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A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Pacific Room, Werner College Center, Western Oregon State College, Monmouth, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 1:15 p.m., Friday, March 1, 1991, by Vice President of the Board, Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr., and on roll call the following answered present:

- Mr. Robert Adams
- Ms. Beverly Jackson
- Mr. Bob Bailey
- Mr. Rob Miller
- Mr. Tom Bruggere
- Mr. George E. Richardson
- Ms. Britteny Davis
- Mr. Les Swanson
- Mr. Christopher Halsey
- Ms. Janice Wilson

Absent: President Mark S. Dodson was present for the meeting of the Committee of the Whole. However, due to a conflict of schedule, he had to leave at noon.

Chancellor Bartlett and Presidents Brand, Byrne, 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; Richard Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administration and Information System Services; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Holly Zanville, Associate 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; George Pernsteiner, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice
Chancellor, Personnel Administration; James Lofgren, Manager, Internal Audit.

University of Oregon--President Myles Brand; Gerard Moseley, Vice Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration; Brodie Remington, Vice President, Public Affairs and Development; Gaye Vandermyn, Director, University News Bureau; Gerald Kissler, Senior Vice Provost for Planning and Resources, Academic Affairs; Maurice Holland, Professor and Dean of Law; Robert D. Gilberts, Dean, College of Education; Judith Grosenick, Professor and Associate Dean, Teacher Education; Christine Chaille, Associate Professor, Teacher Education; Scott Kerlin, Graduate Teaching Fellow, On-Campus Internship, Student Development.

Oregon State University--John Byrne, President; George Keller, Vice President; Graham Spanier, Provost; L. E. Coate, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Keith McCreight, Director, Financial Aid; Thayne Dutson, Director, Associate Dean of Agricultural Experiment Station; Ernie Smith, Director, Associate Dean of Extension Service; E. Alan Kluge, Director, Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Management Program; Ann Robinson, Associate Director, Student Media; Wayne Baseden, Instructor, Broadcast Media Department.

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; Steve Sivage, Acting Vice President, Finance and Administration; John Anderson, Director, Student Financial Aid.

Western Oregon State College--President Richard Meyers; Bill Cowart, Provost; Bill Neifert, Dean of Administration; Michael Cihak, Director, Financial Aid; Dr. John Minahan, Dean, Liberal Arts/Science; Marion Rossi, Associate Professor, Humanities; Stephen Miller, Physical Plant Director; Rick DeMars, Public Security Director; Dr. Victor Savicki, Director, Clinical Child and Youth Work; Dr. Hamid Bahari-Kashani, Associate Professor-Chair, Business and Economics; Dr. Louis Balmer, Professor of Elementary Education.
MINUTES Approved

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on January 18, 1991, and approved them with corrections. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.
CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

The Chancellor commented about the schedule and procedures for next steps in the budget process. He reminded the Board of two important dates: March 11, 1991 meeting with the Joint Ways and Means Education Subcommittee and March 25, the beginning of the full hearings on the Board’s recommended revised budget. The program and budget process now move into the Legislature while at the same time the administration of the proposed cuts begins on the campuses.

The Chancellor commented that staff were responding to a number of requests for specific information about the organization and governance of the Oregon State System of Higher Education including the Clarno Committee on Agency Reorganization and Reform.

Thank You to Western Oregon State College

Chancellor Bartlett thanked President Meyers and his staff for the gracious hospitality and outstanding work and cooperation under very uncertain and difficult circumstances. In conveying his gratitude, the Chancellor reminded the Board that the meeting at Western Oregon State College was originally scheduled as a visitation. The demands imposed by the passage of Measure 5 had preempted it and another visitation will be scheduled in the future.

1991-1993 REVISED BUDGET PROPOSAL

Staff Report to the Board

Background

By the late 1990s, the State System of Higher Education could face a demand for 80,000 students, straining a system already overextended with 63,000. In July 1990, the Board of Higher Education approved a budget for 1991-1993 that set a course for the decade aimed at meeting Oregon’s most critical needs through excellent higher education.

Higher education has an important role in addressing the needs of Oregon’s citizens for personal, social, and economic development. The State’s traditional economic mainstays, primarily forest and agricultural products, are becoming less dominant in the State’s economy, presenting Oregon with two important challenges: to help people experiencing economic hardship (especially in rural regions) and to seek opportunities upon which to anchor its economic future.
Various trade groups, blue ribbon commissions, and community leaders have called for greater contributions by public higher education in meeting the needs of the State. The need for an increase in engineering education and academic research in the Portland area is but one example.

Cognizant of the value of quality higher education, the State provided funding to improve faculty salaries, target program development, and invest in buildings and equipment during 1989-1991. Progress was made in strengthening the excellence of our faculty despite average salaries near the bottom of national scales. The use of the Fighting Funds appropriated by the Legislative Assembly and the additional $5 million for salaries approved last fall by the Emergency Board helped attract 83 new faculty members and retain 147 others who were considering employment elsewhere. The Endowment for Excellence, which combines State and private funds at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University, financed the creation of 15 endowed chairs and two endowed centers.

The 1989 Legislative Assembly approved the use of $2 million for a variety of targeted programs in international studies and languages, computer science, medicine, housing, and other important academic areas. Programs are underway on all campuses.

Lacking money to do anything but emergency repairs, the condition and functionality of the System's classrooms, laboratories, and utility systems worsened considerably during the 1980s. The System's backlog of deferred maintenance alone rose to more than $135 million while the figure to renovate obsolete facilities stood at $400 million. With the help of the State's Emergency Board, the budget for capital repair in 1989-1991 rose to $15.2 million. Although insufficient to arrest the deterioration of campus buildings and grounds, this action, along with the extra funds for faculty salaries and targeted programs, signalled the State's commitment to solidify a foundation for excellence in higher education in the 1990s.

When the State Board of Higher Education adopted its 1991-1993 budget request last July, it did so knowing it was building on a record of recent progress. Mindful of Oregon's economic, social, and educational needs, the Board proposed a budget that stabi-
lized and strengthened existing priorities and called for several major new initiatives in engineering and international programs. The July budget also requested funds for some professional degree programs where accreditation is formally at risk because of long-standing underfunding.

The needs of Oregon for a well-educated populace, one able to meet successfully the challenges of a rapidly changing global economy, have never been higher than in the 1990s. The recognition by business and community leaders of the vital role higher education must play in Oregon's future has probably never been greater. The commitment by the State Board of Higher Education and by the State's elected leaders to invest in higher education salaries and facilities has been demonstrated repeatedly over the past two years. The 1991-1993 budget proposal was a thoughtful reflection of these factors and set the stage for excellence in Oregon's public higher education for the next decade.

The Impact of Measure 5

The Governor's 1991-1993 Budget recommendation for the State System of Higher Education requires cutting the General Fund base budget (i.e., the amount needed to sustain current program levels) by 11.4 percent, or $85,446,706--an amount greater than the combined General Fund budgets of Eastern, Western, and Southern Oregon State Colleges.

An 11.4 percent General Fund budget reduction will permanently change the operations of the State System. As approximately 80 percent of the Higher Education budget is devoted to the compensation of faculty, administrators, and staff, a budget cut in the amount required cannot be absorbed by merely reducing expenditures for travel, supplies, equipment, books, or maintenance. The budget for these items is already inadequate due to cuts in prior years. Thus, the plan presented recommends $49.8 million of the projected shortfall be met through program and support service cuts, with the remaining $35.7 million from income realized through higher tuition.
### Summary of General Fund Reductions

| Continuation Governor's Gen. Fund Level Recommended Reduction |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ed. & Gen. $618,980,570 | $545,398,768 | ($73,581,802) |
| Tuition Offset | | $35,669,130 |
| Net Education and General Reduction | | ($37,912,672) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ag. Exp.</th>
<th>Ext. Ser.</th>
<th>For. Res.</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>CDRC</th>
<th>Dental Clinics</th>
<th>Debt Service</th>
<th>Student Loans</th>
<th>Totals:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$38,081,619</td>
<td>$27,772,830</td>
<td>$3,871,287</td>
<td>$34,565,194</td>
<td>$13,506,462</td>
<td>$634,452</td>
<td>$12,654,756</td>
<td>$217,198</td>
<td>$750,284,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor's Recommended</td>
<td>$34,273,457</td>
<td>$24,995,547</td>
<td>$3,484,158</td>
<td>$31,108,675</td>
<td>$12,155,816</td>
<td>$571,007</td>
<td>$12,654,756</td>
<td>$195,478</td>
<td>$664,837,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chancellor provided the Presidents guidelines for reductions: The cuts must be selective and not "across-the-board," the same programs cannot be carried on with fewer dollars; enrollment reductions must accompany program cuts; the cuts should be treated as permanent; and cooperative ventures among the colleges and universities should be implemented when academic and financial objectives can be achieved. Even though time was limited, each institution developed procedures for making recommendations to reduce its base budget for instruction and support services in 1991-1993. The result will be that the System can serve fewer students. Fewer students also will mean less revenue to support non-General Fund activities (housing, parking, health services) and to meet debt service requirements. The system will become smaller, provide fewer services, and cost students more. But those programs and services that continue must not drop in quality.

