Reallocation of Degree Granting Authority

OSU Transfer graduate degree-granting authority for masters and doctoral degrees in Health and Physical Education from the School of Education to the College of Health and Human Performance.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

1. The staff recommended that the Board authorize State System institutions and divisions to make projected required cuts aimed at the level of $7,997,227 required as part of a reallocation to fund a portion of the faculty salary increase in each year of the 1989-91 biennium.

2. The staff recommended that the Board approve the above-listed program changes.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Bailey inquired whether the eliminations and program changes would still be in effect in the event budget adjustments were not required. Mr. Richardson asked also if there would be additional cutbacks if there were not additional funding.

The Chancellor said planning had been based on the most likely option. If the existing budget stood without any additional appropriation over the spending ceiling, there certainly would be additional cuts. Should significant additional funds become available, the present planning would be reconsidered.

Mr. Adams suggested approval of the staff recommendations be subject to Board review if the required cutbacks were different from one-half of the original target mentioned in the program descriptions. He moved that the Committee recommend Board approval on the assumption it would be reconsidered if the required cutbacks were other than one-half of the original target of 2+2.

President Byrne said the assessment of the entire issue at Oregon State University was that it was not strictly a budgetary matter but also an issue of program reduction. Some things would not be reduced if additional funds were received. Additional budget cuts would force further program reductions.

Mr. Hensley commended President Byrne for leadership in managing the institution. As advocates for higher education, Board members do not like to cut programs, but he said from a realistic standpoint he wanted to compliment Oregon State and the other institutions for their initiative in making the necessary changes.
Mr. Miller asked President Byrne to comment on the statement that the operating budget for administrative services would include a reduction of $850,000 normally available to the administration from energy savings. The amount has traditionally been used for critical university needs, such as building repairs, and will now be directed to alleviate cuts to academic programs. Mr. Miller said this concerned him in terms of maintaining the physical plant. He also asked the reason the $10 microcomputing tuition fee would no longer be collected.

President Byrne said it was understood when the additional fee for computing was introduced that it would be included in the tuition increase this year. The institution will no longer have that special fee, but a certain amount of the added tuition money will go toward computing.

President Byrne said he shared Mr. Miller's concern about facilities. However, in view of the magnitude of this effort, some potential savings were incorporated into the creation of the budget to soften the impact on academic programs. He said his priorities included building maintenance, replacement of obsolete instructional equipment, additions to the library for space and collections, additional computing, and faculty salaries.

Mr. Bruggere inquired whether he understood correctly that some of these programs would be reinstated if additional money were provided by the Legislature in the future.

President Byrne said the program reductions before the Committee were the result of an attempt to restructure the academic elements of the University. Although they are very painful at this point and have been motivated by the budgetary reduction, they also represent an opportunity to consider ways to do things better or more effectively by reorganization. Also, as part of a very intensive effort with the academic leadership at Oregon State, some ways have been identified to make reductions that perhaps would be put back if additional funds were available.

Mr. Bruggere said he would not like to take actions which affect people's lives by acting a month too soon during a time when there is some uncertainty about the money. If programs were deleted and later restored as a result of additional money, it could have a major emotional impact on those persons whose jobs were affected.

The Chancellor said this was unlikely to happen unless the State System had really enormous good fortune beyond what it had any reason to anticipate.
Mr. Hensley stated it was his impression from conversations with President Byrne and Dr. Spanier that the proposals had received consideration at various levels of discussion and all of the players had ample opportunity to be involved in the process. The impact on people was a primary consideration.

The Chancellor and President Byrne described the budgetary reductions as part of an ongoing process of reallocation which started several months ago. The general process was described briefly. The Chancellor said the process placed the State System in a very good position, if the resource situation improved, to know where future funds should be placed for the most advantageous and highest priority purposes.

