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November 16, 1989

Meeting #582

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

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m., November 16, 1989, by the President of the Board, Mr. Richard F. Hensley, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert Adams
Mr. Bob Bailey
Mr. Tom Bruggere
Mr. Mark Dodson
Mr. Gary Johnston

Miss Annette Matthews
Mr. Rob Miller
Mr. Leslie Swanson, Jr.
Ms. Janice Wilson
Mr. Richard Hensley

Absent: Director Richardson was out of the state.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities—Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Secretary Wilma Foster; W. T. Leman, Executive Vice Chancellor; Dick Hill, Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Jim Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies; George Pernsteiner, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; R. S. Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administration and Information Systems Services; Steve Katz, Controller; Kay Juran, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services; Roger Olsen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Virginia Boushey, Gary Christensen, and James Payne, Assistant Vice Chancellors, Academic Affairs; Virginia Thompson, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor; Barbara Barrie, Personnel Officer; 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; Gary Tiedeman, President, Faculty Senate; Mike Martin, President-elect, Faculty Senate.

University of Oregon—President Myles Brand; Norman Wessells, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration; Maury Holland, Dean, Law School.
Oregon Health Sciences University—President Peter Kohler; David Witter, Vice President, Administration; Lesley Hallick, Vice President, Academic Affairs; Margaret Berroth, Professor and IFS representative; W. C. Neland, Associate Vice President, Administration; Lois Davis, Director, Government Relations.

Portland State University—Interim President Roger Edgington; Frank Martino, Provost; Gary Powell, Acting Vice President, Finance and Administration; Eugene Enneking, Professor and IFS representative.

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

Oregon Institute of Technology—President Larry Blake; John Smith, Dean of Administration; Chris Eismann, Dean of Academic Affairs; Herb Jolliff, Professor and IFS representative.

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

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

Others—Lisa Horowitz, Organizing Director, OSPIRG; Gloria Warner, Portland; Lynn Pinckney, Executive Director, and Kate Menard, Executive Assistant, Oregon Student Lobby; Dale Hess, Policy Analyst, Office of Educational Policy and Planning; Gary Conkling, Director, Public Affairs, Tektronix, Inc.; Tom McClellan, Budget Analyst, Executive Department; Sue Acuff, Analyst, Legislative Fiscal Office.

MINUTES
APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on October 20, 1989, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR’S
REPORT

W. T. Lemman,
Announcement of Retirement

The Chancellor reported that Mr. Lemman had announced earlier in the month his intention of retiring in 1990, probably in late summer. He stated Mr. Lemman had served the State System for 40 years and he had found Mr. Lemman to be an extraordinarily helpful ally, colleague, and friend during his association with him. He said he would begin as quickly as possible to seek a reasonable successor to fill the very, very large role which Mr. Lemman played.
Attendance of IFS Representatives

The Chancellor said this was the first meeting at which a new element would be added to the Board's processes. In both of the Board's Committees, members of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate were in attendance as part of an effort to increase communication between Board members and faculty. He introduced the representatives who were in attendance.

Governor's Commission on Higher Education in the Portland Area

The Chancellor indicated the Governor's Commission on Higher Education in the Portland Metropolitan Area had made it very clear its first priority was to determine the needs, be clear on what exists, and to identify problems before it begins to address the issues of structure and organization. The Chancellor said his personal concern was that people not become polarized about particular proposals or issues at this point. The critical thing is to let the commission proceed with trying to identify the problems that are to be solved. The Chancellor stated inevitably there would be a great deal of tension and concern at many points during the next several months.

The Chancellor said his own strong commitment was to support the commission's following its processes as an essential effort in devising a rational process to plan for the future. The alternative is to deal with a series of ad hoc and necessarily unrelated decisions.

Advisory Groups

The Chancellor indicated the five advisory groups had all held two or three meetings and the work in each group is beginning to be more focused. This is a basis for optimism that the February reports from the groups will be extremely useful in formulating the plans and proposals which will be needed both for short-term purposes related to the next session of the Legislature and for establishing longer-term goals.

The Chancellor expressed his personal appreciation to all who had been involved in rearranging schedules and adding the extra burden of work required to accomplish some rather immediate and crucial planning processes.

Enrollment Management

The fall term fourth-week headcount and FTE enrollment reveals that there has been some success in the first attempt at enrollment management. The net result is an overall decline of about 2.6% in enrollment, with a student headcount of 63,260. This decline is in keeping with the decision to encourage campuses to reduce enrollments toward Fall 1990 to a level at which the number of students will match the funding allocations coming to the State System from the state. The Chancellor urged continuation of the program. Presumably, next fall the enrollment then would be about 61,500 and that would become a holding point, depending, of course, on future funding. The Chancellor indicated it was agreed in the Presidents' Council to develop a new and systematic statement of what is being done and how to proceed.
The Chancellor reported that the WICHE relationships and administration had been moved from directly in the Chancellor’s Office to that of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. He recommended that Ms. Virginia Boushey, who was recently named Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, be appointed WICHE certifying officer dealing with WICHE policy issues.

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

The Chancellor said President Kohler had requested establishment of a new position of Vice President for Development and Public Affairs at the Oregon Health Sciences University. The position will be part of the president’s cabinet and have responsibility for the organization, direction, and management of the institution’s comprehensive public relations and development programs. This would include supervision of development, of alumni, governmental relations, communications, special events, community relations, and functioning as the spokesperson on matters of public information and development.

The Chancellor recommended that the Board approve the establishment of the position as requested.

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

The Chancellor said from time to time questions arose on matters relating to presidential housing on the various campuses. These can be a source of considerable embarrassment to a campus president who is charged with the responsibility of taking care of his or her own residence. At times, the responsibility can become a symbolic and political issue. The Chancellor suggested that the best solution seemed to be to treat presidential housing as part of the stewardship of the State System, a responsibility of the Board.

The Chancellor requested the President of the Board to appoint a committee of the Board to oversee the maintenance of presidential housing on the State System’s campuses.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Hensley appointed the following Board members to the presidential housing review committee: Mr. Adams, chairman; Miss Matthews and Mr. Swanson.
The Chancellor said alternate meetings of the Board would include discussion and orientation on a topic without focusing on a decision. He requested Mr. Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services, to report on the State System’s SAT Policy and Use.

Mr. Christensen introduced the report by indicating there were many misconceptions about the SAT and its use. He then presented the following information to the Board:

I. WHAT IS THE SAT?

A. The Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) is a 2-1/2 hour, multiple-choice test that measures generally developed verbal and mathematical reasoning abilities related to successful performance in college. It includes: (1) separate verbal and math test sections; (2) a Test of Standard Written English called "TSWE"; and (3) a Student Descriptive Questionnaire called the "SDQ." The test scores range from 200 to 800 for the verbal and math tests and from 20 to 60 for the TSWE. The SAT score as commonly understood and referred to is a total of the verbal and math scores; the TSWE is not included in this total.

B. In specific, more technical terms, the SAT is a standardized, norm-referenced test that correlates with, and therefore helps to predict, first-year college grades. For this very limited and narrow purpose only, it is considered to be a valid and reliable test.

C. In a very general, but strictly limited and historical sense, the SAT does serve the purpose of showing how well college-bound students over time have performed the general verbal and mathematical reasoning abilities measured by the test.

D. The verbal and math scores are commonly used — in addition to a number of other academic and personal factors — by colleges to compare the abilities of and to admit prospective students.

E. The TSWE is most always used to place students in college writing courses.

F. By voluntarily completing the SDQ, the student becomes part of the College Board’s Student Search Service and a nationwide pool of college-bound students in excess of 2,330,000. Names from this pool are sold to colleges to use for recruiting, and students use the SDQ to learn more about and be recruited by colleges.
G. The Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT) is a different college aptitude testing program and usually taken by students in the junior year to "warm-up" for the SAT and to enhance their opportunity to compete for all scholarships offered by colleges. This is the test used to determine "National Merit Scholarship" winners each year.

H. In sum, then, the SAT in total is a body of extensive academic and personal information about college-bound students nationwide that is used by colleges for marketing, recruiting, admitting, advising and placement, and managing. The American College Testing Program (ACT) provides similar information and services to colleges.

II. WHAT THE SAT IS NOT.

A. The SAT is not the only or best predictor of freshman college grades, nor is it the most important factor in evaluating the quality of applicants for admission. First, the high school grade point average, as a single academic factor, is a better predictor of freshman grades; however, when the high school GPA is combined with the SAT, a slightly better prediction of grades is achieved. Second, the most important factors in determining success in both admission to and performance in college are: quality of academic courses taken in high school, the grades in those courses, rank in class, activities in high school and community, and a wide range of personal characteristics.

B. The SAT alone is not a valid or sufficient measure of an individual's overall educational development and achievement or the academic and personal qualities needed to succeed in college. College admissions officers generally consider an applicant with a low high school GPA and high SAT score to be a high risk. Conversely, an applicant with average or even considerably below average SAT scores can be considered an excellent college prospect because of a number of personal and historical academic characteristics and achievements.

More specifically, in the study of State System freshman academic performance, some categories of students have scored considerably below White males, the highest scoring SAT group, but still recorded higher freshman grade averages. In 1988-89, for example, Asians, Hispanics, and Women all compiled higher freshman grade averages than White males.
C. The SAT alone is not a valid or good measure of the educational quality of a high school or the educational quality of a state or the nation. In a strict educational sense, to use a single academic factor such as the SAT score to evaluate the quality or indicate the success or failure of an individual or educational program is not good professional practice.

D. The College Board has repeatedly cautioned test users and takers over the years to keep in mind that the SAT test score is only one of many factors to be considered in the college admission and scholarship awarding process.

III. The section on State System SAT Policy and Use covered admissions, advising and course placement, scholarship selection, recruiting, and academic research and reporting.

IV. The section on State System Profile of SAT Scores and Use covered Score Averages and Ranges Systemwide, and by Institution, Gender, and Ethnic/Racial Group.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

A. The SAT is a college aptitude test of very generally developed verbal and mathematical abilities. Most students applying for admission to the state colleges and universities must submit test scores as part of the admission process but are not required to meet a minimum test score standard. If a student meets the high school graduation, HS GPA, and subject requirement minimum standards, they can be admitted regardless of their test score results. Students who do not meet the minimum standards, however, may use the SAT and/or the Achievement tests to qualify for admission consideration. Thus State System admission policy utilizes the SAT and College Board Achievement Tests to extend, not limit, educational access.

B. State colleges and universities also may use the SAT and SDQ information available from the College Board to recruit students in and out of Oregon.

C. As an academic predictive factor, the SAT has a very limited validity and utility and should not be used alone and in isolation from other personal and academic factors that are more significant and important in making admission and scholarship decisions.
D. Some categories of students with SAT scores substantially below average have nonetheless recorded freshman grade averages that are above average.

E. Academic courses taken in high school, the high school grades, class rank, and activities, taken together, are a far better predictor of academic performance in college than the SAT.

F. There are many who believe that the SAT is "culturally biased" and discriminates against students on the basis of socio-economic status, gender, and ethnic/racial group. The College Board contends, however, that the problem is not the test, but the features of our culture and society that impede the best educational development of all students regardless of socio-economic status, gender, or ethnic/racial group.

Mr. Bruggere inquired whether other states and institutions used SAT scores similarly as inclusive rather than exclusive indicators.

Mr. Christensen said use was generally similar. The State of Washington uses a predictive college GPA for its state institutions. California uses the College Board Achievement Tests plus the high school GPA based on approved academic courses in high school. He stated the most important thing was that Oregon uses the SAT to improve educational access and opportunity, not to eliminate or exclude people.

Staff Report to the Board

The Oregon Health Sciences University is requesting that the Board establish a project to remodel existing offices in Baird Hall into research laboratories for the University’s Hematology and Oncology Department. These laboratories are needed to meet the growing requirements of conducting ongoing research activities. Further, this work will move the laboratories into the same building as the offices of the Hematology and Oncology Department.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that the Board concur with the request of the Oregon Health Sciences University and authorize the staff to seek the establishment of an Other Funds Limitation of $245,000 and the authorization to expend that amount for the construction of the hematology and oncology laboratories in 3030 and 3036 Baird Hall.
Board Discussion and Action (October 20, 1989)

The Board placed the request on the Consent Agenda for the November meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (November 16, 1989)

The Board approved the staff recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

The 1985 Legislative Assembly, in Chapter 640, Oregon Laws 1985, established an Other Funds Limitation of $2.1 million for the construction of a pedestrian bridge between University Hospital South and the Veterans’ Affairs Medical Center. The Department of Veterans’ Affairs will construct the bridge next year. In July 1989, the Board authorized an easement for the Veterans’ Administration to construct the bridge above Oregon Health Sciences University property.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that the Board concur with the request of the Oregon Health Sciences University and authorize the staff to seek authorization to expend up to $500,000 of Other Funds for the construction of elevators to link the University Hospital South, Parking Structure II, and the Veterans’ Administration Pedestrian Bridge. The staff further recommended that this approval be conditioned upon the construction of the elevators being at the sole option of the Oregon Health Sciences University and not of the Department of Veterans’ Affairs.

Board Discussion and Action (October 20, 1989)

The Board placed the request on the Consent Agenda for the November meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (November 16, 1989)

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

ORS 526.225 provides that the Board of Higher Education shall appoint a Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee composed of fifteen members, nine of whom are to be individuals who are actively and principally engaged in timber management on forest lands, harvesting, or processing of forest products; three of whom are to be individuals who are the heads of state and federal public forestry agencies; and three of whom are to be individuals from the public at large. Although the statute does not prescribe the terms of the committee members, the practice has been to make appointments for a period of three years. Those who are performing actively and effectively traditionally have been recommended for reappointment to a second three-year term, with all members replaced at the conclusion of a second term.

Carl Stoltenberg, Director of the Forest Research Laboratory, with the concurrence of President Byrne and Chancellor Bartlett, recommends the following appointments to replace individuals who are retiring or resigning from positions in the forest industry:

Appointment of Mr. D. Dean Bibles, Northwest Regional Director of the Bureau of Land Management, to replace Mr. C. W. Lusher. Mr. Bibles has served as BLM State Director in Arizona and received the Distinguished Service Award from President Reagan in 1988. The award is the federal government’s top award for distinguished executive service.

Appointment of Mr. Carl Ehlen, Resource Manager for all Georgia-Pacific Forest Land in the western states, to complete the unexpired term of Mr. Dewey Mobley. He is a graduate of the University of Washington and is highly respected in the forestry community of the northwest.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended the Board approve the above appointments to the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee.

Board Discussion and Action

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

President Hensley requested this report of Dr. Richard S. Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administrative and Information Systems Services, for presentation at the November Board meeting. The reason for the request is that many of the current Board members have not been informed about the planning and implementation of automated administrative and telecommunications systems which began in 1980. The information presented below is purposely brief. Detailed information will be provided in a supplementary publication which will be presented to Board members at a later date.

The Oregon State System of Higher Education’s (OSSHE’s) administrative information systems projects are a group of interrelated, closely coordinated administrative computing and telecommunications projects designed to provide the State System with a state-of-the-art technology infrastructure. It consists of a comprehensive collection of computer hardware, application software, data, and related services linked by a communications web supporting OSSHE’s voice, data, and image educational and management requirements. The major projects include the following:

* Upgrading and replacing 12 to 15 year-old data processing hardware, operated by Systems Support Services, OSSHE’s centralized administrative computing services unit, located on the Oregon State University campus.