Appendix A was provided which presented a summary of the 1991-1993 institutional and System plans for program eliminations, reductions and administrative reorganizations, along with a staff analysis of the impact of these recommended actions on selected academic fields.
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The budget proposed will result in:

- Fewer students served (9.5 percent or 4,700 FTE enrollments, which translates to 6,900 students);
- Fewer program choices (about 68 academic programs closed and 28 curtailed);
- Reductions in the numbers of faculty and staff (696 positions);
- Reductions in statewide public services; and
- Higher tuition ($600 surcharge in addition to increases proposed in July, 1990).

A comparison between the Board’s requested 1991-1993 budget and the Governor’s recommended budget was displayed in Attachment B.

Impact on Students

The Education and General portion of the Higher Education budget is determined largely by the number of students enrolled. A permanent budget cut of Education and General funds of $37.9 million requires reducing total enrollment. In order to maintain the 1990-1991 funding adequacy for each institution (as measured by the BAS model), a plan to reduce three-term enrollment for 1991-1993 by 4,700 three-term FTE students (or 9.5 percent from the current enrollment of 49,482 FTE system-wide) has been proposed. The three-term FTE Enrollment levels for budget and enrollment planning for 1991-1993 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>15,244</td>
<td>15,035</td>
<td>13,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>14,136</td>
<td>13,524</td>
<td>12,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>8,954</td>
<td>9,438</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>3,280</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>3,838</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>2,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,482</td>
<td>48,901</td>
<td>44,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The enrollment planning targets were based on three-term FTE students and the current 1990-1991 mix of resident and nonresident students. However, for 1991-1993, it was recommended that the total three-term FTE be allowed to increase if institutions wish to enroll more nonresident undergraduate students to assist in the cash flow problems created by the magnitude of the required General Fund cut. Enrolling additional nonresidents must meet the following conditions:

- Resident students will not be displaced. Any additional nonresident students will be over and above the adjusted enrollment goals for resident and nonresident students.

- The General Fund does not support nonresident undergraduates since nonresident undergraduate tuition covers the full cost of instruction.

- The additional revenue generated by nonresident students will enable the institutions to make a more orderly transition to the reduced program levels necessitated by the General Fund reduction.

- Institutions choosing this strategy will retain the revenue generated by enrolling additional nonresident students less a contribution to system overhead. If an institution fails to generate planned additional nonresident income, it must cut its expenditure budget back to the base.

At this time, the University of Oregon is the only institution that has selected the nonresident student option for 1991-1993. To fulfill the requirement of not displacing resident students, it must enroll at least 11,150 three-term FTE resident students in 1991-1992. After meeting this minimum resident enrollment level, the University of Oregon would be free to enroll as many nonresident students as it determines it can accommodate while assessing all nonresident students a $1,000 annual tuition surcharge.

In managing expenditures and enrollments to the reduced levels for 1991-1993, the unique circumstances facing three institutions merit attention. Oregon State University plans to reduce enrollment gradually to the new target level by Fall, 1993.
Western Oregon State College must maintain a three-term FTE of 3,100 students in order to meet debt service requirements for existing housing and parking. Eastern Oregon State College will be funded at a minimum enrollment level of 1,500 three-term FTE. This funding is necessary to maintain program diversity in academic offerings and operational efficiency in the student auxiliary services.

In sum, the State System must operate below its current level by approximately $85 million. Therefore, there will be 700 fewer administrators, faculty, and staff; and the System will enroll 6,900 fewer students and provide fewer Statewide Public Services.

Impact on Faculty and Staff

Because higher education is a people-intensive enterprise, the cost of operating an institution is dominated heavily by faculty and staff salaries and benefits. Budget reductions of this magnitude must eliminate employees. With fewer faculty and staff, fewer students can be served.

An alternative approach would be to keep the people, but pay everyone lower salaries or enroll more students and increase teaching loads. Such an approach is unsound. The current salaries of Oregon's faculty rank in the bottom 15 percent among doctoral-granting institutions even after the Oregon Legislature's significant efforts during the current biennium. Second, tuition income currently covers only 28 percent of the annual cost of educating Oregon's undergraduate students. Increasing student enrollment to increase tuition revenue would be analogous to the manufacturer who prices each product at one-third of its cost and attempts to make up the difference in volume. This strategy would only create a significant deficit or significant reduction in the quality of each student's education and the possible loss of program accreditation.

Impact on Programs

In making reductions, colleges and universities were forced to eliminate or close approximately 68 academic programs, reduce program offerings in 28 others, and cut back statewide public services. Of these, many will not be offered elsewhere in the State System and some will not be available anywhere
in Oregon. Attachment A portrays the various degree and certification programs currently offered by the State System institutions with a listing of those programs proposed for elimination, suspension, and reduction.

In making the reductions, all institutions will make every effort to meet the needs of existing juniors, seniors, and graduate students who are enrolled in the affected degree programs. This fact, as well as faculty and staff contract notice requirements, means that the full savings from program reductions and eliminations will be phased in.

Substantial administrative cuts were made in the Chancellor's Office and at the colleges and universities. Since many administrative positions were eliminated during the 1980s, this will mean less effective administration of the System and its campuses in years to come. Attachment A also details the reductions in academic and administrative programs.

**Biennial Budget Summary**

As described above, a biennial Education and General budget reduction of $37.9 million would result in the reduction of 6,900 students. By serving fewer students the State System will reduce its teaching faculty by 249. It is estimated that the instructional and institutional support staff will be reduced by 318. Although most support costs such as physical plant, administration, maintenance, and utilities are not as directly sensitive to upward or downward enrollment fluctuations, a significant proportion of the reduction is directed to these areas as a result of changes in workforce, discontinuing services, and reorganizations.

Special attention must be called to the impact of the General Fund reductions on the statewide public services activities of agriculture and forestry research and extension, and medical and dental care. These total $11,841,184. This reduction will result in the loss of 48 research and public service faculty in agriculture and forestry programs along with 25 support staff. The reduction in staff serving patients in the hospital and clinics will total 56. The following summary of the estimated budget impact associated with a biennium base budget reduction
totaling $49,777,576 was recommended by the colleges and universities.

This figure included reductions in Education and General and Statewide Public Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction and Research Reduction</th>
<th>Biennial Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>297 Instr. and Res. Staff</td>
<td>$19,902,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 Support Staff</td>
<td>2,635,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Payroll Expenses</td>
<td>7,976,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td>2,128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Loans</td>
<td>21,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: 423</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,663,552</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Instructional Activities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>273 Staff</td>
<td>$ 7,774,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Payroll Expenses</td>
<td>2,899,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td>1,441,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: 273</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,114,024</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696 Staff Total</td>
<td><strong>$49,777,576</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on Tuition**

The strategy for meeting the budget crisis brought on by the passage of Measure 5 places a financial burden on students and those who support their education through increased tuition.

The tuition increase plan will place a surcharge on all students in order to meet the burdens imposed by Measure 5. The size of the proposed surcharge is $600 per year above the planned increases of 6.7 percent per year for universities, and 5.0 percent per year for colleges. Further, the University of Oregon will impose a surcharge of $1,000 per year on nonresident undergraduate students; and the medical and dental schools will impose a surcharge of $1,200 per year.

A surcharge of $600 would place Oregon resident undergraduate tuition at about $2,700 per year. Currently, Oregon ranks second out of eight public
PAC-10 Conference universities in the level of resident undergraduate tuition. Subject to the actions the other universities take to increase tuition (the University of California Regents have proposed a 36 percent tuition increase for 1991-1992), the surcharge could make Oregon's tuition the highest in the West. Although the resident tuition and fees for undergraduates at the University of Oregon will be higher than those for residents in other Western states (with the possible exception of California and Colorado), Oregon resident undergraduate students still will pay less than the average resident tuition for universities in the Midwest's Big-10 Conference. With the surcharge, an Oregonian will pay less than half the tuition and fees at the University of Oregon than he or she would pay at the University of Washington as a nonresident. Tuition and fees for residents attending Oregon's colleges and the Oregon Institute of Technology already are higher than amounts paid by residents attending the smaller public colleges and universities in the Western states. The surcharge will accentuate the current disparity but will not raise the tuition and fees for Oregonians to levels as high as they would pay if they went to college out of state.

