institutions, and the deans of the schools and colleges of education.

Mr. Lemman also reported the first legislative committee would be deactivated on May 19; the health, insurance, and ethics committees, and most other Senate committees would be deactivated on June 2. This would leave only Trade and Economic Development, Judiciary, Labor, and Ways and Means open, with the expectation of a mid-June sine die.

The Chancellor said SB 879 had been introduced and two hearings on it had been held in the Senate concerning processes of faculty participation and consultation in State System governance. He
read the following statement which, if acceptable to the Board, would probably resolve those issues without the legislative action proposed in SB 879:

Recommendation of
Chancellor Thomas A. Bartlett
To the Oregon State Board of Higher Education
May 19, 1989

The amendments to Senate Bill 879 have raised several issues regarding governance processes within the Oregon State System of Higher Education. I believe those issues can be resolved without the legislative action proposed by Senate Bill 879 as amended.

To that end, I have discussed them with representatives of various faculty interest groups. As a result of those discussions, I would like to outline the following steps to resolve their concerns:

1. Advice and input from faculty is a valuable and necessary ingredient in decision making by the State Board. To that end, I will recommend to the Board that it invite the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate to designate faculty members to present faculty views on the issues on the agendas of each of the Board’s two principal committees: the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant; and the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs.

2. The presidents of our institutions should review the process on their campuses by which academic matters are developed and discussed to insure consultation with faculty. To that end, a major element among the criteria in the triennial evaluation of institutional presidents will be the level of their effectiveness in consulting with faculty on academic issues.

3. I am committed to the development of consultation with appropriate faculty—and allowing for timely notice—on system-wide issues that involve curriculum and faculty conditions of employment, including retirement.

In response to inquiries about the operation of the process, the Chancellor said the views resulting from this process might not reflect, support, or even relate to any individual president’s position on an issue because the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate embodies a system-wide process rather than one from a single campus.

Mr. Dodson said he was receptive to the proposal but questioned the statement on the effectiveness of the president.
The Chancellor said the reference to evaluation in Item 2 meant that, in the regular presidential evaluations, one of the issues would be the effectiveness of the president in consulting with faculty. He said it was his opinion this was absolutely inherent in the process of those evaluations. The statement makes explicit what he assumed was absolutely implicit in that process. It refers only to one of the criteria for evaluation not to the process.

Miss Brooks asked whether the designees from the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate would be the same for each meeting or would change, depending on the issues.

The Chancellor said that point would need to be discussed with the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate but there might be occasions where a representative would come for a particular topic. On other occasions, representatives might come on a regular basis.

Mr. Hensley said that he would assume the statement was acceptable to the Board since he had heard no objections to it.

Renovation of McMorran House, UO

The Chancellor said there had been a long period of planning and preparation for the renovation of the McMorran house, the residence of the President of the University of Oregon. Since the new president, Dr. Myles Brand, and his family will occupy the house, the renovation is expected to begin shortly. He then introduced Dr. Brand to those who had not met him on his previous attendance at the Board meeting in April.

Trip to Japan

The Chancellor announced he would be leaving immediately after the Board meeting for Japan where he would attend a meeting of the U.S.-Japan Foundation Board of Directors.

Interdisciplinary Center for Ethics in Health Care, OHSU

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

The Oregon Health Sciences University requests authorization to establish an Interdisciplinary Center for Ethics in Health Care. The goal of the Center is to improve clinical care and health policy decision-making through research and education on the ethical issues that are involved in health care. A copy of the complete report is on file in the Board’s Office.

The Interdisciplinary Center for Ethics and Health Care will serve as a resource for the three professional schools and service units of the Oregon Health Sciences University. It will
provide forums for public discussion of ethics and health policy issues, undertake health services research to assess public perspectives on ethics and health policy, and provide an interdisciplinary network for innovative teaching projects. Through an active outreach effort to practicing health care providers and civic groups throughout the state of Oregon, the Center will serve as a needed educational resource.

Staff Analysis

The Center represents a natural expansion of activities at the Oregon Health Sciences University related to growing national and local concerns about ethical issues associated with health care. Areas of concern in the ethics of health care include: provider-patient communication, informed consent, shared decision-making, confidentiality in health care relationships, and care at the end of life. Research on these issues will lead to developing new models for effectively teaching dental, medical, and nursing students how to combine the expanding power of health care technology with the wisdom and compassion to apply the technology or withhold it when it is appropriate and responsible to do so.

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The Oregon Health Sciences University's mission is to serve as the State System's primary center for the preparation, specialty training, and continuing education of students and practitioners in the health professions. The proposed Center is fully consistent with this mission. In the Board's Strategic Plan 1987-1993, the Board directed the University to continue to "promote high quality and cost-effective health care in Oregon by . . . . sensitizing students to the ethical . . . . issues of contemporary health care."

2. Relationship to Board's Requirement for Designation as a Center

The proposed Center fully meets the Board's requirements for designation as a center. On March 25, 1977, the Board adopted the following policy statement relative to the establishment of centers and institutes:

(1) That the careful, considered institutional use of the center and institute mechanism be recognized by the Board as a legitimate, potentially valuable alternative approach to the furtherance of institutional mission, through the fostering of interdisciplinary activities in pursuit of basic and applied research and instruction, the attracting of non-state funding in support of institutional mission and goals, the motivation of faculty, the creation of flexibility permitting the shifting of resources to new and different constituencies as the need is apparent, and the strengthening of academic departments.

-227-
(2) That the Board establish the principle that the justification for establishment of centers and institutes must be in terms of their potential for contributing to the achievement of the institutional mission.

That the fact that federal or other non-state funds can be secured to fund totally or in principal measure a given center or institute cannot be considered justification for the establishment of the center or institute. The real test of justification must be in terms of the extent to which the objectives of the proposed center or institute can be shown to be wholly consistent with and fully supportive of the institution's mission. Failing the test, the center or institute ought not to be established.

3. Evidence of Need

With dramatic new technologies, American health care today can restore hope for persons whose hearts, livers, or kidneys are failing, resuscitate persons who are clinically dead, and even turn microbes into biological factories for insulin and human growth hormone. Similar multiprofessional and multilevel ethical problems arise in the care of persons who need organ transplantation or suffer from severe head injuries, burns, cancer, Alzheimer's disease, cardiovascular disease, degenerative diseases of the vital organs, AIDS or numerous other health problems.

Who will benefit from these extraordinary powers, who will pay their costs, and who will control the complex social and financial organization required for their use are perplexing questions involving individual rights, justice, and the promotion of community well being. Society cannot escape these questions; health professionals are increasingly challenged by them to new levels of responsibility and social commitment.

While there currently is an established base for education in ethics and health policy at the Oregon Health Sciences University, it tends to be conducted from within the separate perspectives of the various health professions. There are currently classroom courses on ethics, health policy, and the law in the first, second, and fourth years of the medical curriculum. Issues of ethics are addressed extensively in numerous courses throughout the nursing curriculum. Dental students receive instruction in the principles of business ethics and in the concepts of interpersonal communication.
Bedside and chairside instruction in the application of ethical principles to difficult clinical decisions, however, is still quite limited. Designing, coordinating, and implementing instruction for undergraduate and postgraduate students in the clinical application of ethical principles is a high priority for the Medical, Dental, and Nursing Schools. This area of need has surfaced in all of the professional schools this year as a result of the University's strategic planning process. The University is recommending that the expertise available in this area from various health programs on campus be pulled together into the new interdisciplinary program.

4. Quality of the Proposed Center

More than 40 health care professionals including administrators, dentists, chaplains, lawyers, physicians, nurses, social workers, and other health care professionals have united to establish this new program in ethics and health policy. While the majority of the founding members hold faculty appointments at the Oregon Health Sciences University, the membership is broad and includes faculty from the Lewis and Clark Law School, as well as physicians and nurses from Kaiser Permanente Corporation, Good Samaritan Hospital, the Benedictine Nursing Center, and the Portland Veteran's Administration Hospital.

The creation of the interdisciplinary Center will provide a structure which will ensure quality support for nursing, medical, and dental research on those issues that affect the health of the general public. The Center will be guided by an Executive Committee composed of 10 members. Members will be endorsed by their Dean or appropriate authority to represent their discipline. This group will be the administrative decision-making and quality control body for the Center. The members of the group will be responsible not only for their disciplines but also for maintaining communication and facilitating implementation between and within their respective units.

The Executive Committee will appoint three task forces to facilitate the growth of the Center's three major programs: education, research, and health policy. Members of each task force will collaborate regularly with the appropriate members of the Advisory Board.

Members of the Center will monitor state agency and federal legislative processes in order to shape research projects and develop forum programs that will expand student, faculty, and staff awareness of major health policy issues. The Center will become an important source for timely and relevant data needed by legislators and other health policy leaders.
The University will also use external evaluators who work in health care ethics programs at institutions outside Oregon to assist the institution in monitoring progress toward program objectives in 1989-90. This will help to ensure the development of the Center consistent with quality standards set elsewhere in the nation.