The Board’s staff, following appropriate public notice, contracted with BULL HN Information Systems to purchase a DPS 8000/83R computer system.


* Assisting staff at institutions to enhance or replace administrative data processing computer hardware, implementing Systems and Computer Technology Corporation’s BANNER Student Information System application software and campus-based local area networks. The application software license was purchased following issuance of a Request for Proposal.

The Student Information System application software acquired from Systems and Computer Technology Corporation also included Oracle database management system software and, at 3 institutions (OSU, UO, PSU), the Periphonics Touchtone Voice Response System which permits registration by telephone. The
application software involves modules for grade recording, class scheduling, recruiting, admissions, registration, student billing, degree auditing, and general student information. The hardware platforms at the 7 institutions which have selected SCT applications software are as follows:

- University of Oregon, Digital Equipment Corporation
- Oregon State University, Control Data Corporation
- Portland State University, International Business Machines
- Southern Oregon State College, Digital Equipment Corporation
- Western Oregon State College, Digital Equipment Corporation
- Oregon Institute of Technology, Sequent Computer Systems
- Eastern Oregon State College, Bids being evaluated

Oregon Health Sciences University is considering options for application software.


* Installing a 28,000-line telephone system and associated digital backbone network on the eight campuses.

Following issuance of a Request for Proposal in 1988 which brought 12 responses from competing vendors, AT&T was selected and contracted with to provide System/85 Digital Switches on each campus, an AUDIX Voice Messaging System, and fiber and copper cabling. To date 3 institutions—Western Oregon State College, Oregon State University, and Portland State University—have installed new cabling and cut over to the new switches and telephone equipment. The cabling installation is well underway at the University of Oregon and Oregon Health Science University. Consulting services throughout the project are being provided over four years by JTM Associates of Atlanta, Georgia. The contract was entered into after first issuing a Request for Proposal. The consulting services provide for the writing of the specifications for the equipment, training of users, and monitoring of installations.

This equipment also is used to support interinstitutional instruction and research. The networks allow State System faculty, staff, and students to communicate with peers nationwide.
including the consultant fees, $20,822,862. Sources of
Funds—Centralized Activities operating budget and Certi-
ficates of Participation paying 5.25% interest over 11
years.

* Implementing a systemwide Student Reporting File which will
be maintained at Systems Support Services on OSSHE’s BULL
mainframe. The data which will be transmitted electronic-
ally by each institution to the data file will be used for
reporting within OSSHE and to state and federal agencies.

The Student Reporting File, consisting of software which
will accept student admissions, student enrollment, faculty
workload, and grade reporting data, is being developed in-
ternally by the systems and programming staff at Systems
Support Services because there are no products available in
the marketplace which will meet OSSHE’s needs. A consider-
able amount of the code in SCT’s Banner Student Information
System being acquired and implemented at seven institutions
may be used in developing the Student Reporting File. Ap-
proximately 200 data elements will be collected for use in
preparing management reports.

Began—1987. Anticipated completion—1990. Cost—not de-
determined. Sources of Funds—Centralized Activities operat-
ing budgets.

* Replacing systemwide financial information system (i.e.,
general accounting, accounts receivable, accounts payable,
purchasing) and human resources information system (i.e.,
payroll, personnel, and budget) application software.

The new software will replace 15 to 20 year old in-house-
developed software. Following issuance of a Request for
Proposal and evaluation of responses, OSSHE contracted with
SCT Corporation for its Banner Financial Information System.
The contract includes an option to license SCT’s Human Re-
sources Information System. The SCT contract also provides
training and implementation services.

Began—1987. Completion—FIS January 1991; HRIS (if ac-
Centralized Activities operating budget and Certificates of
Participation paying 6.0% over 6 years.

* Acquiring microcomputers and establishing local and wide-
area networks supporting systemwide protocol conversion,
terminal emulation, electronic mail, and file transfer
services to link all OSSHE institutions.

Oversight of OSHSHE's computing and telecommunications activities is the responsibility of the Division of Administrative and Information Systems Services, operating under the Office of Administration.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Bruggere commented that, due to the magnitude and cost of the project, it would be desirable for it to be a report item with an opportunity to ask questions and discuss the information.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Sale of Monkhouse Property, EOSC

Staff Report to the Board

On May 19, 1989, the Board authorized the staff to advertise property owned by Eastern Oregon State College. No bids were received at the time of the bid opening. Subsequently, the Board received an offer for $25,000, with 20% down upon closing and the balance payable at 10% interest in equal monthly installments over a period not to exceed ten (10) years. The offer was accepted, and the Board’s staff and legal counsel prepared a Land Sale contract and Bargain and Sale Deed, both of which will be executed by the Board President and Secretary.

The proceeds of the sale will be used for scholarships, as directed in the "Personal Representative’s Deed."

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Gift of Equipment & Related Costs from AT&T, OHSU

Staff Report to the Board

The Oregon Health Sciences University recently has received from the American Telephone and Telegraph Company (AT&T) equipment and related costs valued at $1,001,685. The gift includes: three large and one small ISDN Packet Switches; 15 remote concentrators; two 3B21000 minicomputers, and Starlan Work Stations, including fifty 286 microcomputers, 12 file servers, and 10 hubs. The value of these items is $946,685, including shipping, installation, and extended warranty for the first 12-month’s period.

In addition, the gift permits the purchase of twelve 386 microcomputers for the cost of six machines, a contribution valued at $55,000.
In accepting the gift, the University incurs an annual extended warranty maintenance obligation of $101,256, beginning in late 1990. The equipment is scheduled to arrive on the campus between October 23 and November 16, 1989.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES DIVISION ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

Staff Report to the Board

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

Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

Architectural Consulting Services, SOSC

An Agreement was negotiated with Abeloe/Breeden AIA Architects, architects, Medford, for consulting services not to exceed $20,000. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Broadcast Engineering Consulting, SOSC

An Agreement was negotiated with McClanathan & Associates, Inc., engineers, Portland, for engineering services not to exceed $7,500. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Steam & Chilled Water Privatization Project, OHSU

An Agreement was negotiated with Stone & Webster Management Consultants, Inc., consultants, Denver, Colorado, for consulting services not to exceed $133,596. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Awards of Construction Contracts

Parking Lot 24—1989 (Rebid), SOSC

On September 25, 1989, Pacific Paving was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $32,624. Financing will be provided from parking reserve funds.

Langton Hall Golf Shed Reroof, OSU

On October 25, 1989, Pacific Coast Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $33,500. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Trout Cancer Research Facility Addition, OSU

On October 9, 1989, Dale Ramsay Construction Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $261,032. Financing will be provided from state and gift funds.

Chilled Water Distribution Improvements, UO

On October 17, 1989, Lebanon Servco, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $604,141. Financing will be provided from state funds.
Willamette Hall (Science V) Phone & Data Cabling, UO

On October 16, 1989, Phones Plus was awarded a contract for the Science Facilities Additions & Alterations, Willamette Hall (Science V) Phone & Data Cabling Project in the amount of $35,474. Financing will be provided from federal funds.

University Inn Domestic Hot Water Preheating System, UO

On October 2, 1989, Professional Mechanical, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $16,830. Financing will be provided 50% from housing funds and 50% from federal funds.

Outpatient Clinic Building, 4th Floor Minor Surgery Suites & Lab, OHSU

On October 24, 1989, 2 KG Contractors was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $46,808. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Tower House Driveway Replacement (Rebid), OHSU

On October 23, 1989, Arris Corporation was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $39,450. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.

Acceptance of Projects

Administrative Services Building Expansion, OSU

This project is complete and was accepted on August 25, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $1,097,901.50. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

Graf Hall & Alterations, OSU

The Electrical & Computer Engineering Building—Related Alterations, Project #12, Graf Hall & Alterations is complete and was accepted on August 25, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $207,146. Financing was provided from state lottery funds.

Fish Disease Research Lab Phase II, OSU

This project is complete and was accepted on October 13, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $709,224.48. Financing was provided from federal funds.

Parking Lots & Streets Maintenance & Repair, OSU

This project is complete and was accepted on October 18, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $52,534.09. Financing was provided from parking reserve funds.

Powell Butte Shop Building (Central Oregon Experiment Station), OSU

This project is complete and was accepted on October 16, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $89,997.85. Financing was provided from state lottery funds.
This project is complete and was accepted on September 30, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $28,732. Financing was provided from state funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on March 31, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $28,546. Financing was provided from the Medical Research Foundation.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hensley inquired about the reason for selecting an out-of-state consulting firm for the steam and chilled water privatization project included in the above report.

Mr. Pernsteiner explained the item involved a study of the desirability and financial feasibility of contracting the utility systems and have them run privately by a regulated utility rather than by the Oregon Health Sciences University. The firm was selected because it had done a very similar project for the University of Texas system and was the only one that had done such a study for systems at both universities and hospitals.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

Portland State University requests authorization to further implement the Portland Teacher Plan (PTP). In November 1987, Portland State joined with the Portland Public Schools and Portland Community College to develop a plan to increase the number of minorities in the teaching profession. The resulting plan was completed in November 1988 and presented to the Board at its February 17, 1989, meeting. Materials describing the plan were distributed to Board members during the course of that presentation. (Given this earlier review, the details of the plan will not be provided in this summary).

While no Board action was requested at the February meeting, the Board responded favorably to the plan and encouraged its pursuit. It is now necessary for the Board to consider such action in order fully to implement the proposal.
Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed plan is fully consistent with Portland State University’s mission as described in the Board’s Strategic Plan 1987-93: "to provide excellent programs of teaching, research, and public service in Oregon’s major metropolitan area. . ." and specifically to "give special attention to the needs of its multicultural, minority, and nontraditional students."

2. Evidence of Need

Twenty-six percent of the enrollment in Portland public elementary/secondary schools is minority while minority teachers number only 11.2%. If Portland schools are to match the ratio of minority student groups expected in 1991-92, the following professional staff will be needed: 265 Black, 32 Hispanic, 127 Asian, and 45 American Indian.

Nationally, it is estimated that by the year 2000, fully 33 percent of the nation’s school-age children will be non-white. Yet the numbers of minority teachers in the national workforce are on the decline.

Portland Public School recruiters traveling nationwide are finding it is a "seller’s market" as the candidate pool shrinks. Immediate action must be taken to meet the growing needs in the Portland area for minority teachers. Yet at present in Oregon, an average of 12% of Blacks, 7% of Hispanics, and 6% of American Indians who enter the first grade will actually complete a bachelor’s degree, the prerequisite for most teachers.

3. Proposed Program

The purpose of the Portland Teacher Plan is to overcome the barriers that keep qualified minorities from entering the teaching profession. The Portland Teacher Plan is based on a number of strategies that have received broad support within the Portland community as well as within the three segments of the Portland educational system (K-12 education, community colleges, and four-year institutions):

. Within the general community, efforts have been initiated to inform minority students and their parents of the opportunities available in the teaching profession.
Within the public school system, students with the potential to become successful teachers are being identified and provided with both mentors and special programs designed to increase their interest in teaching.

Special programs have been designed for students entering Portland Community College who have been identified within the Portland Public School program. Portland Community College has waived tuition for students in the program, thereby removing an important financial obstacle facing many minority students.

Portland State University now requests that it be given the authority to waive tuition and mandatory fees for students who have successfully completed their Portland Community College experience and who are entering the final stages of their teacher preparation programs at the University.

Individuals who successfully complete the Portland Teacher Plan will be given priority consideration for assignment as a certificated teacher in Portland subject to identified vacancies within the candidate’s area of certification and professional qualifications.

The plan is being managed by an advisory committee representing diverse community and education interests. An executive committee representing the three primary agencies — Portland Public Schools, Portland Community College, and Portland State University — coordinates activities on a monthly basis. A program director coordinates activities and assists each agency’s staff in Portland Teacher Plan activities.

4. Resources to Support Program

Resources to support the Portland Teacher Plan at an annual budget of some $617,000 per year are being provided by a combination of federal and foundation grants, as well as support by each of the three major sponsors: Portland Public Schools, Portland Community College, and Portland State University. Resources have been identified in the areas of:

- Program Coordination, Planning and Development (staffing);

- Recruitment and Outreach (e.g., campus visits, special classes, tours and presentations, career fairs);
Personal Support Systems for FTP Students (e.g., Future Teacher Club, advisers, parent meetings, college orientation materials, motivational awards, and tutorial assistance);

Financial Incentives for Portland Teacher Plan Students (e.g., Portland Public School internship stipends, the Portland Community College tuition waivers, and Portland State University tuition waivers); and

New Curriculum and Instructional Services (e.g., software, early exposure seminars, test-taking skill instruction).

Portland State University is providing the majority of its share of resources to Portland Teacher Plan through existing resources (contributions of faculty, facilities, library). The present request is to permit the University to provide undergraduate tuition and fee waivers to students, as depicted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Term</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Estimated Cost*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989-90 Academic Year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$5,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter and Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91 Academic Year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92 Academic Year</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tuition and fees figured at $577 per term in 89-90, $620 in 90-91, and $655 in 91-92.

When fully operational, tuition and fee waivers provided by Portland State University would amount to some $60,000 per year for a maximum number of 30 students.

The University also proposes to provide stipends of approximately $4,000-5,000 (for a twelve-month period) to students who enroll in the new fifth-year teacher education program. These stipends are expected to be funded by contributions from the private sector.

Program Duplication

This is the only proposed program of this type in the State System or in Oregon. The program is a model of effective cooperation among the educational segments and holds excellent promise of providing a critically-needed new pool of minority teachers for Portland elementary and secondary schools.
Program Review

This program was reviewed preliminarily by the Board as part of a requested report on the Center for Urban Research in Education (CURE) on February 17, 1989. CURE was authorized by the 1987 Legislature to be a collaborative effort between Portland State University and the Portland Public School District. The early work of CURE focused on the growing need for additional minority teachers in the Portland schools. The Portland Teacher Plan was, therefore, developed to meet this need. The Board encouraged Portland State University to pursue its planning with Portland Public Schools as a result of its presentation.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

1. The staff recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to provide tuition and fee waivers for five students in the 1989-90 academic year, 15 in the 1990-91 academic year, and a maximum of 30 in the 1991-92 academic year.

2. The staff further recommended that Portland State University provide an annual progress report on the Portland Teacher Plan to the Board, with the first to be scheduled for October 1990, with reports to follow each October thereafter.

3. The staff recommended that the entire program be reviewed in 1994.

The recommendations should be discussed at the November meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for December.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Hill presented the staff report and recommendations and indicated Dean Everhart was available to respond to questions.

Dean Everhart reported that a $50,000 grant had been received from the Oregon Community Foundation to begin the programs. The grant will provide funds for hiring a director and a half-time staff person. Subsequent to the presentation of the program in February, a grant proposal also was submitted to the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education to begin the future teacher academy in the Portland School District. The proposal was funded, and two high schools and four middle schools will be involved as feeder schools.