The impact on students of a tuition increase of this magnitude is difficult to assess. National studies indicate that a 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent loss in students can be expected for every $100 increase in tuition. If this relationship holds for Oregon, enrollments could decline eight to 11 percent from 1990-1991 actual levels. This projected enrollment loss corresponds closely to the requirement to reduce enrollment by 4,700 three-term FTE students to respond to the required General Fund budget cut. However, the challenge will be to manage enrollment in such a way that economics are not the primary factor in enrolling students. To accomplish this objective, 25 percent of the net revenue generated by the surcharge in excess of the tuition income included in the July, 1990 budget ($8.6 million) has been budgeted for tuition waivers to increase student financial aid.

Capital Construction

The Governor's recommendation substantially diminishes the 1991-1993 Capital Construction program. In the 1991-1993 budget proposed by the Board, there
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were $48.2 million in new and continued construction projects and $78.5 million in deferred maintenance and modernization projects to be funded by the State General Fund. The Governor’s recommendation is to not fund any of the 18 construction or maintenance projects with the State General Fund in the next biennium. The effect of the reduction is to stall projects tied to sustaining the quality of academic programs such as expanding Oregon State University’s Kerr Library, modernizing classrooms and laboratories, initiating the first phase of the deferred maintenance reduction program, and planning Portland State University’s engineering science building.

In addition, the Governor’s recommendation deletes projects to be supported with State Lottery funds including the construction of a Portland area engineering center. The Governor recommended approval of nearly all grant-funded, auxiliary and building fee projects approved by the Board. One project, the Hoke Hall addition at Eastern Oregon State College, may have to be reconfigured or postponed because of the reduction of building fee revenues due to enrollment cutbacks. That project is funded partly with housing funds and partly from the building fee. Attachment C portrayed the Governor’s capital construction budget recommendations.

Summary

The passage of Ballot Measure 5 and the resulting emergency measures the State System and State government generally now are forced to take in no way diminishes Oregon’s need for excellence in higher education, nor does the passage of Measure 5 change the conditions which created the need for higher education services or the goals the State System must ultimately achieve.

However, the proposed reductions for 1991-1993 are necessary and painful. The strategy has been to focus resources on what Oregon needs most and what higher education does best. These proposed budget reductions follow a decade of cuts in which the State System’s budget has eliminated excess and inefficiency. These budget cuts mean, unfortunately, that worthy programs must be scaled down or eliminated. Fewer Oregonians will have the opportunity to enroll as students. This is regrettable from an academic standpoint and will cause hardship for the dedicated students, faculty, and staff.
affected. Such tough decisions—especially tuition surcharges—will cause difficulty for many students and their families. Achieving a balance between program curtailment and tuition increases is difficult since both actions adversely affect access to higher education. The budget proposed attempts to strike that balance.

Unexpected turbulence has altered the course set by the Board of Higher Education. The State System will be downsizing in a period of heightened demand for quality higher education services. Prudent steps have been taken to ensure that diminishing the size of the State System will not unduly diminish its strength and quality. If Measure 5 continues into the 1993-1995 biennium, campus closures and drastic reductions in force may be inevitable. Closing college and university programs will affect communities in the same way as closures of other businesses. The negative economic impact on Oregon is clear.

Staff Recommendations to the Committee

The Board's staff recommended the following actions with regard to approval of a revised 1991-1993 Biennial Budget Request to adjust the July 20, 1990 Budget Request to the estimated funding levels in the Governor's recommended budget:

1. The Board approve the program changes identified in Sections II, III, and IV of Attachment A, including acceptance of staff recommended adjustments, and request that a status report to the Board be provided as part of the 1991-1992 budget recommendation.

2. The Board approve the revised 1991-1993 Biennial Budget Request amounts and policies as outlined in the narrative and Attachments B and C of this agenda item.

3. The Board direct the Chancellor, working with the presidents, to implement the above actions through delegated authority to issue notices of termination and transfer to affected faculty and staff.
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Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Chancellor began the discussion of the 1991-1993 Revised Budget Proposal by emphasizing that the Board meeting culminated five months of intensive work by the institutions and the Chancellor's staff. The process is not over and will undoubtedly extend into the spring or summer of 1992.

The following chronology details the series of planning events:

October: Consequences of passage of Ballot Measure 5 were foreshadowed (Chancellor's Report, October 19, 1990), with a response from many that higher education was "crying wolf," and trying to frighten voters about impact on higher education.

November 7: Conference call with institution presidents to begin planning for implications of passage of Measure 5.

November 15: Council of Presidents met to discuss the events and decisions required to meet a deadline of the February 22 meeting of the Board (subsequently delayed to March 1, 1991). Specific timelines, budget targets, and other decision dimensions were tentative, pending discussions with Governor-elect Roberts. Institutions announced the first hiring freezes.

December: Throughout the month, meetings were held with the president and top administrators of each institution and the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors to discuss general guidelines, target figures, and preliminary analysis of potential program and budget reductions.

January 3: Memorandum, Planning for 1991-1993 Biennium, was sent to presidents requesting a summary of the procedures to be followed by their institution in developing specific recommendations to adjust funding levels, summary calendar for the procedures, and the specific planning assumptions expected to be used in discussions with faculty/staff.

January 18: The guidelines for planning, budget targets, and process/timelines were discussed with the Board.
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February 9: Deadline by which all institutions submitted proposed budget and program reductions which would assure that targets had been met.

February 9-19: The Academic Affairs staff in the Chancellor's Office analyzed all program data, cross-tabulated the information, indicated potential problems with the proposed plans, and formulated a System response.

At the same time, the Finance and Administration staff were re-constructing the budget request, analyzing financial data to assure that proposed changes were fiscally feasible, and created the recommended budget.

Concurrent with these events, the vice chancellors held discussions with provosts and vice presidents on budget/program matters. In addition to a number of individual and telephone conference phone calls, 10 meetings were held with provosts and academic deans. The work of the vice chancellors was critical to assure balance of program and budget reductions within both the institutions and the System.

Throughout the process, a major objective has been to maintain the core missions of the institutions, assuring there is continuing capacity for future adaptation, adjustment, and growth.

The Chancellor expressed enormous admiration and pride for the people who have led the process: presidents, provosts and academic deans, vice presidents and deans of administration, and the vice chancellors and their staff. A task of tremendous proportions was completed in an orderly and timely fashion.

The Chancellor reminded the Board that the program cuts were real: they affect the professional careers of countless individuals; alter the life plans of students and parents; will continue to be felt year after year; and will have substantial economic impacts on the communities of the campuses affected. Finally, the Chancellor mentioned a group of victims of the process who do not know they are affected: the 6,000 potential students who, at any given time will not be on our campuses in the years ahead.

The Chancellor respectfully suggested that Board
members ask: how and why these specific decisions had been made; what other options there might have been; and, whether decisions had been made through proper use of procedures resulting in rational recommendations.

Weldon E. Ihrig, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, summarized the budget parameters which are behind the programmatic decisions. He detailed the process, policies, and decisions which had been made to assure that the budget recommendations were correct and would result in a balanced budget. Mr. Ihrig underscored that the number of students graduating from high school was increasing by almost 30 percent at the same time the capacity of OSSHE institutions was being reduced. "This state, with its strong economy, had such an excellent opportunity to make real progress, improving the BAS model, raising faculty salaries and thus improving the overall competitive position of Oregon in public higher education." Mr. Ihrig indicated that with the present budget situation, that edge will be lost. Finally, Mr. Ihrig remarked that he had presented numbers, but the core of those numbers was people—faculty, staff, students, and citizens who would in one way or another be affected by the reductions the Board would need to approve.

Mr. Bruggere asked Mr. Ihrig to comment on the financial and programmatic scenario of closing a campus rather than each campus sustaining the level of recommended cuts.

Mr. Ihrig indicated the magnitude of cuts required by the Governor’s budget was such that closing a campus was not feasible. The State System is being asked to reduce the budget by $50 million dollars, a shortfall that would require closing two campuses. A second reason for not considering a closure at this time is that there was not sufficient time for all of the decisions and actions required. In addition, the minimum cash flow resulting from a campus closure would not have made any significant difference when weighed against the needs.

