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BOARD LUNCHEON

ADJOURNMENT
A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Bean Conference Room, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m., Friday, January 19, 1990, 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. Mark Dodson
- Mr. Gary Johnston
- Miss Annette Matthews
- Mr. Rob Miller
- Mr. George Richardson, Jr.
- Mr. Les Swanson, Jr.
- Ms. Janice Wilson
- Mr. Richard Hensley

Absent: Director Bruggere was absent for business reasons.

Chancellor Bartlett and Presidents Brand, Byrne, Cox, Edgington, Gilbert, Kohler, and Meyers were present. President Blake was absent to serve as a consultant to assist Purdue University in developing a Strategic Plan for Internationalization.

OTHERS PRESENT

Chancellor's Office—Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Secretary Wilma Foster; W. T. Lemman, Executive Vice Chancellor; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Robert Frank, Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; 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; Roger Olsen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services; Virginia Thompson, Executive Assistant to the Chancellor; Margie Frazier, Assistant to Executive Vice Chancellor; Virginia Boushey, Gary Christensen, and James Payne, Assistant Vice Chancellors, Academic Affairs; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications.

Eastern Oregon State College—President David Gilbert; James Lundy, Dean of Administration; James Hottois, Dean of Academic Affairs; Richard Stenard, Dean of Student Affairs.
The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on December 14, 1989, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Hensley said all were saddened to learn of the death of Dick Hill shortly after the December Board meeting. Most of those who were present at that meeting were deeply moved when Dr. Hill gave his own personal story about academic freedom and tenure.
Mr. Hensley said many individuals probably were not aware that, when there was some stress several years ago between the Board and its relationship with the administration of the University of Oregon, Dr. Hill acted as peacemaker. Mr. Hensley said he had been impressed with the character and integrity that Dr. Hill displayed during those difficult times, not only from the standpoint of his loyalty to the institution and its administration, but also his loyalty to the State System. He said he had asked the Chancellor to prepare and present a resolution for adoption by the Board as a message from the entire State System in the loss of Dick Hill, a dear friend and colleague.

The Chancellor read the following resolution honoring Richard J. Hill:

RESOLUTION HONORING DR. RICHARD J. HILL

The Board of Higher Education expresses its very great respect and admiration for Richard J. Hill. He made notable contributions to all of higher education: as teacher and scholar; as distinguished researcher in sociology; as professor and department head; as college dean; as vice president for academic affairs and provost; and most recently, as Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in the Oregon State System of Higher Education. In a very short time, he had already made a major impact in his service as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. He was deeply dedicated both to his institution and to higher education generally in Oregon. Whatever the task, he threw himself into it with total commitment.

Dr. Hill was a person of the greatest integrity with a passionate devotion to principle. He was eloquent in defense of his convictions, and the Board remembers well his profound statement about academic freedom delivered at the very last meeting of the Board that he attended. This same person, who could be so strong and decisive when the occasion demanded, was also one of the most gentle and humane people and one of the most honest in all of his relations with others.

It is a tragic loss for all of us that Richard J. Hill passed away when he was still contributing so much of value to the future of higher education in this state. We shall greatly miss and long remember our friend Dick Hill, who cared so very deeply about higher education and its people and who was in turn so much loved and admired by all whose lives were touched by him.
The Board adopted the resolution, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Appointment of R. J. Frank as Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

The Chancellor announced the appointment of Dr. Robert J. Frank as Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to fill the vacancy resulting from the death of Dr. Hill. He said it was very fortunate it had been possible to draw Dr. Frank into the position so quickly so the momentum which had been gathering in that office could be sustained. The Chancellor said he felt a great sense of debt to those colleagues at Oregon State University who had made it possible for Dr. Frank to accept the assignment and Dr. Frank for his willingness to assume this heavy responsibility.

The Chancellor indicated Dr. Frank had been chairman of the Department of English at Oregon State University for more than a decade. He was acting dean of the College of Liberal Arts for two years. He is known to his colleagues at Oregon State University as a scholar and leader.

Evaluation of President John Byrne, OSU

The Chancellor said the evaluation of President John Byrne had been completed. It was the first of several presidential evaluations to be made during 1990. He said the full report was confidential in accordance with Board policy and tradition. The Chancellor then read the following excerpts from the letter he was sending to President Hensley as the public record of the evaluation.

The evaluation of Dr. John Byrne, President of Oregon State University is completed. The full report, including President Byrne's statement of stewardship and physician's report, schedule of individuals and groups interviewed, and the report of the consultant, is on file in my office and available for review by members of the Board.

As you will recall, I chose to use an outside consultant for the on-site visitation aspect of the evaluation. Dr. John Ryan, President Emeritus of Indiana University, agreed to conduct this aspect of the evaluation. This letter constitutes my summary of and the public report of the evaluation.

Interviews were conducted by Dr. Ryan at OSU on January 8 and 9, 1990. Vice President M. Lynn Spruill of OSU was on-site coordinator for the visitation and arranged for a cross-section of constituencies of the University's student leaders, student "walk-ins", faculty leaders, staff representatives, alumni officers, Foundation and development volunteers and staff, community leaders, Deans, directors, and vice-presidents.
President Byrne is recognized by all constituencies participating in the evaluation, including those providing written comments, to be an effective, energetic leader in academic and administrative interests of Oregon State University. He is seen to have been active in preparing important academic and administrative milieus which are proving to have been correct and successful. President Byrne is properly cognizant of the participatory requirements of university governance, both formal and informal, and succeeds in bringing the faculty and other members of the academic community into the information sharing and the decision process. Some instances of lapses in communication and breakdown in involvement were reported, but these are seen as minor or unintentional, and it is understood that President Byrne seeks to assure full participation by all associates with the spirit of collegiality.

President Byrne and I have reviewed all of the specifics of Dr. Ryan’s conversations, including comments regarding the Long-Range Plan, the administrative organization structure, the policy process and the leadership of the President in policy formulation, as well as monitoring implementation throughout the “machinery” of the organization. The President proposes to bring the matters reported to him to the attention of appropriate parties.

The many external demands on a President, especially in the early, get-acquainted years, reduced somewhat his visibility and availability, on campus. He has used time well, but Dr. Byrne understands the desirability of increasing contact and communication with students, faculty, and other campus groups. Efforts are already being made to adapt his schedule to this purpose.

President Byrne is universally regarded with liking and respect. It is generally accepted that he exhibits the highest qualities of integrity and honesty. The University community acknowledges and appreciates the contributions of Mrs. Byrne to OSU and the importance of their joint activities to the obvious success of the Presidency.

The consultant concluded his report, "I find Oregon State University to be impressive in its academic vision and potential. The students and faculty whom I met manifest admirable qualities of loyalty, constructive criticism, objectivity and collegiality." In all respects, these qualities reflect the vision, balance and stability of the leadership of John Byrne as President of Oregon State University.
The Chancellor said a consultant had been used for the first time in the evaluation of President Byrne. He said it was a useful device for professionalizing and rationalizing the evaluation process.

Mr. Hensley indicated one copy of the full report would be made available for those Board members who wished to see the full document. Dr. Large will communicate with Board members on the procedure to be followed in circulating the report.

The Chancellor said there had been an opportunity to assist in the development of the Governor's proposal described in his recent Eugene speech. The Governor intends to recommend to the next Legislative Session the faculty compensation proposal described in his speech.

The Chancellor said faculty retention and support were crucial elements in the material developed to advise the Governor. He said the hard work of Dr. Lesley Hallick and her colleagues on the Task Force on Faculty Support and Development had been very helpful in this regard.

The Chancellor said it was important to secure favorable response to the recommendation when it comes before the Legislature.

The Chancellor reported that Dr. Frank and Dr. Zanville appeared recently before the Joint Committee on Education. The meeting provided some clues as to signposts for the future on the issue of teacher preparation.

The issues discussed related to the State System's progress in implementing the fourth- and fifth-year teacher education programs. The issues related to students applying to programs that had not been approved yet by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, compensation to school districts for student teacher supervision, problems that arise over funding summer session programs that must be a part of the new teacher training programs, and faculty load differentiation in the context of shifts in the programs. The committee expressed concern as to whether there was sufficient consistency among these diverse programs. It also reflected the concerns of frustrated students and parents who are caught in the transition between the past and the new programs.

The Chancellor said all of these matters are being addressed; however, the teacher preparation program is an area in which many groups and constituencies outside of higher education will be involved continually.
Mr. Miller said the Committee on Instruction had heard a brief presentation concerning an applied research grant proposal. As part of the Governor's environmental package, he plans to ask the Emergency Board for $1 million of General Fund money for a Center for Applied Agricultural Research. The focus of the center will be primarily pesticide and food safety research. Higher education will be asked to work with these research funds by helping to facilitate the research time and space that currently exist in the State System to work with the shorter-term nature of this type of research. The grant would be matched by $1 million of industry money. The final structure is being developed and will be presented to the Board in future meetings.

No Board action was required.

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

In spring 1988, the Board indicated an interest in altering its program review policies. Two major areas of concern were identified: the need for follow-up review of programs approved by the Board and the need for external reviews of new graduate level programs. The Board asked staff to provide recommendations to the following two questions:

1. Should the Board conduct follow-up reviews of all new graduate level programs approved by the Board to assure that the campuses did, in fact, implement programs as they were approved to do?

2. With continuing concerns about duplication of effort among campuses at the graduate level as well as concerns about the adequacy of the Oregon State System of Higher Education's financial resources, how can the Board be certain that new graduate programs will meet a desired standard for quality and non-duplication of effort?

In response to these concerns, the staff began working in the summer of 1988 to collect data on graduate-level programs, to reexamine the Board's 1978 policy on the review of new program requests, and to survey other states' approaches to graduate-level program review. A chart summarizing the survey of institutional and/or system policy on external review of new graduate degree programs conducted in 1989 appears in Attachment A. Attachment A also contains examples of State System guidelines for the external review of new graduate programs.
In February 1989, Chancellor Bartlett asked the Academic Council to consider the idea of an external review policy for the System. The Academic Council subsequently established a subcommittee (see Attachment B for membership) to develop a draft policy and raise issues that should be considered by the Council and the Board should a policy be put forward. The issue of follow-up reviews of already-approved programs was temporarily tabled until completion of the external review procedure.

Once drafted, the external review procedure was reviewed by faculty between June and November 1989. Revisions were made in the procedure as a result of this review. The recommended policy, which follows, and guidelines (Attachment C) were approved by the Academic Council at its December 13, 1989, meeting.

Also in December 1989, a draft policy and guidelines for follow-up reviews were presented to the Academic Council. These documents are currently under review by appropriate committees at each institution. Revisions will be reviewed with the Academic Council in March. A recommended follow-up review policy and procedure is expected to be ready for Board consideration in May 1990.

Staff Analysis

Many system offices, higher education commissions, and multicampus universities require an external review of new graduate-level programs as part of the approval process. Boards particularly use information developed in external reviews to address issues of duplication and quality. These reviews are regarded as vitally important in light of the growing high cost of graduate level programs, and the impacts on growth potential for research and public service initiatives related to graduate level instructional programs.

The Oregon State System of Higher Education has witnessed considerable growth in new graduate degree programs, centers, and institutes over the past decade, despite severe resource limitations. Since 1983, the Board has approved some 30 new graduate-level programs and some 25 centers and institutes. Most of the new degree programs have been funded through internal reallocation. Some programs were approved by the Board "conditionally" upon legislative funding; these programs have still not been funded. While the centers and institutes are primarily supported by extramural funds, the presence of these entities on campus typically affect the instructional program and must be developed in concert with the institution's mission.
An external review procedure would assist the institution and Board to determine in the future if new programs, centers, and institutes can be supported adequately with available resources in line with quality standards established for the discipline throughout the country. The staff is, therefore, recommending that the Board adopt the following policy and guidelines with regard to external reviews of new graduate level programs.

Proposed Policy

Each Oregon State System of Higher Education institution requesting a new graduate degree program or significant new option within a given degree program is required to complete an external review of its proposed program. The external review must include a site visit by an external evaluation panel.

Each proposal for a new center or institute will be reviewed by an OGSHE Council of Graduate Deans and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to determine if an external review will be required. An external review will be customary for those centers/institutes that will require a significant and long-term state investment of resources and/or involve a significant instructional component.

The purpose of such reviews shall be to ensure quality and fiscal responsibility rather than restrict needed and desirable programs.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

1. The staff recommended that the Board require that any new graduate program request be accompanied by an external review report.

2. The staff recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs working with an OGSHE Council of Graduate Deans, determine if an external review will be required for a request for a new center or institute. An external review for a center or institute should be customary if there will be a significant and long-term state investment of resources and/or the center or institute involves a significant instructional component.

3. The staff recommended that the Board adopt the Guidelines for the External Review of New Graduate Programs as the procedure to be followed for all external reviews.

The proposal should be discussed by the Board at the January meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for final action at the February meeting.
The following supplementary materials were included in the full report which is on file in the Board’s Office. Copies are available from the Office of Academic Affairs:

Attachment A: Survey of Institutional and/or System Policy on External Review of New Graduate Degree Programs and Examples of State System Guidelines for the Review of New Graduate Programs.

