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ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 11:20 a.m., Friday, November 15, 1991, by President of the Board, George E. Richardson, Jr., and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert Adams  Ms. Beverly Jackson
Mr. Bob Bailey  Mr. Rob Miller
Ms. Britteny Davis  Mr. Les Swanson
Mr. Mark Dodson  Ms. Janice Wilson
Mr. Christopher Halsey

Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.

Mr. Tom Bruggere was out of the country on business.

The following representatives of the State System of Higher Education were present:

Chancellor's Office -- Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Virginia Boushey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Robin Brown, Associate Director, School Relations; Jerry Casby, Attorney-in-Charge, Education; Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Francesca Clifford, Assistant Director of Communications; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services and Compliance Officer; Peter Hughes, Director, Internal Audit; Weldon E. Ihrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Steve Katz, Controller; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Jim Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Greg Parker, Director, Communications; George Pernsteiner, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Virginia L. Thompson, Board Secretary and Executive Assistant to the Chancellor; Susan Weeks, Director, Institutional Research Services; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.

Eastern Oregon State College -- David Gilbert, President; Jim Lundy, Dean of Administration; James Hottois, Dean of Academic Affairs.
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Oregon Health Sciences University -- Peter Kohler, President; Peggy Miller, Vice President, Finance; Lesley Hallick, Vice President, Academic Affairs.

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

Oregon State University -- John Byrne, President; Roy Arnold, Acting Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs; Sally Malueg, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts.

Portland State University -- Judith Ramaley, President; Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Robert Frank, Acting Provost; Barbara Holland, Director, Organizational Development.

Southern Oregon State College -- Joseph Cox, President; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration; Stephen J. Reno, Dean of Academic Affairs.

University of Oregon -- Myles Brand, President; Chapin Clark, Professor Emeritus, Law; Gerald Kissler, Senior Vice Provost for Planning and Resources, Academic Affairs; Sherri McDowell, Director, Business Affairs; Jean Stockard, Professor, Sociology, Norman K. Wessells, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration.

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

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate -- Herb Jolliff, Oregon Institute of Technology; Bonnie Staebler, Western Oregon State College; Charles Wright, University of Oregon.

In addition, a large crowd of interested students, faculty, staff, and citizens were present for the Board meeting.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on October 25, 1991, and approved them as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Davis, Dodson, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson.
Professor Chapin Clark, University of Oregon, and Mr. Timothy Sercombe, attorney, requested an opportunity to appear before the Board, representing a group of about 3800 employees and former employees of the University of Oregon and of Oregon Health Sciences University who may be entitled to a refund from a Union Mutual Insurance Fund.

For approximately 20 years, Union Mutual Insurance was part of a long- and short-term disability fringe benefit package. Since it was a group policy, the University of Oregon was named policy holder, but premiums were paid by faculty. When Union Mutual converted from a mutual to a stock company, there was a surplus distribution and, at that time, OSSHE received over $600,000. Since that time, the fund balance has grown to over $900,000.

Because no distribution plan was presented by the State System, a group of faculty formed, hired an attorney and, finally, requested that the Board of Higher Education take action.

Mr. Sercombe urged the Board to consider the benefits as well as the risks of any actions that might be taken, and to consider the best interests of faculty who have waited so long for payment. Mr. Sercombe indicated that the Board's attorneys were considering an interpleader action and suggested that they explore this action carefully. He indicated that there would be considerable cost involved in filing such a claim, since notice would have to be given to all claimants.

Vice Chancellor Weldon E. Ihrig explained to the Board that he had delayed any action until Dr. Clark had an opportunity to appear before the Board. The present plans are to request the Department of Justice to proceed in court with an interpleader action to determine the appropriate disposition of the proceeds of the fund.

Mr. Swanson inquired if there were two classes for the different groups of policy holders, if they need to be informed, and the cost of filing for the action. Mr. Casby responded that it costs little to file a lawsuit, and what is expended following that will be determined by the kind of adversarial contest that develops. As to the cost of providing notice to claimants, Mr. Casby indicated there would be a cost, irrespective of whether or not litigation is pursued.
In closing, Dr. Clark remarked that there was no reason this could not be resolved through an administrative settlement and the issuance of checks. There are, in his opinion, no adversarial groups that require an interpleader action.

(No Board action required.)

STEFAN STANT

Mr. Stefan Stant requested an opportunity to appear before the Board. Mr. Stant is a graduate student at the University of Oregon who wanted to call to the attention of the members of the State Board of Higher the actions during the past months at the University of Oregon regarding military recruitment.

"The Department of Defense directive 133-2 states that openly gay or lesbian persons cannot serve in the armed forces of the United States of America. This policy severely contradicts OAR 580-15-010, which prohibits discrimination of any kind on the basis of sexual orientation. On October 25, 1991, the student-elected Board of the Erb Memorial Union, the student union at the University of Oregon, voted 15-0 to ban military recruiters from the facility. The Erb Memorial Union is run mainly by student fees, and is predominately student operated.

"On November 1, 1991, the president of the University of Oregon overturned that veto, stating that students have 'a first amendment right to have access to military recruiters.' Military recruitment is a highly commercial activity, and I, for one, disagree that the first amendment protects military’s right to recruit here. And the University Senate is currently considering the issue. Many campuses around the nation have acted to suspend ROTC and military recruitment until the military, the armed forces, revokes the policy. The issue will not go away. The University pressures to ban military recruitment until the Department of Defense revokes the issue or changes the discriminatory policy is a key to getting the policy changed.

"I am asking that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education consider this issue, and take some sort of action to combat this needless discrimination."

Mr. Halsey asked if this was the same item Chancellor Bartlett had commented on during his report at the October Board meeting. Chancellor Bartlett indicated
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that, at that meeting, he was commenting on a different issue, namely ROTC programs on State System campuses.

(No Board action required.)

Chancellor Bartlett opened his report by indicating that he had just returned to the state after attending a series of national meetings. An overall impression from those meetings was that the issues with which higher education is involved in Oregon have their echoes and counterparts all across the country.

One of the issues is the struggle for a new balance between undergraduate education and the other purposes of our institutions. A national theme is the reassertion of undergraduate education as an under-emphasized part of the whole university program.

A second concern by public elected officials is for greater accountability for every aspect of administration and assessment, and measurement of outcomes. Added to this are the debates concerning a balance of quantity and quality. Many states are struggling with issues of downsizing and access and with variations on formulations.

Internationalization of the curriculum is clearly an idea being discussed in one form or another across the country. The topic has reached the national agenda in Washington, D.C., as reflected by federal legislation being considered to increase international exposure of students and faculty.

The dual issues of articulation and integration among higher education and other education sectors are echoed nationally. The Chancellor indicated that Oregon appears to have gone farther than most, and has introduced some pioneering ideas.

Finally, the issue of funding for intercollegiate athletics is not just peculiar to Oregon. The last extensive session at the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges was devoted to the question of how to deal with athletic budgeting and shortfalls and attempting to get a handle on the numerous costs involved.

Program Review Process

The Program Review Process has been established as an investigation of program priorities and part of the
Governor's comprehensive plan for examining how the state does business, with what kinds of resources, and determining how Oregonians will pay for the services they want. Each major state agency must provide information and recommendations on the current state of affairs, propose strategies for carrying out missions, and priorities among various assigned missions and programs.

Higher education, along with public education and the community colleges, will begin Program Review presentations on December 2, 1991. The three sectors are working closely to develop a single educational continuum. The Chancellor indicated that the materials that have been prepared for the Review would be mailed to Board members within the next week.

In view of the concerns raised about expenditures of the University of Oregon for the Freedom Bowl in 1990, Chancellor Bartlett asked President Brand to make a report to the Board.

President Brand began by providing some information on the athletic department's programs. Long before Measure 5, the athletic department began to cut back programs and expenditures. During the early 80s, men's and women's swimming, gymnastics, and baseball were eliminated. At the present time, the University of Oregon has the minimum number of sports permissible in the PAC-10. In fact, the University of Oregon is the only university in the PAC-10 to have the minimum.

For several years, the increases in expenditure rate in the athletic programs have been below the general increases in expenditure rate for the University as a whole. Personnel, salaries, staffing levels, and support for individual programs are in the lower one-fifth of the PAC-10.

Concerning the Freedom Bowl, President Brand indicated that there are certain responsibilities for participating in post-season play. For example, it is expected that the university will take the team, the band, and appropriate coaches to the event. Normal standards for the PAC-10 were followed for a game of this kind, which means expenses and income balance out.

However, President Brand continued, even though normal standards and criteria were followed, it may well have
been the case, given fiscal constraints, that Oregon should not apply the same standards that are applied in other PAC-10 or NCAA states. Perhaps some of the $600,000 could have been saved if there were different policies.

Mr. Richardson indicated that, given the current concerns about the University of Oregon-Freedom Bowl expenditures and other issues related to intercollegiate athletics, the Finance and Administration Committee had taken on an additional assignment. Ms. Wilson indicated the Committee will be looking at athletic expenditures at the institutions, including bowl and post-season athletic events. The policy norms and standards of other institutions, NCAA, and PAC-10 will be taken into account. It is anticipated that the Committee will approve a policy recommendation on athletic expenditures that will come with a policy recommendation to the full Board.

Background

In September 1991, President Lawrence Wolf charged the Faculty Senate at the Oregon Institute of Technology to review a proposed reorganization plan for the institution. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee submitted its findings and resolutions on the reorganization plan on September 26, 1991, for review and action by the Faculty Senate. On October 3, 1991, the Faculty Senate passed a number of motions addressing the reorganization plan, determining that there had been adequate involvement of the faculty, and endorsed, in principle, the various elements of the proposed reorganization plan. On October 23, 1991, President Wolf submitted a letter of request to Chancellor Bartlett for authorization to proceed with the reorganization plan.

Under the reorganization plan, the Oregon Institute of Technology would be divided into two new schools -- the Engineering and Industrial Technologies, and Health and the Arts and Sciences. Each school would be headed by a dean who would report to a provost. Other units to report to the provost would include directors of the Metro Center, Learning Resources, Continuing Education, and Institutional Research. No new positions would be created, although there would be revisions in a number of current job descriptions; increased costs are not expected as a result of the reorganization. The current position of dean of
Academic Affairs would be made provost, and associate deans would be made deans of schools. Under the proposed framework, the current dean of Academic Affairs and associate deans would be appointed in an acting capacity to allow time for national searches for permanent appointments.

In the past, the Oregon Institute of Technology has been organized into divisions much like a community college. The divisions were headed by division chairpersons. In the more recent past, the institution has been organized by departments, each reporting to the dean of Academic Affairs. With a large number of department heads reporting to the dean of Academic Affairs, communications are not effective. Particularly problematic is the fact that department heads and deans do not feel empowered to make decisions and, therefore, the timeliness of decision-making does not lead to needed responsiveness.