5. Adequacy of Resources to Offer Program

Faculty. The University will not need to add faculty to implement the Center. The Center’s Director and Associate Director have been identified and will report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The proposed Center’s Director has the support of the School of Medicine to revise her teaching responsibilities to be able to devote 0.5 FTE of her time to the Center. During the labor intensive early phase of program development, the Administration of University Hospital will contribute 0.1 FTE support, and the Department of Medicine will contribute 0.05 FTE. The remaining 0.35 FTE to support the Director’s time in developing and implementing a new clinical ethics program will come from grant support.

Because of the close link between the Center and the proposed Associate Director’s departmental assignments, departmental resources will be used to support fully his involvement in the Center after year one of the grant. Throughout the grant period, he will devote at least 0.5 FTE to the work of the Center.

Faculty members from the Schools of Nursing and Dentistry and hospital nursing have been designated as liaisons to the Center. Each has been authorized to commit 4 hours per week (0.1 FTE) to the development of the Center’s activities.

The Center’s support staff will consist of a full-time (1.0 FTE) Administrative Assistant; Secretary (0.1 FTE in the first year, upgraded to 1.0 FTE in the second year); and Research Assistant. The Administrative Assistant will work under the direction of the Director to coordinate and facilitate the activities of the Center.

Library. The University has adequate library holdings in the area of health care ethics to support the initiation of the interdisciplinary programs of the Center. In order to further expand the journal and monograph holdings, the Center will seek grant funds for an initial $5,000 and $1,000 for each of the next three years as a supplement to the Center’s resources.
Facilities and Equipment. Space for the Center will be provided by the University from remodeled space. Most Center faculty will maintain their current offices in their respective schools/units. Initial operation of the Center will begin with a shared library/conference room and two adjoining offices for the administrative assistant and research assistant.

The supplies and services budget for the Center’s first year is projected to be $21,280. This will cover the cost of telephones, duplication and printing, medical photography, and graphics support, and travel.

The cost of movable equipment needed in the Center’s initial year of operation will be partially covered by two grants totaling $22,000+. The remainder of the cost will be provided by the University.

Budget Impact. The Center will require $1,138,124 to cover the first four years of its operation. Of that amount, $424,416 is attributed to ethics activities already existing at the Oregon Health Sciences University which will become part of the Center’s programs. The remaining cost will be covered from new grants and other activities of the Center. Continued University support for the Center will be dependent on successful applications for additional grant funds, gifts, and bequests.

Program Review

The proposed center was reviewed by the Academic Council at its April 20, 1989, meeting. The Council supports the Oregon Health Sciences University request for this Center as a fully meritorious and needed activity. The campuses of the State System foresee the need for many of their faculty to participate in forums sponsored by the new Center.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize the Oregon Health Sciences University to initiate an Interdisciplinary Center for Ethics in Health Care, effective July 1, 1989. The proposal should be discussed by the Board at the May meeting and placed on the consent agenda for final action at the June meeting.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Following Dr. Zanville’s presentation of the staff report to the Committee, Dr. Robert Koler, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs at the Oregon Health Sciences University, emphasized that the request was a revenue-neutral proposal and would not encumber additional state General Fund dollars.
Dr. Susan Tolle, who will be the Director of the Center if it is approved, described in greater detail the proposed activities and participants in the Center. She indicated the ultimate goal was to promote the rights and dignity of individual patients. The mission of the proposed Center would be to foster collaboration among faculty of all health care disciplines. The educational programs would enhance the curricula of existing degree-granting programs in dentistry, nursing, and medicine. There is no intention of developing a new or separate degree-granting program.

Dr. Tolle then reviewed the assignments of existing faculty to the Center and stated the Center would be supported with private funds. Commitments already have been made by four foundations, and gifts have been received for use by the proposed Center. Federal grant money is difficult to obtain. Some research money might be available from the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Adams said the report stated future support would depend on successful applications for other grants and asked whether the prospects were good for receiving grant support. Dr. Tolle said checks from the four foundations would be received in July if the Board approved the Center.

Mr. Alltucker said it appeared from the information provided that the plan was to network with other similar centers throughout the country. Dr. Tolle said this was correct. There are a number of centers having a somewhat different focus. The proposed Center at Oregon Health Sciences University will be unique in combining a number of disciplines into a truly interdisciplinary Center. The staff is also reviewing other centers for any elements which might be incorporated into the proposed program.

In response to a question concerning the relationship of activities in the proposed Center and those of the Oregon Health Decisions organization, Dr. Michael Garland said there would be an effort to establish collaborative programs. The general public should be aware of the activities of the Center and should have an opportunity to stimulate dialogue and generate access to issues of concern. The relationship would be collaborative, not overlapping.

Mr. Alltucker commented that centers often were primarily for study and research but this proposal included an additional item of fellowships and the presentation of some information on curriculum which was somewhat unusual.

Dr. Tolle explained that it would be desirable in the fifth year of the Center to begin a training program for fellows in clinical medical, dental, or nursing ethics. These persons would have advanced degrees and have completed a residency in medicine or dentistry or the doctorate in nursing. In order to reach a broad focus of looking at all of the issues in different health care disciplines, the educational program would need to be housed in the Center.
Dr. Zarville pointed out that, when the Geriatrics Center of Excellence was considered, it had an educational component because of the importance of disseminating information and affecting the curriculum of the different schools at the Oregon Health Sciences University.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the understanding that it would be placed on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

Miss Brooks presented the report and recommendation from the Committee, and the Board voted to place the request on the consent agenda for the June meeting.

M.S. Degree in Computer Science, PSU

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

Portland State University seeks authorization from the Board to offer a Master of Science degree in Computer Science. The new degree program will be offered by the Department of Computer Science within the School of Engineering and Applied Science. The complete report is on file in the Board’s Office.

Staff Analysis

On May 25, 1979, the Board authorized Portland State University to offer a B.S. degree in Computer Science. Authorizing the proposed M.S. program will strengthen the University’s efforts to be responsive to graduate needs in computer science of the state’s residents in the Portland metropolitan area.

The proposed program will build upon the curriculum currently offered at the University. Implementation of the program will necessitate the addition of three new courses in computer software engineering. Present programs in Electrical and Computer Engineering and Mathematics will provide elective courses outside of the Department of Computer Science.

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed degree program is consistent with the University’s assigned mission to provide excellent programs of teaching, research, and public service in Oregon’s major metropolitan area. The Board’s Strategic Plan 1987-1993 calls for Portland State University to develop programs "that are tied to the community’s focus on high-technology industry..." as part of its priority considerations. The
program being proposed is part of Portland State University's long-term commitment to provide quality educational opportunities for the high technology community in the Portland metropolitan area.

2. Evidence of Need

The growth in and complexity of the high technology and computer-related industries in the Portland metropolitan area has given rise to the need for the proposed graduate program in computer science at Portland State University. In recent years, Portland State has been contacted continuously for graduates trained at the master's level and by prospective students needing additional education at the post-baccalaureate level.

The demand for computer professionals has increased due to the influx of high technology and computer-related companies into the Portland area. Data provided by the Oregon Employment Division indicate that the employment of computer programmers and systems analysts will grow by approximately 17 and 51 percent, respectively, in the Portland metropolitan area between 1986 and 1994. Employment statewide is also projected to grow by similar percentages during that period.

Numerous letters of support from high technology companies in Portland have attested to the need for this program. These include Sequent Computer Systems, Inc., Tektronix, Inc., Intel Corporation, and Mentor/Graphics (see Attachment A in the full report).

3. Duplication Issues

Similar graduate programs in computer science are currently available at two other State System campuses: Oregon State University and the University of Oregon. A master's degree in Computer Science and Engineering is also available at the Oregon Graduate Center.

System institutions currently produce some 250 bachelor's degrees in computer science, of which about 60 or 24% come from Portland State University. The System also produces about 50 master's level graduates. Table A provides a break-out of degrees produced by Oregon State System of Higher Education institutions.
Table A

Degrees Granted in Computer Science
(1987-88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bachelors</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portland State believes its program will serve students who are placebound in the metropolitan area and, therefore, will be supplementary to existing programs. Portland State’s program is not expected to draw away students from programs at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon. Portland State intends to focus its program in the areas of database systems, programming languages, operating systems, theory of computation, and software engineering, which are areas assessed to be currently underrepresented in the "collective" programs within the state.

Industry representatives have commented on the duplication issues as follows:

An MS program serving Portland area students and industry is needed. We do not foresee the Oregon State University or University of Oregon Computer Science programs having the ability to extend themselves to the Portland area with the kind of quality and accessibility which this area needs. The Oregon Graduate Center’s program, though high quality in some research areas, is very small and does not offer the accessibility and breadth needed by our industry. To meet the Portland area needs, we wish for PSU to have an MS program in Computer Science, for OGC to have a larger program than it currently has, and for Oregon State University and the University of Oregon to have computer science offerings via telecommunications technology in the Portland area. We need all of these avenues, but individual programs must cooperate with each other to get maximum effect.
Prior Review of Computer Science Needs by Board

In July 1987, the Board received a "Report on Computer Science Programs in the State System." This report was prepared in response to questions raised in 1986 when the Board was asked to approve two new program options in Southern Oregon State College's computer science degree program. This request followed closely earlier requests for new computer science programs at Eastern Oregon State College and Southern Oregon State College.

