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PRESIDENT'S REPORT

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was called to order at 10:15 a.m., Friday, February 28, 1992, by President of the Board, George E. Richardson, Jr.

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        Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.
Mr. Chris Halsey       Ms. Janice Wilson

Mr. Tom Bruggere was absent due to conflict of schedule.

Chancellor’s Office -- Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Roger Bassett, Director, Governmental Relations; Jerry Casby, Attorney-in-Charge, Education; Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Francesca Clifford, Assistant Director, Communications; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Dale Hess, Special Assistant to the Director, Governmental Relations; Peter Hughes, Director, Internal Audit; Weldon E. Ihrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Susan Johnese, Secretary; Steve Katz, Controller; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Roger Olsen, Director, OCATE; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Greg Parker, Director, Communications; George Pernsteiner, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administration; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Virginia L. Thompson, Board Secretary and Executive Assistant to the Chancellor.

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

Oregon Institute of Technology -- President Lawrence Wolf; Marla Edge, Executive Assistant to the President; Chris Bismann, Acting Provost.

Oregon State University -- President John Byrne; Roy Arnold, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; L.E. Coate, Vice President, Finance and Administration.

Portland State University -- President Judith Ramaley; Barbara Holland, Director, Organizational Development.

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

University of Oregon -- President Myles Brand; Norman K. Wessells, Provost; Gerald Kessler, Senior Vice Provost for Planning and Resources, Academic Affairs; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration.

Western Oregon State College -- President Richard Meyers; Koichi Ando, Director, International Education and Services; Bill Cowart, Provost; Kathleen Faircloth, Dean of Students; Oscar Galindo, Director, Minority Student Affairs; Bill Neifert, Dean of Administration; Sherry Perry, Budget Director; Richard Walker, Assistant to the Provost.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate -- Marjorie Burns, Portland State University; Herb Jolliff, Oregon Institute of Technology; Anna Penk, Western Oregon State College; Bonnie Staebler, Western Oregon State College.

Others -- J.R. Adams, student, Western Oregon State College; Steve Alexander, student, Western Oregon State College; Ken Barcher, student, Western Oregon State College; Heather Beggs, President, Residence Halls Association; Thomas Bosch, student, Western Oregon State College; Scott Bronco, student, Western Oregon State College; Danielle Budlong, student, Western Oregon State College; Julia Buell, student, Western Oregon State College; Amy J.
Butsch, student, Western Oregon State College; Diane Cady, IFC member, Western Oregon State College; Dan Curtess, student Senator, ASWOSC; Michele Edman, student, Western Oregon State College; Paul Evans, President, ASWOSC; Greg Ford, IFC member, ASWOSC; Jack Gartley, student, Western Oregon State College; Elizabeth George, student, Western Oregon State College; Robert Gilmaa, student, Western Oregon State College; LeRoy Gornick, Liaison, Oregon Education Association; Mari Graves, student, Western Oregon State College; Jason Hagey, PSU Vanguard; Kathleen Heath, President, Faculty Senate, Oregon State University; Jim Hill, The Oregonian; Lori Hutchings, Assistant Programming Director, ASWOSC; Rose Imbuye, student, Western Oregon State College; Mike Kingery, student, Western Oregon State College; Cheryl Kohls, student, Western Oregon State College; Heidi Launstein, student, Western Oregon State College; Sara Lee, student, Western Oregon State College; Elizabeth Lenzen, student, Western Oregon State College; Kristy Lundervold, student, Western Oregon State College; Karen M. Madden, Senate Chair, ASWOSC; Thomas Marick, student, Western Oregon State College; Robert C. Mason, Programming Director, ASWOSC; Susan Massey, member, State Board of Education; Andrew W. McBee, Outdoor Program Coordinator, ASWOSC; LaHanda Morris, student, Western Oregon State College; Amy Nicoli, student, Western Oregon State College; Catherine Olson, student, Western Oregon State College; Julie Pflug, student, Western Oregon State College; Jennifer Phillips, student, Western Oregon State College; Lynn Pinckney, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Mark Sanchez, KOIN-TV; Hamida Shiron, student, Western Oregon State College; Viviane Simon-Brown, COCHE Director, COCC; Cindi Smith, student, Western Oregon State College; Stacy Stimson, student, Western Oregon State College; Atsuko Tasaki, student, Western Oregon State College; Ernest Tche, student, Western Oregon State College; Katie Walker, student, Western Oregon State College; Mitch Warren, student, Western Oregon State College; Dan Welch, student, Western Oregon State College; Brooke Wells, student Senator, ASWOSC; Cindy Wrey, student, Western Oregon State College.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on January 24, 1992, and approved them following a comment by
Board Secretary Virginia Thompson that, because of a technicality, the item approving amendments to OAR 580-50 would be resubmitted to the Board at a later time. The following voted in favor of approving the minutes: Directors Adams, Bailey, Davis, Dodson, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: none.