The proposed reorganization plan addresses needs for greater empowerment through the establishment of provost and deans of schools as line officers rather than the staff officers they are now. The plan includes revised, detailed organizational charts and revised job descriptions for the positions of provost, dean of students, dean of administration, dean of the School of Health and the Arts and Sciences, dean of the School of Engineering and Industrial Technologies, director of development, executive assistant to the president, and director of publications and information. These materials have been reviewed fully and endorsed by the Faculty Senate.

These discussions of reorganization also have included discussions of a revised mission statement for the Oregon Institute of Technology. These discussions are continuing and will be reviewed with the Board at a later date.

Since the Oregon Institute of Technology currently is not organized into schools, and it is the Board’s policy to require Board approval for new schools, the reorganization plan was referred to the Board for action.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended that the Board authorize the Oregon Institute of Technology to proceed with the reorgani-
zation of the Institute as described in the September 26, 1991, Faculty Senate Executive Committee Report, and adopted by the Faculty Senate on October 3, 1991, effective immediately.

NOTE: Detailed descriptions of the Oregon Institute of Technology Reorganization Plan are available for review in the Board’s office.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

President Wolf indicated that one of the considerations in the reorganization plan concerned span of control. At the present time, 22 individuals representing all of the departments of the institution report to Dr. Chris Eismann, dean of Academic Affairs. Implied in the reorganization plan is decentralization and "empowerment" and decision-making by individuals closer to where the decisions have an impact.

The reorganization schema was presented to faculty with a request for feedback on whether the right divisions had been made; and the general response was positive. Upon approval of the Board for the reorganization, President Wolf indicated that he would appoint individuals in acting positions of provost and deans of the two schools and, at the same time, begin national searches for permanent appointments.

In light of the work of the Board Committee on Administrative Review, Board member Dodson asked if there would be cost savings in the proposed reorganization plan. President Wolf indicated that the present plan was cost neutral, although the end result would be more efficient and effective management.

Mr. Dodson pursued the question further by asking if it would be possible for the Oregon Institute of Technology to communicate to the Board any possible elimination of positions or other cost savings achieved by the reorganization plan, and if there were ways to incent cost savings. Mr. Dodson requested that President Wolf report back to the Committee regarding effectiveness and efficiencies achieved by the reorganization.

Mr. Swanson asked if polarization would result from consolidation into two schools and whether there would be different graduation requirements, separate faculty meetings, and so forth. Dr. Eismann responded that
some separation would occur, but that general graduation requirements would remain uniform, with variations emerging slowly over the course of implementation. However, there would continue to be one faculty senate -- and, in essence, one institution.

The Committee recommended 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, Davis, Dodson, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

Introduction

The report was designed to inform the Board about a range of enrollment-related activities the State System provides Oregon high schools and community colleges.

State System Post-High School Plans Survey

Each February, the State System's Office of School Relations, in cooperation with Oregon high schools, conducts a post-high school plans survey of currently enrolled juniors. The survey has been conducted for over 30 years, with about 75 percent of the high schools participating each year, and about 70 percent of the enrolled juniors. The survey provides extensive data about students, their priority choices of post-high school plans (education, work, military, or travel), and intended program of study if they plan to pursue post-secondary education. Survey data are used in a longitudinal study of the pattern of post-high school plans, educational reporting to participating high schools, direct mail distribution of educational information to students, and State System and institutional marketing and recruiting. In the fall of their senior year, students indicating a plan for post-secondary education are sent the System's prospective student brochure and a personalized letter from the Chancellor.

State System High School Visitation Program
The State System's high school visitation program has been in place for about 40 years, and serves three primary purposes:

- for students, personal contact with OSSHE institutional representatives to receive information, and individual and group advising on pursuing further education after high school;
- for OSSHE institutions, the opportunity to recruit prospective students;
- for educators and the educational sectors in Oregon, school-to-college articulation through direct contact and dialogue between OSSHE representatives and high school administrators, counselors, and teachers.

In Oregon, there are 253 accredited and/or standard high schools, and 63 unaccredited or non-standard high schools for a total of 316. Of all schools invited to participate in the visitation program, about 75 percent are participating this year. Last fall, almost 15,500 high school seniors and juniors participated in the visitation program that was offered over a 16-week period between the end of September and the middle of December.

In addition to the coordinated System visitation to Oregon high schools, each institution conducts an extensive institutional marketing and student recruitment campaign.

State System Publications for Prospective Students and Schools

- **Information for Prospective Students.** This 12-page, four-color publication is the System-wide prospective student publication for Oregon's state colleges and universities. It is direct-mailed, along with a letter from the Chancellor, in September of each year, to all students who, in the post-high school plans survey, indicated they planned to pursue further education after high school. It also is used in the high school visitation program.

- **The College Guidance Counselor's Handbook.** This 110-page publication is updated
and distributed to all Oregon high schools in August of each year. It contains extensive information on the State System high school visitation program, admission standards, testing requirements and dates, special academic support services, publications and services, college guidance information and resources, and credit policies at all OSSHE institutions for the various types of college credit students may earn while enrolled in high school or upon entering college.

- **College Guidance Newsletter.** This quarterly publication is distributed to all Oregon high schools, as well as all other educational sectors, and contains timely and topical information on issues relevant to counseling for college.

**High Achieving Student Lists**

Beginning fall 1990, School Relations asked each Oregon high school for a list of senior students with cumulative GPAs of 3.5 and higher; additional data elements are requested. These data are sent to each OSSHE institution so that students can be sent scholarship information.

**Transfer Guide to the Colleges and Universities in the Oregon State System of Higher Education**

This newly completed publication currently is being distributed to Oregon community colleges and high schools to advise students about OSSHE transfer admission policies and requirements. It includes information on the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer Degree Program, credit acceptance policies, financial aid, residency policy, student support services, and where to call or write for further information and assistance.

**Special Reports to Oregon High Schools**

Since 1983, the State System has delivered three annual reports to Oregon high schools covering: (1) post-high school plans; (2) enrollment by sending high school; and (3) freshman academic performance. Due to financial constraints, only summarized information on these areas will be provided to the high schools.
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Counselor Conference

In fall 1991, School Relations held its first statewide counselor conference in Eugene. Due to the excellent response, plans now are underway for another conference in September of 1992.

Minority Student Advising

A new project, the Oregon Educational Advisory Team (OEAT) is providing under-represented students of color in grades 9-12 with the tools and information needed to go on to post-secondary education. Two teams of OSSHE professionals from admission and multicultural offices will visit students in 23 pilot high schools in 1991-92. This pilot project replaces an annual minority student conference serving primarily the greater Portland area. The pilot project will be evaluated for potential expansion in 1992-93.

Adjustments in the School Relations Program Related to Fiscal Constraints

Various program and publication reductions were undertaken in response to reduced resources for the current biennium. However, every attempt was made to maintain the essential core programs and services of School Relations. Plans now are underway for the production of a new slide show to use in the high school visitation program, and to provide an updated bank of photographs for System-wide and institutional use in marketing and recruitment.

Future Directions

OSSHE's informational and recruiting activities with Oregon high schools and community colleges will be affected greatly by current reforms proposed for public schools and community colleges, as well as budget restrictions. Efforts currently are underway to explore the potential uses of Ed-Net for providing information to schools. Improvement of articulation processes and policies to facilitate information-sharing and mobility among the sectors also is on the agenda.

Committee Discussion

Dr. Robin Brown indicated that the number one concern of parents, students, and counselors is the stability
and quality of current academic programs. The second most important concern is the increasing cost of a college education.

Mr. Dodson asked if the State System had "shot itself in the foot" by negative impacts on high school counselors and administrators of reducing teacher education programs, and if there had been a ripple effect in the high schools as a result.

Dr. Brown indicated that there had been, but this had been countered by communications with counselors and principals. Dr. Zanville had put together information about teacher education programs that do exist in the state.

Mr. Dodson underscored an ongoing concern that Oregon might lose the "best and brightest" students to other states, and that the State System must remain vigilant to prevent this from occurring. Ms. Davis added that high school teachers play a vital role in conveying information about higher education, and asked how College Relations staff interact with high school teachers, not just counselors.

Mr. Christensen indicated that teachers are included only indirectly. It appears that, in the future, there will be the formulation of some curriculum committees consisting of high school and college teachers to work on implementation of the 21st Century goals.

(No Board action required.)

Staff Report

The College of Oceanography at Oregon State University has been awarded a three-year grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF) Facilities Modernization Program. This grant will fund a portion of the replacement of the fume hoods in the laboratories in Burt Hall, as well as permit the renovation of two laboratories in that facility. The cost of replacement fume hoods, and renovation of the two laboratories, is $250,000 -- half to be paid from the NSF grant, and the other half from building use credits earned from other federal grants.
The College of Oceanography is attempting to improve the efficiency and safety of all laborato­ries. The NSF grant will help fund some of the needed improvements.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff concurred with the request of Oregon State University, and recommended the Board authorize seeking State Emergency Board approval for the establishment of an Other Funds Limitation of $250,000, and authorization to expend that amount for Burt Hall Laboratory Renovations.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended 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, Davis, Dodson, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report

Oregon State University officials are proposing to upgrade and renovate two research laboratories and a classroom at the Forest Research Laboratory (FRL). In addition, handicapped accessibility improvements would be made within the scope of the requested $230,000 project. This upgrade and renovation will be funded entirely from harvest tax revenues and the proceeds of timber sales from College of Forestry lands. The funds already are on hand.

The laboratory renovations are needed because the use of federal laboratories by FRL researchers is being curtailed due to the expansion of federal activities. No additional operating costs are anticipated.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff concurred with the request of Oregon State University, and recommended the Board authorize
staff to seek Emergency Board approval to establish an Other Funds Limitation of $230,000, and to authorize the expenditure of that amount for the Forest Research Laboratory Renovation project.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Ms. Jackson inquired if there were handicap improvements that follow the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Mr. Pernsteiner commented that, upon advice from legal counsel, they follow prior legislation that is relatively equivalent to ADA and meet those standards of accessibility.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

On April 21, 1989, the Board of Higher Education approved the sale of a 17.26-acre parcel of unimproved real property located within the city limits of Jacksonville, Oregon. The property was donated to the University of Oregon in 1960 as part of the Beekman estate. The appraised value was approximately $123,600. Shortly thereafter, a survey revealed that the property actually consisted of 20.79 acres, and that six adjoining property owners at the western boundary encroached upon the Board's property with fences and some structures. The total area of the encroachments was less than one acre. After consultation with the Board's legal counsel, Assistant Attorney General James J. Casby, Jr., Board staff member Truman Baird notified the property owners of the encroachments and provided an opportunity to purchase the encroached portions rather than moving fences and structures. The sale prices established for each parcel were based on the $123,600 appraised value of the entire parcel. The six property owners ultimately accepted the offers and paid cash totaling $3,119 for 22,278 square feet (less than one-half acre). Quit Claim
Deeds were prepared by the Board’s legal counsel, James J. Casby, Jr., executed by the Board President and Secretary, and issued to the property owners.