Because of the Board's questions about Oregon State System of Higher Education's rapidly developing computer science programs, the Board directed the Office of Academic Affairs to prepare a report on computer science programs. An Inter-institutional Committee on Computer Science was thereafter established; the committee was made up of institutional representatives from both computer science departments and other departments that were heavy users of computers.

On the issue of graduate education and research in computer science, the Committee noted that:

Oregon's stature in the world of computer science depends largely on the quality of the research and graduate programs at its universities... Oregon's graduate programs and research programs are magnets that could help draw new industry to Oregon... Our graduate and research programs support our high technology industries. Most of our master's graduates stay in Oregon to be employed by Tektronix, Hewlett Packard, Intel, and other computer-oriented corporations and companies.

The Committee further reviewed Portland State's role in preparing people in computer science:

Portland State University offers an undergraduate degree in Computer Science. The University is committed to meeting the needs of Portland area residents, including workers at the several computer-related businesses in Portland. There is significant demand among these residents for graduate courses and degrees in Computer Science. The Portland State Computer Science faculty hope to be able to offer the Master's degree within three year, in partial fulfillment of its commitment to these residents.
When the Board accepted the report of the OSSHE Computer Science Program Review Committee, it directed the Chancellor’s Office to develop a plan for implementing its major recommendations. A number of initiatives resulted from this plan, including the computer resource fee which enabled those campuses that needed it to provide students expanded access to computers via the funds generated from this fee. Portland State’s proposal to provide a master’s in computer science is another outcome of this planning.

5. Quality of the Proposed Program

The master’s program will build on a sound undergraduate program in computer science that is currently producing some 60 bachelor’s degrees per year. The proposed course of study has been designed in accordance with the recommendations of the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) Curriculum Committee on Computer Science for master’s level programs.

The primary objective of the program is to offer students, effective fall 1989, an opportunity for a level of training in computer science that will lead to career advancement and by so doing, assist the state in meeting its demand for professionals trained at the master’s level. Areas of concentration that will be available initially will include: software engineering, database systems, programming languages, operating systems, and theory of computation.

To ensure that the program is meeting its goals, the department will monitor applicants to the program and graduates of the program annually. Three years after implementation, both graduates and employers will be surveyed to ascertain whether the program meets their training needs and whether the program’s graduates are competitive with those of other master’s programs in computer science.

Additional evidence of Portland State’s capabilities to offer graduate and research programs in computer science comes from Tektronix’s recently awarded three-year grant in the amount of $361,112. With these funds, Portland State University will be able to bring two top software engineering faculty to the University.

6. Adequacy of Resources to Offer Program

Faculty. The present computer science faculty will need to be augmented with an additional 2.0 FTE faculty and 2.1 FTE (seven at 0.3) graduate teaching assistants to initiate this program. Tektronix Foundation has provided a grant award that will provide support for the two faculty positions for
two years each, one beginning in 1989 and one beginning in 1990. The Portland State University administration is committed to providing the resources to fund those positions after the grant funds terminate. The 2.1 teaching assistant positions will be supported from the University's operating budget. The institution has given this program its top priority for new faculty assignments.

Library. The most important library resources in computer science are found in journals and periodicals. The University library currently holds about 71 percent of the journals needed. Present library resources will require expansion and funding to meet the growing acquisition needs in computer science.

Facilities and Equipment. The department does not have adequate or suitable office space for the increased number of faculty or graduate students. There is a need for three additional offices for faculty and offices for seven graduate students. Remodeling of existing space will create five of the needed new offices.

The department states that a mini-computer lab and graphics lab are minimum requirements to initiate this program. Additional equipment will need to be purchased and enhanced. Institutional funding at the level of $87,000 per year for the foreseeable future will help meet equipment needs. The department expects to obtain grant funds to supplement the institutional funds.

Budget Impact. Portland State University has given a very high priority to the implementation of this program. The university will use going-level budget funds to support the program when existing grants are terminated. There is no adverse impact expected for other programs due to enrollment increases. It is anticipated that the additional costs can be covered by sponsored research funds.

Program Review

Copies of the Portland State University proposal were mailed to the other four-year colleges and universities in the state, public and independent, for their review. The responses to that request have been favorable and supportive of the proposed program.

In an attempt to strengthen the existing cooperation to provide excellent graduate education in computer science in Oregon, as expressed in the October 1986 Memorandum of Understanding (see Attachment B in the full report), a new agreement has been formulated and endorsed by Portland State University and Oregon Graduate Center, with the involvement of the Oregon Center for Advanced Technology Education (see Attachment C). The agreement
specifies ways in which the computer science departments will cooperate (e.g., course transfers, television courses, information on course schedules, faculty joint appointments).

The program was discussed at two meetings of the Academic Council. Although similar master’s programs in computer science are offered at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon, the Council concluded after some discussion that the program is needed, is a quality program, and will complement existing programs.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to initiate an instructional program leading to a Master of Science degree in Computer Science, effective Fall Term 1989. The proposal should be discussed by the Board at the May meeting and placed on the consent agenda for final action at the June meeting.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Zanville said that, in response to a request from Mr. Adams, she had collected data on the degrees produced at the private institutions in the state at the undergraduate level. The University of Portland has an undergraduate program. In addition, the new programs at Oregon Institute of Technology have students at the undergraduate program, but no degrees have been awarded as yet. She then invited Dr. Frank Martino, Provost at Portland State University to comment and respond to questions.

Dr. Martino said the State of Oregon was about to embark on a very serious assessment of the higher educational needs in the Portland metropolitan area. An assessment of Portland State University’s mission would be involved in that study. However, he said he could not imagine a program which would have broader unanimity than this with respect to its appropriateness as part of the mission of Portland State University or the real need for it in the Portland metropolitan area. He said the duplication issue should be addressed very squarely because he anticipated it would be a prototype for the analysis of very similar issues in the year ahead.

Dr. Chik Erzurumlu, Dean of Engineering at Portland State, said the proposal for a master’s degree in computer science followed the pattern used previously in the school of engineering for the development of programs. It is based on a solid undergraduate curriculum and has a well-documented demand from undergraduate students and those already in industry who need this degree for advancement. The graduate program is expected to enhance the quality of the entire curriculum by creating a new attraction for faculty who are in high demand nationally. Without a graduate
Mr. Adams commented that computers were a way of life and represented a very necessary duplication. The only question would be the extent or degree of duplication.

In response to a question from Mr. Bailey concerning the source of the students entering the program, Dr. Erzurumlu said they would come primarily from the Portland metropolitan area. One sector would be working professionals in industry; another would be those who had received the bachelor's degree and wished to pursue the master's degree. Once the program has established a name and reputation, it is hoped people from outside the state would be attracted to it.

Mr. Alltucker inquired as to the anticipated number of students who would enter the program next fall. Dr. Martino said the projected numbers on a year-to-year basis were shown on page 5 of the proposal. He indicated it might be difficult to keep the enrollments at those numbers but the staff did not want to make the mistake of being more ambitious than the resources would allow.

Mr. Alltucker then asked if he were correct in assuming the program at the Oregon Graduate Center placed greater emphasis on the design of computer hardware and software while the proposed Portland State program would focus on their use. He said he was interested in a definitive statement to use in explaining the differences to legislators when they raise the issue of duplication.

Dr. Martino said there are always differences between two departments in the same discipline because an academic department is a dynamic entity. He requested Dr. Leonard Shapiro, Chairman of the Computer Science Department, to comment further.

Dr. Shapiro distributed copies of a letter from the Oregon Graduate Center which stated, "PSU's Computer Science Department has worked with us to provide complementary and nonduplicative educational opportunities to Portland area professionals in the past and we expect this cooperation to continue in the future."

The Chancellor asked Dr. Shapiro to comment further on the theme of cooperation in this program and the inner relationships among the various computer science programs. He said he sensed the Portland State faculty had done a very good job in trying to relate the Portland State program to what other people were doing in order to make some of the parts add up to something a little extra. He stated this was a very attractive aspect of the program and the way it was addressed.
Dr. Shapiro said he had come to Portland State two years ago. One of the things that had attracted him was the diversity of resources available in the state to meet the pressing needs of the Portland business and educational community. Expertise from all sources is needed to meet the needs.

Dr. Shapiro stated Mr. Alltucker had been very perceptive in identifying the crucial distinctions between the activities of Portland State and the Oregon Graduate Center. They are complementary parts of computer science. At the same time, both offer full-fledged programs, so there is some duplication.