Chancellor Bartlett indicated that we are at a point where the inescapable truth is that if new replacement revenues are not available by the Spring of 1992, the issue would not be closing one or two campuses, but a minimum of four.
Vice Chancellor Clark expanded on Chancellor Bartlett's description of the process followed in formulating the recommendations on programmatic changes and the resulting effects from implementation of those proposals.

Dr. Clark reminded the Board that to the extent possible, across-the-board cuts were avoided. This meant identification of whole academic programs and services to be eliminated or significantly reduced. General guidelines were to: examine carefully areas of program duplication in the System and, where possible, preserve unique and high-quality programs; assure continued curricular diversity and access to that diversity; protect programs most central to the campus missions; and, wherever possible, streamline for efficiency and cost reductions.

In summarizing the impacts of the cuts on academic programs, Dr. Clark emphasized:

- More than 90 academic programs had been recommended by the institutions for elimination, closure, or suspension. This figure would be even greater if each degree program had been listed separately.

- More than 30 programs were proposed for reduction.

- Approximately 125 administrative and structural changes were recommended.

The burden of impact of reductions was not shared equally, since institutions adhered to the guideline that cuts not be "across the board." As a result:

- Some academic fields have not been seriously affected by program eliminations or suspensions: examples are architecture, home economics and family studies, foreign languages, social work, and law.

- Seventeen fields have been modestly targeted: agriculture, forestry, journalism, marine studies, business, engineering and engineering technologies, computer science, math, statistics, natural sciences, health professions, liberal arts/humanities, social sciences, fine arts, criminal justice, human services, and public administration.
Two fields—education; and health, physical education, leisure studies, recreation—have been targeted for significant cutbacks with the loss of bachelor's masters, and doctoral programs.

Dr. Clark pointed out that the Board's staff had recommended changes in the campus recommendations in two instances: to return the school counseling program at Oregon State University to status quo in order to maintain enrollments; and, to remove the masters and doctoral programs in Curriculum and Instruction from the University of Oregon's program eliminations list until consideration could be given to a possible plan to transfer the program and a critical mass of the tenured faculty to Portland State University.

Finally, Dr. Clark underscored previous comments regarding the personal and professional pain experienced on the campuses during the past six weeks and which can be anticipated in the future. Chief academic officers have reported: a sense of personal tragedy that affected faculty are experiencing; a "deep malaise;" "a sense of violation;" "a foreboding of where the next cuts would be taken;" frustration and anger; and a concern for the long-term viability of public higher education in Oregon. One provost indicated that "the campus is in mourning."

Discussion of the programmatic recommendations centered around three concerns. The first was concern regarding cuts to the Colleges of Education. Dr. Clark emphasized that the acceptance of the institution recommendations had been screened against access to programs on a regional basis and across the system availability of a diversity of four-year, five-year, and masters programs. Many groups have questioned whether the proposed reductions had weakened access of those residing in the central Willamette Valley.

President Brand indicated that the University of Oregon had faced forced choices—not good choices—and that elimination of the Division of Teacher Education was comparable to amputation of a healthy limb. Provost Wessells pointed out that the College of Education's School Administrator Training Program and Special Education Program were not being reduced and that the latter was the source of approximately
95 percent of the $12 million in grants and contracts received in the College of Education each year.

Graham Spanier, provost of Oregon State University provided detail on the process used to determine how reductions would be made and indicated that Oregon State University has 12 academic colleges, eight of which are not duplicated in the Oregon State System; three (Science, Language Arts, and Business) primarily provide service courses; and only two colleges (Education, and Health and Human Performance) remained where there was overlap and a critical mass to achieve the reductions required of the institution. Provost Spanier indicated that there is no land grant institution in the nation without a school of education and it was a step backward for Oregon State. He indicated there would be a substantial enough core remaining upon which to build in the future.

Mr. Richardson expressed continuing concern regarding access of in-state students to higher education opportunities. Provost Frank indicated that in projecting enrollments, Portland State University’s intention was to make the least cuts in in-state/resident students. Portland State will continue to attempt to attract and serve the older, place-bound, more diverse population that is representative of the Portland area. Provost Cowart indicated that at Western Oregon State College, 96 percent of the students are in-state residents and he indicated that applications are up 34 percent this year over last year.

Board members asked how institutions were planning to serve students already enrolled in programs which were slated for reduction. There was general agreement from institutional representatives that every effort would be made to assure that those who were juniors in programs would have two years to complete their degrees. In cases where this is not feasible, adjustments will be made across departments within the institution; and, institutions would be looking at within-system transfers which might enable students to complete their programs.

Discussion of the issue of budget reductions centered on three areas. First, Board members asked how the level of tuition had been determined. Mr. Ihrig indicated that two policies were used. First,
the level of resources required to sustain quality of educational programs as guided by the BAS model was considered. Second, staff examined how the shortfall of resources would be divided between students and program reductions. It was agreed that 50 percent of the burden should be placed on students and 50 percent on program reductions. This formula led to the figure of a $600 surcharge on tuition.

Mr. Bruggere requested the Board have an opportunity in the near future to discuss tuition and the appropriate share that students should bear of the cost of education in Oregon.

Ms. Davis asked for clarification of the term "surcharge" and if she was correct in her understanding that as a "surcharge" it was not permanent. Mr. Ihrig responded that it was a surcharge added on to the present tuition but it is not clear when the surcharge might be changed to become part of the tuition charge, or eliminated.

Board discussion centered around the level of cuts recommended for statewide services, indicating the tremendous impact these would have on extremely valuable and needed services. President Kohler indicated that the cuts in the University Hospital services were even greater than reflected in the budget proposals to the Board since the Hospital would be sustaining cuts from other funding sources as well. The cuts will be translated into reduced access to those who most need health care services.

President Byrne responded that in terms of Agricultural Extension programs, there is a double impact since the Extension programs are supported, in part, by the counties in which they reside and the county budgets are likewise being reduced.

Board members asked about the level of reductions in the administrative areas. Mr. Ihrig indicated that all of the institutions had agreed that administration would take the largest share of the reductions. The rationale was that during the last round of budget cuts, academic programs sustained the heaviest impacts and, in many instances, there were no ways to further cut some programs. This is especially true for the colleges. Another factor was the need to meet cash flow problems. Reductions in programs, and therefore faculty and staff, take at
least a year to begin realizing savings whereas reductions in administrative areas can be put into effect immediately, resulting in increased cash flow. Mr. Ihrig pointed out, however, that institutions in the State System, when compared nationally, already have lean administrative budgets. In the case of the colleges, cuts were, in effect, reducing positions which already were half-time positions. The Chancellor's Office budget reductions were included in the proposed administrative reductions.

Finally, in the area of finances, questions were raised about capital construction and deferred maintenance. At the present time, it is estimated that there will be no state funds for capital construction, and deferred maintenance will be only that which is currently in operating budgets. Facilities already under construction will be completed but there is a distinct possibility that those buildings cannot be used because no funds will be available to furnish them.

To complete discussion on the proposed budget reductions, President Dodson called upon representatives of three groups.

Professor Wright, President of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) reported on the IFS position relative to the budget and program decisions. He indicated that IFS will work toward increased revenues, rather than fighting for a larger share of a limited, fixed pool of money and will support an early vote on new revenues. IFS members had followed closely the procedures used by the Chancellor's office and the Board in reviewing the plans of the institutions and integrating them into a final recommendation. Secondly, IFS has a continuing interest in the comparative growth of administrative and academic staff over the past decade and that interest is heightened with the relative cuts proposed for the academic and support budgets. Finally, Dr. Wright stressed that "Oregon higher education can emerge stronger when this is all over, but only if new and adequate resources are found to let us do the job we are capable of doing."

Three individuals spoke on behalf of the Oregon Student Lobby: Mr. Shahid Yusaf, Student Body President at Oregon State University; Ms. Sheila Stickel, Co-president of the University of Oregon Student Body; and, Mr. Jason Coleman, Western Oregon
State College. The students emphasized many points made at the Thursday evening public forum. Specifically:

- Cuts in higher education are negative for Oregon;
- Disproportionate cuts have fallen in the area of teacher preparation at a time when Oregon needs increasing numbers of teachers;
- Cuts have been demoralizing on all campuses;
- Tuition increases will adversely affect students and make Oregon's tuition the highest in the West and less competitive;
- Increased tuition and reduced enrollments will adversely affect diversity; and
- The Board must assure that tuition increases are temporary.

In closing, the students urged Board members to abstain from voting on the proposed cuts and asked for support in sending a message to the Legislature, urging them to work on finding replacement revenues.

