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Meeting #597  
April 26, 1991

OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN GYM  
FITNESS & SPORTS CENTER, OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY  
PORTLAND, OREGON

April 26, 1991

MEETING #597  
A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Gym, Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, Oregon.

ROLL CALL  
The meeting was called to order at 9:55 a.m., Friday, April 26, 1991, by President of the Board, Mark S. Dodson, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert Adams  
Mr. Bob Bailey  
Mr. Christopher Halsey  
Ms. Beverly Jackson

Mr. Rob Miller  
Mr. George E. Richardson  
Mr. Les Swanson  
Ms. Janice Wilson  
Mr. Mark S. Dodson

Absent: Mr. Tom Bruggere, due to illness, and Ms. Britteny Davis who was attending the American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association Conference as a National Student Representative.

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; 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; 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; Roger Bassett, Director, Government Relations; Virginia Boushey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Jim Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies.
University of Oregon--President Myles Brand; Norman Wessells, Provost; Gerald Kissler, Senior Vice Provost for Planning and Resources, Academic Affairs.

Oregon State University--President John Byrne; Graham Spanier, Provost; Kathleen Mulligan, Assistant Vice President, Finance and Administration; Douglas Caldwell, Dean, College of Oceanography.

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Peter Kohler; Peggy Miller, Vice President, Finance; Lesley Hallick, Vice President, Academic Affairs; Thomas G. Fox, Vice President, Development and Public Affairs.

Portland State University--President Judith Ramsey; Robert Frank, Interim Provost; Steve Sivage, Acting Vice President, Finance and Administration; Earl Mackey, Vice President for Development and External Affairs.

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

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

Southern Oregon State College--President Joseph Cox; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration.

Oregon Institute of Technology--President Lawrence J. Wolf; Doug Yates, Interim Dean of Administration; Chris Eismann, Dean of Academic Affairs.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Members Attending the Meeting--Janice Jackson, Portland State University; Charles Wright, University of Oregon; Margaret Berroth, Oregon Health Sciences University; Rick Hardt, Portland State University; Herb Jolliff, Oregon Institute of Technology.

Others--Kathy McGregor, Portland State University Vanguard; Jim Hill, The Oregonian; Marilynne Keyser, Educational Policy and Planning; J. Robert Swanson, Associated Oregon Faculty; Bill Lynch, Oregon Public Broadcasting; Viviane Simon-Brown, Central Oregon Community College; Lynn Pinckney,
MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on March 1, 1991, and approved them with additions requested by Directors Davis and Halsey. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

The Chancellor opened his report by thanking President Kohler and his colleagues at Oregon Health Sciences University for making the logistical and programmatic arrangements for the day, including easily accessible parking and a provocatively attractive group of visitation activities. He observed that, from his personal perspective, it was much more attractive to be going "up the hill" than anticipating going "over the cliff," using the geological metaphors occasioned by the current Legislative hearings.

Chancellor Bartlett introduced the new Vice President for Finance at Oregon Health Sciences University, Ms. Peggy Miller, who began her position on April 15, 1991. Ms. Miller was formerly senior manager for Arthur Anderson, where her primary focus was on public and private clients with an emphasis on health care and high-tech manufacturing. A graduate of Portland State University with a CPA, Ms. Miller also held the position of audit manager with Price Waterhouse. The Chancellor observed that Ms. Miller is the fourth woman to enter top senior leadership positions in the System within the last 18 months. The others are President Judith Ramaley, Vice Chancellor Shirley Clark, and Vice President Lesley Hallick. Ms. Miller filled a continuing position at a salary of $95,000 per year.

An important challenge of the past few years has been finding productive and meaningful ways to involve faculty in the concerns of the System. The Chancellor indicated that during the present difficult political and financial times, many interesting ideas and proposals have come to him from faculty organizations on the various campuses, most recently one from the Oregon State University Faculty Senate. He indicated that he and staff are
attempting to take advantage of faculty in finding solutions to obvious problems and setting System-wide priorities. The Chancellor called on Professor Charles Wright, president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate, to present his report to the Board.

IFS Report

Professor Wright indicated that the IFS Faculty Senate met on April 5 and 6 at Portland State University, where they were welcomed by President Judith Ramaley. Other guests were Vice Chancellor Large, Assistant Vice Chancellor Ron Anderson, and Board member Britteny Davis. The major topic of the meeting was the possible role of the IFS in influencing the Legislative response relative to Measure 5. In addition, the IFS reviewed the processes used on the campuses to recommend cuts.

Professor Wright indicated that, at the March 1, 1991 meeting, he stated that each institution appeared to have sought and used information from the faculty appropriately. Now that the results of the process have been made public, faculty at several institutions are questioning the congruence of the cuts with faculty recommendations, and the degree of influence faculty had on the final decisions. The IFS will continue to review the procedures employed to find better ways of ensuring genuine faculty involvement in making future decisions, whether in response to further reductions or more positive opportunities.

Further, Professor Wright indicated the IFS message on Measure 5 cuts has three main points. First, there is a need to emphasize the impact of the cuts on the students, the state, and the faculty. Second, there must be a call for replacement revenues, and not just a bigger share of the pie for higher education. Finally, the IFS stresses the disastrous consequences of proposals for a further round of cuts. It is, Professor Wright underscored, crucial that HB 3567, the Higher Education Safety Net bill, be passed.

Chancellor Bartlett thanked Board members for their participation in the proceedings of the Ways and Means Subcommittee, and expressed the full admiration of staff for the amount of time and effort put forth by Board members. This participation represents additional days of volunteer time on the part
of Board members and many are averaging three or four days a month in real time for the work of the State System. The Chancellor indicated that the citizens of Oregon do not understand the degree of involvement and commitment symbolized by their presence in the state Capitol.

The Chancellor welcomed two special guests, Mr. Don Frisbee and Ms. Marilynne Keyser, who were present to discuss specific topics with the Board.

President Dodson introduced Ms. Marilynne Keyser, Governor Robert's Senior Policy Advisor for Workforce and Director of the Office of Educational Policy and Planning. Ms. Keyser, formerly Deputy Secretary of State and a CPA, is an active citizen volunteer who won the 1985 National Public Service Award from the American Women's Society of CPAs, was 1986 Woman of Achievement for the Portland YWCA and is national treasurer of that organization.