President Richardson opened the Board meeting by thanking Dr. Richard Meyers, president of Western Oregon State College, for the hospitality during the campus visit. The Board’s campus visit format allows the president of the institution to appear before the Board to make a formal presentation on an item selected by the president.

President Meyers welcomed the Board to Western Oregon State College and indicated there were a large number of committed people who believe in the institution, generally and, specifically, in promoting diversity on the campus. President Meyers remarked that the nation had a general lack of commitment to honoring diversity and of working with people of different backgrounds and colors. One of the goals of Western Oregon State College is to create a model that will work on the campus to encourage diversity. A director of minority student affairs was hired early in President Meyers' tenure.

President Meyers introduced Oscar Galindo, Director of Minority Student Affairs, who briefly described the major goals and activities of the recruitment and retention programs of the office. Mr. Galindo introduced three student participants in the program: Ms. LaHanda Morris, a freshman from Benson High School in Portland; Ms. Danielle Budlong, a freshman in the Honors Program; and Mr. Thomas Marick, president of the Multicultural Student Union. Each student addressed the Board, indicating their reasons for choosing Western Oregon State College and the positive impact of the program on their experiences.

Another aspect in diversification of the campus is internationalization of the campus and the curriculum. Western Oregon State College has agreements with six countries: Australia, Japan, China, Taiwan, Thailand, and Germany. President Meyers
introduced Koichi Ando, Director of International Education and Services.

Mr. Ando in turn introduced: Mr. Ernest Tche from Cameroon, who is the current president of the International Student Organization; Ms. Hamida Shiron, a Rotary Scholarship student from Bangladesh; Ms. Atsuko Tasaki, a graduate student from Japan; Mr. Thomas Bosch from Germany, a major in secondary education; and Ms. Rose Imbuye, a special education major from Kenya. Each of the students shared with the Board their reasons for choosing Western Oregon State College, the challenges of being a minority in such a small community, and the benefits of the International Student Program.

President Meyers closed the presentation by recognizing approximately 80 other students from Western Oregon State College who were in the audience and who would like to have shared their experiences with the Board. "Diversity was chosen as the focus of the presentation because we feel it is one of the most important aspects of any college or university," concluded President Meyers.

The Chancellor thanked President Meyers and staff of Western Oregon State College for the warm hospitality and for an informative campus visit.

Chancellor Bartlett introduced Ms. Mary Voves, new Dean of Administration of Eastern Oregon State College. Ms. Voves comes to the State System from Northern Arizona State College, Flagstaff, where she was Assistant Director of Business Services and Physical Resources. She will assume duties at Eastern on April 1, 1992.

Chancellor Bartlett pointed out that, during the present difficult financial times, there has been a high level of stability in senior administration ranks, important in maintaining capacity to deal with the turbulence and rapid changes.