Alice L. Dale, Executive Director of the Oregon Public Employees Union, SEIU Local 503, AFL-CIO, CLC spoke on behalf of the nearly 18,000 public employees statewide of which approximately 4,500 are classified staff employed by the Oregon State System of Higher Education. Ms. Dale asked the Board to consider three issues:

- The business climate and job market in the year 2000 will demand the skills of an increasingly educated workforce. The U. S. will not be able to compete effectively in an international market unless we have a highly skilled and highly paid workforce.
- Quality public education systems provide a fundamental opportunity for middle and low income families to educate their children and thereby prepare them for meaningful lifetime contributions to society. Oregon will pay, one way or the other, whether through welfare and unemployment benefits or through solid social services including a quality education system.
Meeting #596

March 1, 1991

- All aspects of the higher education system have to be considered in evaluating the quality of our institutions. The under-funding of classified positions will impact academic efficiency, quality of work, and academic life.

OPEU asked the Board to join them in calling for immediate tax reform to halt the projected devastation caused by the proposed reductions and those which might result in the future.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Bailey asked for clarification of the definition of program elimination and program suspension.

Dr. Clark indicated that to eliminate a program is to effectively close it and to disperse the faculty and students after a phase-out period. Suspension of a program is to stop admitting students to the program, attempt to maintain the program and attempt to see students through the program with the hope of recovering resources to reinstate the program as a full program as soon as possible.

Mr. Bailey questioned the practicality of the proposals to transfer existing programs from one campus to another and whether there were past cases within the System of this procedure.

Dr. Clark indicated that discussions were just beginning to consider moving the Curriculum and Instruction program at the University of Oregon to Portland State University and that the resolution of the proposal is not clear. Staff believe there is a defensible rationale for such a move. Portland State will continue to have a large fifth-year teacher preparation program. Portland, with the urban setting and diverse population, would provide the kind of laboratory setting for educational issues and problems that could enhance the excellent programs currently offered at the University of Oregon.

Mr. Swanson asked for clarification on the status of the Curriculum and Instruction Program after the Board votes on the proposed recommendation. Dr. Clark explained that the effect of the recommendation was to remove the program authorization from elimination, enabling planning to continue. If the University of Oregon and Portland State University...
are successful in negotiating a transfer, a recommendation would have to be presented to the Board for approval. The University of Oregon must realize the savings from elimination of the Curriculum and Instruction program in order to reach the required reduction level.

President Brand indicated that in the short run there will have to be tenured faculty at the University of Oregon to assure that the 700 graduate students already in the pipeline are able to complete their programs. The only way the program could remain at the University of Oregon would be to have an infusion of approximately $1.25 million.

Dr. Clark pointed out that another program under consideration for transfer is the Training and Development option within the Vocational Education area at Oregon State University. The program is of high quality and very popular and has an active component in Portland. There appears to be good reason to move the program from the closure list, pending further review.

Dr. Clark indicated that movement of programs is a truly complicated and human endeavor involving people who have in some cases very-long term careers established at one institution. There will need to be individual considerations of the viability of making these program transfers, as there would have to be assurance that there are enough and appropriate faculty to move with the programs.

Board members asked for clarification concerning several programs about which they had heard a great deal at the public forum. Among these were: Broadcast Media and Hotel, Restaurant, Tourism Management programs at Oregon State University and the Diesel Power Technology and Medical Technology programs at Oregon Institute of Technology.

President Byrne indicated that the proposed elimination of the Broadcast Media and Hotel, Restaurant, Tourism Management programs at Oregon State University was undesirable, but necessary. The Broadcast Media program is one of relatively high cost because of the purchase and maintenance of equipment. In addition, relative to the total student body, the program serves few students—approximately 125 majors and graduating between 25 and 30 per year—
relative to the total student population. The program is an option within the Speech Department and students can complete the core courses required for Broadcast Media at Oregon State University and go elsewhere for the technical training.

In terms of the Hotel, Restaurant, Tourism Management Program, Dr. Byrne indicated that it, too, was a good program but one that requires more, not fewer, resources in order to function effectively. Those resources are not available and, therefore, it is more advisable to suspend it.

Mr. Miller observed that during the public forum he heard individuals from industry indicating the possibility of obtaining industry support for these programs and asked if the programs could be re-instituted should that occur.

President Byrne answered in generic terms, indicating that it was always possible to re-examine any decision which had been made. However, he cautioned against making a decision to keep a program solely on the strength of promises of external funding. These programs require base budgets supported by recurring funds.

In responding to the query regarding the Diesel Technology Program at the Oregon Institute of Technology, President Lemman restated the rationales for elimination of the program: faculty and staff at the college believe that in the next decade, given limited resources, the focus of the institution will be primarily in the science, engineering, health technologies and nursing programs; the Diesel Technology Program is one of the oldest at the Oregon Institute of Technology, but now is least central to the mission of the institution; it is within the top third in the curriculum in terms of student credit hour costs; and, in general terms, least fits the present mission of the institution.

Mr. Lemman indicated that Medical Laboratory Technology is a small program at the Oregon Institute of Technology, and is the most expensive program per student credit hour. There is a similar program at the Oregon Health Sciences University and the two institutions are working to assure that students currently in the program will be able to finish.

Ms. Davis asked for clarification on plans for
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faculty whose positions would be eliminated due to the program and budget reductions.

Mr. Ihrig indicated that staff were examining a series of options including early retirement incentives, and outplacement and counseling services. Planning and implementation of options will be done jointly with the institutions and the Chancellor's office.

Mr. Halsey observed that over the last several months, considerable time and effort had gone into formulating the current recommendations and inquired if there were any procedures for future review. He expressed concern that foresight might not be as good as hindsight and in retrospect, some decisions may not have been good ones.

Chancellor Bartlett responded that backtracking would be extremely difficult as a psychological process has already been set in motion which is hard to reverse. The process is not a static one and the Legislature, public policy makers, and constituents may influence the course of events.

Before calling on the Board for a vote on the recommendations, Vice Chair Richardson provided Board members an opportunity to summarize concerns and points of view. These clustered around three major themes.

First, Board members unanimously agreed that the Board's budget was the one which had been approved at the July 20, 1990 Board meeting. The present reduced budget places members in a dilemma. Board members take an oath to uphold their responsibilities to the citizens of Oregon and the constitution, and that includes presenting a balanced budget based on the recommendations of the Governor. The other side of Board members' responsibilities is to assure the highest level of education to meet the needs and demands of the public of Oregon. The need to approve a reduced budget places members squarely in conflict with these two responsibilities. Board members were in agreement with the Chancellor that this had been a most painful experience for them.

One member indicated that it was tragic because Oregon and the country are about to embark economically, and as a nation, on a decade of potentially great prosperity and that Oregon was looking "that
prosperity in the face and running to hide from it." There was agreement that the proposed recommendations will hurt many people—faculty, staff, students, and citizens.

A second theme which ran through comments by the Board reflected concern about the signals that the proposals would send to Oregonians and the rest of the nation. Oregon has committed itself to having the highest quality workforce in the nation, but at the same time is creating a kind of third world economy where those who are well-off become better-off and public education cannot do what it should to level opportunities. Concern was expressed for maintaining quality and access for all, especially those for whom education is a key to a more productive and promising future. The sentiment was that we are participating in creating a third-world state among the 50 states, a place which individuals will find less than desirable.

Finally, the Board members were in agreement that it was imperative that a new revenue source be identified before the spring of 1992. If a source is not found, the accumulated impact will do irreparable damage to higher education in Oregon.

The Board approved the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

**Staff Report**

In accordance with Board policy, Portland State University requested the State Board of Higher Education's authorization to award an honorary Bachelor of Arts degree at its June, 1991 commencement to Nancy Ryles. A short biographical sketch of the individual being honored was presented:

**Nancy Ryles**

A native Oregonian, Nancy Ryles was an outstanding servant of Oregonians. Her interest in education, in justice, and in the quality of life of the citizens of the State was evident in the many public positions she held. A member of numerous elected and appointed boards, councils, and commissions, she vigorously pursued the interest of those whom she represented. Starting in 1979, she
served in the Legislature on many committees, including Housing and Urban Development, Education, and Revenue and School Finance. In 1985 and in 1987, she was appointed by the President of the Senate as Education Commissioner of the States. And in 1987, Governor Goldschmidt appointed her to a four-year term on the Public Utility Commission. As a member of the Public Utility Commission, she especially was concerned with consumer protection, working on issues of rail safety, and utility consumer services. For her distinguished contributions, she received many honors and awards, among them the Human Rights Award, the Women of Accomplishment Award, the Abigail Scott Duniway Award, and in 1989, the Sue Juba Memorial Award from the Portland Area Women's Political Caucus.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended approval of Portland State University's request to award an honorary Bachelor of Arts degree to Ms. Ryles.