Attachment B: Subcommittee on the External Review of Graduate Programs.

Attachment C: Guidelines for External Reviews.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Johnston said he had seen nothing in the report that dealt with the issue of follow-up reports on degree programs which had already been granted. He also inquired what the cost would be to the State System for the external review.

Dr. Zanville said the institutions had recommended that the cost be covered out of the program on the assumption that, if funds were inadequate to cover the external review, they probably should not be implementing a full graduate program. The cost for the external review was expected to be about $1,500.

Dr. Zanville briefly reviewed the historical background as set forth in the staff report. She said a decision had been made to proceed first with the external review and then address the question of follow-up review. The Academic Council is currently reviewing some recommended procedures.

Mr. Dodson commented that Wisconsin had a mandated five-year review after the start of a new program. He said he would prefer to see the institution voluntarily establish a review at the institutional level. He inquired about existing review procedures on the campuses.

Dr. Frank said graduate-level programs were reviewed every three to five years at Oregon State University. External agencies are part of the review in some cases. The procedures vary among the State System campuses.

The Committee recommended that the Board discuss the staff recommendations as presented and place them on the Consent Agenda for final approval at the February Board meeting.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and placed the item on the Consent Agenda for February. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

Charles Dotter
Institute of Interventional Therapy, OHSU

Introduction

Oregon Health Sciences University requests authorization to establish an interdisciplinary Institute of Interventional Therapy. The activities of the proposed Institute will be focused on interventional treatment of disease, research, education, and patient care.

Interventional treatment is often referred to as surgery without a scalpel — it is an alternative to surgery and other therapeutic modalities. In the last 25 years, new techniques have been developed to treat many pathologic conditions previously treated surgically. With catheters and without surgery, specially developed devices are used to open blocked vessels, control internal and traumatic bleeding, treat vascular lesions, shrink and eliminate tumors, correct female and male infertility, remove gallstones and kidney stones, and drain abscesses.

The majority of interventional procedures are done without general anesthesia and often on an outpatient basis or with minimal hospitalization. Interventional treatment thus substantially decreases the patient's stress, increases safety, and shortens rehabilitation. By eliminating the need for general anesthesia and blood replacement, and by minimizing the need for hospitalization, interventional methods substantially decrease the cost and risk of treatment.

Staff Analysis

The proposed Institute represents an extension of activities at the Oregon Health Sciences University related to the interventional treatment of disease. Charles T. Dotter, M.D., former Chairman of the Diagnostic Radiology Department at the University, fathered interventional treatment in the late 1950s and early 1960s with the opening of blocked leg arteries using percutaneous entry catheters.
1. **Relationship to Assigned Mission**

The Oregon Health Sciences University's mission is to "serve as the State System's primary center for the preparation, specialty training, and continuing education of students and practitioners in the health professions." In the Board's Strategic Plan 1987-1993, the Oregon Health Sciences University was directed to "provide exemplary technical training for students and outstanding care for Oregonians who are acutely ill or medically indigent." The proposed Institute is fully consistent with this mission.

2. **Relationship to Board's Requirement for Designation as an Institute**

The proposed Institute meets the Board's requirements for establishing an institute. On March 25, 1977, the Board adopted the following policy statements relative to the establishment of centers and institutes:

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

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

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

While the demand for interventional treatment increases each year, training and experience in interventional procedures are difficult to obtain because of the shortage of trained interventionalists. Education in interventional treatment is also unsatisfactory at present because it is divided among several medical disciplines. Research in the development of new interventional techniques and devices has been limited because of a lack of broad-based multidisciplinary training programs in this area.

4. Quality of the Proposed Center

The Institute's proposed multidisciplinary approach will substantially improve education, research, and patient care. The Institute will combine the expertise of interventional radiologists and experts in other specialties including cardiologists, surgeons, vascular surgeons, urologists, gastroenterologists, pulmonologists, and gynecologists.

In order to meet a critical need for trained interventionalists, the Institute will emphasize training programs in interventional procedures within the Institute's facilities, and, upon completion of the Biomedical Information and Communications Center, via closed circuit and satellite television broadcasts.

The Institute will also focus on research into patient care through improved interventional devices and procedures. In addition, the patients at the Institute will receive high-quality interventional treatments.

Broad-based education and information programs for physicians as well as the public on the advantages/disadvantages of interventional treatment will also be a focus of the Institute.

The Institute has the potential to become a world-class program which would serve as a model for similar training centers elsewhere in the nation and world.

The Institute will be established with a seed gift of $4 million from William A. Cook, President of Cook Group Incorporated, Bloomington, Indiana. An additional gift of $2 million is expected to be donated by Mr. Cook after the Institute is fully constituted.
The Institute's research activities will be performed in the recently-opened "Charles Dotter Memorial Research Laboratory for Interventional Radiology." This facility was built and equipped at a cost of $1.5 million almost exclusively from private donations, including a $500,000 gift from Cook Group Incorporated and other major in-kind gifts of angiography equipment from Toshiba and General Electric.

5. Adequacy of Resources to Establish Center

Faculty

The faculty for the Institute will include several current faculty from the Department of Radiology and additional faculty to be hired utilizing the Cook donation and patient fee revenues as the patient base expands. It is anticipated that approximately two new faculty members and two fellows (four M.D.'s) will be employed for the Institute. Both part- and full-time faculty will be involved in the Institute.

Dr. Rosch, professor of Radiology at the University and an internationally recognized interventional radiologist, will serve as the initial director of the Institute. With the participation of appropriate faculty including the chair of Radiology, the Director will conduct a worldwide search for additional faculty, with excellence in academic and clinical interventional work the criteria for selection.

Faculty at the Institute will be expected to have admitting privileges at both the Oregon Health Sciences University Hospital and the Portland Veterans Administration Medical Center if approved by the respective credentialing procedures. Institute faculty will be expected to hold joint appointments in other academic departments in the School of Medicine.

Library

The University has adequate library holdings in the area of interventional radiology and treatment to support the initial activities of the Institute.

Facilities and Equipment

Research and development will be carried out in the Charles Dotter Memorial Research Laboratory for Interventional Radiology. This 5,000-square-foot, two-story laboratory is housed in a former campus fire station which was remodeled for Dr. Rosch with the $500,000 gift from Cook Group Incorporated. It houses two angiographic laboratories with
state-of-the-art equipment donated by General Electric and Toshiba. The laboratory also includes a workshop for the construction of tools and devices for interventional procedures. A library/conference room contains valuable reference materials. The building also contains five offices and additional space for expansion of the angiographic/interventional research facilities.

Budget Impact

Most of the required clinical facilities are either in place or have identified funding sources for additionally-needed renovated space from the Cook donation and OHSU patient revenues, grants, and patent royalties. Equipment for anticipated renovated space (non-invasive vascular and invasive ultrasonic equipment) will be paid for with extramural funds. Future expansion of Institute facilities will be dictated by the demands imposed by the patient population.

While the University will be committing some state dollars from going-level budgets to the Institute for the participation of some current faculty and support staff from the Department of Radiology, no additional state dollars are requested for the Institute. State funds from going-level budgets amount to only 7% of the Institute's almost $3 million budget in the first year, and 8% of the $2.4 million budget by the fourth year.

Program Review

The proposal to establish the Charles Dotter Institute of Interventional Therapy was reviewed by the Academic Council on July 20 and December 13, 1989. The Council unanimously concluded that this is a very important and appropriate research activity for the Oregon Health Sciences University.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize the Oregon Health Sciences University to establish the Charles Dotter Institute of Interventional Therapy, effective March 1, 1990.

The program should be discussed by the Board at the January Board meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for final action at the February meeting.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Kohler commented that this was a very exciting new venture and an opportunity to reorganize some teaching and training programs in new ways. Dr. Rosch provided a visual display illustrating the techniques.
Mr. Johnston said he had noted in the library section that adequate library holdings were in place to initiate this program. He said he believed it was still important to improve the libraries because the resources are limited.

The Committee recommended that the Board discuss the staff recommendation and place it on the Consent Agenda for final approval at the February meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and placed the item on the Consent Agenda for the February meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

Introduction

Oregon State University requests authorization to establish a multi-disciplinary Marine/Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Research Center. The Marine/Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Research (MFBS) Center will serve as formal recognition of Oregon State University's marine/freshwater biomedical sciences research activity by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.

The purpose of the proposed Center is to develop aquatic species, principally the rainbow trout, as experimental animals to be used in the study of human cancer. The main emphasis will be to determine and understand the effect of dietary components and environmental toxicants on human cancer.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed Center is well within the mission assigned to Oregon State University. In the Board's Strategic Plan 1987-1993, Oregon State University was directed as "the state's Land Grant and Sea Grant institution" operating under federal and state mandates to "help Oregon, the nation, and the world develop and utilize our human, land, atmospheric, and oceanic resources."

The proposed Center is designed to strengthen and facilitate OSU's mission to provide "research, and service in support of the social and economic development of the State of Oregon."
2. **Relationship to Board’s Requirement for Designation as a Center**

The proposed Marine/Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Center is consistent with the Board’s requirements for establishing centers and institutes:

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

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

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

3. **Evidence of Need**

With the growing concerns about chemical pollution and the adverse effects of industrial and agricultural processes on the environment and human health, there has been a growth in the need for the type of research that will be conducted under the auspices of the proposed Center. Some of the scientists to be associated with the Center will carry out research on food-related carcinogens in fish and agricultural crops. Others will be investigating the neurotoxic effects of insecticides on fish and mammals.

The need to maintain a safe, ample, and nutritious food supply and environment is a central element of the agricultural and basic science mission assigned to Oregon State University. The proposed Center will facilitate and enhance these related research activities at Oregon State University.
4. **Quality of the Proposed Center**

The Center for Marine/Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Research includes Oregon State University faculty who are among the nation’s leading experts in toxicology, biochemistry, and pharmacology. The proposed Center director, Professor George Bailey, is internationally recognized for his research with carcinogens and their effects on freshwater animals. The person appointed director of the Center will be approved by the administration of Oregon State University and program officials at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), the federal granting agency. The director will report to the University’s Dean of Research.

The Dean will appoint an Administrative Advisory Committee from OSU administrative faculty to assist the director. The director of the Center will be provided with scientific advice by an External Review Committee composed of scientists from the National Institute of Health and other institutions. In addition, a Technical Advisory Committee that will include investigators from the Center and the directors of the Center for Gene Research and the Environmental Health Sciences Center will also provide advice and assure collaborative interaction.

The External Review Committee will help the Center maintain the highest caliber research program possible by conducting annual reviews of Center activities and faculty, assessing strengths and advising on weaknesses in the program.

5. **Adequacy of Resources To Establish Center**

**Faculty**

The proposed Center will have eight FTE senior teaching and research faculty positions from Oregon State University, one from Washington State University, and three postdoctoral trainee affiliates. No additional faculty will be needed to establish this Center.

**Library**

Oregon State University has adequate library holdings to initiate the multi-disciplinary research activities of the proposed Center.
Facilities and Equipment

Initial facilities of the Center will consist of an office in Wiegand Hall and the Food Toxicology and Nutrition Laboratory known as the OSU Trout Hatchery and Histopathology Complex. Center investigators will maintain their current offices and research laboratories in their respective home departments.

Budget Impact

Non-instructional institutional funds have been requested through the Office of the Vice President for Research, Graduate Studies, and International Programs in the amount of $25,000 plus OPE annually, which may be used for release time for the director (0.25 FTE), a secretary (0.5 FTE), and supplies. These dollars are provided from indirect costs generated by this program. No additional state funds are requested in this application.

The remainder of research funding for the Marine/Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Research Center will come from federal grants. A second period of core funding for the Center was recently awarded by NIH for the years 1989-1994, at $200,000 per year direct cost. Future renewals are anticipated. Seven Center Investigators also participate in a newly awarded NIH program project grant averaging $530,000 per year direct cost, for 1988-93. Other Investigator research is supported by individual grants from agencies such as the American Cancer Society, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National Cancer Institute, and the U.S. Air Force. The current level of grant support for the MFBS Center program exceeds $1,521,000 direct costs for 1988-89. The faculty associated with this Center thus have well established records for obtaining extramural funding for their research activities. The primary role of this Center is to assist its Investigators in maintaining and expanding this excellent record.

Support for teaching activities exists primarily as graduate student stipends and research costs budgeted in Center Investigator grants, the NIH Training Grant, and home department resources. Approximately 15-20 graduate students conduct thesis research within MFBS Center Investigator laboratories each year. Center funds are available for occasional short course activities for new subjects and techniques in research.
Program Review

The proposed Marine/Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Research Center was reviewed by the Academic Council at its December 13, 1989, meeting. The proposal was previously reviewed by institutional staff. The Council fully supports Oregon State University's request for this Center as one of merit and deserving the Board's approval.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon State University to establish a Marine/Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Research Center, effective April 1, 1990.

The program should be discussed by the Board at the January meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for final action at the February meeting.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Adams inquired whether the work anticipated would include the subject of dioxins and the Department of Environmental Quality concerns. Dr. George Bailey, Professor of Food Science and the proposed Director of the Center, said one of the investigators had done some work with dioxin, but that work is done primarily with rodent models rather than fish models. The Center would have the capability of working with the compound.