Meanwhile, City of Jacksonville Mayor Mick Toney and other interested citizens desirous of preserving the remaining large parcel as a city park, met with Board staff member Richard S. Perry on September 12, 1990, for the purpose of discussing ways of acquiring the property. ORS 273.201 provides the enabling legislation as follows:

It is the policy of the State of Oregon to give political subdivisions . . . the first opportunity . . . to purchase real property to be sold or disposed of by the State of Oregon. The state agency responsible for selling or transferring the property to a political subdivision may require that any real property sold or transferred . . . shall be for use for a public purpose or benefit, and not be for resale to a private purchaser.

Further negotiations and meetings eventually resulted in the three parties -- Jacksonville Woodlands Association, a not-for-profit corporation of private citizens interested in raising the funds to purchase the property for the City of Jacksonville; the City of Jacksonville; and the State Board of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Oregon -- reaching an agreement on the terms and conditions of a Land Sale Contract. The Contract, executed by the Board President and Secretary on October 25, 1991, required a down payment of ten percent or $12,360. An additional five percent, or $6,180, is due on or before January 1, 1992, with the balance of $105,060 due on or before October 31, 1992. If the Association is unable to pay the remaining principal balance on or before that date, the Association will make six equal, semi-annual, principal and interest (ten percent) payments of $20,698.66 each between November 1, 1992 and October 31, 1995. Upon receipt of the full selling price of $123,600, plus accrued interest, if any, the Board’s staff will issue a Bargain and Sale Deed to the City of Jacksonville for the majority
of the approximately 20-acre parcel, and a Quit Claim Deed for three very small parcels of property at the western boundary for which the title company could not ascertain that the Board had clear title. The deeds were prepared by the Board's legal counsel, Assistant Attorney General James Mattis, and have been executed by Board President and Secretary.

One of the conditions in the Land Sale Contract, to which the City of Jacksonville agreed, requires that, as soon as title is conveyed to the City, the City will dedicate use of the property in perpetuity as a "Natural Park."

The proceeds of the sale will be used by the University of Oregon to increase the fund used to organize, equip, and maintain a professorship known as the Beekman Professorship of Northwest and Pacific History, as directed in the will of Carrie C. Beekman, dated October 13, 1947.

(No Board action required.)

Ms. Wilson reported that the Committee had reviewed the Internal Audit Quarterly Report and the report on the Financial Information System. Specifically within the Audit report was a report from Portland State University concerning a bulk cash review of the cashier's office. This item raised the question of what services were being provided on all of the campuses and whether there was duplication with those provided by the outside community. A related question was what can institutions afford to provide and what should be privatized.

In the Financial Information System report, the challenge that has been accepted by the Chancellor's office and the institutions is how to offer a new financial information system at 70 percent of current costs. Reports will be forthcoming.

Introduction

At the September 27, 1991, meeting of the State Board of Higher Education, a staff strategy and proposal were presented for consideration regarding intercollegiate athletic programs. After lengthy discussion, the Board voted to delay action on the
staff recommendation until sufficient public response and comment had been obtained and analyzed.

Subsequently, three public hearings were conducted, and numerous letters and phone calls were received. Attendance at the Corvallis hearing was estimated around 100, with 27 signing up to testify. In Eugene, attendance was estimated around 200. Thirty-four people testified. The Portland hearing drew approximately 100 people with 34 testifying.

In Corvallis and Eugene, support for the staff recommendation was roughly two-to-one. At the Portland hearing, support for the recommendation ran roughly four-to-one. Support for the proposal broke into two categories: those who supported sports because it was good for students and the institution, and those who supported sports because it was good for business. A main source of support for athletics came from "booster" type organizations and members who testified that sports have a role in the development of students and institutions. Some faculty testified that sports were "as important as arts and drama" in providing a well-rounded educational experience.

Opposition to the proposal, while not limited to students, was expressed most strongly and passionately by them, including members of the Oregon Student Lobby. Most often, opposition to the proposal was placed in the context of the recent tuition increase and program reductions. Some faculty members also expressed opposition to the recommendation. Representatives of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate were present at all three hearings, and re-emphasized their opposition to the proposal. Testimony opposing the recommendation appeared to be based, in part, on an assumption that the Board has the ability to "trade-off" resources. In other words, if funds were not used in support of intercollegiate athletics, they could be directed to support other functions of higher education such as academic programs or tuition reduction. Regrettably, the Board has not found that to be an option because of continuing costs related to closing athletic programs.

As of October 23, 1991, over 130 letters had been received by the Board and the Chancellor on the issue of intercollegiate athletic funding. Of
those letters, 61 were supportive of the proposal and 69 opposed. The Office of Public Affairs established a telephone "hotline" for citizens seeking additional information on athletic funding or wishing to register an opinion. A total of 38 people have called, 31 indicating support of, and seven opposed to, the proposal.

Staff Report to the Board

At the June 14, 1990, meeting of the State Board of Higher Education, a detailed report was made on the status of intercollegiate athletics. A significant portion of that report dealt with the issue of deficits at the three universities, and the fiscal solutions required for them to remain in current athletic conferences without incurring greater deficits. The conclusion stated in the June 1990 report was that there was little or no room for reduction of expenditures under current conditions of competition and conference affiliations. The solution presented at that time was to look to the resource side if the current level of competition was to be maintained. The following assumptions were made about resources:

1) Support from incidental fees would not be increased faster than inflation;

2) Contributions would be increased only marginally;

3) Admission charges for athletic events were at or approaching the maximum;

4) Television, conference shares, and concession income were likely to increase only marginally or not at all; and

5) The only remaining resources available for 1990-91 were tuition waivers and the use of other institutional funds.

The Board made the following recommendations concerning resources:

1) Authorize tuition waivers at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University
in a sum sufficient that, in combination with recommendations 2 and 3 below, would permit a balanced budget;

2) At the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University, allow the use of institutional funds for coaches' salaries in non-revenue sports (five men's and all women's sports) as is now permitted at the colleges; and

3) Authorize the use of institutional funds for academic support, operation, and maintenance of facilities.

The Board's policies were implemented by the institutions and, for 1990-91, the athletic departments did not incur additional deficits. The University of Oregon authorized $242,500 in fee waivers, transferred $397,900 from athletic department building and equipment reserves, and applied $61,600 of general institution resources to cover coaches' salaries for non-revenue sports. Oregon State University authorized $625,680 in fee waivers, transferred $436,000 in expenditures associated with facilities, student support, and institutional PAC-10 and NCAA dues to the Educational and General budget, and covered expenditures associated with non-revenue sports coaches' salaries of $420,252 from general institution resources. Portland State University authorized $200,000 in fee waivers. Without the funding solutions provided by the Board, the 1990-91, athletic department annual operating deficits would have been: University of Oregon, $702,000; Oregon State University, $1,481,932; and Portland State University, $200,000. As of June 30, 1991, the athletic cumulative deficits are as follows: University of Oregon, $1,728,537; Oregon State University, $3,001,338; and Portland State University, $1,609,329.

It is apparent, in reviewing the most conservative and realistic revenue and expense projections for university intercollegiate athletics, that the revenues generated by men's football and basketball, TV and radio contracts, concessions and private gifts cannot sustain the current programs. Each of these programs at the University of Oregon
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and Oregon State University have the minimum number of sports and participants to meet NCAA Division I and PAC-10 requirements, as well as meet the Board's and State of Oregon's requirement that there exist equal opportunities for female and male student athletes. The reasons for this conclusion are:

1) Expenditures will continue to outstrip the ability to raise revenues from gate receipts and gifts. A five-year projection of operating revenues and expenditures reveals the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$12.8</td>
<td>$13.8</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
<td>$14.9</td>
<td>$15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>&lt;$1.9&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$2.5&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$3.3&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$3.4&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$4.4&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$11.1</td>
<td>$11.5</td>
<td>$11.8</td>
<td>$12.4</td>
<td>$12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>&lt;$1.7&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$2.2&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$2.6&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$2.9&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$3.4&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$ 2.6</td>
<td>$ 2.8</td>
<td>$ 3.0</td>
<td>$ 3.2</td>
<td>$ 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>&lt;$ .2&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$ .3&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$ .4&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$ .5&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;$ .6&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expenditure estimates for the five-year period do not contemplate any additions to the number of sports currently offered, or any increase in expenditures to become more competitive. In fact, the budgets for 1991-92 were reduced in many areas, and modest inflationary increases of three-to-five percent were projected for most program areas.

An example of rising costs for athletics can be found in the $500 surcharge on tuition for 1991-1993. This increase in tuition is a cost increase being passed on to the athletic departments, greatly impacting their costs for grants-in-aid. For example, the tuition increase for 1991-92 at the University of Oregon
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will increase the cost of operation by nearly $400,000.

2) Revenue increases from current sources are limited. Support from student incidental fees can, and should be, increased. However, the increases should be proportional to inflation. Increased income from private contributions are a possibility. However, private giving would need to grow from 150-to-200 percent to offset the current imbalance between revenue and expenditures. Currently, Oregon PAC-10 institution ticket prices are at the top of PAC-10 institutions. Therefore, only marginal increases can be projected without resulting in loss of income due to declining attendance. While team win/loss records directly impact attendance and revenues, assuming a team will be competing each year for a conference championship is extremely dangerous. Conference, regional, and national television income could, and perhaps should, be shared more equitably. However, those are issues that must be solved on a national level and Oregon cannot place its funding hopes on such action occurring in the near future.

3) The Legislative action to decouple Sports Action Lottery from the regular lottery will provide much needed help to finance intercollegiate athletics. However, it is not the total answer to the athletic funding crisis. In 1989, the original projections were that Sports Action would generate $8 million annually. The actual experience the past two years shows that it generated $2.3 million in 1989-90, and $2.4 million in 1990-91. Current estimates by the Lottery Commission are that Sports Action, in 1991-1993, will generate $1.95 million per year, less than the $2.3 million generated in 1990-91. The reason for the reduced income from Sports Lottery is that the decoupling legislation also limited the games to "an electronic lottery game or games." Therefore, the "scratch games" will not be available to Sports Action, thus the reduced income estimate. With annual income of $1.95 million, the University of Oregon and Oregon State University would realize
$575,000; Portland State University $292,000; and each of the colleges, $68,000.

4) Dropping out of the PAC-10 Conference is not a viable strategy to reduce costs. If the University of Oregon and Oregon State University were to drop out of the PAC-10 Conference and NCAA Division 1A, the number of sports supported could be reduced, thereby reducing expenditures for grants-in-aid, coaches' salaries, and travel costs. But they would no longer receive revenue from major bowl games and television, and gate receipts could be severely reduced. The negative impact on ability to generate gift income would be great. Dropping out of NCAA Division IA level of competition would reduce expenditures but also would reduce revenues, resulting in the need for institutional funds to be continued at 1990-91 or greater levels to sustain minimal programs with equal opportunities for women and men.