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 with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

PROPOSAL FOR THE RESTRUCTURING OF UNDERGRADUATE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, SOSC

Introduction

Southern Oregon State College requested authorization from the Board to offer a restructured four-year teacher education program.

The undergraduate major in education was eliminated at Southern Oregon State College in 1987 following action by the Board to develop extended (graduate-level) teacher education programs at State System institutions. Southern Oregon State College thereafter developed a fifth-year teacher education program (approved by the Board on January 20, 1989
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for initiation summer term 1990) and phased out its Bachelor's of Arts/Sciences degrees in elementary and secondary education. The last group of students enrolled in the undergraduate program will graduate in spring 1991.

Following legislative action and Board concurrence in 1989 to require a diversity of four- and five-year teacher preparation programs in State System institutions, Southern Oregon State College elected to offer an undergraduate elementary teacher certification program. Although the fifth-year programs in elementary and secondary teacher education will continue to provide the route for training and certification for post-baccalaureate students, an undergraduate program for elementary teachers is being proposed at this time.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The program is consistent with the College's assigned mission to serve the educational, social, cultural, and economic needs of Southern Oregon through programs of instruction, research, and service. A major part of that mission is to prepare teachers for schools within the region.

2. Evidence of Need

In 1989 the Board directed State System institutions to offer a diversity of four- and five-year programs in response to legislative action. Each of the regional colleges thereafter elected to offer four-year programs in response to the interest of students in having some undergraduate programs available at locations throughout the state.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The proposed program requires completion of an interdisciplinary major that consists of 46 credit hours in education and 45 credit hours in a second academic area. This degree currently is approved for Southern Oregon State College as the Multi-School Option for Interdisciplinary Degrees. Students who elect to complete the requirements for basic certification in Oregon will complete 15
credit hours of full-day student teaching and a one-hour accompanying seminar.

There are two major changes in the program from the College's old four-year teacher education program: the education major has been eliminated and replaced with an interdisciplinary studies major providing for more diversity and rigor in the undergraduate major; and, student teaching has been removed as a degree requirement to enable faculty to maintain stricter standards about which students actually complete student teaching and go on for certification.

The program has been designed to meet the standards established for program approval by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

The College will enroll between 120-140 students in all its teacher preparation programs. The undergraduate program is expected to prepare between 25-40 students per year. The numbers will vary in relation to demand expressed for the fifth-year program.

Over a five-year period beginning fall 1992 (the first term graduates will complete the program), the College expects to graduate between 125-200 candidates for elementary certification from the undergraduate program.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. Some additional part-time faculty will be added to offer the four-year option in addition to the fifth-year option already available. Part-time faculty FTE of 0.50 will be needed in years one through three (1991-1994), and 0.84 faculty FTE will be needed in year four (1994-1995).

Library. Library holdings are adequate for the program.

Facilities and Equipment. Facilities and equipment are adequate for the program.

Budget Impact. The College is proposing to offer both the fifth-year and four-year programs. Modest increased faculty FTE has been projected
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for years one through four. The College will meet funding for this program through reassignment of faculty positions from existing programs and conversion of enrollment reserve positions.

The introduction of this program comes in the midst of widespread budget cutting of programs at all System campuses including Southern Oregon State College. While the College believes it can provide adequate funding for both the fifth-year elementary and secondary programs and the proposed four-year elementary program, it may need to reassess its capacities within the next two years. Should the College be unable to continue to offer this diversity of program options, the College will return to the Board and submit a request for revisions or eliminations to the existing array.

5. Duplication of Four-Year Programs

Eastern Oregon State College will offer a four-year program for elementary and secondary education; Western Oregon State College will offer a four-year program for elementary and secondary education; and Southern Oregon State College will offer a four-year program for elementary teachers only. Therefore, there would be only three public four-year preparation programs for elementary teachers. Portland State University will not be able to offer a four-year preparation program as earlier planned because of inadequate resources and its higher priority on the fifth-year programs for post-baccalaureate students. (Portland State University has the greatest number of post-baccalaureate students among System institutions.)

Program Review

The program was first reviewed by the Academic Council on January 20, 1991. The program must be approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission prior to initiation after Board action.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize Southern Oregon State College to offer a restructured four-year Undergraduate Elementary Education Program, effective fall term 1991.
PROPOSAL FOR THE INITIATION OF A REVISED INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM LEADING TO THE ENDORSEMENT IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION, SOSC

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Adams expressed concern that under the proposed program, students would have less opportunity for classroom experience early in their course work.

Dr. Steve Reno, Dean of Academic Affairs and Dr. David Hoffman, Chair of the Education Department explained that the new program was designed to maintain the quality of the field experience by having students in the classroom from the time they took the first courses. The proposed elementary program would, in effect, increase field experience by 30 percent. Under the new program, faculty would have a stronger basis upon which to recommend candidates for student teaching.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

Introduction

The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission recently added Early Childhood Education as a new endorsement area. Local school districts may use the Early Childhood Endorsement on a voluntary basis in employing teachers for the primary grades. Other employers such as preschools also may use the Endorsement in selecting teachers prepared with an emphasis on early childhood education.

Southern Oregon State College currently offers an Early Childhood Specialization as part of its program in Elementary Teacher Preparation. The College requested authorization from the Board to replace its Early Childhood Specialization with an Endorsement program in Early Childhood Education.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed program is consistent with the
College's assigned mission to emphasize strong programs in the professions, key among them teacher education (Board's "Strategic Plan 1987-1993"). Southern Oregon State College's "2000 Campus Master Plan" calls for strengthening offerings in education, an important component of which is strengthening the preparation of elementary teachers and others providing service to young children.

2. Evidence of Need

The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission recently established standards for an Early Childhood Education Endorsement in response to needs of local school districts and preschools to employ teachers prepared with a focus on early childhood. Kindergarten became mandatory in Oregon public schools within the past three years, and there is a high priority in Oregon and the nation on preschool education (for example, Head Start programs) and primary grades (particularly the early identification of at-risk children).

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

Southern Oregon State College currently offers a fifth-year elementary teacher education program and is seeking Board authority to offer a revised four-year program for an elementary education teacher program under a separate action. The College also offers a focus on Early Childhood Education or a combined focus in Early Childhood/Special Education available to students enrolled in the Master's of Science/Arts Degree in Education.

The College will emphasize the development of teachers able to deliver comprehensive educational services to young children, birth to age eight, in the 21-credit hour program. All the courses needed for the program are currently available.

The program has been designed to meet the standards of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

About 15 students per year are expected to enroll for an estimated total of 75 over the next five years. Enrollments will come from students in one
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of the teacher education programs at the College as well as practicing teachers who have completed their degrees but wish to enhance their knowledge and employability by adding an Early Childhood Endorsement.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. Faculty teaching the courses for the endorsement already are on board. Three faculty members have graduate-level training and experience in early childhood education. The College already has committed support staff to the existing Early Childhood Education Specialization Program, and these would stay with the Endorsement program.

Library. Library holdings are adequate.

Facilities and Equipment. Facilities and equipment are adequate.

Budget Impact. The cost of the Endorsement program should be no different than the current cost of offering the Specialization program. The College no longer will offer the Specialization since the Endorsement program will replace it.

5. Duplication

Specialty courses in early childhood education are available at several public and independent institutions offering preparation programs for elementary teachers. Western Oregon State College and Southern Oregon State College are requesting the new endorsement program at this time. Portland State University plans to request an endorsement in the future. With the elimination of elementary education at the University of Oregon, a significant reduction in the size of Oregon State University's elementary program, and Eastern Oregon State College's determination not to offer the Early Childhood Endorsement because of inadequate resources, this program would eventually be available at only three public institutions: Western Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, and Portland State University.

Program Review

The program was reviewed by the Academic Council on
January 17, 1991. The program will be submitted to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission for its approval after Board action.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

The staff recommended the Board authorize Southern Oregon State College to initiate a revised instructional program leading to an Endorsement in Early Childhood Education, effective summer term 1991.

**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. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

**Introduction**

The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission recently added Early Childhood Education as a new endorsement area. Local school districts may use the Early Childhood Endorsement on a voluntary basis in employing teachers for the primary grades. Other employers such as preschools also may use the Endorsement in selecting teachers prepared with an emphasis on early childhood education.