The Chancellor said that in discussing cuts at all of the institutions it was not a question of cutting undesirable, unnecessary or superfluous offerings. The choices are among highly competitive good things. It is important for everyone to understand programs may still be cut even though they are well run, necessary, good for the State of Oregon, serve people well, or provide important services.

In response to a question from Mr. Miller as to the extent of the non-campus input into the budgetary reduction process, President Byrne said it had been more general than specific and described some of the outreach efforts.

Mr. Miller suggested it might be a good base to contact more specifically as a means of increasing communication about the entire State System.

Mr. Dodson commended President Byrne for presenting this kind of a proposal. It is a true test of leadership for all of the presidents to propose the cuts that are being required.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendations with the addition presented in the motion by Mr. Adams.

**Board Discussion and Action**

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

Construction of the University of Oregon’s science complex is making rapid progress. Two new facilities should be ready for occupancy by summer’s end. University President Paul Olum appointed a committee to propose names for the various new and existing science buildings and, after working with the Faculty Advisory Council and the Council of Deans, has recommended that committee’s proposals to the Board for approval. The recommendation of the University takes account of the fact that the buildings may not always be devoted to the science curriculum and recognizes that the Board may wish to change the names of one or more of the facilities to honor meritorious individuals at some future time.

The University of Oregon is recommending that the Board of Higher Education officially name the following buildings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT BUILDING DESIGNATION</th>
<th>PROPOSED NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science I (existing)</td>
<td>Pacific Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science II (existing)</td>
<td>Klamath Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science IV-A (new)</td>
<td>Deschutes Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science V (new)</td>
<td>Willamette Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science VI (new)</td>
<td>Cascade Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology (existing)</td>
<td>Columbia Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Wing (existing)</td>
<td>Onyx Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Annex and former Museum of Natural History (existing)</td>
<td>Cascade Annex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the names (except Onyx Bridge which is named after the adjacent street) have a strong Northwest/Oregon flavor and will evoke positive images even if they never are changed. One building, Science IV-B, is not slated for naming at this time since the Board recently named it in honor of prominent University of Oregon scientist, George Streisinger.

Staff Report to the Committee

The staff recommends that the University of Oregon science complex buildings be named in accordance with the suggestions of the University. The University is prepared to present further information and orientation in order to assist the Committee and the Board to understand which buildings will bear which names.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. John Moseley, Vice President for Research at the University of Oregon, presented a model of the science complex and indicated the designated buildings. He also indicated a tour of the buildings would be included in the Board visitation in November.
The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Increase in Other Funds Limitation and Article XI-F(1) Bonds, SOSC

Staff Report to the Committee

The 1987 Legislative Assembly established a project to add space to the Stevenson Union at Southern Oregon State College and set a limitation of $1,560,000. A like amount of Article XI-F(1) bonds was authorized. These bonds were sold and the addition, including the relocation into one place of all student-related retail activities and the bookstore, was designed.

The college and the architect worked hard to keep the costs of the needed improvements within the $1,560,000 limitation. However, despite their best efforts, all bids exceeded the amount allotted for the construction phase of the project. Since the addition involves the bookstore, it is essential that its opening occur at least one month before the beginning of a fall term. The current schedule calls for occupancy in late summer 1990. Recent bids for construction of many OSSHE facilities have exceeded estimates and have caused redesign and rebidding in several instances (e.g., PSU Millar Library, OHSU Casey Eye Center, SOSC Computer Science Building). However, due to the already spartan design and the need to occupy in the summertime, Southern Oregon State College officials believe that a redesign and rebidding strategy would not afford them an adequate facility. Further, the bidding climate is such that even this effort cannot guarantee that bids will come in within budget.

Consequently, Southern Oregon State College has requested that the Other Funds limitation for the Stevenson Union be increased by the amount necessary to allow the award of a construction contract ($283,850) and that the increase be paid for with Article XI-F(1) bonds.