Ms. Keyser indicated there were two issues she wanted to discuss with the Board, the first relating to workforce development. She began by explaining an organizational chart reflecting divisions of state government that deal with education and workforce training and placement issues. With the number of agencies and councils concerned with these issues, Ms. Keyser indicated that it was very difficult for the right hand to know what the left hand was doing relative to setting state policies and goals. Over time, fragmentation and duplication have occurred rather than cooperation and collaboration.

Governor Roberts has proposed a methodology to examine coordination of the systems which is detailed in House Bill 3133, just passed out of the House Trade and Economic Development Committee and due to go to the House. Among other things, the Bill would establish a 21-member Workforce Quality Council to be appointed by the Governor. The Council would be driven by business and labor, with key educational decision-makers involved as well. The Council would be asked to develop goals and delivery strategies around education, training, and placement services, develop overall state policies that can be articulated with the other governing bodies, coordinate training programs, establish
accountability measures, assess progress on achievement of goals, coordinate more effective collection of information concerning which clients are being served and by which programs. One of the first tasks is to create common formats for collection of data as well as shared data bases.

In forming the new Council, several existing councils will be eliminated. Some examples of those eliminated are the State Job Training Coordinating Council, the Workforce Advisory Council, Oregon Occupational Information Coordinating Council, the State Advisory Council of Career and Vocational Education, and the State Apprenticeship Training Council. An important element of the Governor’s bill is the establishment of regional workforce committees to be charged with the development of a strategic plan for the region and ways of coordinating services.

Ms. Keyser reviewed the "lead benchmarks" that have been identified for workforce development in education-related areas, and indicated that real investments made in accomplishing the "lead benchmarks" would provide the greatest opportunities to achieve Oregon’s vision of having the best prepared, best educated workforce in the country. Governor Roberts and the Legislature are currently exploring ways to move these agendas forward.

The second topic of discussion by Ms. Keyser was in the form of written testimony delivered to the Board:

Governor Barbara Roberts shares your concern about the critical issues facing the state’s educational systems. Ballot Measure #5 has created a context for reexamining educational decision-making and the role of local school and community college boards. The changing funding situation requires a serious reexamination of the role of educational service districts and the number of separate school districts the state can support. Recent higher education budget cuts have revealed the importance of recognizing interdependencies between the systems. The elevation of workforce development as a priority for this governor and the challenges of the Progress Board’s benchmarks require those in our educa-
ional systems to respond in creative, new ways to help Oregon achieve its vision of the best educated and trained workforce in America by the year 2000.

There are some who believe that the organizational boxes must be rearranged to address these issues. SB 805, which had a public hearing in the Senate Education Committee on Tuesday, proposes an Education Reform Commission with a broad charge to study all education in the state and make recommendations "for restructuring the system, if necessary, giving special attention to governance and to the delivery of services." The bill provides for legislative and citizen membership and the participation of the Superintendent, the Chancellor, and the Commissioner for Community Colleges. There is no provision for the involvement of the Boards of Education or Higher Education. It is unlikely that SB 805 will move out of committee in its present form.

The Governor does not believe that restructuring the governance system is the most significant issue facing us. She is far more concerned with how things work than with how they look. The Workforce Quality Council proposed in HB 3133 (Oregon Workforce Quality Act), which was moved out of committee to the house floor on Wednesday, will take us a long way toward improving the cooperation and collaboration between the education, training, and job placement systems in Oregon. By focusing on statewide goals, policies, and strategies, we can insure that all systems are pointed in the same direction. The creation of regional workforce committees will help integrate the delivery of education, training and job placement services in local communities. This is certainly a step in the right direction.

However, there is more that must be done. I have been meeting with several members and staff of both boards to identify critical issues that need to be tackled individually by both the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education over the next 18 months, as well as those intersystem issues that should be part of a shared agenda. For the State
Board of Education, the internal focus will likely be on the role of ESD's and the role of local boards in a Ballot Measure #5 environment. For the State Board of Higher Education, the internal focus may be on such issues as tuition policy or faculty productivity. The preparation of teachers and access to higher education are likely candidates for a shared agenda.

The Governor believes that the State Boards of Education and Higher Education have the statutory authority and the responsibility to tackle these issues. It makes little sense to form a new commission for citizen input in this process. You who are serving on the two state boards represent a wide spectrum of Oregon's citizenry. You have the knowledge of our educational systems and the experience with state level policy development to aggressively take up this challenge.

There is a vehicle already in place for addressing the two boards' shared agenda, and that is the joint board meeting required by ORS 348.890. There has been frustration with the ineffectiveness of the joint board meetings in the past. That can--and must--change with the commitment of both boards to use the joint meeting as a vehicle for looking at system interfaces and the continuum of educational services that must be provided to Oregonians.

Once the individual and shared agendas are defined, there will need to be a process that encourages participation by constituency groups and other agencies and boards, such as the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. An open process will be both healthy and productive.

Although the Governor expects an improved joint board process to be ongoing, she is prepared to issue an Executive Order to provide the guidance and direction for these efforts. She is convinced that the two state boards provide the right talent and the right commitment to make collaboration work. You will have her full support in this effort.
Ms. Keyser indicated that she would have a very high level and visible relationship with the Board on behalf of the Governor to facilitate ongoing review and development of a shared agenda for the joint Boards.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Adams observed that many of the initiatives being proposed involve education and reliance on college- and university-educated people at the same time the Governor’s budget required an $86 million cut in higher education’s budget. He asked Ms. Keyser to help reconcile these two divergent directions with a goal that will increase Oregon's strength in the area of developing a highly educated workforce for the year 2000 and beyond.

Ms. Keyser observed Mr. Adams’ remarks were more statements about the critical budget problems facing Oregon, something no one would deny. During the coming months, Ms. Keyser said, the groundwork must be laid and the stage set for development of an assessment of the investments that need to be made once missions have been clarified, goals agreed to and strategies worked out. These steps can be taken in spite of the budget problems.