It is the staff's assumption that continued intercollegiate athletic competition at the existing levels, with the University of Oregon and Oregon State University remaining as full participants in the PAC-10, is in the best interests of the universities and the people of Oregon. Therefore, the key question is how to continue to support these programs at their current levels of performance, while continuing to provide high quality competitive and developmental experiences for male and female students with athletic talents.

It is clear that, while revenues from men's football and basketball can support themselves, the revenues can no longer support the full range of programs required to sustain equal participation by women and men without exerting the extreme pressures of a "win at any cost" philosophy on the students and coaches to fill the stadium and arena. This latter approach is one Oregon has avoided and should continue to reject. Intercollegiate athletic programs in Oregon have been operating with a high level of integrity, and with a sense of responsibility toward assuring that students receive degrees. That is the primary responsibility of the institutions.
Therefore, the issue is how to provide the resources needed to sustain quality athletic programs at current levels. The staff has developed the following strategy for the Board's consideration.
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#### REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Games</strong></td>
<td>3,101,741</td>
<td>3,002,810</td>
<td>2,789,192</td>
<td>3,764,841</td>
<td>3,137,860</td>
<td>3,831,310</td>
<td>3,601,310</td>
<td>3,762,480</td>
<td>3,561,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Away Games/Post Season</strong></td>
<td>1,436,372</td>
<td>1,057,719</td>
<td>2,088,253</td>
<td>1,588,428</td>
<td>1,141,500</td>
<td>816,500</td>
<td>991,500</td>
<td>1,016,500</td>
<td>966,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAC 10 Revenue</strong></td>
<td>1,095,302</td>
<td>1,459,008</td>
<td>1,791,031</td>
<td>1,708,624</td>
<td>2,082,200</td>
<td>2,082,200</td>
<td>2,082,200</td>
<td>2,082,200</td>
<td>2,082,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Television and Radio</strong></td>
<td>515,983</td>
<td>686,073</td>
<td>780,204</td>
<td>792,235</td>
<td>784,972</td>
<td>819,732</td>
<td>844,324</td>
<td>859,654</td>
<td>859,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Incid. Fee</strong></td>
<td>1,155,000</td>
<td>1,186,650</td>
<td>1,314,000</td>
<td>1,191,550</td>
<td>1,091,550</td>
<td>1,091,550</td>
<td>1,091,550</td>
<td>1,091,550</td>
<td>1,091,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contributions</strong></td>
<td>1,150,678</td>
<td>1,700,508</td>
<td>1,408,505</td>
<td>1,997,948</td>
<td>1,568,800</td>
<td>1,602,214</td>
<td>1,603,000</td>
<td>1,603,000</td>
<td>1,603,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports Action Lottery</strong></td>
<td>137,083</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>575,000</td>
<td>575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Revenues</strong></td>
<td>416,268</td>
<td>644,457</td>
<td>836,271</td>
<td>310,397</td>
<td>500,167</td>
<td>507,616</td>
<td>520,404</td>
<td>533,832</td>
<td>547,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Support</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>8,871,344</td>
<td>9,763,025</td>
<td>10,999,069</td>
<td>11,611,473</td>
<td>10,877,774</td>
<td>11,326,122</td>
<td>11,769,288</td>
<td>11,534,216</td>
<td>11,323,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers In:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building and Equip Res.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>8,871,344</td>
<td>9,763,025</td>
<td>10,999,069</td>
<td>12,061,473</td>
<td>10,877,774</td>
<td>11,326,122</td>
<td>11,769,288</td>
<td>11,534,216</td>
<td>11,323,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEBT RETIREMENT REVENUE

- **Ticket Surcharges**
- **Lease Income (Autzen)**
- **Eugene/Springfield/Lane C. Skye/Sites/Sponsors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ticket Surcharges</strong></td>
<td>474,252</td>
<td>430,505</td>
<td>543,894</td>
<td>401,000</td>
<td>482,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>482,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lease Income (Autzen)</strong></td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>542,500</td>
<td>1,082,500</td>
<td>1,082,500</td>
<td>1,082,500</td>
<td>1,082,500</td>
<td>1,082,500</td>
<td>1,082,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eugene/Springfield/Lane C. Skye/Sites/Sponsors</strong></td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Debt Retire. Rev.</strong></td>
<td>564,252</td>
<td>430,505</td>
<td>543,894</td>
<td>401,000</td>
<td>482,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>482,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>8,871,344</td>
<td>10,237,287</td>
<td>11,429,574</td>
<td>13,952,350</td>
<td>12,627,274</td>
<td>12,980,692</td>
<td>12,391,788</td>
<td>13,186,716</td>
<td>12,945,734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURES

- **Coaches Payroll, plus OPE**
- **Financial Aid**
- **Game and Event Expense**
- **Other Direct Sports Rel.**
- **Promotion/Fund Raising**
- **Administration/Facilities**
- **Other(Counseling/Vancash)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Exp.</strong></td>
<td>8,588,619</td>
<td>9,892,925</td>
<td>11,658,196</td>
<td>12,061,471</td>
<td>12,742,662</td>
<td>13,656,577</td>
<td>14,004,475</td>
<td>14,754,614</td>
<td>15,595,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repair &amp; Replacement Res.</strong></td>
<td>(186,368)</td>
<td>(184,036)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(131,966)</td>
<td>(131,966)</td>
<td>(131,966)</td>
<td>(131,966)</td>
<td>(131,966)</td>
<td>(131,966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess (Deficit) Operat.</strong></td>
<td>282,725</td>
<td>(316,206)</td>
<td>(843,163)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1,996,954)</td>
<td>(2,462,421)</td>
<td>(3,367,153)</td>
<td>(3,352,364)</td>
<td>(4,040,713)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Transfers — Debt Retirement

- **Surcharges to Plant Funds**
- **Operating Indebtedness**
- **Bond Debt Retirement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Transfers</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(474,252)</td>
<td>(430,505)</td>
<td>(1,809,879)</td>
<td>(1,462,814)</td>
<td>(1,471,625)</td>
<td>(1,456,037)</td>
<td>(1,476,327)</td>
<td>(1,464,809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess (Deficit) Athletic</strong></td>
<td>282,725</td>
<td>(316,206)</td>
<td>(843,163)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,997,168)</td>
<td>(2,566,546)</td>
<td>(3,497,690)</td>
<td>(3,651,191)</td>
<td>(4,554,022)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Away Games/Post Season</td>
<td>1,552,605</td>
<td>1,463,815</td>
<td>2,221,305</td>
<td>1,262,716</td>
<td>1,660,900</td>
<td>1,581,635</td>
<td>1,421,635</td>
<td>1,541,635</td>
<td>1,461,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC 10 Revenue</td>
<td>1,122,440</td>
<td>1,276,534</td>
<td>1,721,772</td>
<td>1,325,866</td>
<td>1,419,734</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television and Radio</td>
<td>167,725</td>
<td>194,609</td>
<td>270,869</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>609,500</td>
<td>609,500</td>
<td>609,500</td>
<td>609,500</td>
<td>609,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>1,107,612</td>
<td>1,737,500</td>
<td>1,504,605</td>
<td>1,766,322</td>
<td>1,477,964</td>
<td>1,478,000</td>
<td>1,478,000</td>
<td>1,478,000</td>
<td>1,478,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Incid. Fee</td>
<td>627,750</td>
<td>703,385</td>
<td>727,531</td>
<td>763,907</td>
<td>802,104</td>
<td>842,209</td>
<td>884,320</td>
<td>926,536</td>
<td>974,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Action Lottery</td>
<td>318,079</td>
<td>344,163</td>
<td>299,954</td>
<td>508,169</td>
<td>579,340</td>
<td>579,000</td>
<td>579,000</td>
<td>579,000</td>
<td>579,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>1,481,932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Operating Revenue: 6,279,493

| Transfers In: Building and Equip Res. | 7,989,434 | 9,079,887 | 10,223,085 | 9,375,014 | 9,310,890 | 9,183,001 | 9,537,211 | 9,453,643 |

### EXPENDITURES

| Coaches Payroll, plus OPE | 1,446,324 | 1,397,416 | 1,535,830 | 1,776,468 | 1,918,472 | 2,012,674 | 2,113,304 | 2,218,971 |
| Financial Aid | 1,041,892 | 1,144,430 | 1,238,596 | 1,326,832 | 1,475,526 | 1,564,057 | 1,532,752 | 1,686,026 |
| Game and Event Expense | 1,348,383 | 1,535,703 | 1,700,924 | 1,852,222 | 1,937,696 | 2,000,033 | 2,044,425 | 2,094,225 |
| Other Direct Sports Rel. | 1,268,075 | 1,357,033 | 1,700,924 | 1,852,222 | 1,937,696 | 2,000,033 | 2,044,425 | 2,094,225 |
| Promotion/Fund Raising | 299,026 | 331,077 | 836,349 | 840,655 | 817,100 | 846,265 | 888,579 | 933,007 |
| Administration/Facilities | 1,239,877 | 1,214,315 | 1,649,526 | 1,931,869 | 2,079,388 | 2,135,199 | 2,298,708 | 2,396,643 |
| Other (Counseling/Noncash) | 122,838 | 299,413 | 299,593 | 271,973 | 452,131 | 459,879 | 485,934 | 500,289 |

Total Operating Expend.: 6,766,415

| Excess (Deficit) Operat. | (486,922) | (905,937) | (461,389) | (238,820) | (1,172,982) | (2,183,656) | (2,661,545) | (2,881,388) |

| Transfers - Debt Retirement |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |

| Surcharges to Plant Funds | (52,375) | (54,309) | (60,000) | (60,000) | (60,000) | (60,000) | (60,000) | (60,000) |
| Operating Indebtedness | (10,695) | (287,000) | (287,000) | (287,000) | (287,000) | (287,000) | (287,000) | (287,000) |
| Bond Debt Retirement | 0 | (143,000) | (145,000) | (517,000) | (516,000) | (509,000) |

Total Transfers: 0

| Excess (Deficit) Athletic | (486,922) | (814,725) | (345,972) | (3) | (1,901,982) | (2,374,656) | (3,224,545) | (3,443,398) |

| Excess (Deficit) Athletic | (486,922) | (814,725) | (345,972) | (3) | (1,901,982) | (2,374,656) | (3,224,545) | (3,443,398) |