Because the authority to issue bonds can be granted only by the Legislative Assembly during its session, the staff sought from the Board’s Executive Committee approval of the limitation and bond increases immediately in order not to miss Assembly budget cut-off dates. The Executive Committee concurred in this request.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board ratify the authorization of the Executive Committee to seek an increase in the Other Funds limitation for the Stevenson Union Addition project of $283,850 and the increase in Article XI-F(1) bonding authority necessary to provide that amount of project funds. Further, the staff recommended that it be authorized to seek the approval of the Legislative Assembly to expend funds on the construction of this project so that a contract can be awarded.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Johnston inquired whether this would rearrange priorities or eliminate some other project on the list because extra funds would be required.

Mr. Lemman indicated it would not if the Legislative Assembly adopted the building fee as recommended by the Board. The contingency plan for the priorities in the event the fee is not adopted would be the rehabilitation of these two buildings followed by new construction. The necessary reduction would come from the bottom of the Board's priority list.

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

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

As part of the Patient Parking Structure recently erected at the Oregon Health Sciences University a number of traffic improvements were made at S. W. Sam Jackson Park Road, including widening of the road to provide a left turn lane into the Hospital and Outpatient Building area for downhill traffic.

A requirement, as part of these improvements, is the provision of an area for a bus stop and an adjacent sidewalk. The Bargain and Sale Deed would convey to the City of Portland an arc segment with a chord length of about 70 feet and a maximum depth of about 7 feet for the location of the bus stop. The easement, which would provide for the location of a sidewalk adjacent to the bus stop, is about 150 feet in length with an irregular shape up to 9.3 feet deep, following the curve of the road and the adjacent retaining walls on the north side of the sidewalk.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the appropriate Board officers be authorized to execute both the Bargain and Sale Deed and the easement to the City of Portland for parcels of land adjacent to the recently erected Parking Structure for the location of a bus stop and an adjacent sidewalk on the Oregon Health Sciences University campus.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

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

Repeal of OAR 580–50–027,
Affirmative Action Goals;
& Adoption of
OAR 580–50–028,
Affirmative Action Requirements

Staff Report to the Committee

For several years, the Board of Higher Education has had in effect affirmative action requirements for bidders on public improvement contracts approved by the Board. In November 1988, a decision of the United States District Court cast doubt upon the constitutionality of the Board’s existing rule, OAR 580–50–027. Accordingly, at its December 9, 1988, meeting, the Board suspended that rule and adopted a temporary rule in its place. Since that time, the United States Supreme Court has issued rulings making it even more difficult to assert the constitutionality of the existing rule. However, the temporary rule, OAR 580–50–028, is permissible under the Court’s opinion.

The temporary rule, as well as the suspension of the probably unconstitutional rule, expired June 9, 1989. Therefore, in order to permit the Board’s staff to award contracts with affirmative action requirements, as required by CRS Chapter 200, but which will withstand constitutional attack, the Board must act at this meeting to repeal OAR 580–50–027, Affirmative Action Goals, and to make permanent OAR 580–50–028, Affirmative Action Requirements. Meanwhile, Board’s staff and other agency representatives are working to develop the foundations for an even stronger, but legally acceptable, affirmative action rule applicable to public improvement contracts. Staff will propose amendments to strengthen this rule by the September Board meeting.
A public hearing on the proposed repeal of OAR 580-50-027 and the proposed adoption of OAR 580-50-028 will be held June 15, 1989, at 9:00 a.m. Staff will report comments received at the hearing to the Board when this item is considered.

Proposed Rule

580-50-028, Affirmative Action Requirements

(1) The successful bidder for a public improvement project approved by the Board of Higher Education shall have made good faith efforts to subcontract to, or obtain materials to be used in performing the contract from, minority, disadvantaged, and women business enterprises.

(2) Performing all of the following actions by a bidder constitutes a rebuttable presumption that the bidder has made a good faith effort to satisfy the subcontracting requirement described in subsection (1) of this section:

(a) The bidder attended any presolicitation or prebid meetings that were scheduled by the contracting agency to inform disadvantaged, minority, or women business enterprises of contracting and subcontracting or material supply opportunities available on the project.