The Chancellor said there were severe financial constraints at every point in the State System. Every time a new program is proposed, it must meet severe tests of priority. Is the new program so important that the institution is prepared to give up something or reduce designated points in order to add the new program. The Chancellor asked Dr. Martino to describe how the institution proposed to finance the new program so that it would meet severe tests of resources, not simply adding a program that would thin down every other program and also be thin itself.

Dr. Martino said the institution was prepared to meet the costs of the new program, even at the expense of eliminating some other program to do so. He said the institution was prepared, out of existing institutional resources, either within the school of engineering or outside of it, to meet the phased-in requirements of the new program. As a result of a grant from Tektronix, there is a two-year period to accomplish the reallocations. There is adequate future attrition to make this possible.

Dr. Martino concurred in the Chancellor’s statement that they had discussed alternative specific lines that will occur which could be used for this purpose and that the institution was ready to commit if it became an appropriate and necessary thing to do.

Ms. Wilson requested further elaboration of the statement that the proposed program would draw its clientele primarily from students who would not otherwise come to Portland State.

Dr. Martino said the institution did not presently have a master’s program in computer science and could not serve the large number of persons wanting it. They would look elsewhere for the training. If they were site-bound to Portland, those persons would not find the program or would come to Portland State if the institution receives authorization for the degree.

Ms. Wilson asked if Dr. Martino anticipated the clientele would be people new to master’s programs or transfer students from other institutions because the proposed program offers other features. Dr. Martino said it would be more of the former than the latter.
Ms. Janice Larsen, training coordinator for Automatic Data Processing, reported her company had 500 employees in computer software development. Last year, the company spent $48,000 on tuition aid in the area of computer science. She said her budget for training was 5-6 times larger than that. She said she would like to find the best possible training at Portland State and was currently in negotiations with Portland State to try to develop a program that would meet her current training needs.

Ms. Dianna Smiley, representing both the Tektronix Foundation and Tektronix, Inc., supported the proposal. She indicated the funding of the software engineering grant for new faculty had not been contingent upon the formation of a master’s program. It did have the goal of providing software engineering training to the high technology community in the Portland area. She emphasized the needs in the Portland area, indicating that continuing education for employees was an important requirement for her firm. She also spoke favorably of the cooperation among the educational segments during the last few months.

Dr. John Owen, Vice Chancellor for OCAPE, verified the need for graduates in computer science areas at all levels. He commented on the distinction between efforts with the OCAPE programs and the general need for computer science within the metropolitan area. The OCAPE programs focus on the high technology industry. He commended the institutions for the cooperation given to OCAPE and particularly noted the contributions of Dr. Shapiro. However, there are still many people whose needs are not covered through OCAPE. The proposed program would complement the other efforts in the state.

Miss Brooks asked how many applicants were being turned away from the master’s degree programs in computer science at Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, or the Oregon Graduate Center and whether some of those might go to Portland State if the program were approved.

Dr. Owen indicated he could not respond specifically except to say that a large number of applicants to electrical and computer engineering at Oregon State University were not admitted to the master’s program. Dr. Martino concurred and added that many of those who would enter the Portland State program would be site-bound because they have full-time employment in the Portland area.

Mr. Alltucker said Oregon Institute of Technology, Oregon State University, and the University of Oregon had been encouraged by the Board to try to fill this need in the Portland area. If the Board were to increase the level of Portland State’s capability in this discipline, Mr. Alltucker asked whether this would have any effect or withdraw the encouragement given the other institutions.
The Chancellor said he did not think so because the goals have been to work more as a State System and to develop things which would be complementary within the particular disciplines. This is especially true in engineering which is based on the findings of the Board’s engineering study subcommittee. Obviously, there will be some duplication, but it will not be that extensive. He said cooperation had been stressed in the beginning and had taken place in the development of the programs and courses.

President Olum indicated he supported the proposed degree.

Mr. Adams said the Academic Council had considered the request and there was some discussion that perhaps approval should be delayed until after the commission’s study in regard to higher education in the Portland metropolitan area. The consensus was that the program should be approved. Mr. Adams said he agreed.

Dr. Owen said the additional faculty will result in a better quality undergraduate program in computer science.

The Chancellor stated it would be a continuing challenge to be certain programs were complementary and reinforced each other. He said he had some concern that having three or four programs would mean that there would be no critical mass anywhere. He said he was assuming that the proposed program at Portland State basically tapped a new market so that the net result would be an increase in the resources available in the state. That, in turn, helps everybody because achieving a larger critical mass increases the attractiveness of the state to the industry involved. If those assumptions are not correct, the programs will be thinned rather than strengthened. He concurred there would be a significant number of placebound people who needed this kind of program and would have difficulty getting it either through Ocate or by trying to commute.

Ms. Wilson thanked the representatives from Automatic Data Processing and Tektronix for attending. She said it was important for the Board to hear from industry representatives in terms of need. The Chancellor also expressed appreciation to Tektronix for its support because it was critical to the program.

Mr. Alltucker commented that the proposal was really responding to a need that had been neglected for several years.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the understanding the request would be placed on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Alltucker presented the report and recommendation from the Committee.
Mr. Hensley inquired how many other institutions offered a master’s degree in computer science, and Mr. Alltucker indicated the Oregon Graduate Center was the only one in the Portland area. Its emphasis is more on computer architecture and software work as compared to the actual use thereof. In the State System, the University of Oregon and Oregon State University offer programs.

Mr. Hensley inquired whether Dr. Cox would anticipate requesting computer science programs at Southern Oregon State College with the completion of its computer science building. Dr. Cox said Southern would not be requesting degree authorization as it already has a bachelor’s degree. He said he was very supportive of the proposal before the Board.

Mr. Bruggere said he viewed programs such as this master’s degree program in computer science as absolutely essential for the Portland region to grow. Almost all studies indicate that the vast majority of jobs created in the next 10-20 years will require some sort of technology background and understanding. He commented that, even if there were some duplication, the program would be justified because there is a dramatic shortage of computer science graduates to meet the needs of the state. Oregon produces only about 25% of the computer science graduates which it needs. He concluded by saying the master’s degree in computer science at Portland State University would be great for the region and for the electronics industry in general.

Mr. Hensley asked Mr. Bruggere whether he thought this program in this proposal and the one at the Oregon Graduate Center would be viewed as two different compatible programs.

Mr. Bruggere said he would view them as two separate programs but because of the demand for these graduates any overlap in the two programs would be highly justified.

The Chancellor mentioned that the Oregon Graduate Center had sent a strong letter of support for this proposed program. The letter indicated the program supplements, complements, and enforces the Oregon Graduate Center’s program rather than duplicates it.

The Board voted to place the program on the consent agenda for the June meeting.

Staff Report to the Committee
Introduction

Portland State University requests authorization from the Board to establish a North Pacific Applied Research Center (NPARC). The Center would link together faculty from a variety of departments at the University with responsibilities related to North Pacific Studies. Through three subsidiary programs which would
be part of the Center — Applied Linguistics, East Asian Program, and Canadian Program — NPARC would focus on five types of initiatives:

- development of training techniques and programs for businesses with needs for language and cultural training
- policy studies related to linguistic and cultural understanding
- development and publication of educational/training materials on applied linguistics and culture for use by educational institutions
- networking with industry/business training officers to assist in training private sector personnel
- faculty exchanges and collaborative research with other institutions on applied linguistics and intercultural education.

**Staff Analysis**

1. **Relationship of the NPARC Proposal to the OSSHE Pacific Basin Report**

Portland State University’s proposal has been under review by the campuses of the State System for nearly one year. The proposal was submitted to the Board’s Office for review shortly after the University of Oregon’s Center for Asian and Pacific Studies was reviewed and approved by the Board in July 1988.

When the Board approved the University of Oregon’s Center, the Board directed staff to convene an interinstitutional committee to develop a mechanism for coordination between the various instructional programs, centers, institutes, and other related initiatives in Pacific Studies. The Board expressed concern that new initiatives should not be considered in isolation, given the presence of related activities at other campuses. Before any further proposals were to be brought forward for Board review, the Board wished to receive recommendations from the campuses regarding a coordination mechanism that would better link together the growing number of initiatives in this area, including language programs; business forums related to international trade, research and development; and activities of centers and institutes. Portland State University’s proposed center, therefore, was put on hold until the OSSHE Pacific Basin Committee could be established to develop its recommendations.
The Pacific Basin Committee began its meetings in March of 1989, focusing attention on two activities—sharing information about the range of programs at State System institutions in Pacific Studies, and considering the type of coordination activities that would be beneficial to OSSHE programs in this area. A "Preliminary Report of the OSSHE Pacific Basin Committee" accompanies the NPARC proposal in line with the Board's request that proposals such as this not be brought forward until the Pacific Basin Committee had prepare some preliminary recommendations concerning coordination. Since a preliminary report is ready for Board review, the NPARC proposal is being brought forward at this time.