Mr. Miller asked how the tasks of the Workforce Quality Council would differ from the work that has been done by other workforce task forces and councils like the Benchmarks process. Ms. Keyser indicated that the Progress Board has established the overall benchmarks. The Workforce Quality Council would select those benchmarks that relate to particular workforce issues. The Council is intended as the "conscience of the state" in terms of accomplishing specific goals. They would move to coordinate the services state-wide and on regional bases.

Mr. Dodson thanked Ms. Keyser for her efforts and for sharing the important initiatives. He indicated that the Board would look forward to the Governor's Executive Order and moving the initiatives forward.
An eleven-person Governor's Commission on Higher Education in the Portland Metropolitan Area was formed on May 22, 1989, by Governor Neil Goldschmidt. The Commission's purpose was to prepare a plan for the future of postsecondary education in the metropolitan area. Its report, "Working Together -- A Community and Academic Partnership for Greater Portland," was issued on November 15, 1990.

The Commission proposes to link public, private, and community resources in a new and vital partnership between the Greater Portland community and its academic institutions. Within this partnership, the region's postsecondary institutions would operate as a "shared university," each collaborating with its counterparts and sharing strengths and resources to meet regional needs.

The Commission has identified a number of steps needed to realize the "shared university" model. These include a regional Council of Presidents established to coordinate many of the region's postsecondary programs; Portland State University developed into an urban grant university with the mission and means to serve the region's needs; community colleges supported to provide the first two years of college, workforce training, and adult education; a Portland Educational Network created to help students participate in the educational process; joint academic programs/projects developed among the region's colleges and universities; and a Greater Portland Trust in Higher Education established to develop new funding sources for joint academic programs.

On March 22, 1991, the Board of Higher Education received a working paper entitled "Higher Education in the Portland Metropolitan Area: An Action Plan to Implement the Governor's Commission Report." The paper was prepared as a discussion document by President Judith Ramaley of Portland State University and Chancellor Thomas Bartlett as an initial response to the Commission's November report. In light of the impacts of Measure 5 and the downsizing planning that was underway between December and March, a more definitive response could not be prepared. Chancellor Bartlett reviewed the key elements of the action plan at the March 22 Execu-
ative Committee meeting of the Board, but there was limited discussion since this was the Board's first "viewing" of the plan. The Board was invited in April to discuss the plan. The Board did note the draft plan appeared to include the "right topics," but asked that the topic of internationalization be included in the plan in light of its importance to the Portland metropolitan area and the state.

Staff Analysis

The draft action plan reaffirms the Commission's finding of the need for enhanced collaboration and development of new and strengthened programs and services in the region. A number of efforts -- some under development and some to be developed -- are identified as part of the "shared university" concept. These include a Portland Educational Network; Cooperative Regional Library System; special study centers in areas such as social research, forensic studies, environmental studies, and metropolitan studies; joint OSSHE programs in areas such as engineering, architecture, and public health; and cooperative programs between and among the region's public and independent colleges and universities, coordinated through the Council of Presidents. The plan acknowledges that many of these efforts will require funding, although some can be implemented within current resources.

There are a number of issues raised in the preliminary plan that merit further Board discussion and attention:

- The expected nature of the shared university model -- how is greater collaboration envisioned by the various participating institutions, and what barriers will have to be addressed in moving toward this model?

- Establishing a prioritized list of needed programs and services that will contribute the most to the Portland metropolitan area.

- Policies for establishing and operating the Educational Innovation Fund to be administered by Portland
State University on behalf of post-secondary education in the Portland metropolitan area -- including criteria to be used by the Fund in choosing programs to support.

- Development of a philosophy for viewing new collaborative projects (multi-institution) in comparison to new non-collaborative developments (single institution).

- Clarifying the role of Washington postsecondary institutions in a shared university concept.

- The ongoing communication network that will be needed to keep all parts of the state informed about progress in implementing the plan.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

The staff recommended that the Board accept the preliminary Action Plan as a guide for developing a more detailed plan to include:

- A revised Portland State University mission statement;

- Prioritized new or expanded programs, including centers/institutes, needed by the region with identification of those to be developed by Portland State University and those to be developed collaboratively with both OSSHE institutions and other colleges and universities in the region.

The revised plan should be developed under the auspices of the Chancellor and President Ramaley, with a status report made no later than the September 1991 Board meeting.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

Mr. Don Frisbee joined the Committee and reported on the activities of the Governor's Commission on Higher Education in the Portland Metropolitan Area
during the past few months. The two years of work had involved intense and stimulating public discussions with input from over 2000 people, the State Board of Higher Education, and the Chancellor and members of his staff. The work of the Commission provides a strong foundation for a community vision that parallels other initiatives.

"Working Together," the report of the Commission's work, was intended as a blueprint for action. Mr. Frisbee expressed encouragement that the Board and the Chancellor had taken a strong initiative to quickly implement some of the recommendations, in particular those which call for building a comprehensive, collaborative, post-secondary educational network spanning the entire greater Portland region and reaching to Corvallis and Eugene. Mr. Frisbee endorsed the concept of a shared university, with Portland State University as an urban interactive institution at the hub. Three important elements of the Portland State University Plan are congruent with those of the Commission. Specifically important are the Council of Presidents, the Portland Educational Network which is envisioned as achieving a broader involvement on the part of educational resources and opportunities in the greater Portland area, and the development of the Portland Area Trust that will provide some of the "glue" to hold the initiatives together by securing additional outside funding. Mr. Frisbee indicated that Governor Barbara Roberts supports the concept of the Trust and is helping identify individuals to serve on it.

President Ramaley pointed out that, for purposes of the Committee meeting, she would highlight the specific role of OSSHE and, in particular, the roles of its representatives in Portland -- Portland State University, and Oregon Health Sciences University, and articulation with other institutions within and outside OSSHE.

The main goals of the present plan are to: 1) develop a set of common issues that Portland metropolitan area institutions can espouse, adopt, and implement, 2) develop collaborative working relations, and 3) create and foster an environment supportive of new investments, reducing boundaries that traditionally have separated institutions, and thereby maximizing new resources that impact higher
education, both regionally and state-wide. The present plan is the first step as a down payment to the future.