(b) The bidder identified and selected specific economically feasible units of the project to be performed by disadvantaged, minority, or women business enterprises in order to increase the likelihood of participation by such enterprises;

(c) The bidder advertised in general circulation, trade association, minority, and trade oriented, women-focus publications, if any, concerning the subcontracting or material supply opportunities;

(d) The bidder provided written notice to a reasonable number of specific disadvantaged, minority, or women business enterprises, identified from a list of certified disadvantaged, minority, and women business enterprises provided or maintained by the Executive Department for the selected subcontracting or material supply work in sufficient time to allow the enterprises to participate effectively;

(e) The bidder followed up initial solicitations of interest by contacting the enterprises to determine with certainty whether the enterprises were interested;
(f) The bidder provided interested disadvantaged, minority, and women business enterprises with adequate information about the plans, specifications, and requirements for the selected subcontracting or material supply work;

(g) The bidder negotiated in good faith with the enterprises, and did not, without justifiable reason, reject minority, or women business enterprises;

(h) Where applicable, the bidder advised and made efforts to assist interested disadvantaged, minority, and women business enterprises in obtaining bonding, lines of credit, or insurance required by the contracting agency or contractor; and

(i) The bidder used the services or minority community organizations, minority contractor groups, state, and federal minority business assistance offices and other organizations identified by the Advocate for Minority and Women Business that provide assistance in the recruitment and placement of disadvantaged, minority, or women business enterprises.

(3) For purposes of this rule, minority, disadvantaged, and women business enterprises are those certified as such by the Executive Department. The Executive Vice Chancellor or designee shall decide, if necessary, whether good faith efforts have been made, pursuant to the criteria of subparagraph (2) of this rule.

(4) The Board will evaluate annually the effects of this rule, and to this end its staff shall report to the Board at its February meeting.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended the Board repeal OAR 580–50–027, Affirmative Action Goals, and adopt the proposed rule, OAR 580–50–028, Affirmative Action Requirements, pursuant to ORS Chapters 200 and 351.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Ms. Melinda Grier presented the staff report and then requested Mr. George Pernsteiner to summarize testimony from the public hearing held earlier on the proposed rule.

Mr. Pernsteiner said Ms. Debra O'Gara, a representative from the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, had testified at the hearing. She stated that while certain sections of the proposed rule were desirable, the one that eliminated goals was not.
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She suggested strongly the Board reconsider the imposition of goals. This testimony will be considered in preparing a new permanent rule for presentation to the Board in September.

Mr. Parmsteiner indicated the staff was working now with the Governor's Minority Business Task Force. The outcome of two pieces of proposed legislation now before the Legislature will also be considered in drafting the permanent rule. The recommendation before the Board is designed to make permanent the temporary rule adopted previously pending development of the new permanent rule to be presented in September.

In response to a question concerning the number of projects which might be bid prior to September, Mr. Parmsteiner said probably about 60, most of which would be reasonably small. Perhaps two major projects would occur during that time.

Mr. Alltucker said there is a very narrow legal line between setting quotas and setting goals. He said he believed language could be chosen that would meet the spirit of the law and still protect the State System from being sued by either the low or the second bidder. At the present time, there is that risk.

Mr. Richardson complimented the staff for the excellent job done in dealing with a very difficult issue. He suggested changing the word "or" to "and" in three places in the proposed rule to give a clearer message that the focus is on all three groups. The change was satisfactory to the Committee and has been incorporated in the rule shown above.

Mr. Dodson commented that sometimes the rules were not nearly as important as the spirit in which the rules are implemented. He suggested that periodically a telephone call to minority or other contractors would be beneficial to make certain they would be present at the appropriate meetings.

Mr. Hensley added that he had received excellent reports about Mr. Parmsteiner's attitude and response to the minority community and urged him to continue with his approach and policy.