In a recent issue of the Legislative Newsletter, Roger Bassett indicated that action on overhauling the tax structure in Oregon is seen as possible during the spring months. "For too many people," the Chancellor continued, "overhauling the tax structure is viewed as a euphemism for higher taxes. That may or may not be reasonable, but it..."
is unfortunate because I think there is a need for a new tax structure even if the revenue impact were absolutely neutral."

Present indications are that the State System will be called on to construct what the Chancellor termed an "80 percent budget -- a budget that calls for approximately 20 percent reduction in general fund levels." In the meantime, the System is responding to the general strategy of the state to reduce state positions by 4,000 positions. The Chancellor reported that instructions and guidelines had been prepared to guide institutions in achieving their reductions. In all, the State System must reduce the workforce by 813 positions.

Vice Chancellor Weldon Ihrig indicated that a draft memorandum to the Governor's staff had been distributed to Board members, outlining the plan for position elimination between now and June 30, 1993. In the beginning, the impact, according to Mr. Ihrig, will not be for the System to become more efficient, but rather to reduce services to faculty and students. He noted further that "while the teaching faculty in the institutions are absolutely not affected by the present reductions as far as their positions being reduced, they are affected in terms of productivity by the reduction of support staff. In capturing these (813) positions, our first priority is to eliminate vacant positions; second, there will be positions that will open during the next 15 months due to resignations and retirements, and those will be captured. Finally, the third group, which is least desirable, will be actual layoffs of people in positions that cannot be continued any longer. The heaviest numbers in the layoff category will come in the hospital and those will be as a last resort."

Along with processes of state government, Chancellor Bartlett reminded the Board of the ways in which the State System is affected by national decisions and asked Vice Chancellor Larry Large to summarize some federal issues and legislation that will have a big impact in Oregon.

Vice Chancellor Large began with a review of the Omnibus Education Act (originally passed in 1965) and indicated that the amendments are in a final cycle. At the core of the federally funded finan-
cial aid is the Pell Grant program. The issues facing Congress deal with the level of support and amount of the maximum grant and, second, with a philosophical, political, and fiscal question of converting the Pell Grant program to an entitlement. Both houses of Congress have language converting the program to entitlement. All of the dollar amounts mentioned for the program are significantly above the past levels, and it seems assured that there will be an increase this year.

A second area of interest is related to direct loans. Action is pending to convert these loans into a loan program funded by the federal government. Conversion to this type of program is being estimated to save over a billion-and-a-half dollars. The major problem is a fear about the cost of managing and processing such a program.

A third issue relates to the default rate on all student loans and a question of who is responsible for certifying an institution as eligible to have students receive the guaranteed loans. Legislation currently has included some proposals to strengthen the state's role in making the certifications of institutions that are eligible, even to the point of holding the states in partial liability when default rates go over a prescribed level.

This past summer, Chancellor Bartlett and President Judith Ramaley participated in hearings on an addition to Title XI of the Higher Education Act that will be aimed specifically at the urban institutions similar in philosophy and concept to the land grant institutions of 100 years ago. There has been an appropriation of about $8 million in the current fiscal year.

Finally, Dr. Large reported that there is an additional amount of resources for research in an area for which Oregon is well positioned to participate as a result of work to implement HB 3565, the Educational Reform Act. The state initiative runs parallel to a national goal for reform in public education, and it seems likely that there will be research opportunities for potential funding in the new federal legislation.
Chancellor Bartlett indicated that too often he does not have time to report staff activities to the Board, and he wanted to take the opportunity to do so at the meeting.

Of the work of Academic Affairs, three are of particular interest. In the area of distance and continuing education and Ed-Net, a draft paper is presently under review, outlining a new policy. The paper should be completed in May and will be followed with implementation planning. In the area of assessment, a final report will be completed in March for presentation to the Joint Boards. The challenges of assessment and accountability are difficult in higher education and the topic will be around for the foreseeable future. Work is continuing with the Department of Education related to school reform and community college articulation. In addition, a joint committee is addressing the area of applied academics. This is of great importance because it is tied directly to current thinking about workforce development, and particularly in addressing the needs of those who are dropping out or not going on beyond high school graduation.