In response to a question from Mr. Miller, Dr. Scanlan said the support for the Center would come from money derived from indirect costs from grants. No new funds were involved.

The Committee recommended the Board discuss the staff recommendations and place the item on the Consent Agenda for the February Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and placed the item on the Consent Agenda for the February meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.
Staff Report to the Committee

Background

On April 21, 1989, the Board approved a three-part admission and enrollment management policy that consisted of: (1) the general admission policy and standards for 1990-91, (2) a selective admission policy for 1989-90 and thereafter, and (3) an enrollment management policy for 1989-91. The purpose of this admission report to the Board is to seek approval of several changes in the basic admission standards for admission to the 1991-92 academic year. The selective admission policy and the enrollment management policy remain as approved in April 1989.

Staff Analysis and Rationale

The Board is being asked to review and approve admission standards to be effective for admission to the 1991-92 academic year. Table A provides a comparative summary chart on the major freshman and transfer admission standards. Attachment A provides a summary of OSSHE's admissions requirements effective 1991-92 for all institutions and is available from the Office of Academic Affairs.

Three institutions — Oregon State University, University of Oregon, and Western Oregon State College — are requesting changes in admission standards for 1991-92. The changes include: (1) raising the grade point averages required for freshman admission at OSU and WOSC, (2) upgrading the transfer admission requirements at OSU and UO by requiring all transfer applicants to have completed college-level writing and mathematics courses to be eligible for admission, and (3) dropping the summer session admission alternative at OSU.

The overall purpose for requesting the changes is to improve the admission and enrollment management policies and procedures at the respective institutions. The specific requested changes by institution are as follows:

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Freshman Admission

1. Increase the minimum grade point average required for freshman admission (residents and nonresidents) from 2.75 to 3.00; and

2. Drop the summer session admission alternative for all freshman applicants.
Transfer Admission

1. All transfer applicants (residents and nonresidents) must have completed a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with Writing 121, and one mathematics course which has a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra; each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C or above.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

Transfer Admission

1. All transfer applicants (residents and nonresidents) must have completed a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with Writing 121, and one mathematics course which has a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra; each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C- or above.

WESTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Freshman Admission

1. Increase the grade point average required for freshman admission (residents and nonresidents) from 2.50 to 2.75.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the 1990-91 general admission policy be continued for 1991-92 academic year including the specific changes requested in the requirements at Oregon State University, University of Oregon, and Western Oregon State College.
TABLE A

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS AS PROPOSED FOR 1991-92 ACADEMIC YEAR
(Changes from 1990-91 Requirements Parenthetically Noted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRESHMAN ADMISSION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Residents and Nonresidents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Requirements: 14 Units</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4-English, 3-Math, 2-Science, 3-Social Studies, 2-Elective)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT/ACT Scores</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of Standard Written English Score of 30 or Above</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFER ADMISSION:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA Residents</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Consideration for Applicants with 2.00+ GPA and AA Degree from Oregon Community Colleges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum College Hours Required</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Applicants Must Meet Specified Course Requirements</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Course Required: One writing course beginning with WR 121 and one mathematics course with a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra.
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ATTACHMENT A

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS EFFECTIVE 1991-92
OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

OREGON RESIDENT STUDENTS

FRESHMAN ADMISSION

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

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

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

   c. **Graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools** must have:
      
      * a minimum score of 970 SAT or 22 ACT (UO, OSU) or 890 SAT or 20 ACT (FSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC);
      
      * an average 410 or above (1,230 total) on three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and a third of the student's choice); or meet the summer qualifying alternative (4b).

2. **Admission Tests**

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

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

   c. Test scores are used:
      
      * As an alternative means of meeting the GPA requirement;
      
      * As the admission policy for graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools;
      
      * In selectively admitting qualified applicants;
      
      * For advising and guidance purposes; and
      
      * As noted directly below:

\(^1\)Students with any college credit note Section 2. of **Transfer Admission** requirements.
- To enroll at UO, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT-Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT English subtest.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. **Grade Point Average Requirement**

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

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

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

**TRANSFER ADMISSION**

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

   **University of Oregon:**
   - a minimum GPA of 2.25 or better in 36 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work;
   - all transfer applicants must complete a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121, and one mathematics course which has a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra; each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C- or above.

   **Oregon State University:**
   - a minimum GPA of 2.25 or better in 36 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work;
   - all transfer applicants must complete a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121, and one mathematics course which has a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra; each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C or above.

   **Portland State University:**
   - a minimum GPA of 2.25 or better in 36 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work.

   **Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology Southern Oregon State College, Western Oregon State College:**
   - a minimum GPA of 2.00 or better in 24 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work.

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

**FIVE PERCENT SPECIAL ADMISSION**

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

FRESHMAN ADMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

c. Test scores are used:
   
   - As an alternative means of meeting the GPA requirement;
   
   - As the admission policy for graduates of nonstandard and unaccredited high schools;
   
   - In selectively admitting qualified applicants;
   
   - For advising and guidance purposes; and
   
   - As noted directly below:

---

2 Students with any college credit note Section 2. of Nonresident Transfer Admission requirements.
- To enroll at UO, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT-Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English subtest.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. **Grade Point Average Requirement**

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

b. **Alternatives to the GPA Requirement** (either of the following):
• SAT or ACT scores and high school grades to predict a 2.00 college GPA (UO, OSU); 890 SAT or 20 ACT (PSU, OIT); 890 SAT or 20 ACT or 2.00 predicted college GPA (EOSC, SOSC, WOSC).

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

TRANSFER ADMISSION

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

   University of Oregon:

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

   • all transfer applicants must complete a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121, and one mathematics course which has a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra; each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C- or above.

   Oregon State University:

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

   • all transfer applicants must complete a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121, and one mathematics course which has a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra; each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C or above.

   Portland State University:

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

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

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

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

FIVE PERCENT SPECIAL ADMISSION

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

Mr. Miller inquired as to the possible effect from raising these grade-point requirements.

Mr. Christensen responded that the changes were considered necessary at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University in order to improve the management of their admission policies and procedures in light of their experience during 1989-90. The requirements also are consistent with the quality of students these two institutions wish to attract and the type of applicant pool they wish to consider. Both institutions are confident they will be able to use this new policy to meet their enrollment targets successfully.

Ms. Wilson asked why Oregon State University wished to drop the summer session alternative.

Mr. Christensen explained it was one of many alternatives for gaining admission but it had not proved to be a good indicator of subsequent academic performance.

Mr. Dodson asked what procedures were used to make certain high school counselors were aware of these changes and new admission policies. Mr. Christensen said his office distributed a college counseling newsletter and annual publications. After the changes are adopted officially, a special letter will be sent to schools immediately. The institutions will incorporate them into publications being developed for recruitment of students for 1991-92.

Dr. Frank Lang, the IFS representative, asked why Western Oregon State College was seeking a higher grade-point-average requirement than the other state colleges.

Dr. Cowart responded that it reflected the quality of student the institution was now attracting. The average grade-point-average is now 3.05. If the request had been in effect this year, the proposed standard would have affected 16 students.

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

Board Discussion and Action

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

Fee rates and policies are set forth in the preliminary Summer Session Fee Book. Rates are as recommended by the institution. A public hearing is scheduled for January 16, 1990. Fee rates and policies are recommended for Board approval as submitted, subject to change which may be proposed following the presentation of testimony at the public hearing.

Summer Session Instruction Fees

The self-support policy for summer instruction, which began in 1982, is continued in the recommendation for 1990. The self-support feature has resulted in institutional fee recommendations which reflect the differences in programs as well as the differences in approaches to balancing program costs with resources. Similarities of the institutional fee structures include incremental charges for each additional credit hour and undergraduate/graduate rate differentials. Residency status is not assigned during summer session and is not applicable to summer fee determination.

Fee policies are proposed to be revised slightly to accommodate the newly-adopted Extended Teacher Education Programs. Traditionally fees have been assessed solely on the basis of course level. However, the new Extended Teacher Education Programs, some of which require students to take courses summer term, allow those students to take graduate courses at undergraduate rates. It is proposed that the fee policy be revised to allow institutions to assess fees based on either course level or student level.

Instruction fee increases have been recommended by all institutions. Increases are, in general, a consequence of faculty salary rate increases granted in fiscal year 1989-90 and other inflation factors affecting costs.

Rates recommended for 1990 compare with 1989 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>1989 First Hour</th>
<th>Each Add’l Hour</th>
<th>1990 First Hour</th>
<th>Each Add’l Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Graduate Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hour</td>
<td>Each Add'1 Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$99</td>
<td>$79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Sem.Equiv.</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Building Fee

The building fee is $14.00 per student. This is consistent with the fee increase granted by the 1989 Legislature and assessed in the 1989–90 academic year.

#### Incidental Fee

Incidental fee recommendations reflect the various activity and service levels proposed by the institutions. Charges compare for 1989 and 1990 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hour</td>
<td>Maximum Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Enrolled</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Admitted</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-7 SCH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Enrolled</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>41.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Admitted</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>36.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-7 SCH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health Service Fee

Health service fees, like the building fee, are assessed at a single sum per student, based upon the service level available at each institution. For institutions providing summer health service, rates compare as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Service</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$27.50</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC (8 hrs. or more)</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees Compared to Academic Year

Rate structures for summer session have been developing as institutions adapted to self-support following the 1982 elimination of General Fund support. The effect of self-support on fees and assessments can be measured to some extent by comparison with academic year charges. The Summer Session rates proposed for 1990 and 1989-90 academic year rates are compared on the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition &amp; Required Fees</th>
<th>12 SCH Undergraduate</th>
<th>9 SCH Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acad. Year 1989-90</td>
<td>Summer 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acad. Year 1989-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$594.00</td>
<td>$644.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>569.00</td>
<td>670.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>577.00</td>
<td>606.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>562.00</td>
<td>640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>564.00</td>
<td>565.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>554.00</td>
<td>623.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>587.00</td>
<td>569.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuition rates are not fully comparable. The academic year rates apply to a range of credit hours designated for full-time students classified as residents (12-21 credit hours for undergraduates and 9-16 credit hours for graduates). Summer session rates displayed are for 12 credits undergraduate and 9 credits graduate. Additional summer credit hours require incremental charges. Also, incidental and health service levels differ from academic year to summer.
Room and Board Rates

Summer Session room and board accommodations on each campus vary according to the need and demand. They may include rates by day, week, multi-week, or term. A combined room and board rate is usually offered, as well as rates for room only, board only, and conference activities. Rates are generally comparable to those for individual terms of the academic year.

The rates shown in the tables in the fee book are for all of the campuses except Portland State University, where Portland Student Services, Inc., operates the residence halls and establishes the rates as specified in a service contract. The rates require preliminary review and approval by Portland State University officials before becoming effective.

Proposed rate increases vary from 0% to 5.5% for the basic summer session. Anticipated cost increases for personnel, utilities, services, and food since the preceding summer term justify rate adjustments at this time.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that, after consideration of any comments or testimony received at the public hearing, the Board amend OAR 580-40-035, Summer Session Fee Book, as follows:

Summer Session Fee Book

580-40-035 The document entitled "Summer Session Fee Book" dated [January 20, 1990] January 21, 1990, is hereby adopted by reference as a permanent rule. All prior adoptions of summer session fee documents are hereby repealed except as to rights and obligations previously acquired or incurred thereunder.

Through the amendment, residence hall and food service charges and the tuition and fee rates and policies applicable during the 1990 Summer Session will be adopted.

Report of Testimony at Public Hearing

A public hearing was conducted on Monday, January 16, 1990, at 10:00 a.m. in Eugene to receive testimony concerning the proposed rates for tuition and fees and room and board charges for the 1990 Summer Session. One person appeared at the hearing to give testimony.
Lynn Pinckney, Executive Director of the Oregon Student Lobby, presented oral and written testimony on behalf of that organization in opposition to the proposed tuition increases and urged elimination of the self-support requirement of summer session funding. Ms. Pinckney's comments are summarized as follows. A copy of her letter is on file with the Secretary of the Board.

Ms. Pinckney stressed two major points in her testimony to defend the Oregon Student Lobby position. First, the proposed increases of between 5% and 7% in instruction fees are greater than the rate of inflation. She emphasized that she was only addressing the instruction fee issue in her comments. Her second point contains four sub-arguments all concerning the self-support policy. One, the self-support policy, adopted in 1982, which "has resulted in significantly higher tuition charges for summer session students" than for academic year students, reduces access to higher education. Two, the (self-support) "policy results in a tuition differential which unfairly burdens summer session students," particularly those such as students in the new Extended Teacher Education Programs and others who must attend summer session "in order to progress in programs, externships and work placements which are often only available in the summer. In addition, non-traditional students often need the summer session option. Three, a 1988 Oregon Student Lobby survey "results suggest that a significant number of OSSHE students would enroll in summer session if the tuition were not higher than for the academic year." She noted that "increased enrollment could result in more class offerings, better faculty participation, more efficient use of facilities and resources, less need for enrollment caps during the academic year, and improved access to higher education for part-time and non-traditional students." Four, it seems apparent that there is likely to be "a greater student presence on campus during the summer months" because of the increasing numbers of non-traditional students, the teacher education program, and the "recently approved legislation directing the State System to provide part-time degree programs." Ms. Pinckney concluded her comments by stating "the current proposed increases should be rejected and the self-support policy should be replaced in time for the next budget cycle."