504
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 87-88</th>
<th>Actual 88-89</th>
<th>Actual 89-90</th>
<th>Actual 90-91</th>
<th>Estimated 91-92</th>
<th>Estimated 92-93</th>
<th>Estimated 93-94</th>
<th>Estimated 94-95</th>
<th>Estimated 95-96</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>199,730</td>
<td>395,221</td>
<td>527,294</td>
<td>734,283</td>
<td>669,000</td>
<td>707,133</td>
<td>747,440</td>
<td>790,044</td>
<td>835,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Incidental Fees</td>
<td>848,434</td>
<td>995,729</td>
<td>1,128,757</td>
<td>1,202,475</td>
<td>1,239,212</td>
<td>1,199,653</td>
<td>1,247,649</td>
<td>1,297,555</td>
<td>1,349,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>71,252</td>
<td>207,848</td>
<td>314,667</td>
<td>271,313</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>330,750</td>
<td>347,286</td>
<td>364,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Action Lottery</td>
<td>69,564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>291,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36,436</td>
<td>88,426</td>
<td>135,908</td>
<td>172,382</td>
<td>102,580</td>
<td>108,735</td>
<td>115,259</td>
<td>122,174</td>
<td>129,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td>1,155,852</td>
<td>1,687,224</td>
<td>2,176,190</td>
<td>2,580,453</td>
<td>2,601,792</td>
<td>2,621,531</td>
<td>2,732,098</td>
<td>2,848,061</td>
<td>2,969,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>419,713</td>
<td>456,613</td>
<td>673,770</td>
<td>841,386</td>
<td>768,040</td>
<td>821,803</td>
<td>879,329</td>
<td>940,882</td>
<td>1,006,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>354,775</td>
<td>370,054</td>
<td>400,404</td>
<td>471,313</td>
<td>516,000</td>
<td>546,960</td>
<td>579,778</td>
<td>614,564</td>
<td>651,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operations</td>
<td>1,023,643</td>
<td>1,054,679</td>
<td>1,243,677</td>
<td>1,267,754</td>
<td>1,329,112</td>
<td>1,422,150</td>
<td>1,521,700</td>
<td>1,628,219</td>
<td>1,742,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Exp.</strong></td>
<td>1,798,131</td>
<td>1,881,346</td>
<td>2,317,851</td>
<td>2,580,453</td>
<td>2,613,152</td>
<td>2,790,913</td>
<td>2,980,807</td>
<td>3,183,665</td>
<td>3,400,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (Deficit) Oper.</td>
<td>(642,279)</td>
<td>(194,122)</td>
<td>(141,681)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(11,360)</td>
<td>(169,382)</td>
<td>(248,709)</td>
<td>(335,604)</td>
<td>(430,687)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers — Debt Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Indebtedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(145,500)</td>
<td>(145,500)</td>
<td>(145,500)</td>
<td>(145,500)</td>
<td>(145,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess (Deficit) Athletic</td>
<td>(642,279)</td>
<td>(194,122)</td>
<td>(141,681)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(156,660)</td>
<td>(314,882)</td>
<td>(394,209)</td>
<td>(461,104)</td>
<td>(576,187)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Recommendation

The staff recommendation was in three parts: First, the State System should continue to provide a top quality choice of intercollegiate athletic experiences to qualified female and male students while continuing to demonstrate the highest standards of ethical practices. This goal can be achieved only by continuing to authorize the use of institutional funding for support of nonrevenue sports. Second, the university presidents be charged to adhere to the following conditions as a prerequisite to the authorization of the use of institutional funding:

1. Continue to be aggressive advocates within the NCAA to change policies that will reduce costs;

2. Reduce athletic programs' expenditures to the new NCAA policy minimums at the earliest appropriate time;

3. Limit growth in the annual operating budget of the athletic department to a level comparable to the growth in the institution's education and general budget;

4. Operate the athletic department within available resources, i.e. further deficits are unacceptable; and

5. Continue the annual audits of the athletic department finances by the System's Internal Audit Division and annually report the results to the Board along with comments by the presidents of the three universities regarding the financial situation of their athletic programs, as well as the graduation rates of student athletes and integrity of program practices.

Finally, with the above conditions as a prerequisite, the staff recommended that the Board of Higher Education authorize the following as a permanent athletic funding policy:

1) Authorize grants-in-aid support funded from university resources at a level
equiv. to cost of instruction

times num. of student athletes who
received their degrees the prior academic
year. A two-year phase-in period will be
provided in which institutional grants-
in-aid support will not exceed the num.
awarded to students competing in non-rev-
enue generating sports.

2) Continue to permit, at the University of
Oregon, Oregon State University, and
Portland State University, the use of
institutional funds for coaches' compen-
sation in non-revenue sports to provide
comparable opportunities for female and
male student athletes.

3) Require that all academic support provid-
ed to student athletes be the responsi-

4) Continue to authorize appropriate insti-
tutional funds for operation and main-
tenance of facilities not dedicated sole-
ly to men’s football or basketball to
ensure that comparable facilities are
available to women and men athletes.

5) Require that a sum equal to 50 percent of
the annual Sports Action Lottery receipts
be set aside to repay accumulated defi-
cits. After repayment of all deficits,
these funds are available for operating
expenses.

6) Assist the implementation of the above
policies by providing the University of
Oregon and Oregon State University each
$1,500,000 per year, and Portland State
University $350,000 from System
resources.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Richardson called on Dr. Bonnie Staebler,
President of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate
(IFS) to speak to the issue of funding for inter-
collegiate athletics.
Dr. Staebler restated the position of the IFS, that they were unalterably opposed to the use of general education funds for the purpose of athletics. This, she said, was not a vote against athletics, but rather a vote for academics. Faculty senates at all eight institutions have discussed the issue and have voted in support of the resolution.

"Throughout the state, the faculty voice has been clear. We feel that to fund intercollegiate athletics from general fund monies represents a tremendous financial and political risk."

Dr. Staebler continued that the IFS has done an analysis that indicates that the deficit will continue to grow, even with a $16.8 million bailout, to a total of $19 million by June 1996. Using these figures, they submitted that the increased deficit is unavoidable. Presidents of the institutions have worked on the deficit for years, but they continue to grow, she asserted. "To make a permanent change as is called for in the present plan, in the funding of any programs, is ill-advised and IFS stands in opposition." Given this stand, and to honor the Board's request for suggestions, Dr. Staebler presented the following alternatives:

First, IFS "believes that a state of emergency exists around this issue," and that a plan for the Emergency Board of the Legislature needs to be developed to repay the deficit over two or three years. The plan could include matching funds from private donations.

Second, the IFS called for a full range of alternatives with specifically documented outcomes. The IFS "does not support the conclusion in the staff report" that it is often a question of funding or not funding. The conclusions and position statements must have supportive documentation so that "faculty can be convinced that alternatives have been fully explored." Those alternatives might include:

1. Detailed analysis of the option of dropping from the PAC-10.

2. Same standards applied to athletic programs that are applied to academic pro-
grams relative to their centrality to the mission of the institutions. "Are athletics more central to an institution's mission than a school of education? Or a health and human performance program?"

3. A full impact study of direct and indirect costs of dropping from intercollegiate athletics.

4. "Belt-tightening approach," as the IFS simply is not convinced that this has been sufficiently accomplished.

5. The NCAA should be approached and asked to consider changes in national policies and practices. Would the NCAA, for example, accept the idea of System accreditation, rather than on an individualized basis?

Dr. Staebler concluded, "the IFS wants to help. We stand ready with accountants, sociologists, and if you count me, even a special educator. We offer our assistance. We believe, however, that the risks of going forward with this plan are extremely high. . .To accomplish this task, we realize would require a postponement of the Board's decision. We feel it is warranted."

Dr. Staebler introduced Dr. Bob McCoy, president of the Association of Oregon Faculties (AOF), who indicated that the comments of Dr. Staebler epitomized the feelings of the faculty in general, the majority of the faculty in the state of Oregon. IFS, he said, had taken the lead with faculty on the issue of funding for intercollegiate athletics. The AOF conducted an informal telephone poll of their Executive Board and officers, and the vote was nine to one against the plan before the Board. "We are concerned because, as we get ready for the next legislative session, a 'yes' vote would be sending absolutely the wrong message to the citizens of Oregon who already claim that we've cried wolf to the last legislature. . .The AOF knows that we're in for the very fight of our lives during the next legislative session. We're not taking a stand on whether there should be intercollegiate athletics or not. We're just concerned about sending the wrong message."
President Richardson introduced Dr. Jean Stockard, president of the Oregon Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Dr. Stockard referred to a national policy report issued in December 1989, in which "the AAUP stressed the central role of the faculty in reviewing priorities of athletic programs. The statement emphasized, 'the obligation of the faculty to ensure academic primacy in an institution's athletic program. The faculty has a vital role to play in assessing the educational and budgetary implications of decisions concerning the scope of the athletic program. It is in this spirit and with this mandate that the Executive Board of the Oregon Conference of the AAUP voted unanimously in the fall of last year, to protest the proposal to admit additional students to cover tuition costs for athletes. Again, this fall, we voted to oppose the current proposal for permanent allocation of money to offset deficits within the athletic department. Such an allocation within the present budgetary situation would harm the basic academic mission of our universities and colleges. The purpose of the State System of Higher Education is to provide quality education to the young people of the state, and to promote knowledge and research that can help our citizenry. The first priority must be academic programs, and these have already been substantially weakened; they should not be subjected to further cuts in order that a non-academic program can be maintained.

"We, the AAUP, strongly support the IFS request that you explore options other than the ones currently proposed, and urge you to follow the AAUP policy recommendations and involve the faculty on the respective institutions in your deliberations regarding the future of athletic funding. The faculty have sent a strong message that they do not believe that the present proposed solution is academically defensible, but they are very willing to work with you to find better alternatives."

Mr. Richardson called on Ms. Jennifer Bills, president of the Associated Students at the University of Oregon and Chair of the Oregon Student Lobby (OSL). Ms. Bills welcomed the Board to the University of Oregon and thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak. "The OSL commends the Board for the open and interactive process provided in reach-
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...ing a decision point. Student leaders across the state remain opposed to the use of state general fund dollars to fund intercollegiate athletics at the three universities. Students do not oppose athletic programs, but cannot justify the expenditure in light of the extreme academic and access need of the System. These needs include decent levels for our faculty salaries, adequate libraries, and basic program choices for students. The needs include restoring the thousands of students who have been cut from the System. The funds proposed for athletics are only the beginning. The gap between income and expenses is expected to grow and will require an even greater expenditure of state funds in the future.

"We urge the Board to move rapidly to explore other options for stable funding for intercollegiate athletics." Ms. Bills closed by reading comments from students at the University of Oregon, and offering the support of the students to work with the Board to find alternatives to the present proposal.

Mr. Richardson reminded the Board that the topic facing them has been a very difficult and controversial one. "We have spent months considering how to solve the state's problem of funding for intercollegiate athletics. It has been particularly frustrating knowing that the origins of the problem antedate all of us on the Board, and all of the staff whom we have called upon to devise the strategy to solve this problem; a problem that has plagued Oregon higher education for at least 15 years.

