MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION HELD JANUARY 18, 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINUTES APPROVED</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANCELLOR'S REPORT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming President-Elect Dr. Lawrence Wolf</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement of Dr. Robert Frank, Interim Provost, PSU</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH.D. DEGREE IN BIORESOURCE ENGINEERING, OSU</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTER FOR SOFTWARE QUALITY RESEARCH, PSU</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO OAR 580-22-045(3) POSSESSION OR USE OF FIREARMS</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A STATUS REPORT ON STUDY ABROAD AND INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEASURE 5: PLANNING AND BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

| PRESIDENT'S REPORT Waseda University | 34 |
| EXECUTIVE SESSION Possible Litigation to ORS 192.660(1)(h) | 34 |
| ADJOURNMENT | 34 |
| APPENDIX A- PENDING REPORT ITEMS | 35 |
STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN VANPORT ROOM
SMITH MEMORIAL CENTER, PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PORTLAND, OREGON

January 18, 1991

MEETING #595

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

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 11:30 a.m., Friday, January 18, 1991, by the President of the Board, Mr. Mark S. Dodson, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert Adams  Mr. Christopher Halsey
Mr. Bob Bailey  Mr. Rob Miller
Mr. Tom Bruggere  Mr. George E. Richardson
Ms. Britteny Davis  Mr. Les Swanson
Mr. Mark S. Dodson

Ms. Beverly Jackson and Ms. Janice Wilson were absent.

Chancellor Bartlett and Presidents Brand, Cox, Gilbert, Kohler, Lemman, Meyers, Ramaley were present.

Chancellor's Office--Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Virginia L. Thompson, Board Secretary and Executive Assistant to the Chancellor; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services and Compliance Officer; Weldon Ihrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Virginia Boushey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Robin Brown, Associate Director, School Relations; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Roger Olsen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Michelle Warnke, Interim Director, Communications; Francesca Clifford, Assistant Director of Communications; Jack Van de Water, Director, International Education.
University of Oregon--President Myles Brand; Norman Wessells, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration; Brodie Remington, Vice President, Public Affairs and Development; Tom Mills, Director, International Services.

Oregon State University--Graham Spanier, Provost; L. E. Coate, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Andrew Hashimoto, Professor and Head of Bioresource Engineering.

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Peter Kohler; Henry Van Hassel, Vice President, Administration; Lesley Hallick, Vice President, Academic Affairs.

Portland State University--President Judith Ramaley; Robert Frank, Interim Provost; Gary Powell, Acting Vice President, Finance and Administration; Dawn White, Director, International Exchange Programs; Chik Erzurumlu, Dean, School of Engineering; Len Shapiro, Chairman, Computer Science; John Anderson, Director, Financial Aid; Bill Savery, Vice Provost, Graduate Studies and Research; Vesna Marn-Bolec, Fulbright Scholarships.

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

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

Southern Oregon State College--President Joseph Cox.

Oregon Institute of Technology--Interim President W. T. Lemman; Mr. Larry Wolf, President-Elect; and Margie Sherman Frazier, Executive Assistant to the President.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Members Attending the Meeting--Herb Jolliff, Oregon Institute of Technology; Bonnie Staebler, Western Oregon State College; Margaret Berroth, Oregon Health Sciences University; Ulrich Hardt, Portland State University; Charles Wright, University of Oregon; and Janice Jackson, Portland State University.
MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on December 21, 1990, and approved them with corrections. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Miller, Swanson, Richardson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Bartlett welcomed Dr. Lawrence Wolf, president-elect of Oregon Institute of Technology. Dr. Wolf has a Ph.D. in Civil Engineering from Washington University in St. Louis and is coming to Oregon after a distinguished career which has included Dean of the School of Technology at the University of Houston. A distinguished scientist, Dr. Wolf is completing work at the Super Conduing Super Collider in Texas. He has been very active in national and international professional associations and, the Chancellor underscored, would be an asset to the State System.

DR. LAWRENCE WOLF

Dr. Wolf, after being introduced to the Board, indicated his pleasure at having been selected to the presidency of the Oregon Institute of Technology. He observed that he was coming to the Oregon State System at a very difficult time, but expressed confidence, after having attended a meeting of the Council of Presidents and observing the Board discussions, that there was strong leadership to face the challenges.

DR. ROBERT FRANK

Chancellor Bartlett acknowledged the presence of Dr. Robert Frank in his new role as Interim Provost at Portland State University. The Chancellor noted that Dr. Frank was no stranger to the Board, having served as Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
Introduction

Oregon State University sought authorization from the Board to offer a Ph.D. degree in Bioresource Engineering. The program would be offered by the Department of Bioresource Engineering, with the curriculum administered by the College of Engineering and program funding through the College of Agricultural Sciences.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed degree program is consistent with the University's assigned mission. As a Land and Sea Grant institution, Oregon State University operates under mandates from both the state and federal governments to help Oregon, the nation, and the world develop and utilize human, land, atmospheric, and oceanic resources. The budget for the program is consistent with this shared role, with both state and federal dollars to be involved.

2. Evidence of Need

Graduates with Ph.D. degrees in bioresource engineering are needed nationally in industry, state and federal governmental agencies, and academic institutions. There are currently many more openings for people with this specialty than available graduates. This is because of a shortfall of Ph.D. graduates who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents, and the growing demand for academic institutions to hire graduates to replace their retiring faculty. The academic institutions are competing with openings available in industry, where new job opportunities are being created because of advances in the food engineering field.

Oregon has a particular need for people trained in this specialty. Future economic growth in the state will be enhanced by moving to "value-added" products. Increasing the production and improving the processing of value-added products depends heavily on bioresource engineering research.
3. Quality of Proposed Program

The program will prepare students for leadership roles and accomplishments in the bioresource engineering field. This field addresses issues and problems related to the interface of engineering with biology. Students will be required to develop significant knowledge and application of the mathematical, physical, and biological sciences.