Mr. Johnston asked whether this program was part of the minority proposal also presented to the Committee. Dr. Hill responded it fitted the general thrust of the earlier report but as an additional commitment requested from the Board for this particular program and these specific students.
Ms. Wilson said she considered it an excellent program and Portland State should be commended for the collaborative efforts which have been developed.

The Committee recommended that the Board consider the staff recommendations as presented and place the item on the Consent Agenda for December.

Board Discussion and Action (November 16, 1989)

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

### Staff Report to the Committee

#### Purpose

During the Oregon State Board of Higher Education’s discussion of selective admission authorization, several issues were raised. One of those was a concern about the effect the new admission policies and requirements would have on prospective minority students.

In recent months that concern has been translated into a request for a status report on the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative. The Minority Student Enrollment Initiative had as a goal the doubling of the collegiate first-time freshman enrollment of Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans who had graduated from Oregon high schools. In addition, it was expected that the recruitment effort needed to achieve that goal would lead to a college enrollment participation rate of 16-17% for those groups. The fall term 1989 was set as the target date for achieving the goal.

The purpose of this study is to determine: (1) if the Board’s policies have resulted in an increase in minority student participation in the Oregon State System of Higher Education; and (2) what remains to be accomplished to carry out the Board’s policies. The report focuses on the goals set by the Board by examining and analyzing Alaskan/Native American, Black, and Hispanic student enrollment, retention, and graduation.

#### Staff Analysis

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education set for itself the goal of providing the best educational experience possible for the students of the State System. It was thought that achieving that goal required diversity in the cultural, ethnic, and racial
mix on the campuses so as to expose all students to an academic environment that reflects the global community they will join upon leaving the institutions of the State System. The providing of tuition scholarships, along with an earnest recruitment effort of under-represented minorities, was viewed as the center piece of the effort to increase diversity in the student populations enrolled in the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

The data analyzed for this report confirm the trends on minority participation that were identified in the 1985 status report. The 1985 report indicated a possible decrease in minority student participation and graduation in the Oregon State System of Higher Education without a focused and sustained recruitment and retention effort. While minority participation in OSHE has increased overall, the efforts leading to these increases should be viewed as insufficient and fragmentary.

Major Findings

Two years after the Board's approval of the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative, we find minority student participation within the Oregon State System of Higher Education as follows:

. The enrollment of underrepresented minorities increased by 23.6% between 1980 and 1988.

. The first-time freshman enrollment of Black, Hispanic, and Alaskan/Native American students increased by approximately 51% between 1980 and 1988.

. The enrollment of underrepresented first-time freshmen from Oregon high schools increased by 84.7% between 1986 and 1988.

. The first-time freshman participation rate for underrepresented Oregon resident minorities increased from 8% for the High School Class of 1986 to 15% for the High School Class of 1988.

. The academic performance of minority freshmen has improved over the past two years.

. Underrepresented minority graduate student enrollment has increased by 46% over the past four years.

. The number of degrees earned by minority students increased by approximately 73% between 1979 and 1988.

. The number of graduate degrees earned by Black students declined by 48% between 1979 and 1988.
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Black and Hispanic students were not awarded any degrees in computer science in 1988.

No Alaskan/Native American, Black, or Hispanic student earned a degree in medicine in 1987-88.

Of the 2,373 students transferring to the Oregon State System of Higher Education as undergraduates in fall term 1988, 4.4% were underrepresented minorities.

The number of Alaskan/Native American and Black faculty members declined by 15% and 27%, respectively, between 1979 and 1987.

Basis for Recommendations

In November 1985, the Board adopted a policy statement on equal educational opportunity. After adopting the policy statement the Board initiated a series of activities that were designed to strengthen its policies, procedures, and evaluation efforts relative to equal educational opportunity in the Oregon State System of Higher Education. The key to those activities was the adoption of OAR 580-10-003.

OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
CHAPTER 500, DIVISION 10 - BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Affirmative Action Goals: Enrollment

580-10-003 (1) Each institution president shall establish affirmative action goals and procedures for the purpose of increasing the proportion of minorities and women enrolled in programs where minorities or women are underrepresented. Institutions shall be sensitive to the need for effective support for such students.

(2) For purposes of this rule, "minorities" refers to Black African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian/Pacific-Island Americans, and American Indians/ Alaskan Natives.

(3) The goals and procedures established under this rule shall be reviewed by the institution president for adequacy and effectiveness at the end of each biennium and modified accordingly. A report of this biennial review shall be submitted to the Chancellor.

Stat. Auth: ORS Ch.351
Hist: HEB 7-1986, f.& ef.3-19-86
The above administrative rule set forth the expectations the Board had of the institutions in three areas: (1) that the Board intended that minority and female students be appropriately represented in academic programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels; (2) that the institutions take appropriate steps or make efforts in that direction; and (3) that recognition be given to those institutions that achieved the stated goals or made superior efforts and, conversely, that attention be called to those institutions that demonstrated unsatisfactory progress or effort.

The first-time freshman enrollment of minority students has increased over the past three years as a result of the increased recruitment efforts. Unfortunately, similar increases have not been achieved at the graduate levels or across all disciplines. The data presented in this report also indicate that the small number of minority faculty members employed within the Oregon State System of Higher Education is increasing at a slow and uneven pace.

The Board’s commitment to diversity is integral to our fundamental commitment to educational opportunity and excellence. A "higher education" encompasses a commitment to learning, a belief in the search for the truth for its own sake, and exposure to differing points of view and peoples. An education at an OSSHE institution must do more than simply prepare students for making a living. It must prepare students to live in, adapt to, and help shape an ever-changing world.

The Oregon State System of Higher Education is responsible for enriching the lives of the state’s citizens and leaders by exposing them to ideas and experiences that broaden their world view and ensure a greater appreciation for cultural and ethnic differences. A greater emphasis on diversity in the curriculum and a more consistent and affirmative consideration of ethnic diversity in the selection and retention of faculty, staff, and students are crucial to OSSHE’s pursuit of equal educational opportunity and excellence.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

1. The staff recommended that each president develop and present to the Chancellor by April 1990 a comprehensive plan for recruiting, retaining, and graduating minority students at the undergraduate and graduate levels as called for in QAR 580-10-003.

2. The staff also recommended that the Minority Achievement Scholarship Program for first-time freshmen be maintained in its present form.
3. It was recommended also that the Board direct the staff to develop a program that would authorize the waiver of tuition and fees for up to nine quarter terms for academically meritorious minority students who transfer to a State System institution at the junior class level or who have achieved junior class standing in an Oregon State System of Higher Education institution.

The report and recommendations should be discussed by the Board at the November meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for final action at the December meeting.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Hill said the minority report reviewed the progress made on the Board’s initiative with respect to increasing the diversity of State System campuses. The effort has resulted in an increase in the number of underrepresented minority students entering the State System, but additional effort must be directed to further increasing that diversity. He called attention to the three staff recommendations included with the report and requested that specific questions be directed to Dr. James Payne who had the primary responsibility to review the progress made.

Dr. Hill also noted the program had resulted in more qualified minority undergraduates on the campuses than had been present before the program was initiated. Recruitment was done well and the students have a good retention record. It will be possible to build on those foundations to achieve the Board’s priorities with respect to greater diversity.

Dr. Payne reviewed the history and findings as presented in the staff report. The program has been very successful in many respects. The academic record of the students has been exemplary. There is a shortage of students in the graduate programs which may have an impact on recruitment of minority faculty, and certain groups of courses have not made the desired progress.

Mr. Johnston commended the institutions for the retention rate of 77% of these students for the entire State System. He asked if the definition of meritorious students in connection with the third staff recommendation would be made on a System or institutional level.

Dr. Payne explained that the staff did not want to specify for an individual campus a definition of meritorious students. As part of the process of developing the plans, the institutions would include a definition of meritorious students for that campus.

Mr. Johnston reminded the Board that in authorizing the waiver of tuition, it also should be prepared to help provide funds for the counseling and mentoring support needed for retention and graduation.
Mr. Hensley concurred. He asked whether any information had been obtained on these individuals once they have graduated to make sure they become a resource for Oregon, not only in job placement but to recruit other minorities and to be role models for other younger minority groups to enter post-secondary education.

Dr. Payne replied many of the campuses utilize these students as part of their overall effort to inform younger minority students in the middle schools and high schools about the opportunities in post-secondary education. They participate in mentoring and bridging programs and are encouraged to reach out within the campus itself to non-minority faculty and staff to become better acquainted with their future opportunities after graduation.

Dr. Hill said the Academic Council was considering a proposal to provide assistance to graduate students who are underrepresented minorities in the form of scholarships utilizing funds from the sports action lottery. An effort would be made to recruit the graduate students from those who are currently undergraduates.

Mr. Hensley inquired what percentage of the students were planning teaching careers.

Dr. Payne said this was difficult to determine. In looking at certain disciplines in terms of enrollment and degrees earned, it appeared that minority students who had an opportunity to pursue careers in more lucrative careers than teaching were choosing to do so. He mentioned there would be a proposal from Portland State University later in the meeting which was an attempt to get more students interested in pursuing teaching as a career.

Mr. Miller referred to the variations in the degrees granted within the various minority groups and among the institutions and requested Dr. Payne to comment.

Dr. Payne said the reduction in degree acquisition for black students was probably reflective of the earlier decline in student enrollment and correlated with it. He said he would anticipate beginning to see incremental increases in the number of degrees that black students earn in State System institutions. Oregon continues to have a substantial problem with increasing the enrollment of black males. There are three possible reasons. To a certain extent, there has been a good deal of questioning as to the value to those individuals in pursuing a full secondary education. There are other alternatives, such as the military, which has proven to be a more attractive environment than in the past for both employment and training. In addition, black males, as a group, are probably less well prepared academically than other groups coming out of high school. Dr. Payne then commented briefly on birth rates and demographics with respect to minority groups.
Mr. Adams questioned the limit of nine terms on tuition waivers for minority students. It was indicated this proposal was aimed at assisting students who had already had some college work. Other alternatives are available for other groups.

Ms. Wilson suggested the addition of a fourth recommendation to instruct the staff to develop a proposal for graduate stipends.

Mr. Miller congratulated the University of Oregon on its new minority program with a doubling of staff and funding. He then asked Dr. Spanier to comment on the success achieved by Oregon State University in these categories.

Dr. Spanier said a significant gap remained between the success attained by Oregon State University in this regard and where the institution should be. The recognition of this gap might explain some of the significant progress of recent years. The University Administration is very committed to making changes in enrollments of minority students. President Byrne appointed 25 prominent minority citizens as a board of minority visitors to advise Oregon State University officials. There is a minority affairs commission composed of faculty, staff, and students; and all units are engaged in the preparation of minority action plans which include specific things to meet particular and needs opportunities in those units. He indicated resources had been allocated to this activity but additional funding would be necessary to reach the full potential in this activity.

Ms. Wilson moved to forward the staff recommendation to the Board for discussion and placement on the December Consent Agenda with the addition of a fourth recommendation to direct that a program be presented to the Board dealing with the issue of the under-representation of minorities in graduate programs. She withdrew the additional recommendation after Mr. Adams suggested the intent was included in the language of the first staff recommendation. It was understood the report would be presented to the Board at a future meeting.

The Committee accepted the staff recommendations as presented and forwarded them to the Board for discussion at the November meeting and placement on the Consent Agenda for December.

Board Discussion and Action (November 16, 1989)

Mr. Swanson referred to the reports required from the individual institutions with regard to the progress made in matters pertaining to minority student enrollment and graduation trends. He asked if the reports had been received and, if so, what they indicated.
Dr. Payne said the comprehensive report would be presented in April 1990 although information and reports have been received in connection with preparation of the material presented above.

Mr. Swanson also noted there did not seem to be any statement concerning incentives for those institutions who were doing well.

Mr. Dodson described some of the on-going communications with people at the institutions and in state government. He also said Mr. Richardson had been unable to be at the present meeting but had asked him to stress the emphasis on retention which is included in the staff recommendations.

Mr. Swanson stated the comprehensive plan to be presented to the Chancellor by April 1990 should include a set of criteria by which the success or lack of success of the plan would be judged.

Mr. Hensley commented that in the earlier Committee discussion various aspects were discussed. He said he would envision the report would include the number of degrees attained in various disciplines, the lack of graduate opportunities and the competition for graduate activities.

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

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

Oregon State University seeks authorization from the Board to offer a Master of Science Degree in Health and Safety Administration. The new degree program will be offered by the Department of Public Health within the College of Health and Human Performance.

Staff Analysis

Undergraduate programs are offered at Oregon State University in health education, environmental health, safety studies, and health care administration (concentrations in health care administration are available in long term care and general health care administration). Master’s programs are also available in environmental health management and interdisciplinary studies. The proposed program is a natural extension of these ongoing curricular efforts at the University and responds to state and national needs for staff trained at the master’s level in three areas:
Health promotion — concerned with the development and management of efforts targeted toward specific lifestyle behaviors and environmental conditions harmful to health;

Safety studies — concerned with management of business and industry operations to counteract hazards/risks resulting in economic and social loss (work injuries, disasters, other emergencies, and regulatory non-compliance);

Health care administration — concerned with the direction of a broad spectrum of inpatient, ambulatory, and other health service programs in both the public and private sectors.

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed degree program is consistent with the University’s assigned mission to provide "educational opportunity, research, and service in support of the social and economic development of the state of Oregon." (Board’s "Strategic Plan 1987-93") The University was directed by the Board to "continue its commitment to provide high quality educational programs in the . . . professional fields." The College of Health and Human Performance is one of the University’s nine professional colleges.

In 1987, the University developed a Strategic Plan that established criteria upon which any new programs should be built. The proposed program is fully consistent with these criteria: the University requires that new graduate programs should use existing faculty, facilities, and funding resources; contribute to the social and economic development of Oregon through programs explicitly concerned with human service/social needs of the aged, family, and the work force; be based on curricula responsive to changes in the disciplines and the socio-economic environment; be able to strengthen the University’s foundation for research; expand opportunities for minorities, women, and disadvantaged; and strengthen interdisciplinary attributes in teaching and research.

2. Evidence of Need

The health and safety service system nationally and in Oregon is a growing area of concern. Health costs continue to rise, the regulatory climate continues to grow more complex, and staffing needs for a variety of agencies and institutions involved in the health care and safety service industry grow each year.
Employment opportunities in the health and safety service industry occur at both entry level, for students with a baccalaureate degree, as well as for students with graduate-level training. The latter needs relate to mid-career professionals who wish to advance in their job responsibilities.

Oregon State University has submitted forecasts from a recent Surgeon General's Report that reviewed Health Objectives for the years 1990 and 2000. Over 100 priority objectives are specifically cited in Safety Administration, Health Promotion, and Health Care Administration that are not being addressed adequately in the United States.

In the last decade, many students in Oregon interested in advanced training in these areas have had to meet their educational needs by enrolling in out-of-state schools, or in out-of-state schools which have opened programs in Oregon. The University of Southern California has operated a health care administration program at Kaiser Permanente in Portland (the program will terminate this year). The University of Colorado at Denver and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill have also offered regional graduate programs in Portland in health administration (correspondence courses plus residency). These programs are very expensive for students, with tuition costs for the entire program sequence ranging from $16,000 to $19,000.

Oregon State University has conducted a survey of businesses and professional associations in this field. Over a six-month period, 155 persons responded to the survey expressing interest in enrollment in the proposed program.