President Ramaley discussed the five critical elements of the plan: the Portland Educational Network; development of a Cooperative Regional Library System; special study centers to focus on particular topics that are best studied in the laboratories and classrooms of an urban center; prototypes of collaboration such as the Oregon Joint Graduate School of Engineering; and, cooperative programs among the private and public colleges and universities being developed through the Council of Presidents and the Portland Area Trust.

Mr. Adams commended the Commission and President Ramaley for their work and inquired if the private institutions had been provided an opportunity to respond to the Plan. President Ramaley indicated that this was occurring through the Council of Presidents. Much of the action plan depends on the outcomes of the current Legislative session and the level of investment the Legislature and the Governor make to the concepts.

Mr. Richardson added his commendations to Mr. Frisbee, President Ramaley, and the Chancellor, and indicated that the work of the Commission was leading to much needed change. He asked Mr. Frisbee about the level of public and private commitment to investing in the plans. Without replacement revenues for the effects of Measure 5 and private support, he questioned how far any of the plans could advance.

President Ramaley responded that the "down payment" was reasonable, with $5 million for the Oregon Joint Engineering Graduate Schools and $3 million for all other components. On the scale of university budgets, she observed, that is a very modest down payment. She continued that, in her opinion, it was essential to make the initial investment to assure that Oregon does not lose its will to move into the 21st century as a major world player.

Mr. Richardson continued the discussion concerning funding by asking if the initiatives would be competing for private dollars. Mr. Frisbee responded that we can't let that happen -- it would
be counter to the concepts of collaboration and cooperation. The Portland Area Trust would be a mechanism to minimize competition. The idea has already been tested on several national foundations with favorable responses.

President Ramaley reminded the Committee of the importance of acquiring state support to leverage private resources. Without some state investment, it would be difficult to convince a national foundation of any serious intentions on the part of the state of Oregon.

Ms. Jackson asked President Ramaley if there were significant issues and concerns about the mission of Portland State University for the future and if there were other aspects that were not represented in the document.

President Ramaley indicated that the staff recommendation before the Board required Portland State University to present a revised mission statement, accompanied by a set of new or expanded programs that would represent the State System's response. This work is due to the Board in September 1991. The urban university designation is consistent with Title XI of the Higher Education Act and the national definitions and concepts that describe some of the working properties of such an institution. The designation of urban university is an interactive one, describing the institution as interactive, in partnership with, the setting of an institution.

Mr. Miller expressed two questions and concerns. One question related to the relevance of the topics chosen for inclusion in the action plan and how they relate to economics in a competitive business environment in the state, nationally, or internationally. The second question related to whether or not the plan was viewed as relating solely to the Portland metropolitan area or if, in fact, the concepts had been "sold" around the state.

On the first question, Mr. Frisbee indicated that the stakes for business already are present in Portland. The environment of the community is the biggest asset, and part of the definition of environment is the availability of the kind of people who comprise the institutions. Clearly, Portland
is Oregon's service and professional "hub," the center of financial, transportation, and international business and market knowledge. If this concept can't be sold in Burns, Pendleton, Klamath Falls, or Ontario on the basis that Portland provides the mechanisms for the movement of products and services through the remainder of the state, then the plans are already defeated.

Mr. Miller remarked that he, other Board members, and others within the System must learn how to "market our product" better.

In response to Mr. Richardson's inquiry as to the nature of the "product" the Board could expect in September, President Ramaley indicated that, by that time, the level of state funding will be clear, and initial evaluation of how well the Trust is working will be available. Portland State University could then develop a mission statement supporting it as the network "hub," and could develop a strategic plan for implementation.

Mr. Frisbee indicated that down-state institutions, Oregon State University and the University of Oregon, in particular, have tremendous resources and human capabilities that are integral to the hopes and aspirations of all the plans. He indicated that among other things, he hoped that a transportation study would lead the way to "a 200 mile-an-hour Bullet train between Eugene, Corvallis, and Portland to further take advantage of resources."

Building on that comment and an earlier one by Mr. Miller, Ms. Jackson asked if there was a way to incorporate commentary which addressed the benefits of the plan system-wide. She indicated that she has not heard universal acceptance of the concept of strengthening Portland State University, particularly in an environment where the threat of possible regional school closures also is discussed openly. She indicated that inclusion of a special chapter or section which specifically addresses benefits to schools system-wide might be useful.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Frisbee and President Ramaley gave an overview of the plan for the entire Board.
Mr. Dodson indicated that he had a question he always had wanted to ask Mr. Frisbee and said he would like to do it with someone taking minutes. The question followed up on the Chancellor's earlier remarks about citizen volunteer roles and, specifically, Mr. Dodson asked Mr. Frisbee why he had given so much of his time to higher education and always demonstrated a keen interest in higher education issues.

Mr. Frisbee responded that he has "a tremendous respect for the potential of education, particularly for someone like me. If I would just take the time to get better educated, think what I could be. I don't think any of us spends enough of our life involved directly in our own education process sufficiently, and the future of the economy, the future of the world, is closely tied with the way we bring up, educate our youngsters through the total process, with access to it on a continuing basis. It's always there -- to give that nudge and push and to create the additional capability that's inherent in a young person and in an old person."

Ms. Wilson joined in thanking Mr. Frisbee for his leadership and the dedication to higher education at this particularly critical time in the history of the state. The Board supported Ms. Wilson with a round of applause.

Mr. Frisbee indicated that he would relay the applause back to his ten cohorts from the Commission.

The Board approved the committee recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swan- son, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

**Staff Report**

In 1989, the Legislative Assembly added a capital construction project for student housing at the University of Oregon. The $10 million project had not been requested by the State Board of Higher Education.

The Assembly added this project at the request of Lane County legislators who were concerned that University of Oregon students, perhaps unable to
find housing in university facilities, were renting units in the Eugene-Springfield area and displacing other low-income citizens. Because of the very tight housing market in the Eugene-Springfield area in 1989 (reported by at least one real estate association to have a rental vacancy rate of less than one percent), many low-income citizens could not find adequate housing.