Mr. Alltucker said the law requires that extra efforts be made to seek and find appropriate contractors. The only thing that is illegal is setting a quota. The legal problem results when an otherwise qualified low bidder is rejected simply because the contractor does not have the specified number and ignore the extra effort which may have been made to find the right people.

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

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and on roll call vote repealed OAR 580-50-027, Affirmative Action Goals, and adopted OAR 580-50-028, Affirmative Action Requirements. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Holwerda, Johnston, Miller, Richardson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Amendment of OAR 580-21-305, Timely Notice

OAR 580-21-305(1), Timely Notice, requires institutions to provide notice to academic staff members on annual tenure if their appointments are not to be renewed for reasons other than for cause or financial exigency. Annual tenure applies to persons in "tenure track positions," i.e., those whom an institution expects, after an appropriate probationary period, to evaluate and consider for appointment to indefinite tenure. The length of the notice to be given varies according to the years of service of the employee. Staff has become aware that the current language in the Board's Administrative Rule regarding timely notice does not clearly explain the Board's policy.

Prior to the Board's April meeting, a public hearing was held as part of the rulemaking process on proposed amendments to clarify the rule. Although institution administrators supported the original amendments, faculty comments were strongly opposed to the interpretation which the proposed rule clarified. Staff proposed withdrawing the rule to allow time for developing a compromise recommendation. Institution administrators, faculty groups, and individual faculty members proposed alternatives. Board's staff sought input on these alternatives from faculty groups and institution staff. While no single proposal was the preference of all queried, the amendment proposed, while different from the original intent of the rule, has broad support.

Under the proposed amendment, institutions could give timely notice to faculty members in the first year of an annual tenure track appointment only at least three months prior to the expiration of the current contract, March 15 for a typical 9-month contract which expires June 15. Likewise, institutions could give timely notice to faculty members in the second year of an annual tenure track appointment only at least six months prior to the expiration of the current contract, December 15 for a typical 9-month contract which expires June 15. If notice were given to faculty members who are in the first or second year of annual tenure appointments after the dates required in the rule, they would receive twelve-months' notice of non-renewal. Thereafter, in the third or subsequent years' appointments, faculty members would receive twelve-months' notice of non-renewal which could be given at any time during the contract.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board adopt the following amendments:

Timely Notice

580-21-305(1) If any appointment of a full-time academic staff member who is on an annual tenure appointment as defined in rule 580-21-100(1)(b)(A) is not to be [terminated] renewed for reasons other than for cause or financial exigency, timely notice of [termination] non-renewal shall be given in writing as follows: during the first annual appointment, by March 15 for those whose contracts expire June 15 or at least three months’ notice given prior to expiration of the appointment; during the second year of service, by December 15 for those whose contracts expire on June 15 or at least six months given before expiration of the appointment [thereafter]; in the third and subsequent years, at least twelve months’ notice [before expiration of the appointment] which may be given at any time. In the event that notice is given to faculty members who are in the first or second year of an annual tenure appointment after the prescribed deadline, they shall also receive twelve months’ notice of non-renewal.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Hensley received indications of agreement from representatives of faculty groups in the audience.

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and adopted the proposed amendments to OAR 580-21-305, Timely Notice. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Holwerda, Johnston, Miller, Richardson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Amendments to Board’s Bylaws

Staff Report to the Board

Article III of the Bylaws of the Board of Higher Education contains several references to the Oregon Revised Statutes which are no longer accurate citations, either as a result of statutory
changes or renumbering. The following amendments to the Bylaws would correct the citations:

**Article III. Section 2 B**

Representatives of the news media shall be allowed to attend executive sessions other than those executive sessions held under the authority of [ORS 192.660(3)(e)] ORS 192.660(1)(d) and (2) relating to labor negotiations. The Board may require that specified information which is considered in an executive session not be disclosed.