"We have held hearings with faculty, students, and other citizens. We have met with editorial boards. We have met with the Governor, and a number of individual legislators. We have prepared fact sheets -- all in an attempt to clarify the nature of the funding problem for athletics. On Wednesday, the Governor wrote each of us expressing her strong concerns regarding funding for intercollegiate athletics. I personally share many of the concerns she expressed in the letter.

"Through the last month, regretfully, we seem not to have been as successful as we would have liked in communicating that our choices are not as simple
as putting funds into supporting the current level of the athletic endeavor on the one hand, or on the other hand, using those monies to reduce tuition, support new academic programs, or to restore some that were cut as the consequences of Measure 5. The current sports programs within the universities meet the minimum federal and state requirements for men's and women's athletics. And the program also meets the minimum requirements of the NCAA conference affiliations of the three universities. Our problem is that, while we have incurred capital operating debts, capital debt occurred because of the need to improve facilities to attract student athletes and to attract paying fans. In 1981, the State Board decided to finance university intercollegiate athletic programs without using any state dollars. That means that we are dependent on gifts and revenue-producing sports, which are limited to football and men's basketball at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. That strategy has not worked as evidenced by the $6.3 million of accumulated deficits that we have financed by utilizing cash reserves of other auxiliary enterprises.

"It is a real debt. From both legal and moral perspectives, it must be repaid. Over the last few years, several approaches have been tried as we and former Boards have searched for ways to fund intercollegiate athletics. Plus there were other attempts such as: a failed bailout measure in 1988 called, "one cent for sports;" a failed budget request from then Governor Goldschmidt in the 1989 Legislature to provide direct state support for the non-revenue producing sports such as softball, volleyball, tennis, swimming, and the like; Sports Action in 1989, which passed the legislature but, because of a shortfall in the revenues from the general Lottery and the provision within the Sports Action legislation that required it to make up the shortfall, hardly any money was realized. Specifically, there was just over $400,000 received out of an expected $16 million.

"In 1991, the Oregon legislature decoupled Sports Action from the general lottery, but at the same time, the revenue estimates for 1991-93 were about one-quarter of the estimates of the prior biennium. Make no mistake about it -- Sports Action Lottery money is critical to any solution because, without
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it, our problem would be much worse than the $3.3 million we now have. Meanwhile, as these various ideas for funding alternatives have failed, the deficits have grown larger and now exceed $6 million. This Board, in June of 1990, accepted the fact that it was not able to continue financing the debt internally, and acted to stop the accumulation of greater deficits. We required the presidents to balance the budgets of their athletic programs, and gave them the option to use institutional funds on a one-year basis. That brings us to our problem today.

"You have heard Chancellor Bartlett and Vice Chancellor Ihrig both tell this Board that, if we terminate all intercollegiate athletic programs, it will still be necessary to pay -- with institutional dollars -- our remaining contractual obligations. The current proposal before us, in my opinion, is extremely well thought out and innovative. However, to remain sensitive and responsive to those opposing the use of institutional funds, we will continue to seek an alternative to the use of those funds. So, at this time, I am prepared to ask the Board to consider the following:

1. Set aside the current proposal.
2. Reaffirm the present policy that intercollegiate athletics are integral to the educational experience.
3. Sustain each campus conference affiliation, including UO and OSU PAC-10 affiliation, which most people have said is appropriate.
4. Appointment, by the Board chair, of a Task Force on Funding of Intercollegiate Athletics whose charge will be to find a more acceptable way out of the present dilemma. We welcome the support that the Governor has given to this particular proposal. The group is to include: two members of the Board, one of whom will serve as chair; two presidents, one each from a college and university; three people who are associated with foundations of the three universities, one coming from each campus; one representa-
"Presumably, the Task Force will take into consideration all of the suggestions we received from faculty, students, citizens, and state officials. I also would expect the Board and the Task Force to accept the Governor's commitment to assist in this effort. I would ask this Task Force to begin its work January 1992 and give us a report in April so that we can have the benefit of the recommendations for Board action by June 1992. Legally, we must meet our financial obligations. So, to that extent, we must use whatever funds are available to us to cover our current costs. This means that we will begin immediately to seek additional outside funding. However, institutional funds will be used to make up the difference between additional outside resources and our total financial obligation.

"Therefore, I would entertain a motion to support the above recommendation, and then we can follow that by Board debate and discussion."

It was so moved. Mr. Bailey initiated the discussion by asking if the exact dollar amount required to support athletics in fiscal year 1991-92 was $3.3 million, and if the Board would be committing this just until the end of the year. Chancellor Bartlett responded that the State System would, in effect, put in escrow an amount of money up to that amount, which may or may not be spent depending on success in securing funds from other sources. The full answer to the question cannot be known until the Task Force has completed its work and alternatives found.

Mr. Miller asked why the differential in the deficit between the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. Vice Chancellor Ihrig reminded Mr. Miller that last year the University of Oregon had received an unrestricted gift to the athletic department of approximately $600,000 that reduced the deficit. Taking that into account, the deficits would be approximately the same for the University of Oregon and Oregon State University.

Mr. Miller observed that if the Board were forced by a Measure 5-type situation to look at a scenario
where one of the two universities had to be taken out of the PAC-10 Conference and the other left in, then there would be a significant financial impact.

Mr. Swanson indicated that he had written a statement concerning his position and read the following:

"Mr. President, I think this issue is one that is most important to all of us. It's certainly been important to the public and a number of people have expressed their viewpoints to us, and so I want to express my own viewpoints. I did take some time to write them out because I thought it was important that the public know what our positions are with regard to something that has received this much attention. So I want to take just a couple of minutes to say what my position is.

"Competitive activities that require the skillful and tenacious application of the mind, the body, and the emotions have an honored and rightful place in American education and in American higher education. And I think of such activities as music, dance, theatre, and athletics. All have an important place in higher education. All require skilled behavior involving the mind, the body, and the emotions. The whole integrated human self at its highest skill level is the subject of admiration from all of us, whether it's MENAHIN on the violin, FONTAINE on the dance floor, GUINESS in the theatre, or JORDAN on the basketball court, we all admire heart, mind, and body when they are integrated into the best that human beings can perform. Competitive intercollegiate athletics for women in basketball, crew, gymnastics, swimming, softball, golf, tennis, volleyball, and competitive intercollegiate athletics for men in the same sports, and in baseball, football, wrestling, and others, have a rich and honored tradition in higher education. I do not believe that instruction in music, theatre, and dance, and tuition waivers for outstanding students in those fields can be paid for only out of revenue generated by university orchestras or bands or by the university theatre. It is appropriate to use some general funds to support faculty in these areas, and to provide educational opportunity for students who excel in these areas of performance."
"I believe the same is true for athletics. I believe we have an obligation to provide the highest level of competition and peer interaction for our student athletes, and I believe that the membership of the University of Oregon and Oregon State University in the PAC-10 Conference provides that opportunity for student athletes. I do not necessarily believe that participation in intercollegiate athletics results in increased support for strictly academic programs in the university. I do not believe that the positive effect of intercollegiate athletic contests on the local economies of Eugene or Corvallis justify the use of general funds to support intercollegiate athletics. And if I had $100,000 to give to higher education, I would give it as my own personal preference to philosophy, literature, political theory, and economics, and not to Duck or Beaver athletics.

"But the choice before us today is not necessarily to spend .3 of one percent of the annual higher education budget for either more professors or students, or both, in the classroom, or to spend it for coaching of non-revenue sports and tuition waivers for outstanding student athletes. If we don't spend the $3.5 million on non-revenue producing intercollegiate athletics, we will have to spend it on mothballing our facilities, paying off coaches contract salaries, or making up the revenue lost from sharing Rose Bowl and other proceeds with PAC-10 champions. And if there were actually an extra $3.5 million available to higher education, it might well be spent on taking care of some of the tiny part of the $200 million worth of deferred maintenance in our infrastructure rather than on more classroom instruction.

"So I understand the frustration and pain of faculty members who have lost positions, or who are some of the lowest paid amongst their positions, and I'm sympathetic to students who are paying increased tuition and costs. Many people, including the Governor, have expressed their opinions on this issue, and all of these viewpoints have merit and validity. Measure 5 looms on the horizon as the grim reaper of quality public services in this state, and I for one do not intend to send a message to voters that this is business as usual in higher education. It is not.
"In the summer of 1992, we may be forced to slash all of intercollegiate athletics, and to slash the universities and colleges in our System to the point that the academic rubble remaining will not be recognizable. But we aren't to doomsday yet, and I will not abandon reason, good faith, and an optimistic spirit until there is no alternative. Equity for participation in intercollegiate athletics was achieved many years ago. Both women's and men's teams now compete at the highest level of intercollegiate competition. But for the last 10 years we have required the revenue-producing sports of football and men's basketball to fund all other non-revenue coaches and athletics. It doesn't work. Student competition in non-revenue athletics requires some general fund revenue.

"Now that's my feeling about the issue. I think what we're going to decide today is to study it further, and to keep spending the money until April or May when the report comes back, and that's basically a continuation of the decision which we made a year ago to do something temporarily. I don't oppose studying the issue more. But I don't believe that we are going to be able to raise a private capital fund of $50 million that would reasonably spin off $3.3 million a year to support intercollegiate athletics. And so consequently, I believe that any delay that we make today in our decision is simply that. It's a delay. There are no other reasonable alternatives. This is not a choice between academics and athletics. It's a choice between athletic intercollegiate competition or spending the money to mothball facilities, and to make up for the deficits that we would experience if we are not in the level of competition that we are now in.

"I would prefer to vote on the issue today. If the issue were before me to vote on it in a permanent manner, I would vote yes. But I can also support your proposal, Mr. President, because I understand that it's consistent with my view. It's simply putting off the final decision to a later date, which I would prefer to make today."

Mr. Halsey thanked the many individuals responsible for the successful public hearings, indicating that they had provided a helpful forum for airing concerns, opinions, and suggestions. In concurring
with Mr. Swanson's statement, Mr. Halsey continued that he would endorse a postponement of a decision since the Board is looking at a proposal that will maintain a semblance of an athletic system post-Measure 5. "Infusing the $3.3 million in instituting this very progressive and forward-thinking plan will only solidify our position to the extent where we can build in the future." Mr. Halsey continued that the proposal presented by Mr. Richardson, while not making athletics immune to budget cuts in the future, does address the immediate problem of a deficit and provides hope that there will be replacement revenue in the future. "If solutions are not found, we will have to look at alternatives including removal of Oregon State University and the University of Oregon from the PAC-10. Your proposal, Mr. Richardson, is a very thoughtful one but I'm not quite sure that this will appease the public's opinions and questions that we need to address. I'm not convinced that the Task Force can come to any conclusions that have not already been presented to reduce the deficit. I will support the new proposal with the understanding that after more deliberation, the Board might come to the same conclusion."