Discussions between legislators and University of Oregon officials over the issue of providing affordable family housing for students raised questions about how the University and the State System determine the adequacy of, and need for, institution-provided housing. Legislation has been introduced in the 1991 Session to require the establishment of campus housing advisory committees at each institution and to prescribe a variety of investigations and reports regarding institution-provided housing, the conditions of the local housing market, and conditions at other institutions.

After considerable discussion with legislative staff, an alternative approach to introducing legislation has been developed in the form of a proposed administrative rule. The rule has two salient features. First, an institution housing more than 2,000 students (currently the University of Oregon and Oregon State University) would be required to maintain a campus housing advisory committee, with broad representation from the campus community and a local housing agency, to advise the president about the adequacy of housing provided by the institution, the campus master plan and any long-range housing plans, and any proposals to acquire or construct new institution-provided housing.

The second provision applies to all institutions. Each college and university housing more than 2,000 students would be required to provide a report to the Chancellor at least once each biennium. Other institutions would be required to provide such reports whenever they proposed additional housing. The report would use available data to detail housing conditions at the institutions and in their local communities. Those colleges and universities with more than 12,000 full-time equivalent regular students also would include comparisons about the number and percentage of enrolled students housed.
by comparable institutions in the Pac-10 Conference or elsewhere in the United States, preferably in the West. The report also would estimate the cost of providing any additional housing proposed by the college or university, and demonstrate how the provision of that housing would meet the financial self-support requirements of OAR 580-11-020 (Self-Supporting Concept for Student Housing).

The rule also requires that the report be reviewed by the campus housing advisory committee (if one is required) at least 60 days prior to the report's submission to the Chancellor.

The proposed rule provides some standardization in the way in which colleges and universities review their housing programs and needs and, in the case of the larger institutions, provides opportunities for review and advice by representatives of several different groups on the campus.

The text of the proposed rule follows. A public hearing was held on April 23, 1991, in Eugene. There were no objections raised at the public hearing conducted relative to this rule.

Once adopted by the Board, the rule will be shared with members of the Legislative Assembly prior to a scheduled April 29, 1991, hearing on legislation that would mandate campus housing advisory committees and impose the various information-gathering and reporting requirements on all eight colleges and universities.

PROPOSED RULE -- CAMPUS HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEES

580-11-021 (1) Each institution providing housing for more than 2,000 students shall maintain a campus housing advisory committee to be composed of representatives of the faculty, undergraduate and graduate student body, administration and, if available, a local community housing agency. The president shall appoint the members of the committee. The president or designee shall consult with the institution's student government in the selection of student members. At least one member shall be a student who is eligible for student family housing if the institution provides such housing.

Beginning fall term of 1991, the campus housing
advisory committee will meet regularly during the academic year in scheduled public meetings to advise the president or designee of the adequacy of the housing provided by the institution in terms of the number, type, quality, and affordability of units. The committee also shall consider the institution's campus master plan and long-range housing plans and advise about the adequacy of the plans in addressing needs for housing construction. The committee shall report its findings and recommendations, if any, to the president at least once during each biennium. At the discretion of the president, the committee may be assigned additional advisory responsibilities regarding campus housing.

The president of each institution may assign the responsibilities of the campus housing advisory committee to any existing committee if that committee already includes representatives from the faculty, undergraduate and graduate student body, administration, and local community housing agencies. Such a committee may be renamed accordingly.

(2) Whenever an institution proposes to construct or otherwise provide additional housing, or at least once during each biennium for institutions providing housing for more than 2,000 students, it shall report to the Chancellor about the housing conditions and needs of the institution. This report shall include information about the number of students housed in both residence halls and family housing facilities, the rates charged, the vacancy rates in institution-provided housing, the numbers of students on waiting lists for institution-provided housing in residence halls and in family housing facilities, and the vacancy rates or other relevant information available from local public agencies concerning low and moderate income housing needs and conditions in the community in which the institution is located. The institution shall estimate the number of its students eligible to be housed in family and married student housing if the institution provides such housing.

In their reports to the Chancellor, universities with more than 12,000 three-term average full-time equivalent regular students shall provide information about the number and percentage of enrolled students housed in institution-provided housing (both residence halls and family housing facili-
ties) at comparable institutions in the Pac-10 Conference or at least three other comparable institutions elsewhere in the United States, preferably in the West.

To the extent practicable, the institution shall report on undergraduate and graduate students as separate groups. In addition, if an institution is proposing to construct or otherwise provide additional housing, it shall estimate the costs of providing such housing and present a financial plan demonstrating that such additional housing will meet the self-supporting requirements of OAR 580-11-020. That plan must calculate the effect the provision of the additional housing will have on the costs of and the housing rates charged by all institutions in the System. The report required in this subsection shall be reviewed by the appropriate campus housing advisory committee at least 60 days prior to its submission to the Chancellor. Any comments adopted by that committee, either as majority or minority reports, shall be provided in writing by the institution to the Chancellor along with its report.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Committee and the Board adopt proposed OAR 580-11-021, effective July 1, 1991.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Pernsteiner clarified the impetus behind the rule and the general parameters. He explained that it makes good business sense to look at the need for, and the financing of, housing proposed by institutions within the System.

Ms. Wilson asked if the rule was limited to institutions which house over 2,000 students or if it likewise would apply to the smaller institutions.

President Cox from Southern Oregon State College indicated that, within the last ten months, additional housing has opened in Ashland, and 130 town houses and condominiums are on-line at the College, thus easing the housing situation in Ashland. President Cox indicated that Southern Oregon State College already has a Housing Advisory Committee
that governs on-campus housing and a separate one that deals with off-campus operations. Every attempt is made to be responsive to the needs of the greater community.

Mr. Pernsteiner pointed out that the proposed rule does not preclude individual campuses from having committees if they so choose. It does require that the two larger campuses have them.

Ms. Wilson inquired about the composition of the committees which, to her, appeared little different from the present practice, and asked if consideration had been given to bringing a representative from the community, such as a neighborhood association, onto the committee.

Mr. Pernsteiner responded that an early draft of the rule had included such a provision and the Legislative staff in Salem requested it be removed. The rationale was that institutions building or maintaining housing in various neighborhoods throughout the city would find it difficult to identify one, two, or three people who could adequately represent all of the various affected communities. Having a community housing agency representative would bring together, in one or two individuals, both the knowledge of what was occurring in the community and a more objective view of the role of the university for meeting housing needs within the community.