The major focus of Finance and Administration is to complete the plan for staff reductions. In addition, work is underway on planning for the 1993-95 biennial budget. The Chancellor will meet with the Governor to clarify goals; guidelines will be prepared for the institutions by late March; April to June will be used for building budgets; and, finally, the budget will be presented to the Board in July for final revisions and submission to the Governor's office by the first of September.

In Public Affairs, the Chancellor indicated that all presidential evaluations/reviews have been completed. A number of Board committees are working: the Board Administrative Review Committee, the Joint Boards Committee, and the Special Task Force on Athletic Funding are all meeting on a regular basis. Statewide discussions on tuition policy options will be started in the near future, and work is underway to prioritize an agenda for the federal delegations. Finally, Chancellor Bartlett reported that the presidents were meeting later in the afternoon to begin planning for the 1993 legislative session.
As a final footnote to his report of staff activities, Chancellor Bartlett reminded the Board that the Legislature had instructed everyone from the administration to teach one class. Vice Chancellor Clark is teaching during the present quarter, and Vice Chancellor Large will be teaching spring quarter.

IFS Report

Chancellor Bartlett called on Dr. Bonnie Staebler, president of the Interinstitutonal Faculty Senate (IFS) for a report.

Dr. Staebler reported that a meeting of the IFS was held on February 7 and 8, 1992, at Oregon State University. The most noteworthy action was a decision to write to the Governor requesting that a special session of the Oregon Legislature be called immediately "to prevent the imminent destruction of higher education in the state caused by Measure 5. For over a year, the IFS has been deliberating with legislative leaders, OSSHE staff, and other statewide educational leaders. We are alarmed by the magnitude of the crisis and the inadequacy of current measures, taken or suggested, to meet this crisis. We believe the damaging cuts to higher education are an unintentional consequence of Measure 5."

Continuing, Dr. Staebler reported that the IFS joined with students, faculty groups, and administrators in a press conference held at the University of Oregon on February 22, 1992. IFS has created task forces on Educational Reform and Articulation, Differentiation and Access, Teaching and Governance, and Information Dissemination. The separate task force groups currently are working and IFS will keep the Board fully informed.

The next meeting of the IFS will be at the University of Oregon on April 3-4, 1992.
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Staff Report to the Board

The Board of Higher Education permits institutions, with concurrence of their faculty, to award honorary degrees. Each institution wishing to award honorary degrees must adopt criteria and procedures for selection that will assure that the award honors outstanding contribution to the institution, state, or society for distinguished achievement. Criteria and procedures for selection must be forwarded to the Chancellor for approval and, when approved, filed with the Secretary of the Board. Institutions are required to forward their recommendations for honorary degrees for the Board’s approval 90 days before the date for awarding the degrees.

Two institutions, the Oregon Institute of Technology and Oregon State University, requested Board authorization to award degrees at the June 1992 commencement.

The Oregon Institute of Technology proposed awarding an honorary doctorate to Harry Boivin.

Harry Boivin

Harry Boivin, a long-time Klamath Falls attorney, was born in Ashland, Oregon, in 1904 and moved to Klamath Falls in 1910. He earned the J.D. in law from Santa Clara University in 1922. Boivin served in the Oregon House of Representatives from 1935 to 1941 and was House Speaker in the 1937 session. Later, from 1949 to 1954, he served on the State Board of Higher Education. He then ran successfully for the Oregon Senate, served as Senate President in 1961 and 1965 and, during his tenure, worked to keep the Oregon Technical Institute (forerunner of the Oregon Institute of Technology) operating and in Klamath Falls. Harry Boivin, a dedicated citizen, legislator, and Board of Higher Education member, provided leadership in support of the establishment of public higher education in Oregon during an important formative period.
Oregon State University proposed awarding an honorary doctorate to Philip C. Habib.