Mr. Dodson expressed support for Mr. Richardson's alternate recommendations, indicating that if the Board voted on the original proposal, the signal that would be sent would be that the Board somehow saved intercollegiate athletics from elimination. "That would be the wrong signal."

Mr. Adams expressed the hope that the debate would not turn into an academics-versus-sports kind of issue. "I feel that we have to ask ourselves in the beginning: Are athletics important? I personally feel that they are a part of the student programs as much as other student activities are, as part of the total educational program. I believe there is a lot of sincere support, not just support from people who are 'non-thinking' types. I would say that the Board's proposal is not really a vote against academics, but a vote for athletics. I prefer the proposal submitted to the Board in September while at the same time admitting there are some circumstances which may make it better to delay temporarily a final decision."
Mr. Miller indicated support for Mr. Richardson's proposal on the grounds that he "believes that there is some hope for other funding." He went on to describe two roles for the Board.

"First, we must step up to the plate like we have never done before. And second, we must be creative like we have never been before. I think there are at least three possible areas that we should look at for starters.

"First, we should look at the old lottery standby. I think if we look at the $50-100 million every year that floats around because of PAC-10 participation in the state, even one or two percent equals the $3.3 million. Committing even more lottery proceeds is a viable option and one that we should look at very seriously.

"I think that there are other private funds that, as yet, are undefined. Third, there are areas that may come out of the Board's Administrative Review Committee's findings. We will find dollars there, not because the System is bad or rotten, but because it is a big system. I personally do not see a problem at looking very seriously, upfront, and openly with using savings that may be found in the review process for athletics.

"Once-and-for-all, we should say that athletics and participation in the PAC-10 are a valuable part of the instruction and academic process. We have not said that before. It is interesting to hear the IFS and others also say that, but I guess I would like to ask them at some point what value they put on it, since that is where they stop short. That is not intended as a criticism, but until that is directly faced, and until we say yes or no that we want athletics, then we can't go much farther. I think there is a lot of creative hope. I welcome very much the Governor's participation in the process. I support the new recommendation in part because it gives us public participation. If they are asked the question about helping for funding and say no -- folks, there is no issue."

Mr. Bailey indicated that he found an inconsistency in that everyone seemed to be supporting intercollegiate athletics, but finish the sentence with, "we'll postpone a commitment to fund them. That
decision has been put off for 15 years. If you go back and look at the Board minutes, this issue has been discussed every couple of years and now there is going to be another study. It would be my feeling today that we should take the positive approach that we think it is important and we obligate ourselves to fund it. If we can find other funds to decrease the taxpayers' obligations, let's do so. But I think the message we are sending is that we're not quite sure and we still have people sitting on the fence. I would like us today to make a decision one way or the other."

Mr. Richardson concluded the discussion by saying that "his personal feeling is that athletics are really only one small component of the educational experience and when we look at why our colleges and universities exist, the number one reason is for education -- the academics. Within that context, I believe we don't say often enough that we look at our faculty as our most valuable resource and our students as our most valued customers. I don't think this is an attempt to delay a decision and the appointment of a Task Force and the efforts to search immediately for alternative funding is the appropriate way to proceed."

Mr. Bailey asked Mr. Richardson what would happen if the Task Force were able to generate only a fraction of the needed resources. Would the present proposal commit the Board in the future? Mr. Richardson explained that, first of all, his assumption was that the Task Force would be successful and to say, at the outset, that we must be prepared in case they do not succeed, is to deny full support for the work of the Task Force.

Chancellor Bartlett remarked that he had been struck in the past few months by the usefulness of the process. One of the by-products of the process is that there is a reawakened concern for the academic strength of higher education. People have suddenly come to be concerned about things they have previously taken for granted. The Chancellor expressed concern for what seems to be an endless residue of friction that comes over intercollegiate athletics. "I think it's a terrible misuse of emotion and passion on all sides. Another thing that has come out of all of the debate is a deep sense of frustration among many people involved in
higher education. And there are very few places for that frustration to express itself. It would be unfortunate if the net result of taking out frustrations in the context of this issue then lead us to be less able to deal with the real problems, which are not athletic funding.

"The real issues are the whole financial organizational assumptions on which this state is going to conduct the higher education system. We must not let ourselves be deflected from the fundamental issues of public policy and think that is the 500-pound gorilla."

Mr. Richardson thanked the Chancellor and his staff for all the work done on this particular issue.

The Board voted to accept Mr. Richardson’s proposal and, on roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Davis, Dodson, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: None.

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

**Contracts for Professional Consulting Services**

An Agreement was negotiated with Moulds Mechanical Engineering Services, Eugene, for engineering services not to exceed $25,000.00. Financing will be provided from state funds.

**Award of Construction Contracts**

On October 8, 1991, Anderson Roofing Co., Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $36,941.00. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

On October 15, 1991, Mackay Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $62,840.00. Financing will be provided from hospital funds.
On October 8, 1991, Eagle Roofing Company was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $81,300.00. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

Acceptance of Projects

This project is complete and was accepted on October 18, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $326,670.00. Financing was provided from state, lottery, and gift funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on September 30, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $51,409.00. Financing was provided from state funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on October 25, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $57,413.00. Financing was provided from state lottery funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on August 19, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $324,224.00. Financing was provided from state funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on July 3, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $388,372.00. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.
This project is complete and was accepted on September 30, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $65,014.00. Financing was provided from student building reserve funds.

(No Board action required.)

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Halsey thanked the University of Oregon for their hospitality and excellent visit program.

Mr. Bailey indicated that the Joint Boards Committee would be meeting the first week in December. The major agenda topic will be a review of the decisions made at the Joint Board meeting and a plan to begin implementation of those decisions.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Mr. Richardson echoed Mr. Halsey's comments regarding the campus visit and the hospitality extended to the Board.

In addition, he thanked all of those who had participated in the rally prior to the Board and who stayed through the Board meeting.

The December meeting of the Board, if required, will be a meeting of the Executive Committee at Portland State University on December 20. Mr. Richardson asked the Board to empower the Executive Committee to vote and take action on any item that may come before it and, where necessary, take final action at the regular meeting in January.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