**Staff Response:** The summer session self-support policy was established by the Board in 1982 following elimination of General Fund support. Since that time, the institutions have been responsible for assuring their summer session program was financially self-sufficient. This is done for 1990 through the proposed fees recommended in the Summer Session Fee Book. Elimination of the self-support policy would require either additional State General Fund subsidy of summer session programs similar to the academic year or budget reductions in academic year programs.
sufficient to permit reallocation of resources. The first option would require going to the State Legislature for funding in the 1991-1993 budget. The second option would simply be a revised implementation of the 1982 budget reduction that resulted in the original need for the self-support policy.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Quenzer presented the staff report and the report on the testimony at the public hearing.

Mr. Bailey asked about the rationale for full cost in the summer but not in the regular academic year.

Mr. Quenzer said the decision was partly a philosophical one on a source of funds. In 1982, the institutions were largely self-supporting in terms of the direct cost of instruction, primarily the costs for faculty salaries with a small amount for services and supplies. The 1982 policy was a way of balancing the budget at that time and has been maintained in succeeding years. About $2 million would be required now to move summer session off of self-support and thereby reduce summer session fees. He said the Board at some point would need to address the issue of whether summer session can remain self-supporting in the future.

Mr. Bailey then asked whether the people at the institutions were of the opinion access was restricted or there were fewer students because of the cost of summer session.

Mr. Quenzer replied he had not heard recently that those issues were a major concern at the institutions.

Mr. Richardson mentioned that a major change was being proposed regarding the assessment of fees on the basis of the graduate or undergraduate level of the courses being taken. He asked whether that change would pertain only to those students in the teacher education program or would apply to any student.

Mr. Quenzer said the change was permissive and would allow the institutions to make the decision. He said he understood the change would apply only to those students this summer, but it was a policy that he believed could be applied to other students if the institutions choose to do so. He said he thought the institutions would continue to assess fees on the basis of the course level.

Miss Matthews noted the institutions vary substantially in the charges made for summer session and inquired what accounted for the differences.
Mr. Quenzer said the wide range among the institutions reflects the self-support concept. It is easier to be self-supporting in some institutions than in ones where the class sizes are smaller and the tuition has to be higher to meet the self-support requirement.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Wilson requested further explanation of the fee increase at Portland State University, noting that it was significantly more than the increases at any other institution.

Mr. Quenzer said the increase applied only to the first hour and related to cost recovery. The first hour has the fixed cost of administration associated with it.

President Edgington indicated this explanation was correct and that an average load of six hours was relatively the same as the fees at the other two universities. He stated it did not cost more to take the same course at Portland State University as compared to the University of Oregon or Oregon State University. In fact, in the 6-9 hour range, the charge may be less than at some of the other schools.

Mr. Johnston inquired whether the increase at the University of Oregon Law School included the library resource fee discussed at a previous meeting or was there a tuition increase.

President Brand stated the two fees were independent.

The Board approved the staff recommendation and adopted the proposed amendment to OAR 580-40-035, Summer Session Fee Book. On roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

In preparation for the 1990-91 academic year, it is necessary to make several computer programming revisions to the Student Information Systems relating to admissions and fee assessment policies. These revisions take time to perform, and considerable preliminary work is necessary before the Academic Year Fee Book is adopted, normally in July. To facilitate these revisions it would be helpful to have certain guidelines upon which the Academic Year Fee Policy for 1990-91 will be based approved at this time. These guidelines will be included in the Fee Book at the time it is presented for public hearing and Board adoption later this year.
Proposed Guidelines

Audit Only Fees: For several years a special category of student has been defined and assessed a reduced level of fees. These are students who only take courses under the course audit provision.

These students have been assessed only the instruction fee and building fee. However, if students take even one hour for credit in addition to the "audit" courses they then are subject to all fees. As a result, it is impossible to designate and track audit students other than through a strictly manual process. In fall term 1988, there were only 322 students of approximately 65,000 in the System who were eligible for the audit only category.

Guideline Recommendation: Eliminate the "Audit Only" student category.

General Deposit: Current fee policy specifies assessment of general deposits of $50 at the University of Oregon and $25 at Oregon State University, Portland State University, Western Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, and Oregon Institute of Technology. The deposit is used to cover various fines and breakage during the year, with any balance being refunded to the student. Some institutions have developed effective collection procedures resulting in the deposit being somewhat unnecessary. Other institutions would like to retain the deposit, but increase it to recognize the increased costs of the past several years since the deposit was last adjusted.

Guideline Recommendation: Allow the general deposit to be an institution option with a maximum of $50 per year.

Application Fee for Direct International Student Exchange Programs: Traditionally, international students involved in direct student exchange programs in which there are one-to-one exchanges with Oregon State System students have been assessed the $25 Application Fee. However, Oregon State System students have not been assessed such fees by their host institutions overseas. In 1989-90 the fee was increased to $35 at the colleges and $40 at the universities. This increase did not go unnoticed. Several of the international host institutions have indicated they would begin assessing Oregon State System students their application fees, some of which range from $100-$200, if we continue our practice.

It has been estimated that waiving this fee would result in a loss of only $2,500 throughout the System.

Guideline Recommendation: In the spirit of reciprocity, waive the Application Fee for international students participating in international direct student exchange programs.
Refund Schedule: The current fee policy provides for a 90% refund of fees for classes dropped at the end of the 7th calendar day of the term and a 75% refund for classes dropped at the end of the 14th calendar day of the term. The institutions allow classes to be added through the 14th calendar day of the term. The overlapping of the two different refund rates during the time that classes can be added results in considerable manual effort in calculating the various combinations of refunds and added fees.

Guideline Recommendation: Eliminate the 90% refund at the end of the 7th calendar day.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board approve the proposed guideline recommendations as outlined in the preceding staff report.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Lemmon and Mr. Quenzer presented the staff report and recommendation.

Miss Matthews asked what students comprised the group of "audit only" students, suggesting there might be good reasons they preferred that category. Mr. Quenzer indicated the staff knew who the students were but did not have a profile suggesting reasons for auditing courses.

In response to questions from Mr. Swanson, Mr. Quenzer explained the elimination of the "audit only" category would not affect students who took even one hour of course for credit because a student must audit all classes in order to be classified as an auditor. Audit students currently pay only the instruction and building fees and are not assessed the incidental and health service fees. This creates a small category of students for which it would be very expensive to record and maintain separate records.

Mr. Swanson said he had some concern about the effect on access for persons who were outside the regular student stream but want to audit a class. Mr. Quenzer said this could be done by paying the regular fee. The difference would be the amount of the incidental and health service fees. They also might be more likely to enroll under continuing or community education programs and would not pay the incidental or health service fees in that case either. He indicated the cost difference for a 3-hour course was about $20.
Mr. Swanson said this amount would not limit access enough to justify voting against the recommendation if it would simplify and unify the process.

There was a brief discussion of the third guideline regarding the elimination of the 90% refund at the end of the seventh calendar day of the term. It was stated most course withdrawals tend to occur in the first seven-day period. Dr. Coate stated many students register for more classes than they intend to take to make sure they are covered.

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

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Johnston said he could accept the reason that 90% was too large a refund for the first seven days but did not understand why it would be too difficult to calculate with only two percentages based on a fixed day.

Mr. Quenzer pointed out that students who register in the seven-day period pay 100% of the fee, not 90%. An alternative would be to charge only a proportionate fee when students enroll after the first day of class.

Mr. Richardson said the same question had been raised during the Committee discussion. Dr. Coate stated at that time that many students tend to over-register for classes to make sure they will get enough credit hours.

Mr. Lemman said the number of students doing this is high enough that it disrupts the orderly registration and blocks classes by filling them with students who do not intend actually to take the courses.

Mr. Bögington said many students at Portland State University register just for 12 and above hours to get parking and then drop to below 12.

Mr. Johnston said he would support the recommendations based on the reasons stated above but not on the reason presented in the docket item.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley.

Those voting no: None. The guidelines were approved in principle, with the understanding they would be used in development of the recommendations included in the Academic Year Fee Book when it is adopted later this year following public hearing.

Mr. Richardson indicated the Committee on Finance had also heard the report on capital construction which appears below.
### Staff Report to the Committee

At the December 1989 Board meeting, President Hensley requested the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant to review the capital construction projects established as priorities of the Board for the current biennium. The staff suggests that one means of accomplishing this review would be to discuss the present status and plans for the projects on the 1989-1991 priority list. The tables below characterize briefly the current status of 1989-1991 approved projects. They are depicted in the Board’s priority order. Projects with "NA" as their priority numbers are those not requested by the Board but added by the Legislative Assembly. The amounts shown for Knight Library, Stevenson Union Addition and McNeal Hall Repairs and Improvements include monies approved by both the 1987 and 1989 Legislatures.

#### A. GENERAL FUND AND RELATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Knight Library</td>
<td>$27,400</td>
<td>In design; Bid late 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Kerr Library</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>In planning; 1991-93 Proj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>Bldg Modernization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Bldg/Computer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Nursing Building</td>
<td>13,825</td>
<td>In design; Bid spring 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Pediatric Hospital</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Feasibility Study in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Metro Center</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Purchase/Remodel in 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Bldg Planning</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Planning underway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Dixon Expansion</td>
<td>$5,405</td>
<td>In design; Bid in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Child Care Center</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>In design; Bid in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Track/Tennis Rehab</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Track complete; tennis courts under design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Smith Center Rehab</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>In design; Bid summer '90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>EMU Outdoor Storage</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>In design; Bid in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Parking Improvements</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>In design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Parking Structure #5</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Const to start in spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>CROET</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Const to start in spring along with Basic Sci Add</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>Storage/Landscape</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>In design; Bid in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Hamilton Hall Kitchen</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>In design; Bid spring '90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Dormitory Addition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Hospital Renovations</td>
<td>12,685</td>
<td>Under review by OHSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Family Studies Ctr</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>In design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Utility Syst Imps</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>In design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Parking Improvements</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>On hold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects 27, 28, and 29 were approved by the Board and the State Emergency Board after the end of the recent Legislative Session. The purchase of the Fish and Wildlife Building for use by Portland State University will be discussed and decided by the Emergency Board later this month.

In addition to the projects approved for the 1989-1991 biennium, several of the capital construction efforts authorized in prior years are still underway. A review of the status of the 1987-1989 projects follows.

A. GENERAL FUND AND RELATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>H'cap Access</td>
<td>$ 1,645</td>
<td>Most subprojects completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>H'cap Access</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>Most subprojects completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>ESOC</td>
<td>H'cap Access</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>Virtually completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Arch/Allied Arts</td>
<td>8,555</td>
<td>Phase I under construction; Other phases to be bid in 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Millar Lib Add</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ESOC</td>
<td>Classroom/Lab Bldg</td>
<td>8,385</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Various Imps</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>Some completed; westerly bypass in design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Ag Sciences II</td>
<td>25,085</td>
<td>In redesign; spring bid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SOSE</td>
<td>Computer Svos Bldg</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Land Acquisitions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Utility Imps</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>Spring '90 construction (along with Parking Structure #5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

However, most of them are nearing completion. Some projects approved in 1985 and before are still underway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. OHSN Pedestrian Connection</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. OSN Fire Dose Lab</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. SOGC Kiosk</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. OSN Firestone Wavelab</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. D.S. Self-Join</td>
<td>Near Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>For 1989-91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. C.S. Site Join (see 27-28)</td>
<td>720,09</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. LGS Byg. Bldg. Resch. Fac.</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. LGS Student Resch. Exp.</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. WOSC Boundary Add</td>
<td>8,655</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. OSRN Office Space</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. On Campus Construction</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. On South Bank Field Taps</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. On South Amon Svc. Bldg. Expan</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA. Miscellaneous</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. OHSN Smith Mem Ctr Renov</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. OSRN Student Union Food</td>
<td>6,925</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. On Bike Path Taps</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bosc Tennis Court</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. WOSC Various Taps</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OSRN Parking Structure</td>
<td>7,420</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bosc Parking Taps</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. On Parking Taps</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SJS Land Acquisition</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OSRN Outdoor Activity Area</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OHSN Roof Renov</td>
<td>12,025</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. OHSN Office</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting #5/84

January 19, 1990
Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Committee

Background

A "fee remission" waives all or part of the fees which normally are assessed a student. For example, a resident student would have the resident instruction fee waived, and a nonresident U.S. or foreign student would have the nonresident fee waived but pay the resident fee. The State System "cost" is a loss of income.

Over the past 20 or more years, a number of fee-remission programs and policies have been developed and adopted by the Oregon State System of Higher Education for the purpose of enhancing the State System's ability to achieve certain academic or enrollment goals.