Enrollment in safety management courses taught off campus (in Portland and Eugene) during 1986-87 also indicates steady, continuing interest for a formal off-campus program in this area. Enrollments have averaged about 15 students per term. On-campus students enrolled in Oregon State programs also have shown interest in pursuing a master's degree in one of the concentrations proposed by the University.

The Director of the Office of Health Policy, Department of Human Resources for the State of Oregon, has submitted an analysis of need as well. Dr. Cheriel states that the "industry has been going through major restructuring over the last several years, moving from hospital-based delivery to a variety of alternative delivery modes with a great deal of emphasis on the managed care business and health maintenance organizations." With the rise of residential care facilities, assisted living centers, and more
medical clinics established as ambulatory surgical and outpatient care centers, Dr. Cherial concludes that "there will continue to be a number of opportunities for health care administrators in the industry." Those trained in traditional hospital administration programs will have a "tough time since hospitals are in the process of downsizing." The Oregon Association of Hospitals representatives have told Dr. Cherial that they are "supportive of programs that train managers for alternative delivery settings within the industry."

In September 1989, the Oregon State Employment Division provided data to the Chancellor's Office on projected need for supervisors and managers in the broad category of Medical/Health/Service Managers (excludes medical doctors and nurses but includes coordinators, supervisors, hospital administrators, emergency medical coordinators, directors of speech and hearing clinics). While this category includes some professionals outside the training area proposed by Oregon State University, many of the clinic and hospital administrators would be covered by the area of the OSU program. The Employment Division indicates that in 1988 there were 1,554 persons employed in this category, with 75 new openings projected annually due to industry growth, retirements, death, etc. The unemployment rate for persons in this field was 1.6%, compared to 5.8% for all occupations. In 1987, the number of employed persons in this category was 1,394; the projected need by 1995 is 1,634 — a growth of 240 individuals or 17.2%. This compares to projected growth for all occupations by 1995 of 13.5%. The Employment Division indicates that the health field is growing in general, with management positions in this field growing as well.

The University has provided supporting evidence of need from a number of state and federal agencies, for example:

- Portland Area Indian Health Service
- Safety and Health Management Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture
- Assistant to the Governor for Human Resources, Oregon Department of Human Resources
- Oregon Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse
- Oregon Adult and Family Services Division
- Accident Prevention Division, Department of Insurance and Finance
- Employee Health and Benefits, Multnomah County
- Oregon Health Care Association
- Columbia-Willamette Chapter, American Society of Safety Engineers
- Loss Control Services, SAIF Corporation
PACC Health Plans

Educational Services Department, St. Vincent Hospital and Medical Center

Portland Division, Veterans Administration

Health Choice Administrators

West Salem Clinic.

Letters of interest from students already in the health administration field needing a master's program were also provided.

Although programs are already available at the University of Oregon and Portland State University at the graduate level (see Duplication), it appears as if the demand for persons trained at this level warrants the addition of the Oregon State University program.

3. Duplication Issues

Oregon State University is proposing to offer a master’s program with majors in three areas, two of which overlap programs at other public institutions.

Safety Studies. Oregon State University is the only institution in the State System which has an undergraduate program in Safety Studies; the proposed graduate degree major in Safety Studies would also be unique in the West coast.

Health Promotion. The health promotion major overlaps with Portland State University’s Master of Science in Teaching with an option in Health Promotion through the Department of Health, School of Health and Physical Education. It also overlaps with the University of Oregon’s Master’s Degree in Community Health Education, with an option in Health and Fitness Management, through the Department of School and Community Health.

Health Administration. The health administration major overlaps with Portland State University’s Master of Public Administration, with a Health Administration option, through the Department of Public Administration, School of Urban and Public Affairs. It also overlaps with the University of Oregon’s Master’s in Health Education with an option in Community Health Administration, through the Department of School and Community Health, College of Human Development and Performance. The University of Oregon actually offers four options through this master’s program: Health and Fitness Management (already listed above under Health Promotion), Community Health Education, Community Health Administration, and Health Care for the Health Practitioner.
Comparison of Majors by Institution. The issue of duplication may be reviewed more completely by depicting the number of majors in related programs at Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University (see table on following page).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baccal.</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH/HEALTH EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>48*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRON. HEALTH/MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFETY STUDIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>6**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Students in Public Administration with an option in Health Administration.

** In 1987, Industrial Hygiene as an undergraduate major was phased out at OSU because of budget reductions. These are students currently completing their majors as the program is being phased out.
Oregon State is currently preparing slightly more than half (134 out of 254, or 53%) of the undergraduate majors in these health fields. The University has considerable faculty expertise in the health field, but master's programs are currently available only in education and environmental health management. Students in safety studies and health care administration do not have a graduate program at Oregon State available to meet their needs. In the safety studies area specifically, neither of the graduate programs at the University of Oregon or Portland State University would meet the needs of students in this area.

The duplication issue of concern is whether the University of Oregon and Portland State University programs adequately can meet the demand of students interested in graduate-level health administration and health promotion majors. The University of Oregon has indicated it does not intend to move its programs in this area off campus. Students in Portland, Corvallis, and nearby localities will not be able to access easily programs in Eugene. Portland State University is not able to handle a significant number of additional students through its program. Oregon State University has the faculty expertise to offer a master's program in this area. It appears as if the expected demand in the health field justifies duplication of programs at the three universities.

4. Prior Review of Health Needs by Board

When Oregon State University proposed its Master's in Movement Studies for the Disabled (January 15, 1988), the Board reviewed concerns that the program overlapped some program activity in physical and health education at other institutions. The Board noted, too, that while the Board had allocated graduate-level training in physical and health education to the University of Oregon in the 1930s, it also later authorized Oregon State to offer graduate programs in physical and health education as they related to the education programs offered in its School of Education.

Review of the Movement Studies program revealed dramatic changes that have taken place in physical education as a discipline (e.g., the discipline now encompasses sports physiology, sports psychology, sports medicine, leisure studies, and movement studies). The review raised the general issue of how graduate physical and health education has, is, and will be offered in the future.

To assist the Board in making future decisions about allocation of graduate physical and health education programs in the State System, the Board directed that an interinstitutional committee be established to prepare a study of the training needs and opportunities in the areas of health and physical education in Oregon.
This committee met during 1988-89 and provided a report to
the Office of Academic Affairs which recommended that there
would be some circumstances which would render it desirable
to permit selected master’s degree programs to be offered at
multiple universities. The criteria for desirable duplica-
tion were stated as follows:

A. The program should lead to a degree in a specialty
which requires a master’s for entry-level employment in
health or physical education.

B. Existing master’s degree programs do not meet current
or future employment needs.

C. The program should build on special and existing
strengths in the institution in which it is proposed.

D. The required program should satisfy Academic Council
expectations for high quality.

E. The master’s degree program should be subject to review
each ten years.

The proposed program fully meets C, D, and E. The program
generally meets A; although entry-level employment in the
field is possible with a baccalaureate degree, mid-level
management positions typically require graduate-level prepa-
ration. The program generally meets B in that the programs
at the University of Oregon and Portland State University
appear unable to meet the demand adequately.

5. Quality of Proposed Program

The master’s program will build on sound undergraduate pro-
grams in health education, health care administration, en-
vironmental health, and safety studies. These programs
serve approximately 134 undergraduate majors per year.

The program is a 60-credit sequence with about one-fourth
associated with a minor and three-fourths with a major. The
program builds on a set of three core courses needed for all
three majors — health care administration, health promo-
tion, and safety studies — as well as core courses for the
major selected. The program also will require the equiva-
 lent of a minor in community health, designed to provide
specialized study in a variety of selected options: long
term care administration, general health care administra-
tion, health promotion administration, health promotion
consultation, and safety administration. A thesis or 12-
hour projects course in the major will be required.
Of the courses to be provided in the program, 27 already are developed and approved by the University; eight courses will be newly designed in support of the program, four from the Department of Public Health and four from the Health Care Administration Program.

The program at maturation (six years after initiation) is expected to serve some 60 students on campus per year, distributed uniformly among the three option areas. The off-campus component is also expected to serve some 60 students per three-year course of study, distributed in the three options. The off-campus program is planned as a three-year sequence using the cohort approach. The program will be offered only when a minimum number of students (15) has been admitted, and it will be offered no more frequently than every three years.

The undergraduate program in Safety Studies complies with the standards of the American Society of Safety Engineers. The undergraduate program in Health Care Administration is one of only 34 undergraduate programs in the U.S which is a member of the Association of University Programs in Health Administration.

The graduate level Safety Studies option has been designed in accordance with the American Society of Safety Engineers. The Health Care Administration option has been designed in accordance with the Association of University Programs in Health Administration and the Accrediting Commission on Education for Health Services Administration. There is currently no accrediting body in the area of Health Promotion.

6. Adequacy of Resources To Offer Program

Faculty. The University is already providing adequate faculty resources to offer the first two years of the program. Because of faculty turnover (two tenure-track positions in health care administration) during the period of this program's development, the university currently is recruiting for two full-time, tenure-track positions in health care administration. These faculty are expected to be on board by Fall 1990. Additional faculty resources will be provided via adjunct faculty; a core of eight have been involved in the program for some period of time and are drawn from positions of leadership in the health care administrative field. In year one, 1.5 graduate assistants and .25 secretarial assistance will be needed; in year two, 2.0 graduate assistants and .5 secretarial assistance; and in year three, 3.0 graduate assistants and .5 secretarial assistance. In the third year of the program, one additional faculty member.
will need to be employed. The University is committed to providing a new faculty position in year three through internal reallocation, as well as additional graduate assistants and secretarial support to enable the program to be operational. The University has submitted a reallocation plan to the Chancellor's Office which specifies in detail the actions which will be taken to provide the resources for the program.

Library. Current library holdings are generally adequate to meet the needs of the program, although an additional $1,135 per year is recommended to add needed journals and newsletters.

Facilities and Equipment. No additional facilities and equipment will be needed for the on-campus portion of the program. Off-campus sites will require negotiations for adequate facilities and equipment.

Budget Impact. Oregon State University has given a very high priority to implementation of this program. After going through a two-year period of programmatic cutbacks, this is only one of two new programs proposed by the University in 1988–89 (in May 1988 the Board approved a Master's in Scientific and Technical Communications). The University will use going-level funds to support this program. The program costs are modest in the first two years of implementation, increasing to $85,162 in the third year.

Program Review

Chancellor’s Office. Oregon State University submitted its proposed program to the Chancellor’s Office on October 10, 1988. Because of ongoing work with the Interinstitutional Committee on Graduate Program Allocation in Health and Physical Education (described above), the Chancellor’s Office held off on further review until the work of the Interinstitutional Committee was completed.

Other Oregon Institutions. On February 23, 1989, copies of the Oregon State University proposal were mailed for review to all public and independent four-year colleges and universities in the state. No objections were raised by independent institutions but concerns were raised by Portland State University and the University of Oregon (see below).

Academic Council. The proposed program and issues concerning the Board’s charge to review graduate-level allocations in health and physical education were reviewed by the Academic Council on a number of occasions in 1989: March 16, April 20, May 18, and June 14. A number of additional meetings focusing on the overlap between three universities in two of the proposed program majors.
were held between Deans of Colleges and faculty in 1988 and 1989. The Chancellor's Office also convened a meeting on June 1, 1989, between the provosts from the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University, and Oregon Health Sciences University to review developments with regard to the program.

The major concern throughout all these meetings was the overlap between Portland State's Master's in Public Administration (option in health administration), and Oregon State University's plan to deliver its new program in the Portland and/or Salem area. Portland State requested resolution over the issues of special arrangements and transfer agreements between the two institutions and cooperative scheduling of courses for the strengthening of both programs.

Subsequent discussions between Portland State and Oregon State resulted in an agreement that Oregon State would not offer its program off campus unless there is a clear need for it. There would also be opportunities for joint advising of students, joint registration, and faculty joint appointments between the two universities as a result of these discussions.

The University of Oregon also raised concern over some duplication with its master's program. The Oregon State program would duplicate with the University of Oregon in two of the three proposed majors. Since the University of Oregon is not attempting to go off campus with its program, the issue of off-campus coordination is not the same as it is for Portland State.

After considerable discussion, a final agreement was developed by June 1989 on the issue of duplication and off-campus delivery. Oregon State agreed to elaborate fully on the programs available elsewhere in the system in its proposal to enable the Board to determine if duplication was warranted and also agreed that the off-campus majors in Health Promotion and Health Care Administration would not be offered in the Portland and Eugene areas.

Consideration was given in these final discussions to the need for three master's programs in the general area of health administration. It was pointed out that the University of Oregon's allocation in the 1930s for graduate programs in this area focused primarily on health education related to physical education. This represented the state of the discipline at that time; however, the discipline has grown beyond physical education to a growing predominance on health administration, health policy, and community health issues. Portland State's program emphasizes these, and a good portion of the proposed Oregon State program would also. The result is duplication of effort among the three institutions.
The question has been raised, therefore, about who has the allocation among the institutions to provide graduate level programming in this area. The University of Oregon has significant faculty strength in this area and there is interest at the University in developing a master's of public health. Oregon State has strong undergraduate programs (and some master's programs) in this area, making the case for further development at the University a strong one. Portland State also has expertise at the graduate level in this area. At issue too is whether the Oregon Health Sciences University should at some point move into the area of health administration at the graduate level.

Three possibilities were reviewed subsequently by the institutions:

- There could be one graduate/professional public health school for the State of Oregon.
- There could be multiple programs at various campuses.
- There could be multiple graduate-level programs at various campuses linked to a strategic plan for coordination and cooperation among the programs.

In light of the current and projected resource constraints within the State System, the unlikelihood that the Health Sciences University could develop a School of Public Health in the next several years, and in recognition of the expertise that has already developed at Oregon State, Portland State, and the University of Oregon in this area, it was recommended that the State System proceed with the third option: programs at multiple institutions following a coordinated state plan for the delivery of graduate level programs in health administration and public health.

The Academic Council concluded its many months of discussion with consensus that there will be a proper degree of redundancy within the System if the Oregon State University proposal is approved.

Office of Educational Policy and Planning. The OEP also reviewed the proposal and submitted a number of questions to the Chancellor's Office on May 1, 1989. Questions centered on need, accreditation, and organization. Oregon State University revised its proposal in response to OEP's questions and resubmitted it to the Chancellor's Office.

The Office of Educational Policy and Planning submitted additional questions to the Chancellor's Office on October 1989 in response to Oregon State's revised proposal. Questions centered on the adequacy of faculty resources in health care administration given the turnover of two-tenure track faculty in summer 1989, the proper sequence for developing a coordinated plan for
health care administration and public health, the need for people trained in management in hospitals versus a diversity of health care facilities and agencies, and the extent to which the University program will meet criteria of the Accrediting Commission on Education for Health Services Administration. Oregon State revised its program proposal to respond to concerns raised by OEFP. The Chancellor's Office staff reviewed concerns with OEFP in a telephone conference call on October 26, 1989, and addressed the concerns in this staff report.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

1. The staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon State University to initiate a new instructional program leading to a M.S. Degree in Health and Safety Administration, effective Fall 1990.