A uniqueness of the program is the collaborative effort of faculty and students drawn from a number of disciplines and departments. Courses will be offered by the chemical, civil, and mechanical engineering departments, as well as departments of biochemistry and biophysics, bioresource engineering, chemistry, crop science, food science and technology, soil science, microbiology, and horticulture.

The University will recruit students for the program primarily from outside the institution. Students will enter the program typically with a B.S. from an accredited engineering discipline related to the proposed bioresource engineering graduate program. Within five years the program expects to enroll about 20 M.S. students and ten Ph.D. students per year for a total graduate enrollment of between 30-35 students. At this level, three Ph.D. and eight M.S. graduates are expected per year. It should be noted that Oregon State University already enrolls about eight to ten students per year in its M.S. degree program in Bioresource Engineering (formerly called Agricultural Engineering). The M.S. program has been in operation since the early 1950s.

Students admitted with the B.S. degree will be required to take a minimum of 108 quarter hours, of which 45 hours are for the M.S. degree, 36 for the Ph.D. thesis, and a minimum of 27 additional graduate hours for the Ph.D.

Oregon State University already offers a significant number of courses for which graduate credit can be received in the student's major field of bioresource engineering (46 courses are listed in the proposal). A number of
courses for which graduate credit can be received outside the student's major field also are currently identified for electives (17 courses are listed in the proposal).

Only three new courses will need to be added and they are currently being developed. These courses will be added as the undergraduate teaching load is decreased with the phasing out of the B.S. in Agricultural Engineering (elimination of program approved by Board in March, 1990; phase-out will be completed by fall 1991).

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer Program

Faculty. Fifteen graduate faculty will be drawn from three departments initially (bioresource engineering, chemical engineering, and food science and technology). This number of faculty is sufficient to offer the program.

Library. Existing library facilities are adequate; some improvement is required in the area of journals and the University has developed plans to strengthen this area of library support. If additional library funds are not available, the program could still be offered. The Department of Bioresource Engineering currently houses a number of Ph.D. students who are successfully pursuing work in bioresource engineering under the auspices of related doctoral programs. The current deficiencies are minor (and would continue to be) and may be ameliorated if needed by reliance upon holdings in other libraries.

Facilities and Equipment. Existing equipment and facilities are adequate. The Bioresource Engineering Department has recently invested over $150,000 in remodeling and new equipment to support the program.

Budget Impact. Support for the program will come from multiple sources: the department and library through going-level funds, the Agricultural Experiment Station, and grants and contracts. Going-level funds provide funding for faculty positions, equipment, library, etc. Outside funds will be used for support of
graduate research assistants and costs associated with research programs. If these funds are not expanded over the next five years as is anticipated, fewer graduate assistantships will be available to recruit and support graduate students.

Projected budget cuts at Oregon State University for the next biennium are not expected to directly affect the proposed Ph.D. program.

5. Other Issues

Duplication. There are no other programs at the undergraduate or graduate level in Oregon in this specialty. There are only a small number of similar programs in the surrounding Western states. The University of California, Davis, and the University of Idaho have Ph.D. programs in Bioresource Engineering. Washington State University has an interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Engineering Sciences. Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, and Wyoming do not have Ph.D. programs in this specialty. Because of the increasing significance of food engineering, bioprocess engineering, applications of biotechnical advances, etc. to the agriculture industry so central to Oregon's economy, this program is a high priority.

The Name "Bioresource Engineering." Significant discussion over the issue of the name "bioresource engineering" occurred when Oregon State University requested that the Board approve name changes for its existing M.S. program in Agricultural Engineering and Department of Agricultural Engineering (this occurred in July 1990 and was approved by the Chancellor's Office through the Board's policy of delegated authority).

Oregon State University provided evidence that a number of institutions nationally were responding to trends in agricultural engineering by making changes in their curriculum and names of programs to reflect the increasing relationship between biological sciences and agricultural engineering. In the past, agricultural engineering was centered around farm structures for food production, i.e., "production" agri-
culture. The discipline has moved away from an emphasis on farms to reflect a greater involvement in the entire agriculture production field. Agriculture has now broadened to mean anything from food production to consumption. People in the agricultural field have to be trained in "systems" related to food production -- this requires interaction with a number of disciplines. Of 42 programs accredited by the Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology (ABET), nine have already changed their names to agricultural and biological engineering and three to bioresource engineering. Only 20 of the 42 departments have the name "agricultural engineering." All of these changes point to programs that are providing an interface between the biological science and agriculture to reflect the increasing interrelations of these fields. This is the intention of Oregon State University's Ph.D. program.

At the time these discussions were occurring, concern was raised among some in Oregon's agricultural community that Oregon State University might be moving away from its commitment to agriculture. Oregon State University has communicated with those concerned to advise them that agriculture is and will continue to be a key mission and commitment of the University. Agriculture is the college with the largest budget at Oregon State University. There has been no intention to denote lesser importance to agriculture by these name changes. Rather, the name change is an attempt to better reflect the true nature of the discipline.

A second issue related to "name" was raised by the External Review Committee, which noted that most programs using the bioresource engineering title include forestry within the curriculum. The Oregon State University program does not propose that interrelationship at present. The Review Committee has recommended that students who are recruited for this program be so advised if they are looking for that blend in their program.
Program Review

The program was first reviewed by the Academic Council at its July 1990 meeting and recommended for the Board's external review procedure for new graduate level programs.

An External Review Committee was subsequently formed by the Chancellor's Office for the purpose of conducting an outside review of the program. Members of the review committee included:

- Dr. Donald Edwards, Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, University of Nebraska;
- Dr. Norman Scott, Vice President for Research and Advanced Studies, Cornell University (Committee Chair); and,
- Dr. William Splinter, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, University of Nebraska.