During the past several months, fee-remission programs, reciprocity agreements, and residency rules have been reviewed in light of the Board's new selective admission and enrollment management policies. As a result of this review, staff concluded a major reorganization and redefinition of fee-remission policies and residency rules should be initially undertaken. The goal in revising the System's fee-remission policies and residency rules is to:

- improve the management of enrollment and increase academic and financial resources;
- enhance the ability to target specific student populations to meet systemwide and institutional enrollment goals;
- redirect current fee-remission funds to support the recently-developed "Minority Scholarship Program for Students With Junior Standing" and a newly-established academic merit program for Oregon resident students.

The Oregon State System of Higher Education's present fee-remission programs cost $5,889,235 in 1989-90. The proposed fee-remission program at maturity is estimated to cost $4,786,347 annually. Changes in present residency rules should also result in increased revenue to the Board. (The revised residency rules are a separate Board action item at the January 19, 1990, meeting.)
Current Fee-Remission Programs

The following OGSHE fee-remission programs total $5,889,235 and serve an estimated 2,060 students:

1. Minority Achievement Scholarship Program — This program assists meritorious underrepresented Oregon minority first-time freshmen.

2. Oregon Honors Program — This program assists in recruiting academically meritorious nonresident U.S. students.

3. International Cultural Service Program — This program assists foreign students by waiving all of the nonresident fee by classifying them as residents-by-exception in exchange for cultural service in the community.

4. Residency-by-Exception Policy — This policy allows institutions to waive the nonresident fee for specified percentages of the nonresident population based on meritorious hardship, as defined in the current residency rules.

5. Foreign Student Exchange — This program allows for the waiver of fees for foreign students attending an Oregon institution associated with an exchange program with a foreign university.

6. Eastern Oregon State College Program — This is a legislatively-authorized program allowing the waiver of the resident fee for Oregon residents. The number of fee waivers is limited to 2.5% of the total institution enrollment.

Proposed Fee-Remission Programs

The following proposed fee-remission programs total $4,786,347 and are projected to serve approximately 2,700 students by 1993:

. Oregon Minority Enrollment Initiative $1,145,304
. Oregon Merit Program $2,703,552
. International Cultural Service Program $ 937,491

The three components of the revised fee-remission program are outlined below. It should be noted the revised fee-remission programs are intended to redirect program effort and funds from primarily nonresident U.S. and foreign students to Oregon’s academically-talented students.
Oregon Minority Enrollment Initiative — The purpose of this Initiative is to improve ethnic/racial diversity within the System and increase minority enrollment and graduation. The program includes the current Minority Achievement Scholarship Program for resident underrepresented minority first-time freshmen; the Minority Scholarship Program for Students with Junior Standing for underrepresented minority residents; and the Portland Teacher Plan at Portland State University.

It is proposed that the minority program for resident freshmen be maintained at the current level and within existing rules. The new program for resident minority students with junior standing would be funded for 146 full-time students. Academic merit and Oregon residency are the fundamental criteria for participation in both the freshman and junior-level minority programs. The Portland Teacher Plan would be maintained as already approved by the Board in December 1989.

Oregon Merit Program — It is proposed the Oregon Merit Program award fee remissions to academically-meritorious students to sustain and improve academic quality and achievement within the System. Fee remissions would be awarded to both resident and nonresident U.S. students, undergraduate and graduate. Priority consideration would be given to Oregon residents so that over the next several years an increasing percentage of awards would be granted to Oregon residents.

International Cultural Service Program — The International Cultural Service Program would award the fee remissions to academically-meritorious foreign students to contribute to and improve cultural diversity and international awareness within the System and the State of Oregon. Institutions would continue to develop and improve the Cultural Service Programs on their campuses and in their communities and regions.

Budget

The proposed fee-remission program would be phased in over a four-year period beginning with the academic year 1990-91. During that period, students already receiving fee remissions under current guidelines would be permitted to complete their programs as students are added in accordance with new guidelines.

The following estimated 1993-94 budgets (program maturity) are followed by an estimated number of students, assuming that students will receive a full remission of the resident instruction fee. It should be noted that revisions in the institutional
allotments depicted below may change as a result of ongoing data analysis. Any revisions in these allotments will be made after consultation with the State System Presidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget at Program Maturity, 1993-94</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Minority Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$255,837</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>$252,939</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>$277,545</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>$66,816</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>$64,032</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>$56,856</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>$68,085</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>$103,194</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$1,145,304</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Merit Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$602,784</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>$602,784</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>$463,680</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>$178,176</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>$178,176</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>$118,656</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>$185,472</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>$373,824</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$2,703,552</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Cultural Service Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$267,882</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>$257,534</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>$162,799</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>$79,716</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>$84,303</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>$3,858</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>$81,399</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$937,491</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$4,786,347</td>
<td>2,693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

Institutions shall report to the Chancellor’s Office annually by December 1 on the admission and enrollment experience for all authorized fee-remission programs during the previous academic year. The reports shall include:

. selection and award criteria for each program and category of students;

. academic profile and performance of students by program and category; and

. the enrollment profile of students by program and category and the relationship of that enrollment to the institution’s enrollment management goals.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board approve the fee remissions for the Oregon Minority Enrollment Initiative, the Oregon Merit Program, and the International Cultural Service Program as described above, effective for the 1990-91 academic year.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Swanson inquired how many of the six current fee-remission programs had been deleted in the new program.

Mr. Christensen said the minority achievement scholarship program is the freshman program now in its third year. It is included under the Oregon Minority Program. Funding for the Oregon Honors Program is included under the Oregon Merit Program. The International Cultural Service Program is continued at the current level under the International Cultural Service Programs. The residency-by-exception policy has been deleted through revision of the residency rules, but funding for fee-remission awards to academically-meritorious nonresident United States students is continued as part of the Oregon Merit Program. The Foreign Student Exchange becomes part of the new International Cultural Service Programs. The legislatively-authorized program at Eastern Oregon State College continues at its current funding level under the Oregon Merit Program. Less money will be spent, primarily because of the deletion of residency-by-exception.

Mr. Christensen explained that the Oregon Minority Program included three components—the minority freshman program, the minority junior program, and the Portland Teacher Plan funding approved by the Board last month. All three are based on academic merit. He also said the Oregon Merit Program included for the first time substantial funding for a merit program for Oregon residents directed toward Oregon’s most academically-talented students.
Mr. Adams suggested it might be more appropriate to call these programs fee remission scholarships, and Mr. Christensen concurred.

Mr. Swanson said student scholarships would be one of the last areas he would choose for saving money. He asked why it would not be preferable to put money saved from the cost of the previous program into the Oregon Merit Program to provide additional scholarships for more academically-qualified students.

Mr. Christensen explained the rationale with respect to funding for several of the programs. With respect to the Oregon Merit Program specifically, Mr. Christensen said the total of 1,680 systemwide at maturity appeared to be an adequate level to meet both the resident and nonresident United States scholarship needs.

Mr. Swanson commented that, if 500 were qualified when admission standards were lower, there might be 1,000 people who would be qualified on the same academic basis as the previous 500.

Mr. Christensen said he was certain the institutions would favor putting more money into scholarships for Oregon's academically-talented students. The residency-by-exception program was discontinued because of its extremely high cost. He indicated the funding levels were a judgment decision and not based on any scientific determination.

Mr. Swanson said, if other Board members agreed, he would like to ask the staff to consider using those saved dollars for scholarship purposes in the new program in whatever manner would be most beneficial.

Mr. Hensley inquired whether those saved dollars actually were available. Mr. Lemman indicated the savings were not dollars which were available to spend but represented potential income not received. The income budget is already under-realized and offering additional scholarships would exacerbate that problem. He suggested, if the Board wished to reconsider the scholarship proposal, that it request the staff to come back with an amended program developed in the larger context of the total resources.

The Chancellor said Dr. Hill had been concerned that the State System was allocating substantial resources in a process that had grown in response to particular programs on individual campuses at a given time, but without necessarily much order. He said he believed it was Dr. Hill's feeling that the process put too much of these resources into out-of-state students. One of the objectives in the process was to reduce that allocation of resources.
The Chancellor indicated two factors are involved. The first is an attempt to regularize the process. The second is a decision about the allocation of resources. Mr. Swanson's suggestion invites a separation of those two factors by proceeding with the regularization of the process to provide logic, shape, and form in the programs. At the same time, the revised program should not be used as a means of economizing because the purpose is sufficiently important it should not be used as an occasion to save money. He said he thought Dr. Hill's view was that use of these resources for out-of-state students had reached a point where some savings could be made and transferred to other purposes.

Mr. Christensen said savings had not been a primary objective in the development of the program.

Mr. Swanson said it was much easier to consider saving money on tuition waivers or fee remissions than on scholarships.

After some further discussion with respect to the allocation of resources, the Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as a minimum, with the understanding that the staff would bring to the February Board meeting a proposal for a modification which might increase the program.

In response to a question from Mr. Adams, Mr. Christensen stated that the students affected by the six programs listed in the staff report had all been reorganized in whole or in part under the three revised programs.

**Board Discussion and Action**

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

**Staff Report to the Committee**

**Introduction**

On November 16, 1989, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education was presented the report "Minority Student Enrollment and Graduation Trends." The report highlighted the Oregon State System of Higher Education’s recent history relative to minority student enrollment and graduation trends as part of the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative. The Board accepted the report and approved the staff recommendations.
The Oregon State System of Higher Education "Minority Scholarship Program for Students with Junior Standing" is being established as a means of carrying out the following recommendation adopted by the Board:

... 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 goal of the proposed program is to provide support and recognition for minority students who have reached junior class standing while establishing an exemplary academic record. The program is designed to encourage minority students who have achieved at a community college or four year college or university to continue in a baccalaureate or five-year undergraduate professional degree program at an OSSHE institution.

Basis for the Program

While the enrollments of resident minorities as freshmen have increased over the past three years, their graduation rates need to be increased.

State System data in Tables 1 and 2 indicate that 27% of the students enrolled in the State System as freshmen from an Oregon high school in 1983-84 received a baccalaureate degree within five years. Approximately 32% of those students graduated within six years. Of the comparable group of students enrolled in 1984-85, 28% received a baccalaureate degree within five years (see Table 4).

As depicted in Table 2, the percentage of American Indian (13%), Black (13%), and Hispanic (20%) students receiving baccalaureate degrees in six years was well below that of Asian (42%) and White students (31%).

The implementation of the proposed program will create another viable avenue for underrepresented minority students to gain access to the institutions of the State System at the upper-division level. It will also enhance the institutional capability to carry out the Board's directives to increase the number of minority students earning baccalaureate degrees in the State System.
Proposed Program

The "Minority Scholarship Program for Students with Junior Standing" will provide for the waiving of mandatory enrollment fees for 146 Alaskan/Native American, Black, and Hispanic students who have achieved junior class standing while establishing an exemplary academic record. The institutional allocation of these funds will be determined over the next several weeks after the staff consults with institution representatives.

Program Guidelines

The following guidelines are proposed to facilitate in the implementation and administration of this program:

- Scholarships will consist of a waiver of all mandatory fees required for enrollment, including instruction, building, health, and incidental fees.

- Scholarships will be automatically renewed in the amount equal to the mandatory enrollment fees established by the Board for each regular academic year (fall, winter, and spring term) up to a maximum of three academic years or nine regular academic quarter terms as long as the student completes a minimum of 36 credit hours of course work each academic year and makes satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or five-year undergraduate professional degree.

- Scholarship recipients who "stop-out" of college or who transfer to another OSSHE institution shall be permitted to continue in the program commensurate with established institutional policy.

- Where possible, the scholarship should be used to eliminate or reduce a student's need for loans or work study funds.

Program Eligibility

Applicants may be required to submit proof of their eligibility to participate in this program. If proof is required, the applicant will be notified by the institution. To receive one of these scholarships, applicants must:

- be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident and Oregon resident as defined and cited in the Oregon Administrative Rules of the Board of Higher Education (OAR 580-10-030 through 580-10-047, exclusive of the exception policy provided in 580-10-045);
be a member of either the African American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, or Hispanic American racial/ethnic groups; and

have accumulated enough course credit at an accredited institution to be classified at least as a junior level student in good standing.

Scholarship Selection Process

All scholarship recipients will be selected on a competitive basis by a committee at the institution where they are enrolled or plan to enroll. The committee shall have representation from admissions, financial aid, faculty, special or minority programs, and, where possible, faculty/staff representation from the minority groups participating in the program.

Each applicant's college transcript will be evaluated prior to the applicant's being selected as a scholarship recipient.

Factors to be considered in the selection process include:

- the rigor of the student's college coursework;
- the student's college grade point average;
- the quality of the student's personal statement;
- the student's community or school service;
- the student's leadership potential; and
- other activities the committee warrants important.

When making final decisions on scholarship recipients, institutions are encouraged to give priority consideration to applicants who have completed a rigorous college curriculum with a meritorious GPA.

The committee shall make every effort to achieve balance and ethnic group representation in selecting scholarship recipients.