2. The staff also recommended that Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, Portland State University, and the Oregon Health Sciences University submit a coordinated plan for the delivery of health administration and public health programs to the Chancellor by July 1, 1991. The plan should identify the on- and off-campus plans of programs over a three-year period, with specialties expected to be available by location. The plan should document cooperative arrangements developed between institutions and include the most recent supply and demand data in Oregon and the nation. The Oregon State University program should be reviewed by the Board in 1993 (or three years following the first enrolled class of students) along with the statewide plan.

The proposal should be discussed by the Board at the November meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for final action at the December meeting.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Following the presentation of the staff report and recommendations, Dr. Graham Spanier said the motivation for the proposal resulted from a perceived need in Oregon for professionals in a field where Oregon State has had and is continuing to develop substantial expertise. He indicated that 37 programs had been eliminated at Oregon State University over the last three years. The proposed program is only the second request for a new program during that time. Funding will be provided through internal reallocation, utilizing retirements to hire the necessary new faculty.

Dr. Michael Maksud, Dean of the College of Health and Human Performance at Oregon State University, stressed that the proposal built on existing undergraduate programs in each of the
three areas that are part of the overall master's degree and integrated three professional areas. He stated two of the programs which were eliminated were from the College of Health and Human Performance. He cited other resources on the campus which would be of assistance in the program. Professionals in the field will be used as adjunct faculty and assist in bringing the latest information and expertise to the students.

Dr. Annette Rossignol, Chairman of the Department of Health in the College of Health and Human Performance, said there was a campus and an off-campus component to the program. Agreement has been reached for the University of Oregon, Portland State University, and Oregon State University to run the off-campus programs jointly and cooperatively. The three institutions will share the resources, particularly in the area of health care administration, to utilize the resources of the state as efficiently as possible.

Mr. Adams inquired whether the statement that Oregon State had agreed not to offer health promotion and health care administration programs in the Portland and Eugene areas would conflict with the agreement mentioned above with respect to off-campus programs.

Dr. Rossignol responded the primary concern had been a site in Salem which would be accessible to faculty from Portland State University and also to those from Eugene and Corvallis. The decision not to implement off-campus in either Portland or Eugene was to avoid any conflict with existing programs from those two universities. She stated there could be joint programs in those areas if there were an agreement with those universities.

Dr. Maksud said there were in-house programs on those sites so there would not be much need to offer an off-campus program except in the area of safety where there is not that opportunity.

Mr. Miller commented the real issue seemed to be one of duplication and the problems that might create.

Dr. Frank Martino said the issues around this particular program offered an opportunity to address the broader issues of how graduate programs should be offered to the state. He said he hoped whatever decision was reached would be regarded as an interim one. A joint program of this kind might well serve as a model for the future.

The Chancellor concurred that the decision should be regarded as an interim stage. The State System does not have a School of Public Health, but it has all of the characteristics of one in various places. Until these elements become an interactive single program, the task has not been done adequately. He said
the State System was leaving an era in which the development of higher education was synonymous with the development of institutions and moving to one which has more joint interactive, cooperative programs, particularly at the graduate level.

Mr. Miller asked the Chancellor what would be the best argument against the Committee's accepting the second staff recommendation for the development of a plan and then following that action at a later time with the first recommendation.

The Chancellor said there was so much in place at Oregon State University and the process had proceeded so far that there would only be a theoretical advantage in approving only the second recommendation. He indicated he was willing to accept the good faith effort of those involved that they were committed to the second recommendation.

Mr. Miller then asked whether the coordination really required a delay until July 1, 1991. Dr. Hill responded that there was a peculiar set of circumstances which suggested 1991 as a reasonable date. The University of Oregon is in the process of hiring a new dean for the school in which the particular related program is located. Other considerations suggest a longer time period is needed for an effective plan to emerge. While there is a sense of urgency among the three institutions directly involved, there is a genuine concern at the Oregon Health Sciences University to be an active player in the planning session. There is no intention at the Health Sciences University to be involved directly and immediately in terms of devoting resources to this issue.

Dr. Norman Wessells said the University of Oregon had been putting together the resources to establish the first master of public health degree in the state. In the meantime, the University of Oregon is embarking on a comprehensive planning process under the new president to decide what should be emphasized in the future. If, as a result of that process, the recommendation is to go ahead with a master of public health degree, it will be on the Board's agenda next year.

Mr. Johnston inquired why the plan would be submitted in 1991 but the Board would not review it until 1993. Dr. Hill explained the 1993 review date for the specific program Oregon State University was proposing would allow adequate time for it to start and be in operation prior to review. An earlier date would be premature.

Mr. Johnston said he would concur in terms of the Oregon State program but he thought it should be possible to review the statewide plan before 1993.
Dr. Hill said perhaps the recommendation should have been separated. The intention is to present a plan for the Board's consideration by 1991, with a specific review of the Oregon State program in 1993. In addition to having the Oregon State program operational, there will be an opportunity to consider it at a later date following the submission and review of the general plan by the Board.

Mr. Dodson asked whether the reference to an interim step by the Chancellor and Dr. Martino was basically in connection with the study by the Portland Commission. Dr. Martino responded that this was his intention.

The Chancellor explained his conception of the present situation. The State System does not have a school of public health and is not likely to have. All of the elements are either in place or nearly so at some point in the state, with the possible exception of epidemiology. He indicated he would not foresee stopping any of the things which are being done now because there is no evidence they are excessive. They are fragmented. The choice can be made either to stop doing these activities on a variety of campuses and combine them in one place or they can be organized differently. The Chancellor said he did not like either solution because both were difficult alternatives. He stated the process had gone so far that the alternative of stopping and creating a separate school in one place was unrealistic. The difficult challenge is to make all of the pieces fit. He indicated the duplication was in organization and not in the quantities of programs.

The Chancellor stated there was a very fundamental systemic problem in the delivery of off-campus services in the State System and in Oregon. This problem also is an element in terms of the proposed program.

Mr. Chad Cheriel of the Office of Health Policy said the health care industry was the third largest industry in Oregon. There is a shortage of people to fill mid-level management positions in the health care industry. The three major institutions in the state are not preparing their students to be employees for the various health care organizations. He urged the Board to take immediate action to meet the urgent need for trained talent.

Mr. John Hogan of the Benedictine Nursing Center at Mt. Angel said there is an increasing demand for a master's degree in health care administration. It is being met with people from other states. He said from the standpoint of the future of health care in Oregon, it is critical to establish a program to train individuals to meet Oregon's needs. He also cited the anticipated doubling of long-term care needs by the year 2000.
The Committee recommended that the Board approve the proposed program and place it on the Consent Agenda for the December Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (November 16, 1989)

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

B.A. Degree in Theatre Arts, WOSC

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

Western Oregon State College requests authorization for an instructional program that will lead to a Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in Theatre Arts. The proposed program would complement the B.A. degree programs in Art and Music.

The proposal would provide a broad-based theatre arts program of study that would cover basic preparation in acting, technical theatre, theatre history, and design. The structure of the program would allow majors to specialize in acting and directing, history and criticism, technical theatre and design, or children’s theatre.

The program would emphasize a balance between a liberal arts based program of study and the practical skills and knowledge needed in a variety of theatrical productions. The program would provide a vehicle for interested students in the Salem-Monmouth-Independence-Dallas areas to pursue their area of interest while preparing themselves for graduate work in theatre arts or related academic fields or employment as teachers of theatre arts or careers in the professional theatre.

The proposed instructional program would draw upon existing faculty and courses to create the major. It can be implemented by utilization of existing resources.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The program being proposed is within the assigned mission of Western Oregon State College. The Board’s "Strategic Plan 1987-1993" states that as part of its mission Western Oregon State College will "... provide high-quality programs in teacher education, special education, business, and liberal arts and sciences." This is to be done while serving "the educational needs of Oregon’s citizens, especially in the greater Salem-Keizer metropolitan area and the Willamette
Valley." The proposed program is designed to facilitate the carrying out of Western Oregon State College's mission to provide a wide range of undergraduate programs in the liberal arts.

2. Evidence of Need

Western Oregon State College has identified a number of enrolled students and prospective students who wish to pursue a baccalaureate degree program in theatre arts. The faculty indicate that they expect 15-25 students would be pursuing this major at any given time, with 5-10 new students joining the program each year. The college estimates 15-20 students will graduate from the program over a five-year period.

The request for the approval of this program stems in part from the anticipated changes in teacher education programs. In many respects, the proposed program is in place and has been serving students seeking a teaching endorsement in drama. The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission has dropped this endorsement. The proposed instructional program in theatre arts will meet the substantive needs of those students who want to teach theatre arts.

3. Quality of the Program

The program being proposed exceeds the basic accreditation guidelines of the American Theatre Association (ATA). The ATA suggest 45-60 credit hours of course work as the minimum to meet ATA standards. The proposed program will require a minimum of 72 credit hours of course work in the major.

The ATA standards require three theatre-trained faculty as a minimum staffing level for the offering of a major in the theatre arts. At the present time, Western Oregon State College has four theatre-trained faculty and approximately 10 supplementary faculty in dance, music, and the humanities.

4. Resources to Support the Program

Faculty. The faculty needed for this program are currently on the staff. No additional faculty will be needed to implement this program.

Facilities. A well-equipped auditorium provides necessary stage and studio theatre facilities, drawing room space, scene shop, and costume construction areas. No additional equipment or facilities will be needed to maintain the program.
Library. Current library holdings are adequate for the proposed program. Continued drama purchases at the present level should maintain the library holdings at an adequate level in the area of theatre arts.

Budget. The proposed program can be offered with the existing resources and operated at the present level of expenditures.

Program Duplication

Similar or related programs are offered at the following institutions: Oregon State University, University of Oregon, Portland State University, Southern Oregon State College, Willamette University, Lewis and Clark College, Linfield College, Reed College, and the University of Portland.

The initiation of this major to broaden the fine and liberal arts program offering at Western Oregon State College is believed to be a justifiable duplication of program effort.

Program Review

This program proposal was presented to the Academic Council for their consideration on March 16, 1989. The members of the Council offered recommendations and suggestions for strengthening the proposal. The proposal was rewritten after that discussion. A final review of the proposal was completed by the Board's staff in consultation with the faculty and administration of Western Oregon State College.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's staff recommended that the Board authorize Western Oregon State College to offer an instructional program that will lead to a B.A. degree in Theatre Arts, effective Fall Term 1990.

The proposal should be discussed by the Board at the November meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for final action at the December meeting.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Hill presented the staff report and recommendation and then requested Dr. Bill Cowart, Provost at Western Oregon State College, to comment further.

Dr. Cowart said the proposal fundamentally was for a new degree title because theatre arts had been in place for 25 years through teacher education. There was some justification to offering the program through teacher education when Western Oregon State College was a single-purpose teacher education institution, but it
no longer seems appropriate since the institution's mission was broadened a few years ago. In addition, the deemphasis of the endorsement area by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission raises questions for students. The proposal would remove the faculty and resources for the program from teacher education into liberal arts, thus offering students an opportunity to get a liberal arts degree in theatre arts.

Dr. Cowart said the proposed program was viewed as an essential part of the liberal arts core curriculum and would be distinct from the more professional type programs offered at Southern Oregon State College and perhaps at the University of Oregon. He said it was recognized that the degree title would duplicate what is offered in some nine other institutions but that is indicative of the need for this type of program within a unique, truly broad-based liberal arts curriculum.

Dr. John Minahan, Dean of the School of Liberal Arts at Western, emphasized the importance of the degree in faculty recruitment and the importance of theatre arts as part of the liberal arts curriculum. He indicated there was no intention of expanding the size of the program and described the students, facilities, and resources involved.

President Cox said he was not opposing the request from Western but raised the issue of how to find the balance between having the liberal arts essentials on all of the campuses where they are appropriate without injuring or diminishing a particular assignment given to one institution. He said Southern Oregon State College had offered the Bachelor of Fine Arts for almost thirty years and theatre was crucial to the identity of the institution. He urged the Board to review at some point the missions given to each of the institutions because all of the presidents at one time or another must defend those assignments of mission. He asked the Board to be mindful of the particular assignment to Southern in the fine and performing arts while at the same time attempting to find the differentiation that would serve both programs.

Mr. Miller said Western had indicated the program represented justifiable duplication and asked Dr. Cowart to cite an example of unjustifiable duplication.

Dr. Cowart said a request for the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree would be unjustifiable and would be a direct duplication of the role and mission for Southern Oregon State College.

Ms. Wilson requested further elaboration of Western's rationale for moving theatre arts from education into liberal arts.
Dr. Minahan said this was the only program in which the faculty was dedicated to teaching a fine art, in this case a performing art, but which did not have a curriculum unit attached to it. The offerings were a series of service courses for education. Elementary and secondary teachers have been required to have an endorsement in this area in order to teach courses or put on plays in elementary and secondary schools. The endorsement is no longer required. This change, plus the desire of faculty to move from methods courses to a more in-depth, quality program has led to the presentation of the request.

Ms. Wilson said she was uncomfortable with approving the proposal because she believed it was the mission of Southern Oregon State College to be the theatre arts center of the state. Even though Western is currently involved in the field, the program is changing. She said since it is no longer required and is moving into a different arena, she would view it as a duplication.

Dr. Minahan said he would view two Bachelor of Fine Arts degrees as representing duplication because that is a very professional degree. An institution offering that degree would feature it as a training for professional careers in the field and would commit significant funds for faculty and student recruitment. The proposal before the Committee represents an inseparable part of an arts and sciences education and requests the opportunity for students to major in theatre arts as they can in other liberal arts subject areas.

Mr. Adams referred to a statement with respect to suggestions and recommendations from the Academic Council for strengthening the proposal and asked if they were significant.

Dr. Cowart said the proposal before the Committee was the third revision and incorporated many of the changes and revisions. Much of the discussion involved clarifying the basic issue of presenting an existing program in the format used for entirely new programs.

Mr. Johnston noted the institution did not expect the program to expand and asked if the type of students would remain the same.

Dr. Minahan said there would continue to be a significant number of education students. They would be majoring in theatre and would have more background in stage craft and scene craft and less in the teaching of theatre. There will be additional students with the shift in emphasis from the methods courses for teachers.

Mr. Hensley commented that many of the institutions were reviewing their curriculum and reducing or eliminating certain parts of the curriculum they feel cannot be justified because of the small
number of students. He said this program would not have very many students. He also stated it was his understanding the program would not entail any new funds. The Board’s review process, however, is not adequate to determine whether this proves to be true because the funding becomes part of the budget for the next biennium.

Dr. Cowart indicated he would provide the Board with any future reports which it wished to have concerning the program and the funding.

There was a brief discussion about what would happen to existing faculty if the Board were not to approve the request.

A motion to recommend that the Board approve the staff recommendation was not seconded. After a brief further discussion, the Committee recommended that the proposal be forwarded to the full Board for its consideration.

Board Discussion and Action

Dr. Hill explained that Western Oregon State College was requesting authorization for a B.A. in Theatre Arts. A theatre arts program has been available for many years in association with the teacher training program. With the revisions that have been made in the teacher training program, Western wishes to relocate the theatre arts program in the college of liberal arts and is seeking authorization to grant the B.A. degree. The situation is complicated by the action of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission which has recently dropped the endorsement in theatre arts for elementary and secondary teachers. In a sense, the program is without a home as a result.