Western Oregon State College currently offers an Early Childhood Specialization as part of its program in elementary teacher preparation. It also offers a Master's degree in Early Childhood Education. The College asked the Board to authorize replacing its Early Childhood Specialization with an Endorsement program in Early Childhood Education.

**Staff Analysis**

1. **Relationship to Assigned Mission**

   The proposed program is consistent with the College's assigned mission to "provide high-quality programs in teacher education" (Board's "Strategic Plan 1987-1993").
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2. Evidence of Need

The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission recently established standards for an Early Childhood Education Endorsement in response to needs of local school districts and preschools to employ teachers prepared with a focus on early childhood. Kindergarten became mandatory in Oregon public schools within the past three years, and there is a high priority in Oregon and the nation on preschool education (for example, Head Start programs) and primary grades (particularly the early identification of at-risk children).

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

Western Oregon State College has been offering a 24-credit hour Specialization in Early Childhood as part of its elementary education program and a Master's degree in Early Childhood Education. The College has revised some of the existing courses in the specialty program so it focuses more narrowly on the age groups identified by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission for the Early Childhood Endorsement (teaching age three through grade three).

The revised 21-hour program has been designed to meet the standards of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, the National Association for the Education of Young Children, and the Association of Teacher Educators for Early Childhood.

Approximately 25 students are expected to enroll and graduate per year in the Endorsement program.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. Faculty teaching the courses for the endorsement already are on board. Three faculty members have graduate-level training and experience in early childhood education.

Library. Library holdings are adequate for start-up of the program but will soon need to be updated. The College has identified funds to begin purchases of library materials from current sources.

Facilities and Equipment. Facilities and equip-
ment are adequate although enhancements will be sought in the future through grants.

**Budget Impact.** The cost of the Endorsement program should be no different than the current cost of offering the Specialization and Master’s degree. The College will no longer offer the Specialization since the Endorsement program will replace it.

5. **Duplication**

Specialty courses in early childhood education are available at several public and independent institutions offering preparation programs for elementary teachers. Western Oregon State College and Southern Oregon State College are requesting the new endorsement program at this time. Portland State University plans to request an endorsement in the future. With the elimination of elementary education at the University of Oregon, a significant reduction in the size of Oregon State University’s elementary program, and Eastern Oregon State College’s determination not to offer the Early Childhood Endorsement because of inadequate resources, this program eventually would be available at only three public institutions: Western Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, and Portland State University.

**Program Review**

The program was reviewed by the Academic Council on January 17, 1991. The program will be submitted to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission for its approval after Board action.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

The staff recommended that the Board authorize Western Oregon State College to initiate a revised instructional program leading to an Endorsement in Early Childhood Education, effective summer term 1991.

**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. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

Background

It is Board policy to approve admission requirements for each academic year in February of the preceding calendar year. This schedule for establishing admission policy is necessary for reasons of institutional planning, program implementation, publications, and timely notice to prospective students.

Staff Report

The Board was asked to review and approve general admission standards to be effective for admission to the 1992-1993 academic year.

Current Admission Policy Update:

In brief review, since the 1986-87 academic year, several changes have occurred in freshman and transfer admission standards. Five institutions increased the GPA required for freshman admission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>GPA Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>2.75 -- 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>2.75 -- 3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>2.50 -- 2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>2.25 -- 2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>2.50 -- 2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On changes in the GPA and hours required for transfer admission: University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University increased the GPA for residents from 2.00 to 2.25 and for nonresidents from 2.25 to 2.50. In addition, University of Oregon and Oregon State University also require the satisfactory completion of a college-level writing course (WR 121 or higher) and a college-level math course (any course with a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra). Eastern Oregon State College and Southern Oregon State College have not changed their freshman or transfer admission standards since 1986-1987.
Admission Policy Changes for 1992-1993:

Two changes in current admission policy are now being requested for 1992-1993:

1. For transfer admission at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon, the math requirement policy statement would be changed from "one mathematics course which has a prerequisite of Intermediate Algebra" to "College Algebra or above or the equivalent of Math 105."

2. For freshman admission at Portland State University, the high school grade point average requirement would be changed from 2.75 to 2.50. For transfer admission at Portland State University, the college grade point average would be changed from 2.25 to 2.00 for residents and from 2.50 to 2.25 for non-residents, and the college transfer hours required for admission from 36 to 30 for both residents and non-residents.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the 1991-1992 general admission policy be continued for the 1992-1993 academic year as amended by the requested changes in the transfer admission policy at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon and in freshman and transfer admission policy at Portland State University.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Richardson asked if there had been any changes in the GPA requirements for resident and non-resident transfer students. Dr. Clark indicated that they had remained the same.

Mr. Miller inquired about the lower GPA admission requirement for Portland State University. Provost Frank indicated that the level was consistent with the policy of access to students most representative of Portland, and that administratively it was easier to set the GPA lower to be able to accept students than to set it higher and have to make exceptions in order to accept students.

Mr. Adams asked if Portland State University could
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project how many more students could be accessed with this policy and Dr. Frank responded that the figure was potentially several hundred students.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. 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. Two public hearings were held concerning the Summer Session 1991 Fee Book. The first was conducted at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, January 16, 1991 at Portland State University. No one appeared at the hearing to present oral testimony and no written testimony was received. Subsequently five institutions submitted proposed increases to their original proposed instruction fees. A second hearing was conducted at the University of Oregon on Monday, February 18, 1991 at 11:00 a.m., in order to allow for additional testimony on the fee increases. Again, no one presented oral testimony, nor was any written testimony submitted.

Summer Session Instruction Fees

The self-support policy for summer instruction, which began in 1982, is continued in the recommendation for 1991. 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 only slightly. It is proposed that Summer Session policy be made consistent with Academic Year policy by elimi-
nating the reduced fee provision of students who only take courses for an "audit" grade option. The University of Oregon is eliminating the former part-time fee schedule since existing policy allows for non-admitted students to register under the same conditions as degree seeking students.

Instruction fee increases have been recommended by four institutions. Increases are, in general, a consequence of faculty salary rate increases granted in fiscal year 1990-1991 and other inflation factors affecting costs.

Instruction fee rates recommended for 1991 compare with 1990 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990 First Hour</th>
<th>1990 Each Add'l Hour</th>
<th>1991 First Hour</th>
<th>1991 Each Add'l Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UO  $62</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU $77</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSU $83</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOSC $68</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOSC $72</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EOSC $62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OIT  $44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990 First Hour</th>
<th>1990 Each Add'l Hour</th>
<th>1991 First Hour</th>
<th>1991 Each Add'l Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UO  $102</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$113</td>
<td>$88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law,Sem.Equiv. $151</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU $106</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSU $125</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOSC $96</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOSC $111</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EOSC $94</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* OIT has no graduate courses.
* OHSU Summer Session rates are the same as the per term rates for the 1990-1991 Academic Year.

**Building Fee**

The building fee is unchanged at $14.00 per student. This is consistent with the fee increase granted by the 1989 Legislature and assessed in the 1990-1991 academic year.
Incidental Fee

Incidental fee recommendations reflect the various activity and service levels proposed by the institutions. Charges compare for 1990 and 1991 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hour Charge</td>
<td>Maximum Hour Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>23.00</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></th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC (8 hrs. or more)</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>29.00</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 have 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 1991 and 1990-1991 academic year rates are compared on the following schedule:
Tuition & Reg'd Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12 SCH Undergraduate</th>
<th>9 SCH Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$ 655</td>
<td>$ 714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>589</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 academic year.

The rates shown in the tables in the fee book are for all 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 8 percent to 15 percent 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

After consideration of any comments or testimony
received at the public hearing, it was recommended that the Board amend OAR 580-40-035 as follows:

**Summer Session Fee Book**

580-40-035 The document entitled "Summer Session Fee Book" dated [January 21, 1990] March 1, 1991, 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, the residence hall and food service charges and the tuition and fee rates and policies applicable during the 1991 Summer Session will be adopted.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

Ms. Davis asked how the summer session fees rank nationally. Mr. Ihrig indicated that summer session fees are handled differently and comparator information was not readily available. He indicated that staff would explore the question further.

Mr. Bailey inquired if Measure 5 had any effect on the increases. Mr. Ihrig responded that in some cases there was an increase because summer session is self-supporting and, where there had been reductions in support services, replacement costs would be greater.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

**Board Discussion and Action**

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

**Introduction**

At the January 18, 1991, Board Meeting, 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.

The staff analysis indicated that the proposed degree program was 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.

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.

Oregon State University has indicated that faculty, facilities, and equipment are adequate to support the program and, with minor acquisitions, so are the library holdings. 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 directly to affect the proposed Ph.D. program.