Program Conduct, Monitoring, and Evaluation

By September 1, 1991, each institution shall report program activity to the Chancellor's Office for the preceding year, including the number of applications received, and number of eligible applicants, number of scholarships granted and accepted.
Institutions shall develop and maintain a system for monitoring the admission, enrollment, advising, and academic support and progress of all recipients throughout their participation in the program.

Each institution shall make every effort to involve and utilize scholarship recipients in the ongoing conduct of the program such as in recruitment, advisement, and academic and personal support. Program participants are expected to help provide assistance for new recipients of the scholarship in established "mentor programs."

Brief annual reports and an in-depth four-year evaluation report on the conduct and results of the program will be made to the Board by the staff of the Office of Academic Affairs.

Budget

The proposed program will be funded annually for a total of 146 full-time equivalent students. Each scholarship would be worth approximately $1,850 at current tuition rates. At a projected 90% retention rate at program maturity in 1993-94, the estimated cost of the program will be approximately $486,000.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board approve the "Minority Scholarship Program for Students with Junior Standing" for underrepresented minorities, effective September 1, 1990.

The proposed program should be discussed by the Board at the January meeting and placed on the Consent Agenda for final action at the February meeting.
## TABLE 1
OSSHE Undergraduate Degrees Granted To Freshmen Enrolled from Oregon High Schools in 1983-84
Systemwide Summary of Ethnic Groups by Gender

### 1986-87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./Alas. Nat.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Is.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,621</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>5,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>5,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1987-88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./Alas. Nat.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Is.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,621</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>5,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>5,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1988-89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./Alas. Nat.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Is.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,621</td>
<td>2,613</td>
<td>5,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>5,794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1983-84 Freshmen Enrolled From an Oregon High School Receiving a Degree Within Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>1983-84 Freshmen</th>
<th>Degree Recipients</th>
<th>Percent Graduating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./Alas. Nat.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Is</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5,234</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,794</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1983-84 Freshmen Enrolled From an Oregon High School Receiving a Degree Within Six Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>1983-84 Freshmen</th>
<th>Degree Recipients</th>
<th>Percent Graduating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./Alas. Nat.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Is</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5,234</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,794</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 3

**OSSHE Undergraduate Degrees Granted**  
**To Freshmen Enrolled from Oregon High Schools in 1984-85**  
**Systemwide Summary of Ethnic Groups by Gender**

## 1987-88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./Alas. Nat.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Is.</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>5,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>5,945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1988-89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./Alas. Nat.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Is.</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,607</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>5,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>5,945</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:  
(1) OSSHE Institutional Research Services, 1987-8 and 1988-9 D01 Reports.  
(2) Office of Academic Affairs, 1984-5 Academic Performance Reports.
### 1984-85 Freshmen Enrolled From an Oregon High School Receiving a Degree Within Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>1984-85 Freshmen</th>
<th>Degree Recipients*</th>
<th>Percent Graduating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./Alas. Nat.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pac. Is</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5,328</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresident Alien</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,945</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,676</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes students graduating in three years.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In commenting on the data presented in the tables, Dr. Payne said the number of Black, Hispanic, and Native American students graduating was substantially lower than that of the Asian/Pacific Islander and White students. The proposed program is viewed as a means of ensuring that students who had the need and had established an exemplary academic record would have the opportunity to continue through junior standing to graduation.

Dr. Payne also pointed out this program was restricted to residents of the State of Oregon.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation and place it on the Consent Agenda for final approval at the February Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Athletic Funding from Sports Lottery

Staff Report to the Board

Mr. Lemman said HB 3262 had established the video poker and the sports action lottery for the benefit of various aspects of the State System of Higher Education's activities. He described some of the provisions of the legislation. Staff review and recommendations to this point had been based on the assumption that the State System would be receiving $6-8 million during the two years of the biennium.

If the regular lottery transfers do not meet the budgetary expectations of $16.2 million, any shortfall is to be covered by the transfer of the same quarter's earnings from the sports action lottery up to and including the full amount. In the quarter ending December 31, the regular lottery earned for economic development purposes only $11.3 million, $4.9 million short of the budget. The athletic lottery fund earned $1.6 million which, by statute, must be transferred to the regular lottery account. Mr. Lemman said that still leaves a shortfall of $3.3 million in the regular lottery amount.

The statute further provides that when the regular lottery earns more than $16.2 million in any quarter, the excess is applied first to any previous shortfall in that budget before repaying the amount transferred from the intercollegiate athletic fund. Mr. Lemman indicated the largest transfer made from the lottery to economic development was $18.3 in the first calendar quarter of 1988. This was the only time since the lottery began when the quarterly transfer exceeded $16.2 million.
Mr. Lemman said this information necessarily leads to a revision in the anticipated earnings from a range of $6-8 million per year to perhaps a maximum of only $3-4 million and perhaps as low as the $447,000 that was actually transferred to the State System in the first quarter. The lottery cannot recover money that has been transferred after a quarter has ended.

Mr. Lemman said the staff would be obtaining additional information concerning actual current year revenues and expenditures in order to describe more accurately to the Board and others the consequences of any recommendations.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

John C. Calhoun, Appeal of Grievance Decision, OSU

Staff Report to the Board

This appeal has been brought by John C. Calhoun, an untenured Assistant Professor in the University Libraries at Oregon State University. Dr. Calhoun is appealing a decision of President Byrne issued after review of the recommendations of a grievance committee following a formal hearing. President Hensley appointed Assistant Vice Chancellor Virginia Boushey as the Board’s designee to review Dr. Calhoun’s appeal.

Dr. Calhoun’s appeal is governed by the Board’s Administrative Rule 580-21-055 Appeal of Grievance Decisions which states:

The Board shall not reverse a decision of a president unless:

(a) procedural error was committed by the institution during the grievance procedure and the error resulted in prejudice to the grievant;

(b) the decision of the president is not supported by substantial evidence; or

(c) the decision is in conflict with applicable rules or law.

None of these three elements is present in this case. The record contains no evidence that the institution committed a procedural error. President Byrne’s decision is supported by the evidence and is not in conflict with administrative rules or law. The Board should take no action to disturb the decision of the President.
Dr. Calhoun's appeal charges procedural error with respect to two actions:

1. The placement of a letter of reprimand in his personnel file; and

2. His reassignment from a position as Head of Acquisitions to another academic position in the library.

Dr. Calhoun's appeal does not charge procedural error with respect to the hearing process.

1. Letter of Reprimand

Dr. Calhoun argues that a letter of reprimand which has been placed in his personnel file was the product of intellectual dishonesty and lack of objectivity on the part of the Assistant Director for Technical Services and the Director of Libraries. At the grievance hearing, he asked that the letter be removed from his file.

The grievance committee found no valid evidence of intellectual dishonesty on the part of either the Director of Technical Services or the Director of Libraries.

Dr. Calhoun's letter of reprimand was originally issued in December 1988. Dr. Calhoun protested the letter and he and his supervisor, the Director for Technical Services, met several times over the next few months to discuss the incidents that gave rise to the letter. In an attempt to resolve the disagreement over the letter, a mediator was called in. On advice of the mediator, the wording of the letter was amended. The final version was issued in March of 1989 and placed in Dr. Calhoun's personnel file. Dr. Calhoun continued to maintain that the letter should not be placed in his file. The nature of the letter was a primary topic at the grievance hearing.

OAR 580-21-320 specifically exempts letters of reprimand from the requirements of the Board's administrative rules on procedures to be followed for more serious disciplinary actions. The theory underlying this exemption is that supervisors must be free to document unsatisfactory work performance or behaviors. Letters of reprimand are not grievable under Oregon State University's rules of procedure. Oregon State University's procedures provide that recipients of a letter of reprimand be given a copy of the letter, be notified that the letter will be placed in the employee's personnel file, and be given an opportunity to place an accompanying letter of disagreement or rebuttal in
the personnel file. Dr. Calhoun was given an opportunity to place a letter of rebuttal in his personnel file and was urged to do so on more than one occasion. He has declined to do so.

2. Reassignment

Dr. Calhoun was reassigned from the position of Head of Acquisitions to another academic position within the library in June of 1989. He argues in his appeal that his reassignment was a sanction for cause and that the University failed to follow the procedures required in "for cause" proceedings.

QAR 580-21-318 specifically authorizes the transfer and reassignment of personnel within an institution. This rule states that reassignments should not be considered sanctions for cause unless they result from actions described in QAR 580-21-325 which states in relevant part:

"Cause" shall mean: ...

(c) Failure to perform the responsibilities of an academic staff member, arising out of a particular assignment, toward students, toward the faculty member's academic discipline, toward colleagues, or toward the institution in its primary educational and scholarly functions and secondary administrative functions of maintaining property, disbursing funds, keeping records, providing living accommodations and other services, sponsoring activities, and protecting the health and safety of persons in the institutional community.

(2) Evidence to demonstrate cause under the standard set forth in subsection (1)(c) of this definition of "cause" may include, but is not limited to, evidence of incompetence, gross inefficiency, default of academic integrity in teaching, research, or scholarship, intentional or habitual neglect of duty, and failure to perform adequately for medical reasons.

Neither the Director of Libraries nor Dr. Calhoun argued at the hearing that Dr. Calhoun's actions on the job were of the sort that would give rise to a "for cause" action. No evidence was presented at the grievance hearing to support a finding that Dr. Calhoun's behavior and/or job performance would give rise to a "for cause" proceeding. At many points in the hearing, reference was made to Dr. Calhoun's satisfactory performance of his assigned duties subsequent to the incidents that gave rise to the
letter of reprimand. Dr. Calhoun was not demoted in rank and his pay was not decreased. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, the assumption must be that Dr. Calhoun's reassignment was not a sanction for cause.

In a 1984 case having underlying facts similar to Dr. Calhoun's situation, a tenured member of the faculty at the University of Oregon was reassigned from a position as Head Science Librarian to a new position with no supervisory responsibilities. The faculty member was denied a formal hearing. On appeal to the Oregon Court of Appeals, the faculty member argued that the reassignment was a sanction for cause. In a finding for the University, the Court stated: "The record shows that after her reassignment petitioner continued to be a tenured academic staff member. She lost no salary, rank or privilege because of her reassignment. We fail to see how petitioner was 'sanctioned' by being reassigned."

The actions complained of in this appeal are matters of administrative judgment. Dr. Calhoun has had the benefit of a mediation process and has been provided a hearing. A Grievance Committee has made recommendations to the President regarding his complaints. President Byrne has reviewed the recommendations of the Committee and made the decision to take no action with respect to the letter of reprimand in Dr. Calhoun's file and with respect to his reassignment. The Board should affirm the President's decision.

Ms. Boushey said the docket item was provided to Dr. Calhoun and his attorney, and the attorney submitted a letter to the Chancellor requesting an opportunity to be heard and respond to the report. She stated Board policy is generally that review of an appeal of a grievance is done on the record and that there is not an opportunity to be heard. Ms. Boushey said she had discussed the request with Mr. Hensley and conveyed that information on the policy to Dr. Calhoun's attorney who then prepared a written response to the docket item. The response was distributed to the Board and summarized by Ms. Boushey.

She said the attorney stated in the response that Oregon State University did not have a procedure for dealing with letters of reprimand. She said Oregon State did have such a procedure and Dr. Calhoun was advised of that procedure. A second point in the response was that Dr. Calhoun's reassignment was a reassignment for cause under the cause procedure of the Board's rules. This was an area that was not argued at the appeal, and there was no evidence to suggest that Dr. Calhoun's behavior had been to the point of requiring a disciplinary action. No disciplinary action was brought by Oregon State University, and there was evidence in the filing indicating Dr. Calhoun's scholarship level was very high, that he was functioning well, and that he had not broken any laws.
With respect to the annual evaluation, Ms. Boushey said that President Byrne had directed that there be an annual review and he rescinded the letter of timely notice. She also indicated that Dr. Calhoun was presently working in collections management in the library and reporting to the Assistant Director for Collections.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board affirmed the decision of President Byrne with respect to the appeal of Dr. Calhoun. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.

Amendments to OAR Div. 10, Residency Classification; & Staff Report to the Committee Student Exchange

Residency rules are used for the purpose of determining the admission and instruction fee assessment of students applying to or attending Oregon State System of Higher Education institutions. Historically, the State System's residency rules have been relatively liberal in comparison to the rules in other states. Over the past year, the current rules have been reviewed and reevaluated for clarification and strengthening.

Staff Analysis

The long term goal of the rule revision was to increase, over the next several years, the percent of nonresident students who pay the full nonresident instruction fee rate. Consequently, over time the State System should realize financial benefits from the rule revisions.

Revisions to the current rules include major as well as editorial changes. The major changes include the following:

1. The Interinstitutional Review Committee has been renamed the Interinstitutional Residency Committee. This is the committee that considers and decides on appeals by students to institutional decisions on residency status.

2. The six-month option for establishing Oregon residency has been dropped, leaving a clarified, redefined 12-month requirement.

3. The meritorious hardship residency-by-exception rule has been dropped, leaving the classification of residence status to solely one of determining residence or nonresidence.
The Administrative Review Committee has been abolished (Chancellor’s Office committee) and replaces that function with a written appeal to the decisions of the Interinstitutional Residency Committee to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Student membership on the Residency Committee has been discontinued.