In addition to the Committee's recommendations that a coordination mechanism be established to facilitate continued cooperation and information sharing among State System campuses in programs related to the Pacific Basin, the Committee expressed the following concerning issues of duplication:

OSSHE is in a fortunate position to have a broad range of resources available at various campuses to turn to when the State needs to address various issues related to the Pacific Basin. All of the campuses' efforts will be strengthened if they can call upon the resources of one another. The Committee recommends some duplication of effort among the campuses given the importance of the Pacific Basin to Oregon.

2. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed Center is consistent with Portland State University's mission to provide excellent programs of teaching, research, and public service. The Board's "Strategic Plan 1987-93" stated that research programs in international trade, especially with the Far East, will be given priority consideration at Portland State. It also stated that faculty research that serves the economic, social, and cultural needs of the University's larger community will also be essential.

3. Relationship to Board's Requirements for Designation as a Center

The proposed Center fully meets the Board's requirements for designation as a center. On March 25, 1977, the Board adopted the following policy statement relative to the establishment of centers and institutes:
(1) That the careful, considered institutional use of the center and institute mechanism be recognized by the Board as a legitimate, potentially valuable alternative approach to the furtherance of institutional mission, through the fostering of interdisciplinary activities in pursuit of basic and applied research and instruction, the attracting of non-state funding in support of institutional mission and goals, the motivation of faculty, the creation of flexibility permitting the shifting of resources to new and different constituencies as the need is apparent, and the strengthening of academic departments.

(2) That the Board establish the principle that the justification for establishment of centers and institutes must be in terms of their potential for contributing to the achievement of the institutional mission.

That the fact that federal or other non-state funds can be secured to fund totally or in principal measure a given center or institute cannot be considered justification for the establishment of the center or institute. The real test of justification must be in terms of the extent to which the objectives of the proposed center or institute can be shown to be wholly consistent with and fully supportive of the institution’s mission. Failing the test, the center or institute ought not to be established.

4. Evidence of Need

Numerous national studies have provided compelling evidence of the nation’s need to function effectively in the international marketplace. Linguistic and cultural understanding is key to the nation’s competing successfully in the world economy, particularly in Asian markets.

Portland State University has identified needs for materials and training necessary to promote language and cultural proficiency for the many Portland-based businesses that work in or with North Pacific Basin countries. Few of the businesses in the Portland area, including banks, corporations, trade consulting firms, and service organizations, have staff who have an in-depth knowledge of the Pacific region’s history, politics, culture, and language. Local business and community leaders also need additional training opportunities to help them be more effective in dealing with Asian visitors and citizens in the Portland area. With the Northwest’s strong ties to Canada, Portland State sees a need for additional research that includes Canada as well as East and Soviet Asia.
5. Quality of Proposed Center

NPARC would initially be staffed by a Director, who would report to the Provost of the University. The Center would establish an Advisory Board with representatives selected from the academic, business, governmental, and international communities.

The proposed Center would pull together more than 40 faculty from a wide variety of disciplines at Portland State University including applied linguistics, foreign languages and literature, history, international studies, political science, economics, sociology, anthropology, art, geography, speech, education, business administration, social work, and urban studies.

The Center would also maintain a very close relationship with the International Trade Institute (with offices at both Portland State and the World Trade Center) with its state-wide mission to bring the strengths and expertise of the State System to bear on pertinent international trade issues facing businesses, government, and academia.

Under the coordinating mechanism of the OSSHE Pacific Basin Committee, the Center would establish cooperative relationships with other initiatives in this area in order to strive toward complementarity with these efforts. In the State System, this will mean developing active partnerships with the University of Oregon’s Center for Asian and Pacific Studies and Oregon State University’s developing Natural Resource Trade Consortium. Outside the System, this will mean developing active partnerships with independent colleges. Portland State University has already held preliminary discussions with Lewis and Clark College and Reed College to this end.

The Center would operate three subsidiary programs: Applied Linguistics, East Asian Program, and Canadian Program. Each of these programs has been designed to become a hub of academic research, training, and outreach needed by Portland-based business, government, and international service organizations.

Faculty who will be associated with NPARC have already been active in research in the three major programs of the proposed Center. In the past five years, faculty in these areas have generated some $700,000 in grants and contracts.
6. Adequacy of Resources To Offer Program

The University already has most of the resources in place to operate the Center. All of the faculty who would be associated with the Center are presently in academic units at Portland State University. The Director of the proposed Center would be one of these faculty. Each of the Center's three major programs would have specific faculty associated with that program. Initially, 13 faculty would be associated with the Applied Linguistics program, 19 with the East Asian Program, and 12 with the Canadian Program.

No additional facilities, equipment, or library holdings would be needed to establish the Center. As the Center grows the University may consider housing the three programs in the same area in order to facilitate closer interactions among faculty associated with the Center.

The Center's start-up costs will run $20,000 to include funds for a half-time secretarial position, services and supplies, and travel. These funds will come from existing University resources. The Center will be expanded utilizing funds received from grants, contracts, and gifts.

Program Review

The NPARC proposal was discussed by the Academic Council at numerous meetings spanning nearly one year. Portland State University made a number of revisions in the proposal over this period of time in response to concerns by some campuses that the original proposal did not adequately consider initiatives already underway at other institutions in Pacific Studies. This process proved to be an instructive one because the campuses learned more about one another's Pacific programs as a result of these discussions. This increased information sharing created the context for forging an initial proposal for coordination and cooperation among State System campuses through the efforts of the OSSHHE Pacific Basin Committee, advisory to the Academic Council.

The Council concluded its discussions with consensus that the Pacific Basin is so important to Oregon's future that each campus should have an important role to play in a variety of initiatives in this area, including foreign language training, research and development, and outreach. The Council recommended that the NPARC proposal be approved.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to initiate the North Pacific Applied Research Center, effective July 1, 1989. The proposal should be discussed by the Board at the May meeting and placed on the consent agenda for final action at the June meeting.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Zanville presented the staff report, noting that the Chancellor would be playing a stronger role in the international area because of his expertise in that field.

Dr. Martino indicated the proposed center was intended to provide an interdisciplinary structure for the cooperative efforts of existing strength. The entire faculty is in place, and there is a long history of research in each of the areas.

Mr. Bailey inquired whether the proposed center had sufficient flexibility to accommodate any changes in emphasis which might result from the general study of this field. Dr. Martino replied it had been constructed with that kind of flexibility in mind and was the product of substantial interinstitutional cooperation. There were discussions with both State System and the private institutions.

Dr. Mel Gurton, Professor of Political Science and Director of International Studies at Portland State University, said particular effort had been made in the discussions to make this a joint venture and take advantage especially of Pacific area expertise at both public and private institutions. Dr. Gurton said he had had specific discussions with Reed College, Willamette University, and Lewis and Clark College. He then commented briefly on potential cooperative opportunities with institutions and organizations.

Dr. Zanville said leadership in the Governor’s Office and the Department of Economic Development had resulted in a statewide group which has begun meeting on issues of the importance of the Pacific Basin to Oregon. Many State System faculty members have been participating in that forum.

The Chancellor said the stipulations with respect to financing for the proposed center appeared to have been met.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the understanding the request would be placed on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Bailey presented the report and recommendation from the Committee.

The Board voted to place the request on the consent agenda for the June meeting.
The Chancellor said one of his concerns had been that the State System not be proliferating programs and extending its resources and activities in the face of very severe limitations on funds. He emphasized this concern had been considered carefully in the Committee discussion of these three programs. He said, in his opinion, these three programs met the severe test with respect to resources and were not simply being added without provision for financing them.

Article XI-F(1)  Staff Report to the Committee

Bonding Authority for Housing, UO

At the request of community leaders and local legislators, the cities of Eugene and Springfield, Lane County and the University of Oregon are embarking on a study of housing problems in the Eugene-Springfield area. One of the operating assumptions of community members is that the University's growth in students over the years is a primary cause of the shortage of affordable housing for low and moderate income families. The study will determine whether this is probable and will make statements about the causes of, and recommendation concerning the most promising solutions to, the local housing problem.

Study participants are aware of the impending enrollment reduction at the University of Oregon and will take into account its likely effects. However, it cannot yet be determined if the curtailment of University enrollment will resolve all University-related housing problems.

If the study determines that the University is responsible for some of the local housing difficulties and recommends that the University construct additional housing units, the University must have bonding authority from the Legislative Assembly. Bonding authority cannot be established by the Emergency Board, although projects and Other Funds limitations for projects can be.