Mr. Bailey asked if the committees were to be advisory only and if the campus could proceed after taking the advice.

Mr. Pernsteiner indicated that the report of the housing committee would be transmitted to the Chancellor to assure independence of the committee. However, the president of the institution would make the final recommendations and may or may not include all of the results of the committee.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation. On roll call, the following voted in favor: Direc-
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AMENDMENTS TO BOARD'S PROPOSED 1991-1997 CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

tors Adams, Bailey, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report

In July 1990, the Board approved a capital construction budget proposal for 1991-1997. That proposal included a wide variety of new construction, maintenance, and repair projects totalling more than $1.1 billion. The 1991-1992 projects amounted to more than $240 million, with more than $100 million coming from the State General Fund. At its March 1, 1991, meeting, the Board, in response to the Governor's post-Measure 5 budget recommendations, revised its 1991-1993 capital construction budget to be consistent with that sent by the Governor to the Legislative Assembly. The revised budget proposal is for $84,705,000 of Other Funds. All projects funded in whole or in part from the State General Fund were deleted from the revised 1991-1993 capital construction budget.

Oregon State University has received a large multi-year grant from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) as one of the universities selected to engage in significant weather research as part of NASA's Earth Observing System. The grant is for a minimum of $30 million over ten years, and promises to attract large amounts of private industry participation in Oregon State University research programs. Oregon State University officials estimate that the value of the private industry participation could equal that of the federal government within ten years. The tool to be used in the research is a state-of-the-art supercomputer acquired through NASA funds. The supercomputer could be used for other Oregon State University research in addition to that required by NASA. The computer is to be delivered to Oregon State University in the spring of 1992.

For Oregon State University to perform under the grant, a suitable facility must be provided to house the supercomputer. Originally, Oregon State University officials had proposed to add 2,000 square feet to Burt Hall at a cost of $700,000, the amount of General Funds proposed for this project in the Board's initial capital construction budget request. The Governor's Office disapproved the
request because it included General Fund support.

After further clarification from NASA about the requirements of the research and a more thorough evaluation of the space needs of Oregon State University researchers, Oregon State University has determined that an addition of 5,000 square feet, with more extensive electrical and air conditioning capacity than had been anticipated originally, is required to accommodate the NASA supercomputer in a suitable environment. Therefore, Oregon State University now is proposing a 5,000-square-foot addition to Burt Hall, costing no more than $2 million. This will permit the construction of the necessary secure space suitable for the supercomputer and will be adjacent to the offices and other research facilities of the investigators assigned to the work.

Because Oregon State University will lose the NASA grant and the attendant use of the supercomputer for other research activities if adequate space is not provided, officials believe it is necessary to request that a project be approved by the Board, the Governor, and the Legislature to construct the Oregon State University Environmental Computing Center as an addition to Burt Hall. Since no General Fund financing is likely to be available, Oregon State University is proposing to raise gift funds and, if necessary, to borrow from the reserves of its auxiliaries or from the Oregon State University Foundation, and to repay any borrowing, including appropriate interest, from a combination of gifts and building-use credits (indirect cost recovery monies) received from the NASA grant.

If the project is not approved, Oregon State University must decline the NASA grant award, thereby foregoing an estimated $60 million of federal and private grants and contracts over the next ten years, as well as eliminating the opportunity for Oregon State University researchers to utilize the capabilities of the NASA supercomputer for other University research.

In January 1991, at the request of the Board, the Legislative Emergency Board approved the establishment of an Other Funds Limitation and authorized the expenditure of $1,910,000 for the renovation of the Cascade Cafeteria and the construction of
adjacent space at Southern Oregon State College. This project was originally included in the Board’s 1991-1993 Capital Construction Budget request. The effect of the Emergency Board’s action is to change the project into a 1989-1991 effort. Therefore, it should be deleted from the 1991-1993 Capital Construction Budget request.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Committee request the Board to authorize the staff to submit a revised 1991-1993 Capital Construction budget request that adds an Other Funds Limitation of $2,000,000 for the construction of the Environmental Computing Center at Oregon State University and deletes an Other Funds Limitation of $1,910,000 for Cascade Cafeteria Improvements at Southern Oregon State College.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Pernsteiner explained that the NASA project at Oregon State University is expected to last for ten years and is expected to generate an additional $30 million infusion of private money for the research to be conducted. However, the NASA grant does not contain up-front money for facilities construction and Oregon State University does not have a facility with sufficient cooling, power, and security to meet NASA requirements for the computer center. Oregon State University is requesting Board approval to borrow from reserves for up-front cash to build the facility, with the reserves being repaid as gift funds are received.

Mr. Bailey asked whether the Governor’s budget office and interested legislators were aware of the project and the need for additional facilities.

Mr. Pernsteiner indicated that the Governor’s budget office had been briefed, but he doubted that Legislators were aware of the project. A similar project had been included in the Board’s original proposed budget under the General Funds category. It, along with all other construction projects utilizing General Fund Support, had been deleted by the Governor after the passage of Measure 5. Mr. Pernsteiner continued that a portion of all indirect cost recoveries are called "building use
credits." Those monies return to the university and are used for facilities. In the case of the NASA grant, the facilities will be used for research related to NASA and it is appropriate that some of the money come back for that purpose.

The second portion of the proposed change was a proposal to delete the Cascade cafeteria improvements at Southern Oregon State College. Basically, the project was moved into the current 1989-1991 biennium. The Board granted its approval for that change in the fall of 1990; the Emergency Board approved it in January 1991. The request is a technical amendment to the budget to align it with present realities. The architectural firm has been selected and a contract will have been secured within a matter of days for the design. The project already is underway.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Bailey called on Dr. John Byrne, President of Oregon State University, to provide background on the NASA Project. President Byrne observed that, "at a time when the horizon seems to be covered by clouds, it is good to share a rainbow that only comes when you have bright sunlight focused in one place. That particular sunlight at this time emanates from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and focuses on Corvallis and Oregon State University."