The External Review Committee completed a report after reviewing Oregon State University's written documentation regarding the program and making a two-day site visit in September 1990. The Committee's report presented a unanimous expression of findings and offered 15 recommendations covering a range of issues, key among them to:

- Move forward with submission to the Board;
- Make the program truly unique by placing increased emphasis on the centrality of the biological sciences in the engineering sciences program;
- Strengthen linkages with business/industry;
- Develop an effective recruitment strategy for students;
- Improve on the external support record;
- Enhance instrumentation and equipment;
Determine, within a five year timeframe, if an undergraduate program will be needed; and,

- Nurture relationships with other departments at the University.

The Academic Council reviewed the External Review Panel's report in November 1990 and found it supportive of Oregon State University's request. Other than concerns about the "name," no other issues were raised by the Academic Council.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

1. The staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon State University to initiate a new instructional program leading to a Ph.D. degree in Bioresource Engineering, effective fall 1991.

2. The staff recommended that the follow-up review for this program occur no later than five years after the implementation date of the program. The review should include a review of recommendations made by the External Review Committee.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In introducing the discussion of the proposed program, Vice Chancellor Shirley Clark noted that this was the first opportunity for Academic Affairs to implement new guidelines for external review of graduate degrees. She indicated that the process involved many steps, including the use of three distinguished individuals to conduct an evaluative review of the proposed degree.

Dr. Clark introduced Provost Graham Spanier who explained to the Board that during the last biennial budget reductions, Oregon State University had experienced considerable reorganization and program reductions. One of the areas under consideration was a program change within the College of Agriculture which included the discontinuation of the undergraduate program in Agricultural Engineering while at the same time realigning it for the future. The undergraduate program is nearing the final stages of phase-out and no new students are in the pipeline. Subsequently, Oregon State University
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returned to the Board with a plan for realigning the department which included the renaming of the department from Agricultural Engineering to Bioresource Engineering, thus strengthening the department in conjunction with other units in the College of Engineering and the College of Agricultural Sciences, and shifting of faculty and budgetary resources of the department in the direction of the graduate programs. Provost Spanier explained that the Ph.D. in Bioresource Engineering was the last step in the process of re-orienting the department and the Colleges of Engineering and Agriculture around it.

Dr. Spanier indicated there were adequate resources for the new program resulting from internal shifts which were part of the plan from previous program reductions. In addition, there is considerable support that comes to the department from resources outside the normal academic budgets, including grants and contracts and support from the Agriculture Experiment Station.

Mr. Adams indicated that the review group had suggested that Forestry was frequently included as part of the bioresource doctoral program and asked if there were any plans for that inclusion in the future.

Dr. Andrew Hashimoto, head of the Department of Bioresource Engineering, responded that at Oregon State University there is a Forest Engineering program and that a student interested in forestry has that as an option. There is no plan to include forestry in this degree program at this time.

Mr. Adams noted that there appeared to be a difference of opinion among the reviewers regarding the need to up-grade laboratories with more up-to-date instrumentation.

Dr. Hashimoto directed the Board's attention to a handout which indicated that since 1986-87 the department was able to acquire approximately $290,000 per year; and, for the first six months of the present fiscal year, this sum was in excess of $822,000. It is estimated that $200,000 of those funds are being used to up-grade instrumentation and that substantial, significant improvements have been made in facilities, both in terms of laboratories as well as equipment.
Mr. Bruggere asked, given the present climate with Measure 5 and the cuts which would be required, how the Board would explain start-up of a new program.

Dr. Hashimoto responded that the undergraduate program in agricultural engineering had been eliminated, the master's program has been in place for many years, and doctoral students are completing degrees in this area but through other existing degree programs. Formal approval of the Ph.D. program enables Oregon State University to attract higher quality students. In addition, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has a national needs fellowship which is available only to Ph.D. students, and presently Oregon State University students are not eligible for these monies.

Dr. Clark indicated that this program has been in the pipeline for over a year, was given careful consideration by the University in the campus-wide planning efforts, and had been carefully reviewed before being brought to the Board.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation and place the item 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, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Introduction

Portland State University requested authorization to recognize its Laboratory for Software Quality Research as the Center for Software Quality Research (CSQR). Two goals have been established for the CSQR: (1) to advance the state of the art in software quality through a planned program of research focused upon the needs of the local computer software industry; and (2) to maintain a vigorous technology-transfer program to ensure that research results, both those of the CSQR programs as well as results from the wider research community, are available to the local software industry. The Center will take a holistic view of software quali-
ty, which includes both internal quality (e.g., correctness and maintainability) and external quality (e.g., "user friendly" interfaces and well-written documentation). A Board-approved research center on software quality will better help Portland State University address the unique industry needs for software quality assurance and project management in the Portland metropolitan area.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The mission of Portland State University includes providing instruction and research support to high technology industries in the Portland area. In the Board's Strategic Plan 1987-93, the expectation was established that Portland State would expand its close ties with local industries. More specifically, research programs related to the sciences and engineering that are tied to the community's focus on high technology industry were among the areas to be given priority consideration.

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

The proposed Center is consistent with the Board's requirements for establishing centers and institutes:

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

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

3. Evidence of Need

Locally and nationally many software-related industries are beginning to recognize the importance of software quality assurance and are searching for techniques that lead to more predictable software quality. Software quality is an area of significant importance to local industry as evidenced by the success of the Northwest Software Quality Conference organized by Portland area companies and by the interest several companies, such as the Mentor Graphics Corporation, have shown in the proposed Center.

In the 1989 Oregon Shines report, the software industry was identified with three other industries as having tremendous potential for growth in Oregon. Pivotal to this growth "is a strong need for the industry players to become better acquainted with each other, to identify opportunities for collaborative ventures, and to communicate industry needs with a variety of institutions," (p. III-3). The Center would serve as a critical catalyst in the Portland area for furthering the software industry's growth and development through targeted research opportunities, seminars and workshops, and through corporate membership or sponsorship services.
Furthermore, supported with a major grant from Tektronix to hire and support faculty in software engineering, Portland State University is the state's leader in the area. The Center will provide faculty in software engineering and related fields a research and service context for collaboration and interaction as colleagues with local industry.