**Article III. Section 2 A**

During a duly-called meeting, on the call of the Board president, the Board may meet in executive session to consider matters set out in [ORS 192.660(4)] ORS 192.660(1).

**Article III. Section 2 C**

Prior to meeting in an executive session during a duly-called meeting, the Board president shall identify the authorization under [ORS 192.660 to 192.670] ORS 192.660 for the holding of the executive session.

**Article III. Section 2 F**

The Board may limit the minutes of executive sessions [to material the disclosure of which is not inconsistent with ORS 192.660] as provided by ORS 192.650(2).

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

The staff recommended that the Board adopt the proposed amendments as presented above.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented and on roll call vote the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Holwerda, Johnston, Miller, Richardson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

**Interdisciplinary Center for Ethics in Health Care, OHSU**

**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 Kolter, 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. Zanville 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 (May 19, 1989)

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.

Board Discussion and Action (June 15, 1989)

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

M.S. Degree
in Computer
Science, PSU

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 program at the master’s level, it would be very hard to recruit top quality faculty. The program will be operated in a cooperative mode with the other public and private institutions in the state.

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 was 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, "FSU'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 OCATE, verified the need for graduates in computer science areas at all levels. He commented on the distinction between efforts with the OCATE programs and the general need for computer science within the metropolitan area. The OCATE programs focus on the high technology industry. He commended the institutions for the cooperation given to OCATE and particularly noted the contributions of Dr. Shapiro. However, there are still many people whose needs are not covered through OCATE. 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 OGATE 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 (May 19, 1989)

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 reinforces 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.

Board Discussion and Action (June 15, 1989)

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

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 Gurtov, 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. Gurtov 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 (May 19, 1989)

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.
Board Discussion and Action (June 15, 1989)

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

Sale of Monkhouse Property, BOSC

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. Fernsteiner 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 (May 19, 1989)

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

Board Discussion and Action (June 15, 1989)

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

Revision of Campus Boundaries & Authorization To Dispose of Surplus Property, WOSC

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 recommendations as presented, with the understanding the item would be placed on the consent agenda for the June Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (May 19, 1989)

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

Board Discussion and Action (June 15, 1989)

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

Further Consideration, Lease of Whiskey Creek Fish Hatchery to Tillamook Anglers, Inc., OSU

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. Pernsteiner 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 (May 19, 1989)**

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

**Board Discussion and Action (June 15, 1989)**

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

**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 (May 19, 1989)**

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

**Board Discussion and Action (June 15, 1989)**

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

**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 bikepath 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 (May 19, 1989)

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

Board Discussion and Action (June 15, 1989)

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

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES DIVISION ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

Staff Report to the Board

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

Contracts for Professional Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Financial Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Housing, SOSC</td>
<td>An Agreement was negotiated with James A. McNamara, Ashland, for engineering services not to exceed $5,000. Financing will be provided from Article XI-F(1) Bond Proceeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Housing, SOSC</td>
<td>An Agreement was negotiated with Professional Service Industries, Inc., Eugene, for engineering services not to exceed $4,500. Financing will be provided from Article XI-F(1) Bond Proceeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson Union Addition, SOSC</td>
<td>An Agreement was negotiated with James A. McNamara, Ashland, for engineering services not to exceed $2,500. Financing will be provided from Article XI-F(1) Bond Proceeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services, UO</td>
<td>An Agreement was negotiated with Soderstrom Architects, Portland, for architectural services not to exceed $25,000. Financing will be provided from state funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure, UO</td>
<td>An Agreement was negotiated with Professional Service Industries, Inc., Eugene, for engineering services not to exceed $2,000. Financing will be provided from parking reserve funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Campus Plan, OHSU</td>
<td>An Agreement was negotiated with L. Rudolph Barton, Portland, for consulting services not to exceed $4,000. Financing will be provided from state funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Awards of Construction Contracts

Food Toxicology & Nutrition Lab, Phase II, OSU

On May 1, 1989, Wayne Anderson Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $41,590. Financing is provided from general funds and federal funds.