Ms. Wilson reported the Committee did not recommend the request from Western be approved but moved to bring the item to the full Board for consideration. The issue was whether the program was a duplication of current programs, especially in view of the small number of students who would be acquiring the degree. She said at least two members of the Committee regarded it as duplication because four institutions currently offer a degree in theatre arts. One, Southern Oregon State College, is preeminent in the field. The Committee believed the full Board should consider the question of duplication as part of one of its major responsibilities with respect to the missions of the institutions.

President Meyers stated that Western was primarily a teacher training institution prior to 1981 and all of its programs were oriented to that mission. In 1981, the name and the mission of the institution were changed and new degrees were added in business, computer science, and public administration as part of a comprehensive liberal arts mission. The theatre arts program is
the first of several new programs which are being prepared for presentation to the Board. The others are new programs, but the request for the B.A. in theatre arts represents the transfer of an existing program connected with teacher training into the liberal arts and sciences mission of the institution. No additional faculty, equipment, facilities, or funding is requested.

President Meyers said he also was concerned about duplication but viewed this request as part of the liberal arts core needed on the campus as part of the mission assigned to Western by the Board. He commented that Western was phasing out programs as part of its concern with duplication and budgetary matters.

In response to questions from Mr. Swanson, Dr. Minahan listed the liberal arts majors which presently are offered at Western Oregon State College and explained the importance of the authorization in recruiting and retaining quality faculty members for theatre arts.

Mr. Swanson asked how the Board would distinguish the theatre arts request from the possible requests for other new programs which President Meyers had mentioned. He stated it would be unlikely the Board would approve new programs which would require new resources if it were unwilling to approve the theatre arts request where no new resources were required.

Mr. Hensley commented that proposals which purport to have no budgetary impact always do because they are in the budget at some point.

President Meyers said any new proposals would be a part of the existing budget. He added that this particular proposal was important in terms of sending a signal to the institution that it either had or did not have a liberal arts mission. Two-thirds of the students are now in liberal arts rather than education as a result of the transformation that has been made in the institution and the faculty employed to raise the quality of that school.

Mr. Hensley asked if the similar programs at the other four institutions were embodied in the liberal arts sectors of those schools.

Dr. Hill said he was not sure about the program at Southern Oregon State College but those at the other institutions were in the liberal arts area. Dr. Cox indicated the BFA and BA at Southern were in a free-standing school of fine arts within the liberal arts sector.

Mr. Miller said, if this were the beginning of some other proposals, it would make more sense to see this in a comparative light with those requests and with allocations in the State System.
President Meyers said this program is different from the others to be submitted because it is not a new program.

Dr. Minahan said 45 people had been hired within the budget in the last three years. Requests will come forward within the budget as a result of systematically replacing retirements so that faculty are already in place for some of the new programs.

Mr. Hensley said once proposals of this kind are approved the Board does not have a review process which enables it to know the predicted number of students actually involved. If the number is not achieved, the budget goes up. The Board is in the position of having approved a program that has a high cost per student ratio and could be obtained at a nearby institution which already has perhaps 40-50 students in a similar program.

Dr. Minahan said about 20% of the course offerings are being moved out of the school of education through cancellation of methods courses in education and moving those people into the upper-division or elective course areas where they are needed. Part-time faculty will be replaced by the regular full-time faculty. He also commented that the students elect this late in the sophomore year or early in the junior year so it is not a matter of making this choice as a freshman and choosing to attend some other institution.

The Chancellor asked if it were true that many of the faculty in this program would be teaching students who were taking other majors.

Dr. Minahan responded that this was correct and about half of the faculty time already is used in a service function to the liberal arts core. Every student must take nine hours through a distribution of theatre, music, and innovative arts. If these students were to move to another campus, the faculty would still be needed to serve minors for other programs and the liberal arts and sciences core for all majors.

Mr. Johnston suggested moving the program into liberal arts as a minor instead of offering a degree. Dr. Minahan said theatre arts could be selected as a minor if a student selects a 27-hour package of coherent course work in theatre. This would be difficult to require 27 specific hours in that field.

Mr. Adams said the request was really for continuation and recognition of an existing program. He said he thought there were some valid duplications in the State System. This is one of those things which some consider to be a necessary part of education and which, in this particular setting, involves future teachers. He said there was substantial theatre activity of various sorts from grades K-12 in different localities and communities throughout the state. He said he viewed this as a widespread kind of need and would support the proposal.
Ms. Wilson said she would not support the proposal because, even though theatre arts is currently part of Western's curriculum, it was an endorsement and not a major. The proposal would move it to a different school, elevating that particular arena of theatre arts within Western's mission. She said she personally considered the proposal a duplication, one of the most difficult issues the Board must address. There are not enough resources to allow everyone to do everything they might like. She cited places in the State System where additional resources were needed badly.

The Chancellor said the decision was reached some time ago that Western would cease to be a teacher education college. Some rather important things follow from that decision, one being that Western increasingly will resemble every other non-education institution in the state. As it develops a general undergraduate curriculum, things will disappear from education and be translated into what in American higher education becomes standard undergraduate majors and programs. At that level, virtually everything that occurs is duplication.

At this point, it can be determined Western should maintain more of a focus in the teacher education area and less on a general undergraduate liberal arts education. Another set of issues then becomes involved in terms of the effort to restrict the numbers in teacher education and decrease the emphasis on methods.

The Chancellor suggested that theatre arts is viewed somewhat differently because it is both an academic subject and a professional subject and there is a concern about duplication, particularly with respect to the program at Southern Oregon State College. The latter is a professional program preparing people in many cases for careers in the theatre. The Chancellor said he did not think that was the purpose of the program at Western, but the decision was difficult because the first case in the movement from education to liberal arts is a field typically regarded as a professional program.

The Chancellor said it was clear the Board was divided, largely over the issue of the professional character of theatre, not over the issue that Western should increasingly be shifting its resources to basic disciplines while maintaining its teacher preparation courses.

The Chancellor indicated he would vote to approve the program because the principle of the shift in the nature of Western was more important than the particular case before the Board. One of the challenges Western would face if the proposal were approved would be to make certain the theatre arts work is an undergraduate major like other liberal arts course work rather than preparing people for work in the theatre.
The Board approved the staff recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Matthews, Miller, and Swanson. Those voting no: Directors Dodson, Johnston, Wilson, and Hensley.

**Establishing a Limitation and Transferring Appropriation for a New Project, South Stadium Drive Parking and Access, WOSC**

**Staff Report to the Committee**

A new dormitory (Heritage Hall) recently was opened for use at Western Oregon State College. As part of the construction of this dormitory, a new parking lot was built and access roads were constructed from Monmouth Avenue to the new lot, located behind Heritage Hall. The lot and its access roads end just north of the gymnasium and physical education and athletic facilities.

Although the new parking lot and access roads serve well the new dormitory and provide some ability for persons attending classes and events at the college’s physical education and athletic facilities to access those facilities from the north, the new improvements do not permit through traffic to Church Street and other arterials to the south. Therefore, the athletic facilities are not as readily accessible as college officials wish. Further, the parking situation on the campus demands additional parking on the west side of the campus. The new dormitory lot is on the west side but, due to the nature of those using it, is not available for other students or for those attending athletic events.

Consequently, Western officials are requesting that the Board approve a new project designed to link the just-completed dormitory access road with Church Street and to construct two parking lots adjacent to the gymnasium and the athletic fields, respectively. This will create a through road, permitting traffic to flow diagonally from Church Street on the south side of the campus to Monmouth Avenue at the north end of the campus. Such a road is contemplated in the recently-adopted Campus Master Plan. City of Monmouth officials have indicated that the construction of such a road will permit the college to petition for the closure of Monmouth Avenue, which also is an approved feature of the Campus Master Plan.

The new roadway, whose suggested name is South Stadium Drive, is expected to cost $365,000. This price tag includes the construction of the roadway itself, the installation of needed street lights, and the relocation of those parts of the college’s athletic and physical education fields situated in the path of the new roadway. The cost of the two parking lots is expected to be $70,000, bringing the total cost for the project to $435,000. The parking portion of the project would be paid from Western’s parking funds. The remaining $365,000 would come from monies remaining from a 1987 General Fund appropriation targeted for campus improvements at Western Oregon State College. A total of
$433,250 of the 1987 General Fund remains available. Western Oregon State College officials are requesting that $365,000 of that amount be transferred to the South Stadium Drive project and that the remaining $68,250 be reserved for future campus improvements.

Currently under consideration are plans for restoring the northern edge of the campus which has been the site of temporary housing units now being sold as surplus to the college's needs due to the construction of the new dormitory. No specific project has yet been developed to restore this area when the units are removed.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board concur in the request of Western Oregon State College to establish the South Stadium Drive Parking and Access Project with an Other Funds Limitation of $70,000 and a General Fund appropriation of $365,000, for a total project budget of $435,000. The staff recommended further that the Board authorize the staff to seek the approval of the State Emergency Board for the establishment of the Other Funds Limitation and the transfer of the General Fund appropriation required for such a budget and for the expenditure of the total budget amount. Further, the staff recommended that the Board require Western Oregon State College to seek the vacation of Mormouth Avenue upon the completion of the South Stadium Drive Parking and Access Project and the waiver of the vacation fee. Finally, the staff recommended that the Board require Western Oregon State College to insure that the City of Mormouth accepts the new roadway (preliminarily called South Stadium Drive) from Church Street to Mormouth Avenue as a City arterial, with the City becoming responsible for the management and maintenance of the roadway.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Bailey asked whether the street would become a public street or remain under the ownership and jurisdiction of the college once it was constructed.

Mr. Pernsteiner explained it was intended that Mormouth Avenue ultimately would be closed but one of the conditions of doing so was that the new road would become a public street. He said the State System should not be involved in maintaining arterials for any city because maintenance costs are fairly heavy. One of the conditions is that the proposed road would be built to arterial standards but would be maintained by the city as part of its grid of arterials. The proposed road would benefit both the college and the city. It is intended that any arterial built by the State System would be taken over by the city as its arterial as one of the conditions of building it.
Mr. Neifert commented the city had been very helpful in making sure that construction met all criteria. The proposed arterial was included in the comprehensive plan accepted by the planning commission in July 1987 and also on the land use plan at that time.

Mr. Bailey asked if there would be any liability to bring any connecting streets to arterial standards. Mr. Fernsteiner said the only two streets that intersect with the proposed arterial are already in city ownership.

It was agreed the word "request" would be changed to "require" in two places in the staff recommendation in order to assure the new arterial would be maintained by the City of Monmouth. The change has been incorporated in the staff recommendation above.

The Committee then discussed the vacation or closure of Monmouth Avenue. Mr. Lemman explained the intent was to seek closure of Monmouth Avenue. Vacating a street means the city would close it to traffic but would still own it. Closure means that the street would be closed and the property would be deeded to abutting property owners, which, in this case, is Western Oregon State College on both sides of the street.

Mr. Fernsteiner indicated the term vacate was used because that would give the State System underlying title. It also says at no cost, and the city may not agree to that. Legal counsel will be obtained about the long-range implications when a decision is made on vacation or closure. The important issue at present is to have city agreement in principle with respect to vacating or closure of Monmouth Avenue. The city has approved the master plan which contemplates that action.

Mr. Neifert provided a history of the developments leading to the recommendations. He indicated the access road in this location was needed regardless of the action taken with respect to Monmouth Avenue.

Mr. Swanson summarized his understanding of the discussion by saying there seemed to be sufficient rationale for building the arterial regardless of whether Monmouth Avenue was closed. Further, because the arterial is part of the overall planning process and because of discussions with the city, the chances appear excellent that Monmouth Avenue will be vacated or closed once the arterial is built. The difference is only whether the property reverts to Western Oregon State College or stays within the city, but in any event Monmouth Avenue would be closed.

Mr. Neifert stated this was correct.

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, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

The Western Oregon State College Development Foundation is about to receive the donation of 1.4 acres of unimproved land just north of the current campus boundary and adjacent to the Gentle House. (The Gentle House already is owned by the Foundation.)

One of the conditions of the gift to the Foundation is that the land be donated by the Foundation to Western Oregon State College. Therefore, Western Oregon State College officials have requested that the Board accept the donation from the Foundation of 1.4 acres of property, to be used for any legal purpose. They also have asked that the boundaries of the campus be amended to include this property.

The recently adopted Campus Master Plan for Western Oregon State College contemplates the acquisition of this property for use as a new site for the Jensen Arctic Museum, currently ensconced in a building across the campus in space which planners have determined would best be used as the new home of the WOSC Physical Plant complex. The ultimate use of the donated property as the location for the museum is attractive both to the Foundation and to the Independence Group, the current owners of the property. However, the Board is not required to move the museum to this site, or to move it at all, as a condition of receiving the property. The use of the adjacent Gentle House as a museum makes the siting of the Jensen Arctic Museum on the donated property logical, however.

The legal description of the parcel Western officials are asking that the Board accept is as follows:

"Beginning at an iron pipe 47 chains South and 48.22 chains West of the Northeast corner of the John B. Smith Donation Land Claim No. 47, situated in Section 24, Township 8 South, Range 5 West of the Willamette Meridian in Mornmouth, Polk County, Oregon; and from such point of beginning thence North 00 degrees 46' East a distance of 190.00 feet to an iron pipe; thence North 88 degrees 42'30" West a distance of 444.26 feet to an iron pipe on the Easterly right of Mornmouth Avenue; thence South 03 degrees 15' East along said Eastern right of way of Mornmouth Avenue a distance of 200.30 feet to an iron pipe; thence East 430.06 feet to the place of beginning."
"SAVE AND EXCEPT that portion thereof conveyed by Deed from Maurice M. Gentle and Catharine M. Gentle unto the City of Mormonuth, by Deed dated May 21, 1973, and recorded at Book of Records 43, Page 876, Polk County Records.

"ALSO SAVE AND EXCEPT that portion thereof conveyed by Deed from Hal Secrest, as to an undivided one-fifth (1/5th) interest, Brice Caldwell, as to an undivided one-fifth (1/5th) interest, Harold Pippin, as to an undivided one-fifth (1/5th) interest, Caroline G. Ward, as to an undivided one-fifth (1/5th) interest, and Margaret G. Hall, as to an undivided one-fifth (1/5th) interest, all as tenants in common, unto the Western Foundation, an Oregon non-profit organization, by Bargain and Sale Deed dated August 13, 1985, and recorded at Book of Records 189, Page 1519, in the Polk County Records on September 23, 1985, and re-recorded at Book of Records 189, Page 1666 of the Polk County Records on September 26, 1985."

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board concur with the request of Western Oregon State College and accept the donation of the property described above, without restrictions as to use, and adjust the boundaries of the campus to include the donated parcel.

The proposal should be discussed by the Board at the November meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for final action at the December meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (November 16, 1989)

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and placed the proposal on the Consent Agenda for the December meeting.