4. Quality of the Proposed Center

The Center for Software Quality Research grows out of the current Computer Science Department's Laboratory for Software Quality Research (LSQR) created in July, 1990. The LSQR focuses on three major research areas:

- Software measurement and management;
- Software testing; and,
- Software usability.

Each project is headed by a computer science faculty member.

The research efforts of the LSQR will continue with the Center. The number of projects will expand with identification and support of relevant efforts at Portland State and other Oregon research universities. The Director, the Advisory Board, and participating corporate affiliate members, will be responsible for identifying and encouraging research efforts that relate to the goals and objectives of the Center. Faculty associated with the Center will organize conferences and workshops as well as publish technical reports and periodic research summaries. Finally, the Center will maintain two library collections: one of technical reports and hard-to-find informal publications from industrial and academic research groups, and one of public domain software tools related to software quality, along with tutorial materials in their use.

The University of Oregon and Oregon State University also provide instruction, research and public service in software engineering and related areas. Also, OCATE provides continuing education classes on related topics. The Center's goals are focused on software quality
assurance in an applied research context. The Center will complement OCATE classes and will provide a forum for collaboration with faculty from the University of Oregon and Oregon State University.

5. **Adequacy of Resources to Establish the Center**

**Faculty.** Currently four faculty members are affiliated with the LSQR and will continue their affiliation should the Board approve the proposed Center. One faculty member was recently hired in software engineering with funds from Tektronix. Additional faculty may become affiliated with the Center as assigned by the computer science department. A 0.5 FTE graduate student is currently assigned to the LSQR.

**Facilities and Equipment.** The Center will require space of approximately 500 square feet. The location of the Center will be on the Portland State University campus. Office and laboratory space has been identified in the Fish and Wildlife Building. Portland State University has included $10,000 for space rental in the program's budget. However, the campus will give priority to locating space on campus that will require minimum or no rental fees for the Center. The Center's need for computing resources will be accommodated by the Computer Science Department current computing facilities.

**Library.** Portland State University has adequate library holdings to support faculty research efforts for the proposed Center.

**Budget.** A three year budget has been developed to support the Center's operation. In the first year $48,000 will be required. The Computer Science Department will allocate 60 percent ($30,000) of the budget with the remaining 40 percent ($18,000) coming from corporate affiliates (at $7,500 per affiliation). In year two, the budget will be $66,000 with 45 percent ($30,000) from the Computer Science Department and 55 percent ($36,000) from the Computer Science Department. And, in the third year, the budget will be $76,000, with 13 percent ($10,000) and 87 percent ($66,000) from
corporate affiliates. Increases in budget will be primarily in the areas of secretarial and graduate student support based on the level of industry revenues to the Center. In addition to secretarial (0.5 to 1.0 FTE) and graduate student (0.5 to 1.0 FTE) support, 0.3 FTE will be budgeted for release time to a faculty member to serve as director of the Center. The Center is expected to be totally self-supporting by its fourth year of operation.

Program Review

The proposal for the Center for Software Quality Research was reviewed by the Academic Council initially at its November 15, 1990 meeting with follow-up discussion at its December 20, 1990 meeting. The Council supports the staff recommendations as cited below.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to establish the Center for Software Quality Research, effective April 1, 1991.

The staff also recommended that the Center establish effective mechanisms to encourage collaboration with the University of Oregon and Oregon State University faculty on appropriate projects with Portland area software-related corporations.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Miller called on Vice Chancellor Clark to introduce the proposal. Dr. Clark indicated that the presentation was being made under Board policy for establishing centers and institutes.

Dr. Chik Erzurumlu, Dean of the School of Engineering at Portland State University, indicated that the thrust of software engineering within the Computer Science Department was launched two years with support from the Tektronix Foundation to add two faculty members. He underscored that Software Engineering is an important field and one in which Portland State University can make a substantial contribution.
in a time- and cost-efficient manner. The Center will respond to the needs of business and industry and serve as a point of cooperation among the University of Oregon and Oregon State University whose faculty also would be active participants.

Dr. Len Shapiro, head of the Department of Computer Science at Portland State University, underscored that, although Portland State's focus on software engineering is unique within the State System, other institutions have expertise. In particular he indicated Professor Steve Fickas at the University of Oregon who was supported by the Center as a visiting faculty member last year; Professor Ted Lewis of Oregon State University with whom there have been joint research projects; Professor Harrison through the OASIS parallel processing initiative; and, Professor Curt Cook at Oregon State University in a co-sponsored and co-organized software quality metric conference.

In response to a question raised by Mr. Bailey regarding outside funding and corporate support, Dr. Shapiro indicated that the Center has been establishing contacts and is confident of forthcoming support.

Mr. Bruggere raised the question of support within the context of Measure 5 reductions. Dr. Shapiro responded that the proposal contained the requirement for obtaining external support and that Departmental funding was for a period of three years. If, in that time, external funding is not forthcoming, the Center would be closed.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation and place the item 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, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO OAR 580-22-045(3) POSSESSION OR USE OF FIREARMS

Summary

The Board's Rules have, for many years, prohibited possession or use of firearms, explosives, dangerous chemicals, or other dangerous weapons on campus or institution-controlled property. The 1989 Legislature eliminated criminal penalties for possession of concealed weapons by those licensed to carry concealed handguns. Because of the wording of the Board's Rule, this allowed holders of concealed weapons licenses to bring them on campus or institution-controlled property. The proposed amendment would reinstate the Board's previous policy, prohibiting firearms on campus, with certain exceptions.