The criteria for determining residency have been clarified.

Parents/guardians of dependent students must establish residency before dependent students can be classified as a resident.

The policy that granted resident fee status to Oregon high school graduates who are nonresidents has been discontinued.

Residency status for fee purposes has been extended to spouses and dependent children of members of the Armed Services who reside in Oregon while assigned to duty. It should be noted that this rule change is a result of legislative action.

The rules and procedures for determining the residency status of students applying for participation in the WICHE Professional Student Exchange Program have been clarified and further defined.

The amendments to the residency rules were prepared with the assistance of the Department of Justice and the Interinstitutional Residency Committee and reviewed by the Academic Council. Public hearings on the revised rules and proposed amendments were scheduled on January 8 and 19, 1990.

At the January 8 public hearing, Andy Clark, President of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon (ASUO), presented written testimony on the proposed residency rule changes. In sum, the ASUO recommended the Board consider the following before adopting the proposed rule revisions: "The Associated Students of the University of Oregon strongly urges the State Board of Higher Education to continue the current program of Residence-by-Exception for the following reasons: diversity, access, and need." The ASUO further maintains that "The State of Oregon has a vested interest in going beyond the state's border to attract and recruit ethnic and racial minorities." No other testimony was received at the January 8, 1990, public hearing.
In addition, the Oregon Student Lobby (OSL) has written to the Board’s Office in objection to two of the proposed changes and no objections to the other changes. The Oregon Student Lobby objects to: (1) eliminating student membership on the Residency Committee; and (2) dropping the meritorious hardship exception policy primarily for the reason that the rule provides for non-resident fee exceptions for nonresident students who enrich campus academic life and add to ethnic/racial cultural diversity on our campuses.

The ASUO and OSL letters are available upon request from the Chancellor’s Office.

Prior to adoption of the proposed changes to Division 10, it will be necessary to consider any testimony which might occur in the public hearing on the OAR 580-10-046, 047, and 085, which were not included in the hearing notice for January 8.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

The staff recommended that the Board adopt the residency rules as revised and set forth below, to be effective July 1, 1990. The amendments to OAR 580-10-085, Student Exchanges, would be effective upon filing.

**Determination of Residence**

580-10-030 (1) For purposes of admission and instruction fee assessment, Department institutions shall classify all students (except students attending a summer session) as Oregon resident or nonresident.

(2) For this purpose, an Oregon resident is a person with a bona fide fixed and permanent physical presence established and maintained in Oregon of not less than twelve consecutive months immediately prior to the term for which residence status is requested. Determination of residence includes finding it to be the place where the [student] person intends to remain and to which the person expects to return when leaving Oregon without intending to establish a new domicile elsewhere and shall be based on consideration of all relevant objective factors, including but not limited to:

(a) [a] Abandonment of prior out-of-state residence;

(b) [b] History, duration, and nature of noneducational activities in Oregon;
(c) [§] Sources of financial support, including location of source of support and amounts of support; (Receipt, from a non-Oregon resident of support greater than the difference between resident and non-resident tuition at the institution where residence is sought, whether or not the student is actually claimed as a dependent for tax purposes, is a strong inference of non-residency.)

(d) [1] Location of family;

(e) [§] Ownership of real property in Oregon;

(f) [presence] Location of household goods in Oregon;

(g) [§] Filing of Oregon income tax return as an Oregon resident; and

(h) [place] State of vehicle and voter registration. Residence is not established by mere attendance at an institution of higher education and physical presence in the state while attending such an institution.

[(3) A person who resides continuously in Oregon for at least six consecutive months immediately prior to the time of initial registration and who also qualifies as an Oregon resident under section (2) of this rule, shall be considered a resident unless the person attended a public or private institution of higher education during any part of the six-month period.

(4) A person who resides continuously in Oregon for twelve consecutive months immediately prior to the term for which residence status is requested and who also qualifies as an Oregon resident under the other requirements of section (2) of this rule shall be considered a resident even if the person attended an institution of higher education during the twelve-month period.]

[(5) (3) The [objective factors described] criteria established in section (2) of this rule [will] shall also be used to determine whether a [resident] person who has moved from the state has established a non-Oregon residence.

(6) If institution records show that the residence as defined in OAR 580-10-030(2) of a person or the person's legal custodian is outside of Oregon, the person shall continue to be classified as a nonresident until entitlement to resident classification is shown. The burden of showing that the residence classification should be changed is on the person requesting the change.
Residence Classification of Armed Forces Personnel

580-10-035 (1) For purposes of this rule, armed services means officers and enlisted personnel of the United States Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard.

(2) Notwithstanding OAR 580-10-030, members of the armed services and their spouses and dependent children who reside in this state while assigned to duty at any base, station, shore establishment or other facility in this state, or while serving as members of the crew of a ship which has an Oregon port of shore establishment as its home port or permanent station, shall be considered residents for purposes of the instruction fee.

(3) An Oregon resident entering the armed services retains Oregon residence classification until it is voluntarily relinquished.

(4) An Oregon resident who has been in the armed services and assigned on duty outside of Oregon must return to Oregon within sixty days after completing service to retain classification as an Oregon resident.

(5) A person who continues to reside in Oregon after separation from the armed services may count the time spent in the state while in the armed services to support a claim for classification as an Oregon resident.

(6) The dependent child and spouse of a person who is a resident under section (2) of this rule shall be considered an Oregon resident. [The spouse of a person who is a resident under section (2) of this rule may be considered an Oregon resident if the residency standards of OAR 580-10-030 are otherwise met.] "Dependent child" includes any child of a member of the armed forces who:

(a) Is under 18 years of age and not married, otherwise emancipated, or self-supporting; or

(b) Is under 23 years of age, unmarried, enrolled in a full-time course of study in an institution of higher learning, and dependent on the member for over one-half of his/her support.
Residence Classification of Aliens

580-10-040 (1) An alien holding an immigrant visa or an A, E, G, I, or K visa, or otherwise admitted for permanent residence in the United States, is eligible to be considered an Oregon resident if OAR 580-10-030(2) is otherwise satisfied. The date of receipt of the immigrant visa or the date of approval of an alien’s application for lawful permanent residence, whichever is earlier, shall be used for determining residence under rule(s) OAR 580-10-030.

(2) [Under 580-10-030] Notwithstanding any other rule, an alien possessing a nonimmigrant or temporary, i.e., B, C, D, F, H, J, L, or M visa cannot be classified as a resident.

Changes in Residence Classification

580-10-041 [(1) A person who enrolls in a Department institution within one year after graduating from an Oregon high school shall be considered a resident provided the person attended the Oregon high school one school year immediately prior to graduation from the high school.]

[(2)] (1) If an Oregon resident student transfers to an institution outside of Oregon and later seeks to re-enroll in a Department institution, the residence classification of that student shall be re-examined and determined on the same basis as for any other person.

[(3)] (2) A person whose nonresident legal custodian establishes a permanent Oregon residence as defined in OAR 580-10-030(2) during a term when the [person] dependent is enrolled at a Department institution, the enrolled person may register as a resident at the beginning of the next term.

[(4)] (3) Once established, classification as a resident continues so long as the student remains in continuous academic-year enrollment in the classifying institution.

[(5)] (4) A person who seeks classification as a resident under these rules [may] shall [be required to] complete and submit a notarized Residence Information Affidavit. [If true] The affidavit [is required, it] must be submitted by the last day to register for the term in which resident status is sought.

[(6) Nonresident legal custodian means a parent or other person with guardian responsibilities for another person as determined by Oregon or other applicable laws.]
Review of Residence Classification Decisions by IRC

580-10-045 (1) An [permanent] interinstitutional [review] residency committee (IRC) is established consisting of the officers determining student residence classification at Department institutions and [two-students] a member of the Chancellor's staff appointed by the Chancellor. [r-with-a] The member of the Chancellor's staff [selected by the Chancellor] shall serve as chairperson. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum. A majority of a quorum may make decisions.

(2) Residence cases of unusual complexity, especially where there may be conflict of rules, may be referred by an institution residence classification officer to the IRC for decision.

(3) Any person who is [dissatisfied with] aggrieved by the [local-campus] institution residence classification may, within ten (10) days of the date of mailing or other service of the classification decision, appeal the classification to the IRC. [for decision. In exceptionally meritorious hardship cases, the IRC may allow exceptions to the residence rules. In evaluating the applications for meritorious hardship exceptions, the IRC shall consider the person's financial resources and obligations; the degree of the person's need to continue in an educational program without interruption; the person's past academic performance; the person's potential contribution to the institutional community, and any other factors which tend to make literal application of the residence classification rules unjust or inequitable under the facts of the particular case. Exceptions shall be limited in number based on the preceding-year's fall-term nonresident fee-paying enrollment by institution. Exceptions shall not exceed 5% of such enrollment at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University, 7.5% at Portland State University, and 10% of such enrollment or one (1) person, whichever is greater at each of the remaining institutions. The decision of the IRC shall be final as to the application for a meritorious hardship exception. An aggrieved person may supply written statements to the IRC for its consideration in reviewing the case and may also make an oral presentation to the IRC. The decision of the IRC shall be final unless appealed.

(4) A person dissatisfied with the IRC decision may, within ten (10) days of the date of the mailing or other service of the IRC decision, appeal the IRC decision to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or designee. An appeal to the Vice Chancellor shall be in writing only. The Vice Chancellor's decision shall be final.
(5) A person granted a meritorious hardship exception to residency under this rule prior to July 1, 1990, shall not lose the exception solely because of the repeal of the exception authorization.

(Administrative Review Committee (ARC) Review)

580-10-046 A permanent administrative review committee (ARC) is established consisting of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Vice Chancellor's designee, who shall serve as chairperson, an Assistant Attorney General assigned to the Department, one student, and a non-voting member from the Chancellor's staff, selected by the Chancellor. A person whose residence classification has been reviewed by the IRC and who is dissatisfied with the decision of that committee, may appeal to the ARC. However, a person may not appeal to the ARC for review of an application for a meritorious hardship exception. The decision of the ARC shall be final.

Residents Under WICHE

580-10-047 A certification officer designated by the Board shall determine the residence classification of any person seeking certification as an Oregon resident, pursuant to the terms of the WICHE Compact. Any person dissatisfied with the decision of the certification officer may appeal to the [ARC] IRC. The decision of the [ARC] IRC shall be final unless further appeal is made to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs pursuant to OAR 580-10-045(4).

Student Exchanges

580-10-085 (1) (a) Under the WICHE Student Exchange Program, certification of students as Oregon residents for purposes of attending institutions not under Board control or in other states shall be guided by rules set forth in Division 10. In order to be considered for WICHE certification, the student's completed application must be received by the certifying officer on or before October 15 of the year preceding admission. An application received after that date in an envelope postmarked not later than October 15 will be deemed to have been received on the 15th. Residency shall be determined as of the date of the application for WICHE certification, not as of the date of expected admission or registration to an institution.

(b) Persons applying for WICHE certification must be certified as Oregon residents and placed in ranked preference order within each program. Ranked preference order is determined by a score based on the grade point average of all college work plus .25 times the number of years of residence in Oregon up to a maximum of ten years.
(2) (a) The Department and separate institutions may enter into agreements with individual institutions in other states or other countries whereby resident students specified by name in the Oregon institutions may transfer to the other institution, and an equal number of students specified by name from the other institutions may transfer to the Oregon institution with a reciprocal waiving of additional fees ordinarily assessed to nonresident students in both institutions.

(b) The recommendation for a student exchange program, together with a copy of the proposed agreement between the institutions, shall be approved by the Chancellor or designee before the exchange program is undertaken. Further, the program recommendation and the proposed agreement between institutions shall set forth the reasons why the exchange would be of particular benefit to the students in their chosen study programs and specify: fees to be paid by incoming and outgoing students; student responsibility for costs of transportation, housing, books, board and room, and other incidentals; responsibility of institutions to assist students in obtaining housing, counseling, and interpreters; procedures to be followed in state entitlement funding and counting credit hours; action to be taken if students do not regularly participate in the academic program being pursued, and procedures for providing transcripts.

(c) If an approved agreement provides for exchange of equal numbers of students, then unforeseen circumstances which later might cause a student to withdraw from the program shall not void the arrangements agreed upon by the two institutions.

(4) Notwithstanding any other rule, and effective fall term of the 1989–90 academic year, a Department institution may provide that a vacant WICHE opening may be occupied by a nonresident, non-WICHE student who agrees not to seek residency status for the duration of the student’s degree program and who agrees to pay a fee equal to the non-resident tuition fee for the duration of that program.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Adams said University of Oregon students during the visitation had asked that the residency-by-exception be retained in the rule. He asked the staff to elaborate further on the reasons for deleting that provision.
Mr. Christensen said the exception was a long-standing policy expressed as meritorious hardship. The meritorious hardship residency exception was intended to apply to students who had suffered undue hardship in establishing residence, either financial or circumstantial. The meritorious portion referred to any particular talents, achievements, or abilities those students might have. Both elements had to be present for an institutional residency officer to be able to grant the student residency by exception. The policy became more difficult to monitor and implement because the judgments became more subjective. The program became a very, very expensive program and percentages at the institutions kept growing. It eventually seemed wise to review all of the residency rules and bring them more into line with the stricter applications typically used in other states. Some of the goals of this policy are incorporated in proposed fee remission programs included in another docket item.