Authorization To Dispose of Surplus Property, OIT

Staff Report to the Committee

Institutional officials at Oregon Institute of Technology have requested that the building and land owned by Oregon Institute of Technology in the down-town area of Klamath Falls be declared surplus to the needs of the institution and offered for sale. The property consists of a parcel approximately 66.25 feet by 112 feet located at 239 Main Street (the southwest corner of the intersection of Main and Third streets). The property was acquired as a gift from California Oregon Broadcasting Investments, an Oregon partnership. The property has been used as a storage facility by Oregon Institute of Technology but, due to structural limitations of the building, it is no longer suited for this purpose.
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 value indicated by appraisals of the property.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that an area of approximately 0.17 acres in the downtown area of Klamath Falls 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 improved with a building known as the old KOTI-TV facility.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

Officials at Oregon State University have forwarded to the Board's Office an option for the sale of a parcel of land on the north end of the campus at 2963 Orchard Street. The property is owned by Evan K. and Mary E. Gibson, and the option price of $59,750 is the average of two independent appraisals obtained by the University. The property has a total area of approximately 5,000 square feet of land, or about .115 acres. The property is in an area of campus that has a critical shortage of parking and has been designated for parking purposes.

A 50-year old house which the College plans to demolish is located on the property.

Funds required for the purchase of the property and related costs are to be provided from balances available at the institution from parking revenues. The land would be purchased under authorization of Chapter 640, Oregon Laws 1985, as amended by the State Emergency Board.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Office of Administration be authorized to purchase the Gibson property at 2963 Orchard Street on the northern edge of the Oregon State University campus at the option price of $59,750.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Bruggere asked if the purchase had any fiscal impact other than that covered by parking fees and was told that it did not. In response to a question from Mr. Swanson, Mr. Fernsteiner also explained the source of parking reserves.

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

Mr. Hensley said the price for the property seemed somewhat expensive. Mr. Fernsteiner explained that even though the house would be demolished it did have value to the owners. They were willing to sell at this price, and the property was of value to the state because it would complete the holdings needed for parking purposes in this location.

Board Discussion and Action

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

State Land Use and Campus Plans: QAR 580-50-001 and IMD 7.100

Staff Report to the Committee

Under Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 197.180, each state agency is required to prepare a State Agency Coordination (SAC) program to assure that its "rules and programs affecting land use" comply with the Statewide Land Use Planning Goals (Goals) and are compatible with acknowledged city and county comprehensive plans and land use regulations. (Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) QAR 660, Division 30.

ORS 197.180 is implemented by Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 660-30-060, which defines and explains the four requirements a state agency must include in its State Agency Coordination program as follows:

1. Agency rules and summaries of programs affecting land use.

2. A program pursuant to ORS 197.040(2)(e) coordinating planning efforts of state agencies to assure compliance with goals and compatibility with city and county comprehensive plans.
3. A program pursuant to ORS 197.090(1)(b) coordinating the land conservation and development functions of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) with such functions of federal agencies, other state agencies, local governments, and special districts.

4. A program for cooperation with and technical assistance to local governments.

To fulfill our obligation under the statute, it is necessary for the Board to adopt an Administrative Rule and implementing Internal Management Directive. Both the proposed rule and directive follow current practice.

The proposed rule will be scheduled for public hearing during the next several weeks and presented to the Board for final adoption at the December meeting. The IMD may be approved and presented on the Consent Agenda for the December meeting.

The rule and directive are presented below. The new IMD 7.100 will replace the present IMD 7.100, Master Campus Planning.

OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
Division 50

REAL PROPERTY, FACILITY, AND CAMPUS PLANNING

Comprehensive Plan Coordination

580-50-001 Use of property owned by the Board shall conform to the Department of Higher Education Coordination Plan created pursuant to the Land Conservation and Development Commission OAR 660, Division 30, State Agency Coordination.

Compliance with Statewide Goals and compatibility with acknowledged Comprehensive Plans shall be achieved by making decisions concerning property owned by the Board in conformance with local jurisdiction comprehensive land use plans and land use regulation as follows:

(1) For each of the Board’s institutions, a long-range campus development plan shall be formulated covering at least the area within the approved campus boundaries. Campus plans shall be reviewed with officials of the local jurisdiction for conformance with the local acknowledged Comprehensive Plan. A campus plan may be formulated as a refinement plan or amendment to the local Comprehensive Plan and be implemented as a special zoning district or planning district within the local jurisdiction land use regulations.
(2) For other lands which support activities governed by the Board, the activity and the land use shall conform to the local jurisdiction acknowledged Comprehensive Plan and associated land use regulations.

INTERNAL MANAGEMENT DIRECTIVES

Section 7 - Planning, Facilities, and Physical Plant

Planning and Capital Construction

7.100 Long-Range Campus Development Planning

Long-range campus development plans shall be formulated for each institution of the State System of Higher Education.

A long-range campus development plan is a generalized outline statement of the present status of an institution and how it is expected to develop in the future, consistent with the institutional mission, enrollment data and projections. The plan shall serve as a basis for making decisions about facilities needed to support the instructional, research, and service programs of the institutions. A campus plan shall identify Board-approved campus boundaries, land development characteristics, aesthetic considerations, location of facilities serving the various programs of the institution, location of sites for proposed facilities, student housing, relationship to the surrounding neighborhood, and the infrastructure to support the programs, students, faculty, staff, and facilities. The infrastructure to be outlined shall include the pedestrian circulation, bicycle circulation and parking, automobile circulation and parking, mass transit, the pattern and layout of service requirements, and utility systems.

The Board’s Office and institution staff members shall review the plans and update them periodically. Professional consultants may be employed to review and assist in preparing such plans. The assumptions and objectives upon which a plan is developed or modified shall be reviewed by the Board. Each campus plan and amendments or revisions shall be approved locally under procedures specified by the institution. Long-range campus development plans and significant revisions thereof shall be submitted to the Chancellor and the Board for approval.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant and the Board discuss the Internal Management Directive at the November meeting and place it on the Consent Agenda for approval at the December Board meeting. The staff further recommended that the Committee approve the Administrative Rule, subject to further consideration after the public hearing.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Bruggere asked what things in the proposed rule might be controversial at the time of the public hearing, and Mr. Pernsteiner said he did not anticipate there would be any. The proposal is something that is required of every state agency. As long as the local jurisdictions are reasonably pleased with the progress being made by state agencies, there has been very little opposition to date. He described briefly what the proposed rule would do.

In response to a question from Mr. Swanson, it was stated the proposal also would apply to off-campus facilities.

Mr. Pernsteiner commented that it had been the practice in the State System to conform to the local planning and approval processes.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations and place the proposal on the Consent Agenda for the December Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (November 16, 1989)

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

Authorization To Deed Lands to Federal Government, OHSU

Staff Report to the Committee

In July 1989, the Board authorized an easement to accommodate construction of a pedestrian bridge which will link the Veterans Administration Medical Center and University Hospital South at the Oregon Health Sciences University, including placing of a supporting pier through OHSU Parking Structure Two.

The U. S. Department of Justice recently has advised the Veterans Administration that an easement is not totally satisfactory and a general warranty deed of some land from the State of Oregon to the federal government will be required before the project may proceed to bid and contract.
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Counsel has advised there are no legal proscriptions against issuing a bargain and sale deed and transferring ownership from the state, assuming the necessary standard processes are cleared, (e.g., offering to other state agencies and political subdivisions). President Kohler has requested that the replacement of an easement with a deed be authorized, if necessary, in order to expedite this important capital project. The actual parcel or parcels to be deeded require further verification. In any event, if property must be deeded, the amount will be negligible.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize the President and Secretary of the Board to execute an appropriate form of deed to the federal government necessary to enable the sitting of a pier through OHSU Parking Structure Two.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Swanson inquired who would pay the increased cost of doing the project this way. Mr. Pernsteiner said the federal government was paying for the entire project except for the elevator. There is an agreement that limits the State System’s financial responsibility. A potential disagreement could occur if that limit were not reached.

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, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Amendments to
QAR 580-21-200
through 580-21-240; Adoption of QAR 580-21-245, All Relating to Sabbatical Leave Policy

Staff Report to the Committee

Institution presidents, with the concurrence of the Chancellor, have recommended that final approval of sabbatical leave applications and agreements be delegated to the institutions and that several other modifications be made to the Board’s Administrative Rules on sabbatical leaves.

The purpose of a sabbatical leave is to enable a member of the faculty to undertake research, writing, study, travel, advanced degree work, or other creative endeavors which would not be possible while performing regular institutional responsibilities. Experience verifies our expectation that the practice of granting sabbatical leaves increases the usefulness, effectiveness, and productivity of faculty.

-537-
In addition to the major policy change delegating final approval of sabbaticals from the Chancellor to the institution president or his designee, other significant changes proposed are explained below.

1. The current rule provides that staff must be continuously employed in the Department of Higher Education at half-time or more for six academic or fiscal years at the rank of instructor or above as a major criteria for eligibility. The proposed provision would permit an accumulation of six FTE years or continuous appointment for eighteen academic quarters. The proposed policy removes those in the instructor rank from eligibility but retains eligibility for senior instructors. Prior service at rank of Instructor, Lecturer, or Research Assistant with subsequent promotion to a higher rank, however, may be considered as part of the period of accumulated service.

2. It is proposed that a sabbatical may be delayed up to two years from the date of eligibility without postponing eligibility for a subsequent leave, thus allowing eligibility for two sabbatical leaves within fourteen years.

3. Salary calculations are changed to be consistent with eligibility modifications, and provision is made to permit salary increases to become effective during a sabbatical.

4. Additional language is proposed under the obligation to return section. If there is failure to meet this obligation, full payment is required within three months, including health care and retirement contribution payments.

5. Institution presidents are to submit to the Chancellor an annual report describing sabbatical leave activity.

The fiscal impact of the proposed rule change would be nominal.

Drafts of the proposed language were circulated to the institutions, and the response has been favorable. The proposed language was also sent to the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS), the Association of Oregon Faculties (AOF) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). They each responded in support of the amended policy, the last two at the public hearing held pursuant to ORS 351.070 on October 31, 1989, at 2:30 p.m. on the University of Oregon campus. No testimony opposing the changes was offered designated hearings officer Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board adopt the proposed amendments to OAR 580-21-200 through 580-21-240 and also adopt OAR 580-21-245, Sabbatical Leave, to become effective January 1, 1990. The proposed changes should be discussed at the November Board meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for the December meeting. The proposed rules appear below:

Sabbatical Leave

Purposes of Sabbatical Leave

580-21-200  (1) Sabbatical leave is granted to [staff-members of unclassified employees having academic rank for purposes of research, writing, advanced study, travel undertaken for observation and study of conditions in our own or in other countries affecting the applicant’s field or related scholarly or professional activities. Since sabbatical leave is a privilege and not a right, it is granted only when it can be shown that the applicant is capable of using this period in a manner which will provide greater service thereafter increase the applicant’s effectiveness to the institution and to the state.

[(2) The policy on sabbatical leaves shall be uniform for all Department-institutions insofar as possible.]}

Eligibility for Sabbatical Leave

580-21-205  (1) [An academic staff may be considered for sabbatical leave only after having been continuously employed in the Department of Higher Education at half time or more for six academic or fiscal years at the rank of instructor or above. An unclassified employee appointed at .5 FTE or more, with the rank of Senior Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, Research Associate, or Senior Research Associate may be considered for sabbatical leave;

(a) After having been continuously appointed without interruption by a sabbatical leave for eighteen (18) academic quarters (excluding Summer Session) or, in the case of twelve-month faculty, seventy-two (72) months; or

(b) After having accumulated the equivalent of 6.0 FTE years over an indefinite period of nine-month or twelve-month appointments uninterrupted by a sabbatical leave.

(c) Prior service at the ranks of Instructor, Lecturer or Research Assistant, when leading to a promotion to a higher rank, may be considered by an institution president as part of the period of accumulated service for the purposes of the time requirement for sabbatical eligibility.
(2) A series of [annal] appointments shall be considered continuous whether or not interrupted by one or more authorized leaves of absence other than a sabbatical leave. A one-year period of appointment at less than .5 FTE will count as a period of accumulated service for purposes of the time requirement for sabbatical eligibility. [However, a] An authorized leave of absence [does] will not [count] as a year of service for purposes of the six-year requirement for sabbatical eligibility, nor does it prejudice the staff member’s [right to consideration] eligibility for sabbatical leave. Academic staff members [employed on academic-year-appointments] may be considered for subsequent sabbatical leaves after [completing six years of continuous service following return from the last sabbatical leave] again satisfying the conditions specified in 580-21-205(1)(a) or (b). [Academic staff members employed on a twelve-month appointment may be considered for a second or subsequent sabbatical (limited to four months) after four and one half years of continuous service following return from the last sabbatical leave; or, in the alternative, may be considered for any one of the three types of sabbatical leave listed in rule 580-21-230 after six years of continuous service following return from the last sabbatical leave.] Cases involving mixed terms of service [or other irregular conditions] may be adjusted by [administrative officers] the institutional president or the president’s designee, in accordance with the principles set forth in this [division] rule.

(3) For institutional convenience, and at the initiative and sole discretion of the institution, a sabbatical leave may be delayed by up to two years. In such instances, the academic staff member will become eligible for a succeeding sabbatical leave after an equivalently reduced period of years. This subsection applies to a maximum of fourteen (14) consecutive years, covering two possible sabbatical leaves. The same agreement may be negotiated, again for institutional convenience, in subsequent fourteen-year periods.

[42] (4) Sabbatical leave privileges may be granted to [staff members] unclassified employees in special positions of responsibility and trust, even though [these staff members] they do not hold academic rank. Eligibility for this class of employees will be determined in the manner described in 580-21-205(1). Recommendations for sabbatical leave for [persons] the above-referenced unclassified staff members not otherwise qualified may be made in exceptional cases only at the discretion of [individual] institution Presidents.
[(3)] (5) For purposes of determining eligibility for sabbatical leave, time spent [by a staff member] on an authorized military leave from a Department institution shall be considered as institutional service [with the understanding that during the military leave the staff member is considered to have the same academic rank held at the commencement of the leave].

[(4)] (6) Salary received by an academic staff member during sabbatical leave will be calculated as follows:

(a) Salary under OAR 580-21-205(1)(a) shall be a percentage (determined by OAR 580-21-225 or 580-21-230) of the academic staff member's annual rate multiplied by the average FTE at which the academic staff member was appointed during the [eligibility] 6.0 FTE years immediately preceding prior to the sabbatical leave. Presidents shall have the authority and discretion to interpret special circumstances in this regard. For purposes of [this rate] OAR 580-21-205(6)(a), eligibility years are the [years] eighteen (18) academic quarters (excluding Summer Session) or in the case of twelve-month faculty, seventy-two (72) months of continuous employment at half-time or more that result in the academic staff member's eligibility for sabbatical leave under OAR 580-21-205(1)(a).

(b) Salary under OAR 580-21-205(1)(b) shall be a percentage (determined by OAR 580-21-225 or 580-21-230) of the academic staff member's annual rate in effect at the time the sabbatical leave begins.

(c) If during the period of sabbatical leave the institution allocates salary increases to its academic staff members, the annual rate of the academic staff member on sabbatical leave will be increased by the appropriate amount effective on the date that the salary increase was granted.

Approval and Revisions of Sabbatical Leave Agreements

580-21-210 (1) Sabbatical leave shall be granted only if approved by the President [and the Chancellor] or designee.

(2) Revision of the sabbatical leave program or other terms and conditions of the agreement shall be approved by all parties to the original agreement.