President Byrne indicated that the NASA project is important -- one that will have implications for much of science and technology in the future. He introduced Dr. Douglas Caldwell, Dean of the College of Oceanography, who shared information about the program. Dean Caldwell provided background on Oregon State University's College of Oceanography, its contribution to the University and the state, and some background on the Oregon State University Environmental Computing Center.

Dr. Byrne emphasized that Oregon State University is requesting authorization to raise $2 million for an addition to Burt Hall for the supercomputer to support the NASA program.
Mr. Richardson asked for clarification as to how the financing would occur. Dr. Byrne indicated that Oregon State University would generate funds primarily through gifts and the indirect cost that will accrue to the program.

Mr. Adams asked if there was a connection between OCATE and OACIS and the proposed program. President Byrne responded that the program essentially stands on its own and, at least at the present time, there is no connection with either OCATE or OACIS.

Chancellor Bartlett underscored the significance of this extraordinary development and indicated his amazement about how little attention was being focused on this important initiative. He continued that "this should be a headline story for Oregon because it is a major development and that Oregon State University should be congratulated on having received it. Items such as this program provide a real lift during these difficult days."

The Board approved the Committee recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swan- son, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report

At the October 1989 meeting of the Board of Higher Education, Administrative Rules (OAR 580-46-005 et seq.) were adopted establishing guidelines for the relationship between the colleges and universities and their affiliated organizations. The Board also instructed staff to report concerning how the rules were working and what problems, if any, had arisen.

The Board's Division 46 Administrative Rules have two components: to create standards and procedures for affiliation between colleges and universities and their associated foundation, and to describe the operational restrictions upon the relationship between the institutions and their affiliated entities. Upon meeting the requirements for affiliation, the institution president may award recognition to an affiliated entity. The operational relationship would be realized by a contract between the institution and the foundation containing each party's rights and responsibilities.
Since the rules were adopted, institution staff and Foundation officers have worked diligently to achieve both goals. At this point, all institutions have recognized those affiliated entities with which they have been associated. In many instances, this has required amendments of the articles of incorporation and/or the bylaws of the affiliated entity. In all instances, it has required intense effort by all parties. The process of contract development has been even more protracted. The problem has been to balance the need for independence with the requirement of cooperation between closely-related entities. Accomplishing these apparently conflicting aims required hours of effort on both sides and close work between the Chancellor's staff and the institutions.

At this point, seven of the institutions have completed the work and the contracts have been reviewed by the Board's counsel and approved by the Chancellor's Office as required by the Board's rule. The eighth institution, Oregon Institute of Technology, has a contract in place but amendments are under discussion. It is anticipated that these will be approved in the near future.

Operationally, the Board's rules do not appear to have hindered and, in fact, may have enhanced the relationships between the institutions and the affiliated entities. Staff does recommend, however, Board review on an "as needed" basis.

Board Discussion

Over a year ago, when the Board approved the Rules, it requested that the Chancellor's office report on implementation of the procedures. Ms. Grier indicated that the report provides for that by describing the establishment of recognition of the institution foundations and negotiation of contracts between the institutions and the foundations.

Mr. Bailey indicated that, at the time the rule was adopted, there were concerns about the Oregon State Foundation and he asked about the present status.

President Byrne indicated that the concerns of a year ago had been adequately addressed.

(No Board action required.)
Roger Bassett provided the Board with a summary report on the status of various activities and initiatives before the present Legislature. He indicated that there were eight-to-ten major issues of greatest concern to the Board. It appears that the Ways and Means Education Subcommittee almost has completed the hearings of its budget process and is beginning to work through a series of decisions. Mr. Bassett indicated that the process had been much more difficult due to the Chair of the Committee being new to the higher education agenda, the change of party leadership in the Legislature, and the passage of Measure 5.

Mr. Bassett clarified the additional one percent reduction in all agency budgets, which is in addition to those cuts already approved by the Board. At the present time, the Subcommittee is attempting to reach closure on several items: a charge to the Board for conducting a review of administrative arrangements and costs; a budget note regarding travel; line item budgeting; and the unresolved issue of access, or the 6000 incremental cut planned as part of the budget balancing process. These items require a great deal of patience in working to mutual agreement.

Other questions yet to be resolved are the issues of budget notes, the undefined add-back process, and whether there are sufficient resources to allow the Board adhere to the principles upon which the entire post-Measure 5 budget was based, namely, are there sufficient resources to assure quality. Mr. Bassett indicated that it may be June 1991 before the politics of add-backs are resolved through the Legislative process. To date, according to Mr. Bassett, nothing has happened to address directly the replacement revenue question, and it may not happen before fall 1991 (and then in the form of a special session).

Mr. Bassett closed his remarks by indicating that he usually approaches the Legislative process with an optimistic attitude, but the situation in Salem makes that approach difficult. This is due, in part, to the confusion regarding whether replacement revenues will be available; to the inexperience of the legislative leadership; and to a lack of knowledge and experience that will assure
appreciation of higher education as a precious state resource.

Chancellor Bartlett added that there has been a great sense of frustration that the present Legislature can't deal with the problems it faces, and a sense that it is reaching out in all directions to find a way through the problems. One possible outcome is that there will be a series of "paper solutions," such as an agreement to downsize the faculty, downsize the programs, but not downsize the student body. There is a real question as to whether or not it is possible to maintain adequate quality by arbitrarily deciding to increase the student load by ten percent without offsetting the increase in resources. Logical questions arise. Are we adequately serving students? Are we fulfilling the responsibilities that we undertake when we bring together students and faculty and resources into an education process? If we aren't providing access to the substance and the reality, then access and form becomes misleading, hollow and, indeed, a delusion. As we seek to "cut the fat" out of all public services (which has become the slogan in Salem), one of the curious versions of logic is that we then say that wherever we find elements suggesting quality, achievement, and high performance, we may be spending too much.

The Chancellor indicated there is a kind of absurdity which can result from this process. One of the primary concerns now, as we enter into the next phase of the Legislature, is that the implications of actions be made clear as patterns of decision and potential actions are considered.

Staff Report to the Board

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

EMU Outdoor Program Storage, UO

An Agreement was negotiated with Northwest Testing Laboratories, Consultants, Eugene, for consulting services not to exceed $1,600. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Award of Construction Contracts

Agricultural Sciences II Building DDC System Project, OSU

On March 4, 1991, Careco Inc. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $531,203. Financing will be provided from state, federal, and gift funds and grants.