Staff Report

The Board Rule regarding proscribed conduct prohibits possession or use of firearms, explosives, dangerous chemicals, or other dangerous weapons on campus or institution-controlled property "in contravention of law or institutional rule." ORS 166.360 and 166.370 establish criminal penalties for possession of firearms in public buildings. The statute includes campuses as "public buildings." In 1989, as part of a comprehensive gun control bill, the Legislature modified these statutes to eliminate criminal liability for individuals who are licensed to carry concealed handguns. Because of the wording of the Board's Rule, the amendment had the effect of changing the Board's proscribed conduct rule to allow individuals licensed to carry concealed handguns to bring them to campus.

In previous discussions, Board members have expressed preferences to have no firearms on campus, with few limited exceptions. Staff has conferred with institution executives who support this policy. Additionally, the State Risk Management Division has urged all state agencies to adopt rules prohibiting firearms in state buildings. Thus, we propose to amend the Board's Rule so that firearms would be allowed only if specifically authorized by statute or rule. The effect of the amendment would be to reinstate the Board's policy which was inadvertently changed by the 1989 Legislature.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended that the Board amend OAR 580-22-045 as follows:

580-22-045 Procedures to impose applicable sanctions may be instituted against any person engaging in any of the following proscribed conduct:

1. Obstruction or disruption of teaching, research, administration, disciplinary procedures, or other institutional activities, including the institution's public service functions or other authorized activities on institutionally-owned or controlled property;

2. Obstruction or disruption interfering with freedom or movement, either pedestrian or vehicular, on institutionally-owned or controlled property;

3. Possession or use of fire arms, explosives, dangerous chemicals, or other dangerous weapons or instrumentalities on institutionally-owned or controlled property, [in contravention of] unless expressly authorized by law, Board or institutional rules (for purposes of this section, absence of criminal penalties shall not be considered express authorization);

4. Detention or physical abuse of any person or conduct intended to threaten imminent bodily harm or endanger the health of any person on any institutionally-owned or controlled property;

5. Malicious damage, misuse, or theft of institutional property, or the property of any other person where such property is located on institutionally-owned or controlled property, or, regardless of location, is in the care, custody, or control of an institution;

6. Refusal by any person while on institutional property to comply with an order of the President or appropriate authorized official to leave such premises because of conduct proscribed by this rule when such conduct constitutes a danger to personal safety, property, educational or other appropriate institutional activities on such premises;

7. Unauthorized entry to or use of institutional facilities, including buildings and grounds;
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A STATUS REPORT ON STUDY ABROAD AND INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and, on roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Background

The international dimensions of education are becoming a national priority. Numerous reports have confirmed the links between economic interdependence and the need for educating U.S. students about other countries and cultures. The nation's economic as well as political security is closely related to our ability to compete in the global marketplace and understand what motivates those with whom we interact in other countries.

The Oregon State System of Higher Education has placed a high priority on strengthening the international dimensions of our higher education programs. These include strengthened foreign language
programs, programs in international business, added international content in a range of courses, faculty and student exchanges, and research programs addressing international topics.

This report concerned one aspect of international education — opportunities for OSSHE students to participate in study abroad and international exchange programs.

Oregon State System of Higher Education International Exchanges

OSSHE has maintained a systemwide program of inter-institutional cooperative exchanges for more than 12 years. The current network of OSSHE exchange programs serves as a model of a systemwide program in the United States. Although California and New York have larger systemwide programs, OSSHE's network is unique for the following reasons:

• Each OSSHE program is administered by an OSSHE Executive Board consisting of institutional representatives with experience and expertise in the country involved in the exchange. These executive boards provide the framework for direct institutional involvement and a sense of ownership on each campus. They also create the network for good communication and sharing of information and resources.

• OSSHE has established a stable funding base and promoted the concept of direct exchange; that is, a two-way flow of students that serves to commit both exchange partners to the quality of the program.

• Institutions within OSSHE have been cooperative in the development of an OSSHE network and have recognized the advantages of pooling students, faculty, and resources.

• The OSSHE policy of assigning its faculty to serve as resident directors at most exchange sites has provided for good leadership and communication and has contributed to faculty development objectives. Upon returning to OSSHE, these faculty members become key resources for Oregon.
Oregon State System of Higher Education Programs and Priorities

The OSSHE network of programs currently includes 17 sites in seven countries, as follows: Germany, China, Japan, France, Korea, Ecuador, Hungary.

In addition, a small program for State System M.B.A. students operates in Denmark.

A summary of recent student participation in each program was provided as an attachment.

These programs are diverse but, in general, they involve language and culture study; last an academic year; are designed for advanced undergraduates; include exchange students coming to Oregon; provide opportunities for students to pursue their major area of academic interest within a foreign university; and, promote social and cultural interaction.

For the past five years, first priority has been given to program development involving the Pacific Rim. New programs have started in Japan, China, Korea, and Ecuador.

The first priority at present is to increase student enrollments throughout the State System. The Chancellor's Task Force on International Competence identified increased enrollment as one of its two primary areas of emphasis for new funding.

Institutional Programs

Most OSSHE institutions administer their own study abroad and exchange programs. Southern Oregon State College, for example, has an exchange with Guanajuato, Mexico as part of a Sister City agreement. The OSSHE programs and the institutional programs need to be complementary and not duplicative. This has been accomplished, with minor exceptions, although more attention to this will be needed in the future as institutions become more involved in international programs.

The institutional programs are diverse. A summary of programs of Portland State University, Oregon State University, and the University of Oregon program is attached. It is not comprehensive and does not include Southern Oregon State College,
Western Oregon State College, and other institution-based programs. Many institutional programs reflect a special interest or program of that institution, for example, the Oregon State University exchange with Lincoln College, an agricultural institution in New Zealand.