Because of the acute nature of the Eugene-Springfield housing shortage, community leaders and study participants do not believe the University should wait until the 1991 session of the Legislative Assembly to seek bond authorization to build additional housing units. If, later in 1989, it appears that the University should build such units, these persons would like the University to be able to proceed with minimum delay. The legislators involved in starting this study have indicated their willingness to add bonding authority in this session, to be used only if the study determines, and the Board agrees, that the University should construct additional housing units.
Therefore, the University of Oregon has requested that the Board authorize staff to seek from the Legislative Assembly the authority to issue Article XI-F(1) bonds, with debt service to be paid from housing revenues, for the purpose of constructing housing units if it is determined that the University should build them. Naturally, the Board would have to authorize any project to build the housing. Bonds would not be issued until such approval had been given by the Board and by the Emergency Board. University officials believe that a $10 million amount would be sufficient.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board concur with the request of the University of Oregon that the staff be authorized to seek from the Legislative Assembly, through the appropriate Executive Department channels, authority to issue up to $10 million of Article XI-F(1) bonds for the expenses associated with the construction of additional housing units for the University of Oregon. Such bonds would be sold only upon the specific approval by the Board of a project to construct such housing and upon the establishment by the Emergency Board of an Other Funds limitation for such project. In making this recommendation, the staff emphasizes that the Board is not endorsing or approving any project to construct housing at or for the University of Oregon at this time.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Richardson said he was concerned that prior to undertaking the study, it almost seemed a conclusion had been reached with respect to the cause of the housing problems. In the event the study reveals the University of Oregon does not share in the responsibility for the housing shortage, Mr. Richardson asked if the cities of Eugene and Springfield were prepared to do something with respect to building.

Mr. Pernsteiner said it was his understanding city officials were looking at alternatives within their resources, including housing monies available to them. The proposal would give staff permission to seek bonding authority from the Legislative Assembly. A two-year delay until the next Legislative Session otherwise would occur because only the Legislature can approve bonding authority.

Mr. Bruggere asked if there were any other alternatives to the two-year delay. Mr. Lemman explained that two things were necessary before a capital construction project could proceed under Article XI-F(1) bonds. The Legislature must authorize the issuance of bond and also authorize the project. The Emergency Board can authorize a project which has not gone to the Legislature previously, or it can increase or decrease the expenditure limitation. It cannot authorize issuance of Article XI-F(1) bonds. The proposed provisional authority need not be exercised, but
without the authority to issue the bonds presumably there would be no way to finance the project until the next Legislative Session. Even with the bonding authority, the Board of Higher Education would have to approve any housing project and seek State Emergency Board authority to proceed.

Mr. Bruggere and Mr. Richardson inquired about the relationship of this project to the overall priority list for construction projects and whether a determination by the Board that housing was a low priority would place the Board at a disadvantage with the Eugene-Springfield area.

Mr. Lemman said housing projects were self-supporting. Family housing is not part of pools like residence halls, so the matter of priority essentially becomes irrelevant. It would not impair other projects and their priority because there is ample bonding authority under the Constitution. The only time priority becomes a factor is for projects to be financed by the building fee where there is a limited resource for debt service and multiple projects to be financed from it or in the case of residence halls financed from pooled resources.

Mr. Lemman said in his opinion a housing project would not impair or enhance the priority of any other project, nor would it inhibit the Board. He said he had advised the University of Oregon that he would not recommend this project unless he was convinced it was genuinely a self-supporting and self-liquidating project over 30-year bonds. The Eugene-Springfield area has a problem, but it may be a two-year or five-year problem. The staff would not anticipate recommending to the Board a project that will not be feasible unless it can be demonstrated to be needed over that long a period of time.

Mr. Bruggere questioned whether the bonds should be authorized because he did not think it was the appropriate process to do so before the study was completed. By doing so, the Board implicitly agrees there is a problem and that it should be solved by the state's building more housing. The University of Oregon is not yet in agreement that there really is this kind of problem. If there is, then the solution of the state's building housing as opposed to some private developers doing so has not been decided yet. If the authorization is approved, the case will be made at some point that the State System thinks there is a problem and favors doing something about it. He said he would recommend not seeking bonding authority.

In response to a question from Mr. Johnston, Mr. Lemman stated the proposal merely asked that the Legislature increase the bond limitation by the additional $10 million so that it would be possible to finance a housing project, if appropriate, prior to the next Legislative Session. The proposed authorization would not require issuing bonds or building any projects.
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Mr. Bruggere suggested seeking the authorization limit without tying it to the Eugene situation, but Mr. Fennsteiner explained that the staff must specify the purposes for which it intends to issue the bonds.

Vice President Dan Williams said there was not necessarily a degree of uncertainty about the need for the University of Oregon to make some contribution to relief of the housing problem by building some housing stock during the next two years. The emphasis of the study would be on the character of the solution and the size of it, and how it fits into solutions advanced by Lane County and the cities of Springfield and Eugene.

Mr. Richardson said the staff report discussed the cause of the shortage of affordable housing for low and moderate income families and refers to the University of Oregon as perhaps a major contributor to that particular issue. As a means of solving the problem, housing will be constructed on the assumption students would then move from the low-income dwellings into campus housing. This seems to be making an assumption before all of the facts are available.

Vice President Williams agreed this might be true but said a number of legislators and community leaders were quite convinced that much of the problem with an absence of low and moderate income housing in the community was attributable to the University of Oregon. They also intend that there will be a constructive response to their concerns.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the understanding approval did not represent any commitment to proceed with housing. Mr. Bruggere was opposed.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Miller presented the report and recommendation from the Committee.

Mr. Alltucker asked if now the general trend in State System institutions, and the University of Oregon in particular, was to fill the residence halls as contrasted with an earlier period when occupancy was decreasing.

Vice President Dan Williams said there had been a trend on all college campuses, including the University of Oregon, to a renewed interest on the part of students in more traditional forms of housing. The dormitories have been full for several years, and the waiting lists have been much longer than could be met.
The plan would be to build housing that would allow the maximum amount of flexibility as the student body and student needs change over the next 10-15 years. This suggests that probably apartment-type housing, rather than traditional dormitory housing, would be recommended for construction.

Mr. Bruggere said he had voted against this proposal in Committee primarily from a process standpoint because he believed the Board should not get authorization for $10 million in bonding before the study was actually done. He said he was concerned people would look at the fact the Board approved the request for bonding authority and assume it favored the state’s providing the housing rather than having a private developer do so. In some way that might be used to influence the study improperly or to have the results be a foregone conclusion. He indicated he would vote in favor of the recommendation from the Committee since the Committee as a whole did not think bonding authority would cause a problem with the study.

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

Sale of Monkhouse Property, EOSC

In December 1988, Walter S. Lovely, personal representative to the estate of Fred R. Monkhouse, deceased, conveyed to the State Board of Higher Education, on behalf of Eastern Oregon State College, a single family dwelling. Instructions in the "Personal Representative’s Deed" were that Eastern Oregon State College "convert the property into money and invest the same only in bank savings accounts or obligations of the United States of America or the State of Oregon, and preserve the corpus of the trust fund in perpetuity...Use the income only from the trust fund, as invested, annually to provide all-tuition scholarships...." The property has been appraised.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Board authorize the Board’s staff to advertise the property for sale by bid for a minimum of $25,000. If sold on contract, the minimum acceptable terms would be 20% down, payable on closing, with the balance in equal monthly installments over a period not to exceed ten (10) 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 property is 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 ORS 273.201, 273.205, 273.211, and 273.216.
If the 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 for scholarships, as directed in the "Personal Representative's Deed."

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Miller asked whether there was any possibility the property would ever be used by the institution for any purpose.

Mr. Pernsteiner replied that the institution would be in violation of the will if the property were used in any way other than that set forth in the will. Under those provisions, it would not be possible to use it for college purposes. Mr. Lundy added that it was approximately an acre located about three miles from the campus and there was no reasonable way the College would have any use for it.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented and place the item on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting. Mr. Richardson was absent from the Committee at this time.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board voted to place the item on the consent agenda for the June meeting.

Staff Report to the Committee

Institutional officials at Western Oregon State College have indicated to the Board's Office that the land on the west side of Stadium Drive should be declared surplus and sold. The property consists of two parcels which were purchased in 1965 with the intent to develop student family housing on the property. Western Oregon State College officials now indicate that the community has been able to handle the need for student family housing and that it is not economically viable for the institution to develop the housing on this site. The original purchases were financed from restricted fund balances available to the institution.
Although Western Oregon State College has received offers to buy the property, the provisions of Oregon law require that notice be provided to the Department of General Services for circulation to other state agencies to determine whether purchase of the property or interest therein would be advantageous to them before advertising the property for sale to the general public.

If the staff recommendations are approved, it is expected that unless another state agency expresses interest in acquiring any or all of the property, the property would be advertised for sale at minimum prices not less than the fair market values indicated by appraisals of the property.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that an area of approximately 1.882 acres on the west side of campus be excluded from the approved projected campus boundaries, be declared surplus to the needs of the Board and be offered for sale in accordance with the provisions of Oregon statutes. The property is an unimproved parcel on the west side of Stadium Drive between W. Jackson Street and W. Church Street.

If this revision of the campus boundaries is authorized, the total area within the campus would be reduced to 135.820 acres. The Board owns all but 9.431 acres within the boundaries.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Johnston asked why Western Oregon State College was purchasing property in one report and disposing of it in another request. Mr. Pernsteiner replied the campus development is occurring in the northeast portion of the campus and that is the reason for acquiring property in that area. The above recommendation for disposal of property is not in an area of development.