Benton Hall Room 303 Renovation Project, OSU

On March 13, 1991, Morris P. Kielty, General Contractor, was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $68,467. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution, OSU Foundation funds and gift funds.

COES Facilities, Madras, OSU

On April 2, 1991, Wayne Anderson Construction was awarded a contract for the COES Facilities--Madras (Three Ag Exp Station Bldgs), Central Oregon Exp. Station project in the amount of $310,770. Financing will be provided from state, lottery, and gift funds.

Entomology Building Smith Farm, OSU

On April 1, 1991, Dorman Construction was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $40,486. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Cordley Hall Chiller Replacement, OSU

On March 4, 1991, Dale Ramsay Construction Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $62,305. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

Oceanography Shop Building 221, Roof Extension, OSU

On February 1, 1991, Merle Doty & Son, Inc. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $20,400. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Gleeson Hall Entrance Reconstruction Project, OSU

On April 1, 1991, Merle Doty & Son, Inc. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $46,500. Financing will be provided from state funds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Award Date</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount (in USD)</th>
<th>Financing Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theater Program Relocation Project, OSU</td>
<td>March 11, 1991</td>
<td>Dale Ramsay Construction Co.</td>
<td>554,542</td>
<td>State funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Stadium Improvements 1991, OSU</td>
<td>April 8, 1991</td>
<td>Blumenstein-Dean Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>3,659,763</td>
<td>Gifts and bonds from athletic revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Bldg. Remodel for Conference Room, OSU</td>
<td>February 1, 1991</td>
<td>Terry Hackenbruck Construction</td>
<td>37,653</td>
<td>State funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Plantings, UO</td>
<td>April 8, 1991</td>
<td>Landscape Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>79,844</td>
<td>Federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Courtyard Site Improvements, UO</td>
<td>February 8, 1991</td>
<td>McKenzie Commercial Contractors, Inc.</td>
<td>164,401</td>
<td>Federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Cabling and Pathway Lighting, UO</td>
<td>March 25, 1991</td>
<td>Schaumberg Enterprises, Inc.</td>
<td>357,534</td>
<td>Article XI-(F)1 bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird Hall Plumbing Replacement, OHSU</td>
<td>January 23, 1991</td>
<td>Hydro-Temp Mechanical, Inc.</td>
<td>299,600</td>
<td>Capital repair funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baird Hall Room 2038 Pulmonary Lab Remodel, OHSU</td>
<td>February 20, 1991</td>
<td>Todd Hess Building Co.</td>
<td>69,600</td>
<td>State funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On March 4, 1991, Todd Hess Building Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $39,775. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

On April 1, 1991, Anderson Electrical Service, Inc. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $75,264. Financing will be provided from state funds.

On April 1, 1991, Anderson Electrical Service, Inc. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $323,065. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Acceptance of Projects

This project is complete and was accepted on November 21, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $45,850. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $217,997. Financing was provided from state lottery and capital repair funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on February 18, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $160,279. Financing was provided from Article XI-F(1) bonds.

This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $34,241.21. Financing was provided from state funds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting #597</th>
<th>April 26, 1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burt Hall Reroofing Project, OSU</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on December 31, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $105,436. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Hall Basement Heating &amp; Condensate System Modifications, OSU</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on December 31, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $74,231. Financing was provided from state funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton Hall Reroof, Areas C, D &amp; E, OSU</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on January 31, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $192,360. Financing was provided from state funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magruder Hall Reroofing Project, OSU</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on January 31, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $153,980. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Columbia Ag. Research &amp; Extension Center Cold Storage, OSU</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on January 28, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $165,307. Financing was provided from a combination of state, gift, and lottery funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hall Cafeteria Reroofing, OSU</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on March 25, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $114,976. Financing was provided from Residence Hall building reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiegand Hall Reroofing, Areas B &amp; C, OSU</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on December 31, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $180,832. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNeal Hall Addition, SOSC</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on January 15, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $1,023,446. Financing was provided from building fee funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Housing Electrical Improvements--Phase II, UO</td>
<td>This project is complete and was accepted on March 4, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $28,077. Financing was provided from housing reserve funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This project is complete and was accepted on March 4, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $650,298. Financing was provided from state funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on January 14, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $124,745. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on March 7, 1990. The estimated total project cost remains at $14,237. Financing was provided from housing funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on January 25, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $171,346.40. Financing was provided from federal funds.

(No Board action required.)

President Dodson thanked President Kohler and his staff for their patience with an extended Board meeting that impinged on the beginning of the visitation schedule. He commented on the relevance and importance of the items chosen for the visitation.

Mr. Dodson thanked the Chancellor, staff, and other Board members for the hard work evidenced through the recent Legislative sessions. Although most of the time, energy, and attention of the Chancellor and Board have been focused on Salem, Mr. Dodson reminded the Board that they had just adopted an action plan for the Portland metropolitan area, and were ready to embark on a new action plan with the Board of Education. Great progress continues to be evidenced in other arenas as well.
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ADJOURNMENT The Board meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

[Signature]
Virginia L. Thompson, Secretary
Oregon State Board of Higher Education

[Signature]
Mark Dodson, President
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 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Degree in Health &amp; Safety Administration, OSU -- Review along with statewide plan in three years</td>
<td>12-14-89</td>
<td>December 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Plan for Delivery of Health Administration &amp; Public Health Programs</td>
<td>12-14-89</td>
<td>July 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Women and Minorities in High Administrative Positions</td>
<td>01-19-90</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC Double Major Designation</td>
<td>05-18-90</td>
<td>May 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on Athletic Financing (Annual reports requested, with others when budgets are forecasted to be out of balance.)</td>
<td>06-14-90</td>
<td>June 1991, or as necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAR 580-40-041, Revolving Charge Account Policy</td>
<td>07-20-90</td>
<td>July 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Undergraduate Exchange Program</td>
<td>07-20-90</td>
<td>July 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Original Presentation</td>
<td>Tentative Presentation Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<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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