Autzen Stadium Improvements, Len Casanova Center Shell, UO

On May 22, 1989, John Ryland Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $1,013,892. Financing is provided from Article XI-F(1) Bond Proceeds.

Steam Trap Replacement & Monitoring System, UO

On May 22, 1989, Harvey & Price Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $88,470. Financing is provided from general funds.

Project Acceptances

Accessibility—Removal of Barriers to Handicapped (Hendricks Hall), UO

This project is complete and was accepted on May 12, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $161,089. Financing was provided from state funds.

Dental School Elevator Modernization Project, OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on March 27, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $221,186. Financing was provided from Capital Repair Funds.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Johnston reported that he and Ms. Wilson had attended the Board/Institutional liaison committee visitation to Southern Oregon State College. They saw the Medford Center and had a productive meeting with both students and faculty. Students were concerned with the issues of infrastructure support, the effects of the enrollment cap, state support for the art department. The faculty members were concerned with issues related to HB 3038, SB 879, and SB 618, plus discrepancies in the appendices of a report from the State System office. There was discussion about the Portland State University study and various other issues.
Ms. Wilson said one issue that was raised was housing as it related to attracting faculty. Housing is a major problem in Ashland due to the attractiveness of the area. The Board might want to look at that particular issue in the future as part of a package in attracting faculty to Southern Oregon.

Mr. Hensley commented that housing was very critical in Ashland. The city is experiencing a tremendous real estate boom. Values are running perhaps 25-30% more than the Medford area. Ashland is a seller's market and very costly to students and difficult for faculty.

Ms. Wilson indicated she had been very impressed with Southern Oregon State College and with the community support for the institution. She said the fine arts program was an excellent program and she had enjoyed her visit very much.

Mr. Johnston also mentioned the meetings with community members and stated they were very supportive of Southern.

Several of the Board members reported briefly on their appearances at the various Commencement exercises. Brief tributes and farewells were also expressed for the retiring Board members and for President Olin.

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Mr. Hensley thanked Board members for serving as representatives at the Commencement exercises, stating he considered it as one of the most rewarding experiences one had as a Board member.

**Next Meeting Dates**

The next regular meeting of the Board will be held at Portland State University on July 21, 1989. He also announced a Board Retreat to be held in Eugene on August 2 and 3, 1989. The presidents will be asked to participate in the sessions on August 2.

On September 7 and 8, 1989, there will be meetings of the Board in regular session, a joint meeting required by statute with the Board of Education, and joint sessions on the 7th and 8th with the Board of Education and the Economic Development Commission. Further details will be provided later.

Mr. Hensley concluded by thanking the retiring Board members for their contributions to the State System and for the pleasure of having them as friends during their period of service. He said he hoped they would continue to follow the Board's endeavors.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

The Secretary reported a letter had been received from Mr. Dale Fischer, President of Farwest Steel, in which he reiterated some concerns expressed previously about the Riverfront Research Park in terms of noise and vibrations. He stated he supported the project but questioned its location. Copies were to be provided to the Board.
ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Hensley requested Mr. Richardson, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, to present the Committee's report with respect to Board officers for 1989-90.

Mr. Richardson said the committee, which also included Ms. Wilson and Mr. Johnston, recommended the following individuals as Board officers for the coming year:

Richard F. Hensley, President
Mark S. Dodson, Vice President
Executive Committee Members—Robert Adams, Rob Miller, and George Richardson, Jr.

On motion by Mr. Richardson and second by Ms. Wilson, the above individuals were elected to the positions indicated. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Holwerda, Johnston, Miller, Richardson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

BOARD BREAKFAST

The Board met for breakfast prior to the meeting. They discussed the tentative schedule for the Board Retreat in August and heard reports of legislative progress. Board members were also asked to identify policy topics which they would like to explore for future meetings. One topic mentioned was that of quality versus quantity or access.

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

June 15, 1989