The Northwest Interinstitutional Council on Study Abroad (NICSA) is a consortium including Portland State University, Oregon State University, and the University of Oregon. NICSA offers a network of west European, term-length programs. A NICSA policy was worked developed last year that permits any student within Oregon State System of Higher Education to participate in a NICSA program; therefore, these programs are now accessible to all State System undergraduates.

Obstacles and Opportunities

Opportunities abound in regard to high quality universities in other countries desiring to exchange students with OSSHE. The major obstacles in Oregon are:

- Lack of student participation;
- Lack of funding;
- Lack of student language preparation; and
- Lack of diversity in opportunities (more international internships, short term programs, summer programs, and programs for professional school students are needed).

Throughout the Oregon State System of Higher Education, institutions are working to overcome these obstacles. Students arrive on campus with more interest and better preparation, more encouragement is being given to students by faculty, funding sources are being sought, language enrollments are increasing, and new models of programs are being proposed. For example, at Oregon State University there are several exchange program proposals awaiting the results of the budget cuts to determine if they can be implemented. These proposals relate to the College of Science, Engineering, and others that have not in the past had many students participating in study abroad and exchanges.
Whenever the potential for program development exists on a systemwide basis, the opportunity for pooling resources and taking advantage of interinstitutional cooperation should be explored. At present, this is happening in regard to the possibility of a new OSSHE program in Thailand. An OSSHE Executive Board for Thailand has been established and is meeting to discuss options and prepare a proposal. Other possibilities for the future include USSR, Mexico, and Africa (Africa is the only major area without a State System exchange program).

Policy and Priorities for the Future

The State System has a solid base from which to build. There is growing support among students, faculty, and administrators for the expansion of present programs and the development of new programs. The quality of existing programs is high and there are excellent opportunities for new program development. Financial realities suggest that the Oregon State System of Higher Education should be very selective in proposing new programs and strive to locate external funds whenever possible.

Academic work completed abroad needs to lead to OSSHE credit that allows the student to meet requirements for his/her major and degree. This will encourage more students to participate because their graduation will not be delayed.

Program quality will remain a priority. Each participant in an OSSHE program completes an evaluation form. More that 90 percent of these students report that their international program was the most outstanding educational experience of their lives.

Committee Discussion

Dr. Jack Van De Water, Director of International Programs, indicated that the programs described in the report item were characterized by system-wide, interinstitutional cooperation through executive boards. These boards exist for each major program and consist of individuals from throughout the State System who have a special interest and expertise related to the specific program. These boards usually meet twice a year to set policy and priorities.
A second aspect of these programs is reciprocity -- the two-way flow of students between the State System and other countries. Dr. Van De Water indicated that the resources for these programs comes from pooling resources of each of the institutions. In addition to the State System network of programs, there are institutionally-based programs.

Mr. Adams observed that in both the current programs and the ones for the future there was no reference to Middle Eastern countries and wondered if there had been any discussion of that possibility.

Dr. Van De Water indicated there had been a great deal of discussion concerning those countries in the past few months and a desire for students within the State System to have opportunities in every major region of the world. Africa and Latin America are two other areas which have not yet been provided for within the system. Future expansion of programs is largely a resource issue.

Mr. Richardson inquired about the process for establishing new programs. Dr. Van De Water explained that the process begins with discussions with colleagues within the State System or if a particular opportunity is presented from a university in a country. In other cases, proposals are referred to the Academic Council and, when there is agreement, programs can be initiated.

In response to the question as to the major barriers confronting development of international programs, Dr. Van De Water indicated that lack of student interest, insufficient levels of language preparation, and lack of faculty resources to support programs are all factors.

In addressing the topic of Measure 5, the Chancellor explained that he would be covering: a summary of the nature of the problem as it is presently understood; discussion of the strategic approaches being followed in preparing to respond to Governor Roberts' budget; and a schedule for preparing the budget for presentation at the February Board meeting.

The extent of the fiscal impact was explained. For the current biennium the State System has been instructed by the Executive Department to reduce the
State System budget by $3.5 million. In addition, in the biennium for which we are preparing, there will need to be a budget reduction of $85.4 million. Stated another way, the level of activities that will be carried on in the State System in the upcoming biennium will have to be reduced by $85.4 million from the current running rate. This implies no increases during the next biennium, except $10 million for inflation on goods and services, not on people.

To achieve the $85.4 million level of reduction will require a multi-pronged approach. There are six lines in the state budget, five of which are for public service agencies: Forestry Research Station, Agricultural Research Station, the Hospital, Child Development Rehabilitation Center, and the Dental Clinics. Present planning indicates that these must sustain cuts in the order of $11.8 million. That's the first number to subtract from the $85.4 million biennial number.

What remains are programs that are tuition related in the amount of approximately $73.6 million dollars. The Chancellor indicated that there has been some confusion about the exact targets: is it $73.6 million as projected in the Governor's announcement, or $85.4 million, as the Chancellor's office has estimated? The Chancellor explained that these are not in conflict with the Governor's estimations, but the number the Governor used during the budget presentation included an offset for some tuition increase. The $85.4 million dollars starts before any adjustments are calculated -- a different way analytically of approaching the problem.

The question remains: how does the State System deal with a $73.6 million problem? At the extremes, as pointed out previously, it can be dealt with entirely by getting smaller -- simply reducing the budget by cranking down to the point where the problem is dealt with by downsizing. However, to do that and not make an all-out assault on the quality of programs, the system would have to downsize by the equivalent of about 21 percent of the present student body or approximately 13,000 students. Another way to deal with the problem would be to meet the total shortfall by increasing tuition, not
by decreasing expenses -- increase our income. This solution would require compounding tuition increases 40 percent each year of the biennium -- 40 percent the first year, 40 percent the second year.