Mr. Miller asked if the sale price for the property would have a minimum amount and whether it was obvious the College never would have a need for it.

Mr. Pernsteiner indicated a formal appraisal was being sought. It is anticipated the price will be in the range of $72,000, based on an unsolicited offer made earlier this year.

Mr. Neifert said the official appraisal had just been received in the amount of $59,200. The College received an offer of $72,000. He described the property and other developments in that vicinity and indicated that, even if Western were to double in size, there was substantial land which would be preferable for expansion instead of going into a residential area.
The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the understanding the item would be placed on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board voted to place the request on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting.

Staff Report to the Committee

At its March 17, 1989, meeting, the Board authorized the staff to negotiate and execute a five-year lease, including an option for an additional five years, with the Tillamook Anglers, Inc., represented by Mr. Jerry Dove of Tillamook. The rent would be $1.00 per year. The lease would include a provision which would enable Oregon State University to terminate the lease in the event the University found it necessary to expand its use of the property for salmon propagation. Should such action become necessary during the lease term, the University would have to reimburse the Tillamook Anglers, Inc., for the cost of improvements that organization might have made during the period of possession.

When the staff recommendation was brought to the Board to lease the property, it was the staff’s understanding that Mr. Dove had already agreed to the proposed terms and conditions. It became necessary to negotiate further with Mr. Dove, however, following the Board meeting. These negotiations included a provision that the lease include an option to extend the lease for a third five-year term at the discretion of the University and Board. This provision was discussed with Board President Richard Hensley. On April 10, 1989, Board staff member Richard Perry sent Mr. Dove a revised lease which incorporated further amendments discussed with, and seemingly agreed to, by Mr. Dove during an April 6, 1989, telephone conversation. The amendments were also agreed to by University authorities. University authorities were adamant, however, that any lease negotiated should not be in perpetuity, because the Whiskey Creek facility is the only facility where the University can conduct research on salmon propagation. Further, it is the University’s intention to expand such research when funds become available.

The major terms and conditions which the University authorities are now recommending, and to which Mr. Dove has orally agreed, are as follows: (1) a 10-year irrevocable use of the facility by the Tillamook Angler’s, Inc.; (2) immediate transfer of ownership to the University of any improvements made by the Tillamook Anglers, Inc., during its occupancy and use of the facility; (3) limited use of, and access to, the existing facilities by the University during the lease term; and (4) no reimbursement by the University to the Tillamook Anglers, Inc., for any repairs or improvements made during the lease term or upon expiration of the lease.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Board authorize the staff to execute a 10-year irrevocable lease with the Tillamook Anglers, Inc., which would include the above-identified provisions, as well as all of the risk-minimizing and cost-of-maintenance provisions routinely included in leases of this type. Before the lease is executed by the appropriate Board staff member, it will be reviewed by the Board’s legal counsel.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In response to concerns and questions expressed by Committee members, Mr. Pernstainer indicated the following:

1. Minimal amounts of structural improvements are planned at the present time. Other improvements have not been defined.

2. The lease on the property requires that it be maintained free and clear from all liens, but there could also be a requirement that a notice of completion be sent to the state to verify there were no liens on the property for failure to make payment.

3. The state is an additional named insured on the liability insurance.

4. The right to retake the property has been reserved to the state in the lease, either for the needs of the institution or for violation of the terms and conditions of the lease. Some uses are specified in the lease.

5. The consent of the state is required to sublease.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the understanding the item would be placed on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board voted to place the item on the consent agenda for the June meeting.

Staff Report to the Committee

Officials of the Oregon Health Sciences University and of the Veterans Administration propose locating a stairway between the amphitheater on the Veterans Administration property and S. W. U. S. Veterans Hospital Road, facilitating more direct pedestrian access between the Oregon Health Sciences University and
the Veterans Hospital. To obviate expensive relocation of retaining walls associated with the amphitheater, the stairway would be located approximately centered on the property line between the Oregon Health Sciences University and Veterans Administration property.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officers be authorized to execute an easement granting the U. S. Government Veterans Administration a strip of land approximately 3 feet by 48 feet upon which to construct and maintain a portion of stairway between the Oregon Health Sciences University and the Veterans Hospital.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the understanding the item would be placed on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board voted to place the item on the consent agenda for the June meeting.

Easement to Benton County for Location of Irish Bend Covered Bridge, OSU

Staff Report to the Committee

At the March 25, 1977, meeting the Board approved an easement to Benton County for the location of a bikeway and a limited vehicular access route upon the existing gravel roadway between 35th Street and 53rd Street known as Campus Way Extension. At no expense to the Board, the County built and maintains a 16-foot wide paved roadway which is divided into an 8-foot wide bikepath and an 8-foot wide roadway for authorized vehicles requiring access to adjoining facilities of Oregon State University. Gates were installed to facilitate livestock movement and to prohibit through motor vehicle traffic. The terms and conditions incidental to the easement are outlined in an agreement between the County and the Board.

Near 53rd Street there is a bikepath/roadway bridge across Oak Creek. It is proposed to move and reconstruct the Irish Bend Covered Bridge, one of three Benton County covered bridges, at a site adjacent to the existing bridge at no cost to the Board. The location would be an appropriate pastoral setting and provide year-round crossings for bicycles and pedestrians over a frequently flooded Oak Creek.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officers be authorized to execute an easement granting to Benton County a site adjacent to the present bridge across Oak Creek for the location of the Irish Bend Covered Bridge on the bikeway between 35th and 53rd Streets, Corvallis, within the western portion of the campus of Oregon State University.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the understanding the item would be placed on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board voted to place the item on the consent agenda for the June meeting.

Salary Adjustments for 1989-1990, House Staff, OHSU

Staff Report to the Committee

The Oregon Health Sciences University is requesting that a salary adjustment of 4.5%, effective July 1, 1989, be approved by the State Board of Higher Education.

Need for the adjustment is supported by the following:

1. The Oregon Health Sciences University’s first postgraduate year salaries are 9% below the 25th percentile stipend for western university-owned hospitals.

2. The Oregon Health Sciences University’s first postgraduate year salaries are 4.25% below the mean stipend for the non-California western university hospitals.

3. The Oregon Health Sciences University’s house staff salaries at all postgraduate years are below the mean stipends for the non-California western university hospitals.

4. The Oregon Health Sciences University’s house staff salaries at all training levels rank fifth out of the six non-California western university hospitals.

Evidence is mounting that highly qualified individuals are not applying for house staff positions at Oregon Health Sciences University because of the relatively low salary levels. In order to attract these individuals, it is incumbent that house staff salaries be increased incrementally over the next few years to equal the mean stipend for the non-California western university hospitals, the Oregon Health Sciences University’s chief competitors...
for house staff. At the present time these hospitals are estimating that their house staff salary increases will be from 3.5% to 5% for 1989-90.

In July 1989, the Oregon Health Sciences University will be notified of the exact salaries for 1989-90 house staff at the non-California western university hospitals. If indicated at that time, the Oregon Health Sciences University may return to the Board to seek approval for an additional mid-year salary increase. The overall objective is to set salary adjustment at a rate of 1½ higher than the average 1989-90 increase for competitor hospitals. Approval of such an increase before recruitment for 1990-91 would improve the competitive position for house staff.

The specific salaries which the Oregon Health Sciences University is recommending are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Level</th>
<th>Postgraduate Year</th>
<th>1988-89 Salary Levels</th>
<th>1989-90 Salary Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 21,491</td>
<td>$ 22,458</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,779</td>
<td>23,804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24,147</td>
<td>25,234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25,597</td>
<td>26,749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27,132</td>
<td>28,353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28,760</td>
<td>30,054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Portland Council of Teaching Hospitals has agreed with this recommendation.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board approve a salary adjustment of 4.5% for house staff at the Oregon Health Sciences University to be effective July 1, 1989.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In response to a question, Mr. Lemman explained that the Portland Council of Teaching Hospitals was a voluntary organization of hospitals having resident and intern programs. Its purpose is to coordinate the fixing of salaries in a cooperative rather than a competitive situation. He also indicated the proposal would have no effect on any of the labor negotiations.

Mr. Richardson said he was always somewhat concerned when there were reductions in the workforce and, at the same time, increases for those individuals who are still part of the organization. He requested further comment with respect to the proposal before the Committee.
Mr. David Witter said there was continuing review of the composition of the house staff but it was primarily from the standpoint of the composition of the education program and the needs in those specific areas. The proposal before the Committee was made to maintain some reasonable level of competitiveness with other western university hospitals in attracting and retaining the best house staff.

With respect to potential further increases on January 1, 1990, Mr. Witter indicated that would depend on the competitive situation at that time.