George E. Richardson, Jr., President

Virginia L. Thompson, Secretary
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Operating Budget, 1991-92, 339
Oregon Administrative Rules
Appeal of Grievance, 580-21-055, 224
Campus Housing Advisory Committee, 580-11-021, 118
Comprehensive Plan Coordination, 580-50-001, 211
Definition of Discrimination, 580-15-010, 229, 481
Employment Assistance to Students, 580-15-065, 229
Employment Discrimination, 580-22-050, 229
Firearms, Possession or Use of, 580-22-045(3), 19-21
Foundations, 580-46-005, 126
Grievance Procedures, 580-21-050, 380
Other Personnel Actions Not for Cause, 580-21-318, 224
Professional Activities-Outside Employment, 580-21-025, 203, 205, 328
Summer Session Fee Book, 580-40-035, 77, 81
Vacation Accrual, 580-21-030(2), 153
Oregon Arts Commission, 321, 447
Oregon Baccalaureate Bonds, 265
Oregon Business Council, 185
Oregon Cascade Plumbing & Heating, Inc., 165, 454
Oregon Community Colleges Services, 152
Oregon Conference of the American Association of University Professors Athletic Funding, 510
Oregon Department of Education, 161
Oregon Ed-Net, 158
Oregon Graduate Institute  
Council of Presidents, 376  
Work with OCATE, 412  
OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES  
UNIVERSITY  
Accreditation, 417  
Area Health Education Centers, 347  
Authorization to Expend Other Funds, 217  
Baird Hall  
Plumbing Replacement, 131  
Room 2038 Pulmonary Lab Remodel, 131, 455  
Rooms 3030 & 3036, 167  
Basic Science/CROET Project, 421  
Biomedical Information and Communication Center, 421  
Casey Eye Institute, 421  
CDRC Phase II Repairs, 388  
Consulting Services, 383  
Council of Presidents, 376  
Dean of Medical School, 250  
Degree List, Confirmation, 449  
Dental Clinics, 346  
Dental School  
Biochemistry Lab 825, 827, 827A, 132, 455  
Electrical Upgrade, Phase II, 132  
Reroof & Mason Repairs, 167  
Ed-Net, 159, 161, 162  
Framework Master Plan, 212  
Gaines Hall Upgrade, 89, 455  
Grievances, Report of, 380  
Hospital Priorities, 338  
Hospital Renovation, 268, 270  
Institute for Advanced Biomedical Research, 421  
Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies, 187, 278  
Jones, Emma Hall  
Electrical Upgrade Phase II, 232  
Elevator Improvements, 385  
Plumbing Upgrade Project, 385  
OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES  
UNIVERSITY (con’t)  
Mackenzie Hall, 90  
Medical Research Building  
Dental School Animal Care Areas: Epoxy Floor Covering Installation, 134  
Electrical Upgrade, Phase II, 132, 167  
Fire Sprinkler Retrofit, 385  
HVAC Systems, 385  
Molecular Biology Lab Remodel, 385  
Minority Action Plan, 194  
Neurosensory Center, Increase in Other Funds Limitation and Authorization to Expend Funds, 219  
Nursing  
BS Degree Program, 415  
Practice Plan, 426  
Outreach Program, Mid-Willamette Valley, 415  
Outreach Program, Rural Frontier Program, 415  
Patient Equipment, 268, 270  
Post Measure 5, 307  
Primary Electrical Services Improvement, 4160 KV Replacement, 386  
Property, Authorization to Dispose of Surplus, 220  
Rural Health Network, 346  
UHN Chiller Plant Modifications, 165  
UHS  
Air Handler Filtration Survey, 453  
C-Wing Elevator Upgrade, 232, 386  
Domestic Water Piping Replacement, 454  
5C Medical/Surgical Unit, 167  
9A renovation for VA Bridge, 386  
Reroofing Project, 388  
10B-1 Patient/Visitor Lounge, 521
OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY (con't)
Third Floor Kitchen, 89, 388
University Hospital, 265 Projects, 452
University Hospital Resident Staff Pay Increase, 215
VIABR M502, 165
Greenhouse, Glass Washing Area, 455
VIABR Room 3412 Lab Remodel, 166, 455
Vice President Appointment, 102
Visitation, 102
OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
Admission Policy, 75
College Union Reroof, 90
Commencement, 233
Cornett Hall Reroofing, 386
Degree List, Confirmation, 449
Diesel Power Technology, 61, 62
Engineering and Industrial Technologies, School of, 484
Enrollment, 43
Faculty Senate, 484
Geothermal Reinjection Well #2, 386
Grievances, Report of, 380
Health and the Arts and Sciences, School of, 484
Investiture, President Wolf, 456
Medical Technology, 61, 62
Minority Action Plan, 194
Multipurpose Playfield, Phase II, 90
Operating Budget, Attachment B, 352
Operating Budget, 1991-92, 354
Parking Improvements, 166
Physical Plant Reroof, 522
Post Measure 5, 307
Reorganization Plan, 484
Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering, 186, 285, 286, 346, 456
Oregon Lottery, 49, 185
Appropriations of, 347
Oregon Museum of Science and Industry (OMSI), 161
Oregon Progress Board, 286
Oregon Public Broadcasting, 162
Oregon Public Employees Union, 59, 185, 347
Oregon Revised Statute
183.355, 153
237.003, 154
244.040, State Ethics Statute, 329
273.201, 494
286.031, 267, 269
286.033, 267, 269
288.605-288.695, 336
348.890, 107
351.067, 329
351.070, Incidental Fees & Student Government, 437
526.255, 379
Compensation for Officers and Employees, 351.067, 203, 210, 329
Conflict of Interest, 244.020, 204
Firearms, Possession of in Public Buildings, 166.360, 166.370, 19
State Ethics Statute, 244.040, 203, 329
Oregon Shines, 14, 85
Oregon State Board of Education, 149
Oregon State Board of Nursing, OHSU School of Nursing, 417
OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
Counselor Conference, 490
International Exchanges, 21
Recruiting, 487
Recruitment Publications, 488
School Relations and Student Recruitment, 487
Strategic Plan 1987 - 93, 13
Transfer Guide, 489
Oregon State Treasurer, 265
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OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
Accessibility for Handicapped, Phase III Contract D, 132; Contract G, 166
Admission Policy, 75
Agricultural Experiment Station, 346
Agricultural Sciences II Building DDC System, 130
Applied Anthropology, M.A., 308, 438
Arnold Hall Cafeteria Reroofing, 165
Benton Hall Room 303 Renovation Project, 130
Bioresource Engineering Ph.D Degree, 4-12, 81
Broadcast Media, 61
Burt Hall, 122
Lab Renovations, 491
Reroofing Project, 133
Callahan Hall Piping Replacement, 231
Chemical Storage Building Rebid, 231
Coaches' Salaries, 498
COES Facilities, Madras, 130, 522
College of Agriculture, 4
College of Engineering, 4
Commencement, 233
Cordley Hall
Chiller Replacement, 130, 386
Reroofing Project, 453
Crop Science Parking Lot/Moreland Hall Parking Lot, 387
Degree List, Confirmation, 449
Dixon Aquatic Facility, 88, 268, 270
Dryden Hall Reroofing Project, 383
Ed-Net, 159, 161
Enrollment, 43, 44
Entomology Building Smith Farm, 130, 455
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
(con't)
Environmental Computing Center, 124, 231
Extension Service, 161, 346
Forest Research Lab, 347
Renovation, 492
Reroof and Glulam Replacement, 387
Foundation, 275
Gilbert Hall Basement Heating/Condensate System Modification, 133
Gill Coliseum Reroof, 89
Gleeson Hall
Entrance Reconstruction Project, 130, 522
Reroofing Project, 383
Graf Hall Reroofing, 387
Greenhouse, Columbia Basin Agricultural Research Center, 453
Grievances, Report of, 380
Headhouse Addition, Columbia Basic Agricultural Research Center, 453
Hotel, Restaurant, Tourism Management, 61, 62
Housing Service Building Dock, 231
Intercollegiate Athletic Deficits, 498
Revenue & Expense, Summary of, 365
Tuition Waivers, 357, 497
Kerr Library Construction, 49
Langton Hall
Balcony Project, 88, 387
Langton Hall (Con't)
Reroof, Areas C, D, E, 133
Remodel Rooms 10/12 Rebid, 454
Magruder Hall Reroofing Project, 133
Mid-Columbia Ag. Research/Extension Center Cold Storage, 133
Minority Action Plan, 193
NASA Grant, 122
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OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
(con’t)
National Forage Seed Research Center, 420
Oceanography
Administration Bldg. Reroofing, 165, 522
NSF Grant, 491
Shop Building 221, Roof Extension, 130, 166
Oregon Climate Service, 346
Parker Stadium Improvements, 1991, 131
Peavy Arboretum Machine Shed Expansion, 383
Post Measure 5, 303
Reciprocity, 152
Rosenfeldt Lab & Feed Barn Bldg. Reroof, 454
ROTC, 410
School Counseling, 55
Science and Math Investigative Learning Experience, 347
Seed Research Bldg., 274
Software Engineering, 15
Speech Communication, 448
Street & Parking Lot Patching, 166, 383
Tennis Court Renovations Project, 454
Theatre Program Relocation Project, 131
Tuition Waivers, 497
Veterinary Medicine/Diagnostic Laboratory Accreditation, 345
Water Research Lab Reroof, 521
Weniger Hall Areas B & C Reroof, 384
West Hall Cafeteria Reroofing, 133
Wiegand Hall Reroofing, Areas B, C, 133
Wilkinson Hall Reroofing, 387
Women’s Bldg. Remodel, 131, 387

Oregon Student Lobby, 30, 58, 258, 496
Intercollegiate Athletics, 458, 510
Oregon-Washington Student Exchange Reciprocity Program, 149
Other Funds Limitation, 123
PAC-10, 358, 360, 501
Pacific University, Council of Presidents, 376
Pendleton, Theatre Arts, 447
Perron, Robert, Landscape Architects and Planners, 451
Ponder Burner Co., 231
Portland, City of, 192
Portland Community College, 161, 389
Council of Presidents, 376
Ed-Net, 159
Work with Lintner Center, 412
Portland Educational Network, 377
Portland, Higher Education in, 372
Portland Initiatives, 345

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
AAUP Agreement, 224, 225
Action Plan, 110
Admission Policy, 75
Anthropology, 309, 311
Graduate Program, 441
Basic and Standard Handicapped Learner..., 327
Cashier’s Office, Bulk Cash Review, 495
Center for Software Quality Research, 12-18, 84
Coaches’ Salaries, 498
Commencement, 232
Council of Presidents, Development, 376
Curriculum and Instruction, Move, 60
Degree List, Confirmation, 449
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
(con't)
Division of Continuing
Education and Summer Ses-
son, 224, 225
Ed-Net, 159
Enrollment, 42
Greater Portland Trust in
Higher Education, 377
Grievance of Beattie, Nich-
olas, 223
Grievances, Report of, 381
Higher Education in Port-
land, 358
Honorary Degree, 64
Institute of Portland Metro-
politan Studies, 187, 278, 378
Intercollegiate Athletic
Deficits, 498
Revenue and Expense, Sum-
mary of, 366
Tuition Waivers, 357, 497
International Programs, 23
Math, Engineering and Sci-
ence Achievement, 347
Minority Action Plan, 194
Mission, 111, 374, 375
Revised, 278
Parking Facilities Mainte-
nance and Repair, 453
Parking Structure I Rehab., 268, 270
Portland Educational Net-
work, 377
Post Measure 5, 305
Reroofing of Four Buildings, 386
ROTC, 410
Science Bldg. I Repairs, 166
School of Urban and Public
Affairs, 278
Strategic Action Plan, 375
Student Housing, 268, 270
Theatre Arts, B.A., 322
Tuition Waivers, 497
Vice President for Finance and Administration, 250, 302
Practice Plan, School of Nurs-
ing, 426
Presidential Evaluation
Cox, 147
Presidents, Council of, 51, 185
President's Report, 34, 134, 168, 233, 285, 390, 457, 523
Priorities, System-wide, 341
Program, Impact, 45
Program Review, 482
Presentations, 483
Public Affairs, Office of,
Intercollegiate Athletics, 459
Public Hearing, Academic Year
Fee Book, 258
Ramsay, Dale Construction, 88, 130, 131, 384
Reciprocity, Oregon-Washing-
ton, 149
Fiscal Impacts, 153
Recruitment, Military, 481
Reductions, Faculty/Staff, 63
Reed College, Council of Pres-
idents, 376
Residence Hall and Food Ser-
vice Charges, 257
Resolution, Lemman, Retire-
ment, 182
Resolution, March 1, 1991, 91
Retirement, Perry, 249
Robertson/Sherwood Architects, 451
Roll Call, 1, 36, 100, 145, 180, 248, 299, 407, 478
Roof Toppers, 384, 386
ROTC, 481
Discrimination, Sexual
Orientation, 410
Russell Construction, Inc., 166
Salary Policy, Unclassified, 348
Salem, Nursing, 415
Salem-Keizer School District, 456
Sasakawa Foundation, 147
Schaumberg Enterprises, Inc., 131
Schneider Equipment, Inc., 386
Schultz, Martin, & Geyer, Architects, 451
Science and Math Investigative Learning Experience, OSU, 347
SELP Loan, UO, Steam Line Intertie, 454
Senate Bill
607, 346
661, 347
805, 106
5520, 267
5577, 267
Snyder Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc., 165, 383
Soderstrom Architects, 451, 453
Southern Oregon State College
Admission Policy, 75
Basic and Standard Handicapped Learner..., 327
B.F.A., 322, 448
Campus Fitness Center, 384
Campus Visit, 301
Cascade Cafeteria, 123
Addition & Remodel, 450
Commencement, 232
Comprehensive Campus Plan, 212
Degree List, Confirmation, 450
Endorsement in Early Childhood Education, 69
Enrollment, 43
Foundation, Fund Drive, 455
Grievances, Report of, 382
Housing Advisory Committee, 120
International Programs, 23
Library Roof Repairs Project, 384
McNeal Hall Addition, 133
Minority Action Plan, 211
Music Building Roof Repairs, 384
Naming of Racquetball Facility, 382
Post Measure 5, 306
ROTC, 410
Tennis Courts, Resurfacing, Wightman Streets, 454
SOUTHERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE (con't)
Undergraduate Elementary Education Programs, Restructuring, 65
South Africa-free Equities, 419
Sports Action Lottery, 500, 512
Squier Associates, 452
SRG Partnership PC, Architects, 231
State System Investments, 419
Statewide Public Service Divisions, 1991-92 Operating Budget, 356
Statewide Services, Reductions, 57
Stevens, J. T. Construction, 231
Students, Impact on, 43
Study Resources Fee, 255
Summer Session Fee Book, 580-40-035, 81
Summer Session Instruction Fee, 77
Summer Session Room and Board, 80
Systems West Engineers, Inc., 452
Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, 68, 69, 72, 327
Technical Services, Consulting, 452
Tektronix Foundation, 17
Testimony, Joint Board Proposal, 105
Theatre Arts, B.A. in, EOSC, 319, 445
Title XI, Higher Education Act, 114
Total Mechanical, Inc., 454
Transfer Guide to Colleges and Universities, OSSHE, 489
Treasure Valley Community College, Theatre Arts, 446
Tuition and Fee, Policy Changes, 256
Tuition and Fees, 253-261