The expectation is that either of the two extremes -- reducing enrollments by 13,000 students, or increasing tuition by 40 percent a year -- is unwise and an unacceptable solution to the downsizing problem. Therefore, the going-in assumption is that there is a need to combine reductions in programs with tuition increases, to avoid either of the extremes. The planning model being used is one that splits the problem in half and results in a recommendation for cuts in programs that equal about $38 million dollars. The Chancellor indicated that these would be real cuts as will become clear as this drama plays itself out in the weeks ahead.

The other part of the model assumes that approximately $44 million would be generated in tuition initially. Of that amount, $8.6 million would be assigned to financial aid to offset the obvious financial hardships that are going to occur immediately with a tuition increase of this magnitude. This would have a net effect on the problem of about $36 million dollars. The Chancellor restated that the numbers represent a model that assumes about $38 million dollars in cuts of programs, about $36 million dollars in increases in tuition, with about $8.6 million dollars increase in financial aid to offset the impact of the tuition increase.

The Chancellor focused the discussion on reductions and tuition. Over 80 percent of the State System budget is salaries -- people. Put in business terms, the State System is a people business. Therefore, a $38 million reduction means that the overwhelming amount must come by decreasing the number of people employed. Based on traditional expenditure ratios, this means that something over $30 million of the $38 million, should come out of salaries, personnel, and the remainder would come out of things and other kinds of expenditures, thus approximately the ratio of present general expenditures.

If in fact there are fewer people, other things will follow. One, there will need to be a good deal of internal reorganization in downsizing, so that the
System does not simply thin down the opportunities for students, the quality of programs, and the activities of faculty. This implies a concurrent drop in the size of the student bodies. Current projections are a 10 percent reduction in the size of student bodies to take into account the fact that there will be fewer faculty and staff to achieve the $38 million in cuts.

On the tuition side, the model would call for maintaining the planned tuition increases originally built into the current year's budget, or a 6.75 percent increase in each year of the biennium for the universities, and 5 percent increases in tuition in each of the years for the colleges. In addition, beginning in the first year of the biennium, there will be an added $200 per term, or $600 per year as an average student surcharge. The result, in the case of the universities for example, would be that resident undergraduate tuition (or mandatory charges) would go up from $1,965 a year to between $2,600 and $2,700 a year. This increase is greater than the $600 since there would be the regular tuition increases in addition, making it in the range of $700. The Chancellor explained that these numbers are not precise because different campuses have different charges that vary slightly and affect the figures. In percentage terms, this results in somewhere around a 37 percent increase in tuition the first year of the biennium and then either a 6.7 percent increase for the universities or a 5 percent increase for the colleges the second year of the biennium.

Development of an approach and working with this kind of model has been done with some very critical assumptions and guidelines. The Chancellor indicated that he had reviewed these with the Board at the December meeting but that it was important to repeat them in the present discussion. The first concern is to sustain quality and assure that downsizing be done in a way that assures sustainability. The State System will get smaller -- but not weaker. The System is already too thin at too many points to tackle this problem, a problem of that magnitude by short term across-the-board cuts.

It is critical that the System maintain sustainability. The Chancellor used the metaphor of digging potholes in dealing with budget cuts in the short
run with no likely way of filling them in the future. One of the problems now being faced is that the System has put things off in the past and has not been able to fill in. This applies at the very largest level to faculty salaries, maintenance, and overextension of programs. Sustaining at a level greater than resources must be avoided at every point through the process. In a session with the Board of the Oregon Student Lobby, the Chancellor used a phrase that summarizes the minimum objectives of any proposals: "If we go through in the direction that I think we must, students will be paying more...they will not be getting less." This is a minimal outcome. One of the challenges, therefore, is to avoid across-the-board cuts so that the problem is not simply moved into the future where there is little reason to believe there is an adequate solution waiting.

The Chancellor focused on some variables in the future which are a part of the planning process. One of the concerns is the demography of the state of Oregon. For example, there are presently 26,000 plus graduates from Oregon high schools. By the end of the decade, which is not far away in planning terms, it is estimated that there will be 8,000 more high school graduates. These are firm estimates because projections are based on people who presently exist, not hypothetical people. That 8,000 represents a large increase. What position will the State System be in at that point to accommodate those students? Will the State System simply say at that point, "Sorry, you'll have to go out-of-state or just not continue with your education?" Or, will the State System at that point be able to expand again? This is clearly one of the future issues that must be kept in mind in the current context.

Another major problem that has been discussed a good deal in the past is the concern for shortage in the faculty ranks. This is an important consideration because of both national pressures on faculty numbers and Oregon's inadequately competitive salaries. The salary problem, which has been of such concern in the last biennium, hasn't gone away, and therefore steps must be taken at the very least to assure that it does not get worse during this biennium. The Chancellor indicated that one of the critical objectives, with the abrupt resource problems confronting the System, is to assure that as downsizing occurs
we not inadvertently let Oregon higher education become a kind of "academic backwater of the West." The System must maintain elements of competitiveness and sustainability in the process of downsizing. If Oregon doesn't do that, it could very easily end up as a state which, outside of a few centers, becomes the source of cheap labor and a producer of basic commodities for the use of other people. The future will depend on how the System deals with the present circumstances.

In the context of all of what needs to be done in downsizing, the Chancellor indicated that it does appear that Oregonians are not going to close down the system of higher education. Therefore, there is a need to keep alive some clear dreams that become part of the agenda, and part of the hard choices as the Board and the System proceed to deal with the reductions in budget and size that have been suggested. The Chancellor suggested some of those dreams.

An important one, underscored by the current world situation, is internationalization. It is imperative that there be an increase in the international sophistication and confidence of Oregon citizens -- it is a matter of survival. In the case of higher education, internationalization needs to go right through the curriculum, the programs currently in place, not by adding things on, but by changing the nature of what presently exists.

Second, the Chancellor suggested that in a rather specific way there is a need to keep alive and aiming toward the dream of a major new engineering and graduate research center. This area is already under-developed in Oregon and the state and the System can not lose sight of the joint engineering project that was being enthusiastically developed during the summer.