Sabbatical Leave Reports

580-21-215 [During the period of sabbatical leave the staff member shall inform the President in writing if any change is made in the program for sabbatical leave as outlined in the application.]
(1) At the end of the sabbatical leave, the staff member shall submit a report of the accomplishments and benefits resulting from the leave, filing copies with the Department Head, the Dean, and the President.

(2) Institutional presidents shall submit an annual report describing sabbatical leave activity in the manner required.

Obligation to Return

580-21-220 Each academic staff member in applying for sabbatical leave shall sign an agreement to return to the institution for a period of at least one year's service on completion of the leave. If an academic staff member fails to fulfill this obligation, the academic staff member shall repay the full salary paid during the leave plus the health care and retirement contribution paid by the institution on behalf of the academic staff member during the leave. This amount is due and payable three months following the date designated in the sabbatical agreement for the faculty member to return to the institution.

Length of Leave for Academic Year Staff

580-21-225 Staff members employed on an academic year basis are eligible for one of the following types of leave:

(1) Academic year staff other than the University of Oregon School of Law faculty:

(a) One academic year (three terms) on 60% salary during the period of sabbatical leave;

(b) Two-thirds of an academic year (two terms) on 75% salary during the period of sabbatical leave;

(c) One-third of an academic year (one term) on 85% salary during the period of sabbatical leave.

(2) Academic year staff at the University of Oregon School of Law:

(a) One academic year (two semesters) on 50% salary during the period of sabbatical leave;

(b) One-half academic year (one semester) on 100% salary during the period of sabbatical leave.

Length of Leave for Fiscal Year Staff

580-21-230 Staff members employed on a fiscal-year basis are eligible for one of the following types of leave:
(1) One year (twelve months) on 60% salary during the period of sabbatical leave;

(2) Two-thirds of a year (eight months) on 75% salary during the period of sabbatical leave;

(3) One-third of a year (four months) on 85% salary during the period of sabbatical leave.

Cost of Sabbatical Leaves

580-21-235 The cost of granting sabbatical leaves shall be financed within the funds allotted to the institutions.

Supplementing of Sabbatical Incomes

580-21-240 Staff members on sabbatical leave may supplement their sabbatical salaries to a reasonable degree, provided that such supplementation [does not interfere with the objectives of the sabbatical leave.] strictly conforms to the stated and approved purposes of the sabbatical leave.

Policy Regarding Sabbatical Leave

[580-21-200(2)] 580-21-245 The policy on sabbatical leaves shall be uniform for all department institutions insofar as possible.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Lemman presented the staff report and recommendation. He said the proposed changes had been reviewed on all of the campuses and by the Academic Council and others. Three people attended the public hearing and their testimony was all in support of the proposed changes.

In response to a question from Mr. Bailey, Mr. Lemman estimated that perhaps one-third to one-half of those eligible for sabbatical leaves actually take them.

Mr. Bruggere inquired how the sabbatical leave policy would compare to that of other state institutions once the changes were made. Mr. Lemman responded that it was his impression the State System's policy was very much in line with those of other public institutions. He said the changes did not represent a liberalization of the policy except in one instance, the accumulation of FTE years. The nominal cost would result from having a few additional people eligible who are not eligible under the present policy.
Mr. Bruggere said he noted there had been no particular opposition to the policy. He asked whether the reaction appeared to be positive, negative, or neutral.

Mr. Lemman said it was very positive in testimony and review by faculty groups, deans, and presidents. The proposals came from them and were not imposed upon them.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Bruggere presented the Committee report and recommendation.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and on roll call vote adopted QAR 580-21-200 through 580-21-245, Sabbatical Leave Policy. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

The University of Oregon is requesting an increase in the Law School Resource Fee to generate additional funds to meet the problems of underfunding at the Law School. This request is in response to the American Bar Association's unfavorable accreditation review of the University Law School.

The University Law School currently assesses all full-time students a Resource Fee of $600 per year. This fee generates about $240,000 a year to support library acquisitions, support staff in the Law Library and salaries of Law faculty.

The University proposes that the Resource Fee be increased differentially for resident and non-resident students, with the major increase being borne by non-resident students. Further, the University proposes incremental increases in the fee over a three year period from the current $600 per year to $860 per year by Fall 1992 for resident students, and to $2,400 per year for non-resident students. The proposed increases in the Resource Fee and estimated increases in other fees through Fall 1992 are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed Resource Fee</th>
<th>Estimated Instr. Fee</th>
<th>Estimated Other Fees</th>
<th>Estimated Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>$ 600</td>
<td>$2,120</td>
<td>$446</td>
<td>$3,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>3,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>3,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>$ 600</td>
<td>$3,722</td>
<td>$446</td>
<td>$4,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>5,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>6,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>4,685</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>7,605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Instruction Fees and Other Fees are estimated for 1990-91 through 1992-93.

To help ease the burden of the fee increase on students, the University proposes that the Resource Fee be frozen until graduation at the level in effect upon entrance for all students who enroll prior to Fall 1992. This request by the University will result in having to administer no fewer than six, and more likely eight, different fee levels for law students by Fall 1992.

The University estimates that the requested increase in the Resource Fee will generate the following additional resources for the Law School:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>$ 35,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>127,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>231,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>261,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>274,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the University wishes to phase-in the increases over three years and to freeze the fee for students admitted prior to Fall 1992, the full revenue impact of the recommended Resource Fee increases will not occur until 1994-95.

The University is desirous of responding in a positive way to the concerns expressed by the American Bar Association in its accreditation review, and thus is requesting that the Board adopt a temporary (emergency) administrative rule increasing the Law School Resource Fee effective Fall Semester 1990. In the opinion of the University, the adoption of a temporary administrative rule by the Board will provide the needed evidence that the Board is in agreement with the University's plan for addressing the concerns expressed by the ABA in its accreditation review. It should be noted that the final administrative rule establishing all fees for 1990-91 will come before the Board in July 1990.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board of Higher Education adopt a temporary administrative rule establishing the following Law Resources Fees beginning Fall 1990 through Fall 1992:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Non-residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admitted Fall 1989</td>
<td>$300/semester</td>
<td>$300/semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted Fall 1990</td>
<td>$375/semester</td>
<td>$450/semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted Fall 1991</td>
<td>$400/semester</td>
<td>$825/semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted Fall 1992</td>
<td>$430/semester</td>
<td>$1,200/semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Bailey expressed concern that, if the crisis is as great as has been presented, this proposal would not raise enough money in the short term. There would be no significant effect for at least two to three years in funding for faculty, resource, or library support. He questioned whether the support generated would be sufficient to satisfy the American Bar Association. He asked if it were unrealistic to increase the fees over five years when the crisis would occur over the next eighteen months.

President Brand said one reason for the slow increase in revenue for the first few years was the importance of not placing an additional burden on students already enrolled who entered the law school without the prospect of these increased fees. At the same time, the needs pointed out by the American Bar Association can be met over several years. Although the revenue would not come in immediately, faculty recruiting would begin a year before the funds would be available because an academic search takes a full year in any case. It will be possible to make up the major problems in the law library in the short term. It will take longer to improve partially the faculty salaries, but the promise of that happening would probably be sufficient to retain good faculty members.

Mr. Bailey then asked if the funds available at the end of the four-year increase would be adequate to bring the law school to the place it should be, or does the Board in its budgetary and planning processes need to go immediately to the Legislature and others to explain the importance to the institution and the state of adequate funding for this program.

President Brand stated this was a stop-gap measure and the proposal would not solve the problem. He said it was a solution that would permit moving forward while solving more general problems in the entire university. He stated the salary structure at the University of Oregon was between 25% and 50% below national norms to attract the type of people the institution wants.
Mr. Bruggere said he understood the accreditation problem which the proposal was attempting to solve by sending a somewhat positive message to the American Bar Association that the Board was willing to increase resources. It also sends a negative message to students. He commented that the fee income would have only a small impact on the problems that exist and questioned whether the American Bar Association might consider the response as mere tokenism. Given the level of the problem, Mr. Bruggere suggested the Board should perhaps be doing something significantly more.

President Brand said there was a limit to the amount which could be charged to the students. He indicated the University already was funding the law school slightly above the average among all of the colleges on campus. The real problem is the institution as a whole is underfunded by 25% in the BAS model and that has hurt faculty salary needs. This proposal will not solve that problem, but it will be possible to make progress. The resources can be used immediately for library and other needs, and faculty recruitment can begin for later implementation. In seeking new faculty, it will be possible to address the concerns of the Bar Association with respect to complete coverage in various areas.

President Brand said an effort had been made in the recommended fees to bring the out-of-state and in-state fee schedules in line with the national and regional norms.

President Brand said the American Bar Association had raised questions over a period of several years and there had been no progress in considering those issues. This led to presentation of the show-cause letter. He commented similar letters had been sent to other institutions with no subsequent action by the Bar Association. Nevertheless, such a letter is harmful in recruiting new students and faculty. President Brand said he believed the proposed action would satisfy the American Bar Association as a genuine movement forward.

Mr. Bruggere then asked whether it would not be relatively easy for an out-of-state student to establish residency and not be assessed the higher nonresident fee. President Brand said the Board’s staff was currently reviewing changes in the residency requirements which would make it more difficult to gain resident status. This has been considered in the projections.

Dean Maurice Holland emphasized the importance of timely action and concurred in the earlier remarks of President Brand with respect to funding. He said this modest action is critically important at this particular time to provide the American Bar Association with evidence that the University administration and the Board had taken emergency action to authorize the request.
Mr. Bruggere said that, regardless of the ultimate decision on this request, the Board should address the long-term problem. The University should come back to the Board with a plan with various options to do so on a long-term basis.

Mr. Hensley said he was concerned that the law school be of top quality and said he did not have a sense of how this investment would improve the quality.

Dean Holland cited library improvements specifically. Dr. Brand stated there were severe university- and system-wide problems which needed to be addressed but the market flexibility with respect to charges for out-of-state students was an opportunity to meet some of the needs.

Mr. Swanson said it was his understanding the resource fee was approved by the Legislature because the needs of the law school had not been met. The situation is part of a larger issue of whether to charge market rates to out-of-state students. The recommendation before the Committee was for a modest increase for in-state students, with the major burden falling on out-of-state students. If the quality of the law school is high enough to attract students from other states, the Board has an obligation to the people of Oregon to charge those students the market price for their education rather than giving them a terrific bargain. Mr. Swanson added that he viewed this as part of a larger issue. If graduate education offers people from out of the state an opportunity to increase their income capacity, it makes sense for the Board to set tuition at the market level in order to increase its in-state funding.

Mr. Hensley cautioned that departments in high demand also have suggested they could go to a different pricing structure for some of the undergraduate programs. The Board traditionally has resisted market-level pricing. He said the present proposal was being watched as a precedent with respect to differential pricing.

President Brand stated this question was one which should be faced in reviewing tuition policy. Unfortunately, waiting for the tuition policy to be established would have the potential of seriously affecting adversely the law school. In addition, there is a precedent for the law fee.

Mr. Bruggere asked if there were any assurance the law school would not lose its accreditation even if the fee increases were approved.
President Brand said he did not believe the accreditation was seriously at risk but the ability to recruit and retain students and faculty was at risk as long as the accreditation issue remained. He said he was extremely optimistic the American Bar Association would be satisfied with the approval of the request. Dean Holland concurred. Mr. Bruggere's remarks that the tuition represented a small part of the overall effort would be helpful as well.

The Committee discussed the accreditation situation and procedure briefly.

Mr. Bruggere said approval to increase the fees should include an instruction to the staff to return with a plan for what really needed to be done in order to solve the University of Oregon Law School's problems.

President Brand said he would appreciate that opportunity. He indicated the University was engaged in a long-range strategic planning process for the entire institution. The law school plan would be a key element in that process.

Mr. Bruggere asked staff to comment about the precedent-setting aspect of the proposed action and any alternatives available.

Mr. Lemmon said he did not view the recommendation as a precedent or that it would require doing the same thing elsewhere. The increase is a resource fee, not an increase in tuition where the entire amount would go to the Board for reallocation.

Mr. Bruggere moved to amend the staff recommendation to add instructions to the Chancellor's Office to come back to the Board with a long-range plan for the University of Oregon Law School. The plan should look at all possible alternatives to accomplish what needs to be done. Mr. Bruggere originally requested the plan be brought to the Board within three to six months. Since the long-range plan will not be completed for almost a year, it was agreed the time could be flexible but a preliminary progress report within the six-months' period was requested.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented, with the addition of the amendment to instruct the Chancellor to bring the long-range plan for the law school to the Board.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Bruggere summarized the Committee discussion and recommendation.
Mr. Hensley pointed out the maximum period for a temporary rule is 180 days and that the fee was a resource fee rather than a tuition increase. Any later change in tuition policy would be a separate issue from the proposal before the Board.

In response to a question from Mr. Johnston, Mr. Lemman indicated it was Board policy to hold a public hearing concerning fees and one would be held prior to the expiration of the temporary rule.

Mr. Adams inquired how the proposed rate would compare with those of the other two private law schools in Oregon. Dean Holland said their tuitions are about $9,000 per year. The University of Oregon's total charge, even at the end of the four-year implementation period, would be below that of the private schools. For nonresidents, it would be slightly below; for residents, the fee would be considerably lower.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation to adopt the temporary rule and instruct the Chancellor to develop a long-range plan for meeting the needs of the law school. On roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Ms. Wilson reported she had spent part of a day on the campus of Oregon State University in the business school. She said she had been very pleased with the computer technology and the creativity of the staff in the computer world. Oregon State's business school, in the computer arena, is the testing site for a number of major companies for software products before they are placed on the market.

Mr. Adams said he had attended the opening ceremonies for the new dormitory, Heritage Hall, at Western Oregon State College. The facility is a very attractive and practical dormitory to house 400 students.

Mr. Bruggere announced that OCAIE had received a $50,000 grant from GTE. The official presentation was made at a very well attended ceremony on November 6.

Mr. Bruggere said the report of the American Electronics Association with respect to Portland State University was a complicating factor in the PSU Presidential Search. Fortunately, at the time the report was released, Dr. Large and he were on the way to Washington, D.C., and had an opportunity to talk various association heads and others what was occurring, inform them about the Portland Commission, and explain some of the preliminary developments. He said they learned other states were facing similar commission activities.
Mr. Bruggere said the announcement of the position at Portland State was in the November 15 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Mr. Dodson said he had represented the State System at a conference which the Chancellor moderated on the state of education in Oregon. He commended the Chancellor on his participation and said he thought activities of this nature would be helpful in terms of greater outreach in the next legislative session.

**PRESIDENT’S REPORT**

Mr. Hensley said he had been impressed with the ceremony inaugurating Dr. Brand as President of the University of Oregon and welcomed him officially as the new president.

Next Meeting Dates

Mr. Hensley announced that the next regular Board meeting would be held on Thursday, December 14, at the new OCATE facility.

Presidential Housing Review Committee

Mr. Hensley appointed the committee for review of presidential housing. Mr. Adams will chair the committee, and Miss Matthews and Mr. Swanson will serve as the other members.

**BOARD LUNCHEON**

The Board met for luncheon at the conclusion of the regular meeting. No business was transacted at that time.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

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