Mr. Bruggere asked whether approval of the request would mean automatic increases for all individuals at the university who were at this level. Mr. Witter said that it would. There is only one salary rate for all individuals in a particular training year. The financial analysis prepared with respect to the hospital's financial problems has assumed approval of this proposal. Only about 210 individuals actually are paid on the payroll of the University Hospital. The increases range from slightly less to slightly more than $1,000 for the 210 people in the various categories. This would still be within the budget available.

Mr. Witter explained that the term house staff referred to those individuals who basically have completed an M.D. program and are engaged in a period of postgraduate training. They were formerly called interns and residents and now tend to be classified as residents. The length of the residencies varies by specialty.

Mr. Miller asked whether there would be other situations in which the Committee and the Board would be authorizing this kind of an increase. Mr. Lemman stated the house staff salary proposal was the only one that was brought to the Board separately from the general faculty increase proposal. He said it was well understood that there is no relationship of this proposal and what is done with the faculty. House staff are treated independently and are regarded as such by both faculty and the central office staff.

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

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Johnston presented the report and recommendation from the Committee.

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

Board Discussion and Action

At the May meeting, the Board approved the staff recommendation as recommended by the Committee. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Brooks, Bruggere, Dodson, Johnston, Miller, Richardson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

In May 1974, the Board received and approved a Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Properties of Historical and/or Architectural Value. Included in the report were 6 buildings listed for Western Oregon State College (then Oregon College of Education).

Five buildings were listed as being of Prime Significance and one of Secondary Significance. Of the 6 buildings, the City of Monmouth has designated landmark status for Campbell Hall, Jessica Todd Hall, and the Administration Building. Maple Hall and the Senior Cottage were considered but not designated because such designation could preclude the implementation of the Western Oregon Campus Plan.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

In October 1987, the Board authorized the purchase of several parcels of land and improvements lying east of Monmouth Avenue and south of Gentle Street. At the April 15, 1988, Board meeting it was reported that two of the parcels had been purchased. Two of the four remaining parcels have now been purchased.

The Weniger property, consisting of 4.481 acres in 21 different tax lots and improved with a 60-unit, low-rise apartment complex, was purchased for $875,000 in June 1988.

The Fischer property, consisting of 4.094 acres in three different tax lots and improved with a 43-stall mobile home/trailer court, was purchased for $287,392 in March 1989.

As reported at the October 16, 1987, meeting, all of the properties to be purchased in this area are to be financed from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds to be repaid from rental of the properties in their present configuration.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

SUMMARY OF
FACILITIES
DIVISION
ACTIVITIES,
OFFICE OF
ADMINIS-
TRATION

Staff Report to the Board

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

Contracts for Professional Services

Food Toxicology
An Agreement was negotiated with Endex Engineering, Inc., Corvallis, for engineering services not to exceed $7,200. Financing will be provided from federal and private funds.

Parker Stadium
Improvements, End Zone, OSU
An Agreement was negotiated with Settecace Smith Doss, Salem, for architectural services not to exceed $93,700. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution through gifts/grants, cash-on-hand, and a loan from the Oregon State University Foundation.

Shaw Historical Library
Remodel, OIT
An Agreement was negotiated with The Amundson Associates, Springfield, for architectural services not to exceed $1,500. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.

Awards of Construction Contracts

Dorm Addition, General Furni-
ture, WOSC
On April 20, 1989, B & I Interiors was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $264,116. Financing is provided from Article XI-F(1) Bond proceeds.

Dorm Addition, Student Room
Furniture, WOSC
On April 20, 1989, Northland Furniture Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $585,115. Financing is provided from Article XI-F(1) Bond proceeds.

N. Willamette Ag. Research &
Exp. Station/ Office Lab
Addition, OSU
On May 2, 1989, Oak Hill Construction Corporation was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $340,062. Financing is provided from General Funds.

Withycombe Hall
Room 303 Fume Hood Installa-
tion, OSU
On April 20, 1989, Beaver Plumbing & Heating, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $29,862. Financing is provided from general funds.

Campus Roofing Project
Phase IV, (Law Bldg & PLC), UO
On April 6, 1989, Umpqua Roofing Company, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $131,350. Financing is provided from capital repair funds.
Dental School 8th Fl. Animal Area, HVAC Alterations, OHSU

On April 17, 1989, Michael J. Watt, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $106,129. Financing is provided from funds available to the institution.

UHN 15W, Remodel for Psychiatric Outpatient Clinic, OHSU

On March 31, 1989, Ron Construction (Oregon), Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $356,377. Financing is provided from hospital funds.

Utilities Extension, OIT

On April 24, 1989, R. A. Chambers & Associates, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $1,080,500. Financing is provided from general funds.

Acceptance of Projects

Marine Science Center, Public & Central Facilities Wing Reroof, OSU

This project is complete and was accepted on April 21, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $60,007. Financing was provided from general funds.

Residence Hall Quad Reroofing Project, OSU

This project is complete and was accepted on April 15, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $326,902. Financing was provided from housing reserve funds.

Snell Forum Reroofing Project, OSU

This project is complete and was accepted on April 12, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $120,096. Financing was provided from building reserve funds.

13th Avenue Improvements, UO

This project is complete and was accepted on April 7, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $70,728. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

Baird Hall Electrical Distribution Improvements, OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on March 30, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $46,032. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

Outpatient Clinic, 1st Flr Remodel, East Entrance, OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on March 31, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $287,981. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

PCAT Building, Solid State Lab Remodel, PSU

This project is complete and was accepted on March 3, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $184,688. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution and state (lottery) funds.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Johnston reported that Ms. Wilson and he would visit Southern Oregon State College on May 22 as the Board/Institutional Relations Committee for that institution.

Mr. Johnston also mentioned that Miss Brooks would be married prior to the next Board meeting and wished her well.

Mr. Bruggere said Mr. Alltucker and he had made their visit to Portland State University since the last Board meeting. The concerns expressed during the visit included the presidential search, the study commission, and the problem of some students in teacher education who were trapped between the switch from the four-year to the five-year program.

Mr. Alltucker added that the students' problem had been reported to the provost with the request he investigate the concern and resolve the difficulty. Mr. Alltucker said he also had discussed the matter with the Chancellor, and it would be appropriate for the issue to be handled administratively.

Mr. Bruggere said the meetings with faculty dealt with the process for choosing the new president, the procedures for the commission study, and funding issues.

Mr. Adams said he had accepted an invitation from Oregon State University to attend a day of classes with students and had found it an exhilarating experience. He also mentioned that, within the last month, reports had been distributed to Board members on liaison visits made by the Board/Institutional Relations Committees to Western Oregon State College and Oregon State University. In addition, Mr. Dodson and Mr. Adams attended the opening of the OSU Center in Portland.

Mr. Alltucker mentioned he had received and declined a similar invitation but subsequently had been asked to teach a class instead. He spent two hours with a class in labor relations and collective bargaining and found it a very interesting and rewarding experience.

Mr. Dodson congratulated the Oregon Health Sciences University on the appointment of Dr. Hallick to succeed Dr. Robert Koler upon his retirement.

Mr. Hensley expressed the Board's appreciation to Dr. Koler for all of the contributions he has made to the State System over the years.
At the invitation of Mr. Hensley, Mr. Rich Davidson, representing the Neighborhood Association in the area of the Oregon Health Sciences University, thanked the Board for its approval of the extension of the western campus boundary to the Veterans’ Administration Hospital road. This decision gave the neighborhood planners and owners a clear path for designing their new campus district. It will include commercial, mixed use, and residential facilities, as well as general sidewalk and road improvements and lighting. He stated this planning often moves slowly because the area is not a property tax generator and sometimes receives lower priority status for improvements. He urged continued support and recognition from the Board to aid the association in achieving its goals.

Mr. Davidson stated the association was actively supporting the Health Sciences University’s beginning activity to develop road and sewer access to its south campus acreage. The availability of 50-plus private acres adjacent to similar acreage owned by the Oregon Health Sciences University provides a very unique opportunity for future growth to meet several needs and goals.

Mr. Hensley announced that Mr. Adams and Mr. Dodson had been reappointed to the Board and it was anticipated the name of a student member to succeed Miss Brooks would be announced soon. Miss Brooks will be completing her term in June.

Mr. Hensley called attention to a forum on teacher preparation to be held from 6:00-9:00 p.m. on May 22, 1989, in Room 338 of Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University. Board members were invited to attend. Dr. Zamvili will conduct the session and the deans from the various schools of education will participate. Mr. Adams indicated the Board’s Committee on Instruction would be represented at the meeting.

Mr. Hensley said the next regular Board meeting would be held on Thursday, June 15, 1989, on the campus of the University of Oregon. There will be a social event the previous evening.

The September Board meeting will be held on September 8 and will be followed by the joint meeting with the Board of Education in the afternoon, probably on the campus of Portland Community College. He indicated he had been discussing agenda items with the president-elect of the Board of Education.

Mr. Hensley called attention to copies of a news release dealing with economic development in the State of Oregon for the 21st century.

The Board meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Board met for luncheon. No business was transacted.

Richard F. Hensley, President

Wilma L. Foster, Secretary