Third, the Chancellor suggested that the System needs to maintain the concerns that we have been developing in the past year about higher education support for work force development which means continuing off-campus education programs that support retraining, advanced training, and those programmatic aspects needed to support the capacity of Oregonians in the work force.
A fourth objective which needs to be included in planning is the progress which has been made toward the integration of the four universities in the state, around Portland State University, to expand services in Portland. That problem, that challenge, that opportunity does not change in the current budget crisis.

Lastly, the Chancellor suggested that momentum needs to be accelerated to look at education as a single process -- kindergarten through doctoral programs -- through better articulation among the sectors. Reference is not being made to budgets, but rather about content of the sectors. Articulation of all of the parts of education implies an interactive system, one that is interdependent, and manifestation of our concern for Oregonians which is to prepare our people for the future.

The Chancellor concluded his remarks by indicating that the presidents of the institutions were on a very tight time line. Programmatic cuts of the magnitude required to bring the budget within the Governor's targets are not made easily and require time for campus discussions before being presented to the Chancellor's Office for inclusion in a systemwide plan. The Chancellor indicated that he and staff would make every attempt to keep Board members informed through the next few weeks as the budget preparations proceed. The important dates are preparation for the Board meeting and the Ways and Means Committee the first of March.

Mr. Miller asked if it were possible to identify the amount of special fees. In responding, Vice Chancellor Ihrig indicated that for the current biennium sales and service fees were just under $400 million, including self-support for the University Hospital of approximately $322 million.

Mr. Adams suggested that because of the comprehensive and complex nature of the task ahead it would be important for Board members to be involved in or able to listen to discussions prior to having the budget package sent to Board members. Chancellor Bartlett echoed Mr. Adams concerns and stated that he and the vice chancellors were putting in place a communication process to facilitate the process.
Mr. Richardson complimented the Chancellor and staff on the excellent job that had been done in developing a framework within which to complete the task. One of the major concerns expressed by Mr. Richardson was how to maintain quality of education and access while at the same time "getting smaller."

Building on Mr. Richardson's comments, Mr. Bruggere commented that maintaining quality would be very difficult to achieve even if the System were able to achieve the levels of cuts in programs and increases in tuition projected. He indicated that tuition was the only leverage the State System has and even though the tuition increases are high in percentage terms, public higher education remains a relative bargain compared to other options. This led him to inquire as to whether consideration had been given to doubling tuition and exploring different ways of off-setting it with student loan programs to assure accessibility.

Chancellor Bartlett said that one of the major concerns in increased tuition is to maintain the maximum amount of flexibility that resources would permit. However, "getting smaller" means fewer people -- students, faculty, and administrators. The challenge is how to avoid the social implications of tuition increases which limits accessibility to some but not to others. Models for increasing tuition are accompanied by increased levels of financial aid and scholarships to assure accessibility for students not able to pay. The Chancellor indicated that the model is common practice in private higher education -- that is, high charges and a very sensitive financial aid program based on ability to pay. One of the implications of Measure 5 could be that more and more of the cost of public services will go to the direct beneficiaries rather than being paid for by general taxes.

Mr. Bailey inquired about the process for downsizing and the kinds of measures being taken to assure that program reduction and elimination are considered from a system perspective, not just an institutional one. Chancellor Bartlett explained that the provosts had met to discuss general strategies and conversations among the institutions would be ongoing during the process. In addition, the institutional plans would be examined for system-wide impacts. The Chancellor assured the Board members
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that every effort would be made to present reasonable alternative models for balancing the cuts to be sustained by the System with the increases required in tuition.

Mr. Miller asked the Chancellor what the likely scenarios would be in the second biennium of major budget reductions. The response was that the question would not be one of what cuts would have to be taken but rather of how fast the system could be closed down altogether.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Mr. Dodson reported that every effort would be made to keep Board members informed concerning the budget process.

Waseda University

Mr. Dodson indicated that the president and former president of Waseda University had been in Oregon recently. He indicated that Oregon should take pride in the fact that a major university of the stature of Waseda was interested in establishing a branch in the state.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. Dodson announced that the Board would meet in Executive Session in Room 333, Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, pursuant to ORS 192.660(1)(h) for the purpose of receiving legal counsel regarding current litigation or litigation likely to be filed. Hearing no objections from Board members to convening in Executive Session, Mr. Dodson recessed the Regular Session and convened the Executive Session in Room 333. At the conclusion of the Executive Session, the Board adjourned to lunch. Following lunch, the Board reconvened in Regular Session in Room 338, Smith Memorial Center.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m. at the beginning of the joint meeting of the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education.

Mark Dodson, President

Virginia L. Thompson, Secretary
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APPENDIX A

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>Selective Admissions</td>
<td>04/21/89</td>
<td>Periodic reports on effect at each campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Athletic Funding from Sports Lottery</td>
<td>07-21-89</td>
<td>Report made in January; others to be made as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Expectations re Expenditure of Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td>09-07-89</td>
<td>September 1990 (Not ready yet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Education--Institutional Plans, including graduate education</td>
<td>11-16-89</td>
<td>June 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Discussion: Diversity &amp; Educational Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 1991</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>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Plan for Delivery of Health Administration &amp; Public Health Programs</td>
<td>12-14-89</td>
<td>July 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Women and Minorities in High Administrative Positions</td>
<td>01-19-90</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC Double Major Designation</td>
<td>05-18-90</td>
<td>May 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on Athletic Financing (Annual reports requested, with others when budgets are forecasted to be out of balance.)</td>
<td>06-14-90</td>
<td>June 1991, or as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAR 580-40-041, Revolving Charge Account Policy</td>
<td>07-20-90</td>
<td>July 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Undergraduate Exchange Program</td>
<td>07-20-90</td>
<td>July 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering</td>
<td>07-20-90</td>
<td>July 1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>