Mr. Dodson commented that four Board members had met with the affirmative action officer at the University of Oregon following the meeting with students. There had been some concern that discrimination might be an inadvertent consequence of eliminating the residency-by-exception provision. The conclusion from that meeting was that it would probably be better to handle discrimination issues directly rather than through this procedure.

Mr. Christensen indicated there were three options available for students in terms of tuition assistance if there is a financial hardship. They can establish residency; they can compete for appropriate scholarships; and they would be eligible for the same financial aid packages which are available to all students.

Mr. Johnston asked about the rationale for deleting student membership on the residency committee.

Mr. Christensen said the students did not attend. It also was very difficult to contact students because the committee moved from campus to campus throughout the year. Cost was not a factor. He said the committee functioned in a structured, legalistic fashion when it was interpreting the rules. There will be less subjective judgment in decisions under the new rules.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hensley announced that the time set for the public hearing on the proposed amendments to QAR 580-10-047 and 580-10-085 and the repeal of QAR 580-10-046 had arrived. He asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against amendments or repeal. There being no response, he declared the public hearing closed.
The Board approved the Committee recommendation and adopted the amendments to Division 10 as presented above and repealed QAR 580-10-046. On roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, 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.

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

The proposed rule was scheduled for public hearing December 18, 1989. 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

[ACQUISITION-GF] REAL PROPERTY, FACILITY, AND CAMPUS PLANNING

Comprehensive Plan Coordination

580-50-001 Use of property owned by the Board shall conform to QAR 580-50-001 and the procedures in the Department of Higher Education Coordination Plan created pursuant to the Land Conservation and Development Commission QAR 660, Division 30, State Agency Coordination. In approving decisions concerning use of property owned by the Board, the Department, institutions, and managers at activity locations shall find that the project, plan, or action complies with the Statewide Planning goals and is compatible with applicable acknowledged comprehensive plans.
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, Physical Plant, and Equipment

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. Fernsteiner 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. Fernsteiner 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.

Board Discussion and Action (December 14, 1989)

The Board had no further comment or discussion of the proposal at the December meeting. Formal approval of the recommendations will be taken at the January Board meeting following the report of public testimony received at the public hearing December 18.

Public Hearing Report

No one appeared to testify in person at the public hearing on December 18, 1989, but additions were requested in written form prior to the hearing. The legal counsels to the Board and the Department of Land Conservation and Development have agreed that it would be appropriate to make these minor additions to the first paragraph of the proposed Administrative Rule. The additions would clarify the responsibilities for implementation of the rule. The additions have been incorporated in the first paragraph of the proposed rule presented above. The procedures would continue to be those practiced by the Oregon State System of Higher Education since 1978.

Board Discussion and Action (January 19, 1990)

Mr. Fernsteiner reported there had been minor changes in wording to restate in the first paragraph some of the same things stated in subsequent paragraphs. There were no substantive changes from the previous presentations.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and adopted, on roll call vote, QAR 580-50-001, Comprehensive Plan Coordination. The Board also adopted an amended title for Division 50 and the implementing IMD 7.100, Long-Range Campus Development Planning. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.
Staff Report to the Board

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

Contracts for Professional Services

Public Service Park, WOSC
An Agreement was negotiated with Boatwright Engineering, Inc., Engineers, Salem, for engineering services not to exceed $9,500. Financing is provided from capital construction funds.

Agricultural Sciences II, OSU
An Agreement was negotiated with RMC Consulting Services, Consultants, Aumsville, Oregon, for consulting services not to exceed $40,000. Financing is provided from federal and state funds.

Architectural Services - Loading Dock 4 Modifications and Materials Management Building, OHSU
An Agreement was negotiated with Ankrom Moisan Associated Architects, Architects, Portland, for architectural services not to exceed $20,000. Financing is provided from federal funds, general funds, and Article XI-G bonds.

Research Magnetic Resonance Imaging Facility, OHSU
An Agreement was negotiated with Petersen Kolberg & Associates, Architects, Wilsonville, for architectural services not to exceed $8,750. Financing is provided from state funds.

Science Building II, DEQ Ventilation Hoods, PSU
An Agreement was negotiated with System Design Consultants, Inc., Engineers, Portland, for engineering services not to exceed $7,225. Financing is provided from state funds.

Award of Construction Contracts

Autzen Stadium Improvements, L. Casanova Athletic Ctr.- Phase II-B, UO
On December 18, 1989, Elliott-Jochimsen Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $2,030,400. Financing is provided from gift funds.

Riley Dormitory Moped Parking Shelter, UO
On December 18, 1989, McKenzie Commercial Contractors, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $17,878. Financing is provided from housing funds.
On December 27, 1989, Palmer/Philips Electric, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $14,326. Financing is provided from housing funds.

### Acceptance of Projects

**Parking Lot 24—1989, SOCSC**
This project is complete and was accepted on October 22, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $32,624. Financing was provided from parking reserve funds.

**Accessibility for the Handicapped Phase III (Contracts A & C), OSU**
This project is complete and was accepted on December 5, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $465,466. Financing was provided from capital construction funds.

**Food Toxicology & Nutrition Lab, Phase II, OSU**
This project is complete and was accepted on December 19, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $42,159. Financing was provided from general funds and federal funds.

**Gill Coliseum Exterior Renovation, OSU**
This project is complete and was accepted on October 20, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $345,086. Financing was provided from institutional funds.

**President’s Residence Reroofing, OSU**
This project is complete and was accepted on November 20, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $42,892. Financing was provided from state funds.

**Hayward Field Renovations Phase IV, Warm-Up Track, UO**
This project is complete and was accepted on December 1, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $174,673. Financing was provided from Article XI-F(1) Bond Proceeds.

**Honors College Remodel (Chapman Hall—3rd Floor), UO**
This project is complete and was accepted on November 10, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $62,477. Financing was provided from gift funds and building use credits.

**McMorran House Reroofing Project, UO**
This project is complete and was accepted on December 11, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $51,861. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

**Science V Sidewalks, UO**
The Science Facilities Additions & Alterations (Science V Sidewalks) project is complete and was accepted on December 29, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $47,405. Financing was provided from federal funds.
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Willamette Hall (Science V) Phone & Data Cabling Project is complete and was accepted on December 15, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $35,474. Financing was provided from federal funds.

Walton Hall Domestic Hot Water Piping Replacement, UO

This project is complete and was accepted on November 14, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $14,866. Financing was provided from housing reserve funds.

Outpatient Clinic, Ear, Nose & Throat (ENT) Clinic Renovation Project, OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on July 7, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $656,503. Financing was provided from gift and hospital funds.

Tower House Driveway Replacement (Rebid), OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on December 14, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $41,285. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

UHS, 7C SICU Renovations, OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on November 8, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $25,018. Financing was provided from hospital funds.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Bailey said the Board discussed several major issues during the past several months, including minorities, funding, and tuition policies. He said he had discussed with members of the Chancellor's staff the need for the Board to review the status of women and minorities in high administrative positions in the State System. He said there had been difficulties in recruiting people to those positions and the Board should review the situation and see if the issue could be addressed in a way that would have a productive result.

Appreciation to UO

Mr. Swanson and other Board members expressed appreciation to President Brand and his staff for the courtesies extended to the Board during its visit to the institution the previous day.

Board Materials

Mr. Richardson commented that Board members receive a substantial amount of material from many sources. He said he had noticed marked improvement during the past few months in the materials received and thanked the Chancellor and staff for their efforts in this regard.
Mr. Dodson said the discussions during Committee meetings often go into much greater detail than what occurs later at the time of the Board meeting with respect to various issues. He suggested that Mr. Bailey's comments and those of other Board members would tend to indicate that affirmative action might be a topic the Board would like to focus on directly as a Board, rather than trying to deal with it indirectly in connection with such things as the residency requirements.

Mr. Hensley said President Brand and the faculty, staff, and students at the University of Oregon should be congratulated on the attitude and policy of the institution with respect to the issue of color on that campus, as evidenced by comments during the meeting with student body representatives during the visit.

Mr. Hensley announced that the next regular Board meeting would be held at Portland State University on February 16. He also reported the second Board renewal would follow the March Board meeting on the afternoon of March 16 and the morning of March 17. The Board meeting and renewal session will be held in Portland.

Mr. Hensley said last summer the Board had approved salary adjustments of unclassified staff averaging 5% to be effective on January 1, 1990, and a further 5% adjustment to be effective on January 1, 1991. The Board delegated to the Chancellor the approval of institutional salary plans and the salary adjustments for staff of the Board's Office.

The Board also asked Mr. Dodson and Mr. Hensley to consult with the Chancellor individually regarding the increases for the vice chancellors and for the executive deans and vice presidents of the institutions. Mr. Hensley reported this had been done.

He said the Board reserved to itself the responsibility to set the salary and allowance for expenses incident to the positions of the Chancellor and the presidents and asked the President and Vice President of the Board to make recommendations in this regard.

Mr. Hensley reported that Mr. Dodson and he had consulted with the Chancellor with respect to the salaries and expenses of the presidents and between themselves with respect to the salary and expenses of the Chancellor. He said it was their recommendation that these salaries be increased by 5%, effective January 1, 1990. He said they further recommended that the allowances for the presidents of Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University also be increased by 5% and that the allowance for expenses for the president of the Oregon
The specific amounts as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>7,980</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,3'840</td>
<td></td>
<td>95,760</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,690</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113,720</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,200</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>113,020</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>135,020</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126,620</td>
<td></td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Salary and Expenses

Current Salary and Expenses

The specific amounts as shown below:

and express information prior to the meeting. Mr. Hensley read
Since board members indicated they had not received the Salary

of the other institutions.

In addition, they recommended the allocation for the presidents of Oregon State University and the University of Oregon. In addition, they recommended the allocation for the presidents of Oregon State University and the University of Oregon.
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hensley moved that the Board approve the proposed salary and expense increases as recommended.

Mr. Adams said Mr. Hensley had referred to the increases for the college presidents being more in line with other institutions and asked for clarification of what was meant by other institutions.

Mr. Hensley responded that it was his understanding this referred to other similar institutions outside of the State System.

Mr. Swanson said the earlier report on salaries for unclassified staff referred to a one-year period. He asked about the effective time period for increases pertaining to the Chancellor and presidents.

Mr. Hensley said he would assume the Board would be following the same schedule as those for the other unclassified salary changes. That schedule was 5% each year on January 1, 1990, and January 1, 1991.

Mr. Swanson asked how these salaries compared with faculty in general. The Chancellor indicated the percentages on the whole were the same because 5% was used in both instances as the base number. The actual dollar amounts would be different for the same percentage figured on larger salaries.

Mr. Swanson said he supported the increases but wanted to be sure about the relationship to what faculty members were receiving and whether the Board would be granting an increase at the top and cutting people at the middle or in the faculty system.

Mr. Hensley commented this was a very legitimate concern because there had been some misunderstanding in this regard. He noted it was important to keep the presidents competitive because salary had been a problem in the search for new presidents.

Mr. Johnston said he would have preferred to have seen the information earlier but supported the recommendation because Oregon has been underpaying its top administrators.

The Board approved the recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Dodson, Johnston, Matthews, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Hensley. Those voting no: None.
At the conclusion of the meeting, the Board met for luncheon. No business was transacted at that time.

The Board meeting was adjourned at 12:00 Noon.

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

Pending Report Items

A summary of reports, requested information, or topics designated for future review or consideration is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Original Presentation</th>
<th>Tentative Presentation Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordination &amp; Development of Higher Education in Portland-Governor’s Comm.</td>
<td>2/17/89</td>
<td>March 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Strategy re Inadequate Resource Allocation for Operation and Maintenance of Buildings</td>
<td>2/17/89</td>
<td>March 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Progress of Student Athletes</td>
<td>March 1983</td>
<td>March 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Admissions</td>
<td>4/21/89</td>
<td>Periodic reports on effect at each campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of Student and Faculty Housing in Ashland</td>
<td>6/15/89</td>
<td>March–May 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Athletic Funding from Sports Lottery</td>
<td>7–21–89</td>
<td>Report made in January; others to as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Expectations re Expenditure of Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td>9–7–89</td>
<td>March 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School, UO—Plan for adequate solution to resource problems</td>
<td>11–16–89</td>
<td>May 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Information System</td>
<td>11–16–89</td>
<td>February 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Education—Institutional Plans, including graduate education</td>
<td>11–16–89</td>
<td>April 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Degree in Health &amp; Safety Administration, OSU — Review along with statewide plan in three years</td>
<td>12–14–89</td>
<td>December 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordinated Plan for Delivery of Health Administration and Public Health Programs  
12-14-89  July 1, 1991

Review of Women and Minorities in High Administrative Positions  
1-19-90  Not specified