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 subsequently was 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.

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

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 (January 18, 1991)

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.

Board Discussion and Action (March 1, 1991)

The Board approved the Committee recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

Introduction

Portland State University requested authorization to recognize its Laboratory for Software Quality Research (LSQR) 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 quality, 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.

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 1987-1993, 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.

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

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.

The need was further reinforced 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.

The Center for Software Quality Research grows out of the current Computer Science Department's Laboratory for Software Quality Research 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.

There are currently adequate faculty, facilities, equipment, and library resources to support the Center.

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 corporate affiliates. 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.

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

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 (January 18, 1991)

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.

Board Discussion and Action (March 1, 1991)

The Board approved the Committee recommendation with
the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

In March of 1981 an agreement was entered into between Eastern Oregon State College and the La Grande Cemetery Maintenance District wherein each entity agreed to perform certain obligations. One of Eastern Oregon State College's obligations was to provide a quitclaim deed to the Cemetery Maintenance District for the College property within the cemetery fence. The Cemetery Maintenance District and Eastern Oregon State College fulfilled all of the obligations except that the small parcel of land within the cemetery fence owned by Eastern was never quitclaimed to the Cemetery Maintenance District.

Eastern Oregon State College officials are now requesting that a quitclaim deed for the area within the cemetery fence owned by the College be given to the La Grande Cemetery Maintenance District. The College area within the cemetery fence is on the south and west sides of the cemetery and is approximately 10,492 square feet or .241 acres.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board provide to the La Grande Cemetery Maintenance District a quitclaim deed for that portion of the Eastern Oregon State College property which is within the cemetery fence.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES DIVISION ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

Staff Report to the Board

A summary of activities within the Office of Finance and Administration's Facilities Division is presented below:
Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

Consulting Services, Roof Management, OSU
An Agreement was negotiated with Mackenzie Engineering, Inc., Portland, for engineering services not to exceed $50,000. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Theater Program Relocation Project, OSU
An Agreement was negotiated with Settecase Smith Doss, Architects, Salem, for architectural services not to exceed $52,000. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.

Master Campus Plan (Framework), OHSU
An Agreement was negotiated with Zimmer Gunsel Frasca Partnership, Architects, Portland, for architectural services not to exceed $25,000. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Medical Research Building Sprinkler System, OHSU
An Agreement was negotiated with Melott & Associates, Inc., Beaverton, for consulting services not to exceed $17,360. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Awards of Construction Contracts

Child Care Center, OSU
On January 15, 1991, Dale Ramsay Construction Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $758,932. Financing will be provided from Article XI-F(1) bonds supported by building fees.

Dixon Aquatic Facility Expansion, OSU
On January 31, 1991, Elliott-Jochimsen Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $4,273,000. Financing will be provided from Article XI-F(1) bonds supported by building fees and from SELP loan proceeds.

Langton Hall Pool Balcony Replacement Project, OSU
On December 26, 1990, Dale Ramsay Construction Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $37,709. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Hamilton Hall Kitchen Alterations, UO
On December 24, 1990, 2G Construction was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $1,100,449. Financing will be provided from Article XI-F(1) bonds supported by housing fees.

Hamilton Hall Kitchen Alterations Equipment, UO
On January 23, 1991, Curtis Restaurant Equipment was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $236,720. Financing will be provided from Article XI-F(1) bonds supported by housing fees.
On December 10, 1990, John Hyland Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for the Science Facilities Additions and Alterations (Science Green Site Improvement) project in the amount of $298,580. Financing will be provided from federal funds.

On January 28, 1991, Meng-Hannan Construction was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $362,392. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

On January 3, 1991, Todd Hess Building Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $73,200. Financing will be provided from hospital funds.

On January 3, 1991, Todd Hess Building Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $73,200. Financing will be provided from hospital funds.

Acceptance of Projects

This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $246,198. Financing was provided from state funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on February 1, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $522,084. Financing was provided from state funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on October 15, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $62,890. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on August 29, 1986. The estimated total project cost remains at $114,178. Financing was provided from federal funds for Science Facilities Additions and Alterations.

This project is complete and was accepted on November 15, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $499,546. Financing was provided from federal funds available to the institution for Science Facilities Additions and Alterations.
The Science Facilities Additions and Alterations (Science V) project was accepted on November 21, 1989. The estimated total project remains at $14,289,637. Financing was provided from federal funds.

The Science Facilities Additions and Alterations (Science VI) project was accepted on June 11, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $6,630,143. Financing was provided from federal funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on June 1, 1989. The estimated total project cost remains at $57,236. Financing was provided from state funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on December 31, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $170,554.75. Financing was provided from building repair reserve.

This project is complete and was accepted on January 4, 1991. The estimated total project remains at $253,268. Financing was provided from state funds.

(No Board action required.)

Ms. Jackson indicated this was her first visit to the Western Oregon State College campus and that, no matter how serious the business of the days had been, she had enjoyed seeing the campus. She indicated that, as a business person who had just been through a similar professional experience, she understood the hard work and pain that the presidents and their administrators had been through.

Mr. Richardson thanked the Board members and the Chancellor’s staff for the fine way in which a very difficult series of challenges had been met. He underscored that there were no good choices and that the Board would be working closely with the Chancellor to move through the Legislative phase of the process.

Mr. Richardson indicated that, due to the delay of the February 28, 1991 Board meeting to March 1 and the potential conflicts of Board members with Spring Break, that he would propose that the March 22 meeting be an Executive Committee meeting to which
all Board members were invited to attend. In proposing this, Mr. Richardson read the following statement:

Pursuant to Article II, Section 5 of the Bylaws of the Board of Higher Education, the Board delegates to the Executive Committee authority to take final action as here designated or deemed by the Committee to be necessary subsequent to the adjournment of this meeting and prior to the Board’s next meeting on April 26, 1991. This delegation includes decisions regarding the 1991-1993 budget and program, personnel plans, matters involving pending litigation, and others. At its March 22, 1991 meeting, the Executive Committee may act for the Board in minor or emergency matters subject to Board approval at the Board’s April 26, 1991 meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the delegation of authority. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Adams read the following resolution into the record:

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION OF THE OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION -- March 1, 1991

The future of Oregon depends on its people. Education is the essential means for developing the highest quality of life for its people.

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education understands and reluctantly accepts the fiscal necessity of making cuts in our budget and programs. However, we believe that these mandated reductions are highly detrimental.

The proposed budget cuts will negatively affect Oregonians because they represent a significant loss in educational services. Oregon has committed itself to having the highest quality workforce by the year 2000.

We will do our part to support the design of a new system to finance higher education so that we can contribute to Oregon’s future.
We have confidence in the Legislature and in the Governor, and we are eager to work with them to resolve these complex and far-reaching education issues.

Furthermore, we trust that the people of Oregon understand our future is at stake and will respond appropriately to the challenges facing Oregon.

ADJOURNMENT  The Board meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Mark Dodson, President  Virginia L. Thompson, Secretary
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 state-wide 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>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Original Presentation</th>
<th>Tentative Presentation Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering</td>
<td>07-20-90</td>
<td>July 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Alternative Tuition Models</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mr. Halsey commented that it was strange to find himself
in a position of sitting on the Board with the responsi­
bility of upholding the constitution of the state of
Oregon and therefore approving the proposed cuts while at
the same time sitting as an advocate for higher education
and knowing that the cuts would decimate the State
System. He indicated that was a horrible message for the
Board to send.

Mr. Halsey continued, "As a native Oregonian, it pains me
to be in this dilemma. I commend the people of the
Chancellor’s Office and all the administrators, presi­
dents, faculties, staff, and students who have worked to
get us to this position. I trust that their decisions
were analytical and progressive enough to look toward the
future. If we use this budget proposal as a starting
point, we need to keep in mind that even in proposing a
program cut, it is permanent in the sense that the
repercussions last far beyond the immediate announcement.
I need to stress that whatever recommendations we give,
even if we use that as a starting point, there are
permanent ramifications. I reiterate some of the points
my fellow Board members have already made: that we must
send a public message now that we are not happy with the
changes that higher education faces, and if alternate
funding sources are found, we will apply them appropri­
ately. This has been a painful experience today;
painful since the morning of November 7, 1990. Hopefully
now we can move onward and forward towards making the
Oregon State System of Higher Education one that people
will enjoy working in and attending."

Britteny Davis added: "I don’t like any of these budget
cuts. I hope that we can do something to allocate funds
to the Higher Education System to make it a stronger
System in the future. I voted for the tuition surcharge
increase because it is a surcharge and defined as such."