Philip C. Habib

Philip C. Habib, one of the most distinguished and versatile foreign affairs officers in U.S. history, is perhaps best known as U.S. representative in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War, and as President Reagan’s special representative to the Middle East in the early 1980s -- a role he accepted after retirement and a serious illness. Dr. Habib was born in 1920 in Brooklyn, New York; however, his higher education was at University of Idaho and University of California, Berkeley, where he studied for the doctorate. Preceding his important role as the State Department’s foremost expert on Southeast Asian affairs and his contributions to resolving the Vietnam conflict, Habib held positions in Canada, New Zealand, Trinidad, and Korea. His career continued with service as Ambassador to Korea, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, and, finally, to Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs, working with President Carter in bringing about the historic meeting at Camp David that included Egyptian President Anwar Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin. Habib has received many awards in recognition of his accomplishments, including the President’s Medal of Freedom and the Legion of Honor from France.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended approval of the Oregon Institute of Technology’s request to award an honorary doctorate to Harry Boivin at the June 1992 commencement, and Oregon State University’s request to award an honorary doctorate to Philip C. Habib at the June 1992 commencement.

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

Background

In November 1991, President Lawrence Wolf presented a plan for the reorganization of the Oregon Institute of Technology to the Board of Higher Education following earlier consultation with Chancellor Bartlett and review and action by the Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate. The Board took action to approve the reorganization plan that included the establishment of two schools from existing divisions and streamlined reporting arrangements to key academic administrators. The goals of the reorganization plan are to fix responsibility for decision making more clearly, enhance communications among academic programs and administrators, and empower administrators to make decisions in a timely, responsive way.

The Board was advised that the reorganization planning process also had included continuing discussions of a revised mission statement for the Oregon Institute of Technology that would be brought to the Board at a later date. The revised mission statement evolved from a campus-wide strategic planning process begun during 1989-90 that identified a number of governance issues requiring further study. The Faculty Senate established a governance committee that prepared an initial draft mission statement. Subsequently, through a series of meetings in spring and fall of 1991, a revised mission statement was reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate, the faculty as a whole, and the President’s Council at the Oregon Institute of Technology.

Rationale for Changes and Staff Analysis

In the revised statement, Oregon Institute of Technology's mission is focused more clearly and directly upon the provision of degree programs in the applied technologies. This designation defines Oregon Institute of Technology’s niche, and distin-
guishes its mission from other professional and technical programs offered within OSSHE institutions.

The revised statement permits technology degree programs at any appropriate level, in contrast to the old mission statement that did not contain permissive language. The Oregon Institute of Technology is not precluded from forwarding proposals for master's-level instruction for the Board's consideration as entry-level requirements increase in certain industries, demand is clear, and faculty qualifications and resources permit.

Continuing education is explicitly a part of Oregon Institute of Technology's mission in the proposed statement. This inclusion and the charge to provide advanced professional studies are not new, but the language is updated to reflect the institution's larger role within the State System to respond to the need for technology education as occupations and careers develop and change.

Finally, new language about the role of applied research at Oregon Institute of Technology was added. Faculty has been engaging in applied research, but this domain of activity had not been highlighted in the formal mission statement. This is regarded as important in Oregon Institute of Technology's ability to serve its constituencies and to attract needed resources and support.

Mission Statement

The following mission statement was presented for Board approval:

The mission of Oregon Institute of Technology, the only institute of technology in the Oregon State System of Higher Education, is to provide degree programs in the applied technologies that will prepare students to become effective participants in their professional, public, and international communities. Therefore, Oregon Institute of Technology is committed to the following objectives:

1. To provide degree programs in engineering technologies, health technologies, business technologies, and nurs-
ing that enable graduates to obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for immediate employment.

2. To develop abilities in critical thinking and problem solving and, through study of the arts and sciences, the ethical and cultural awareness required to meet the changing needs of individuals and societies.

3. To offer continuing education, advanced professional studies, and courses in the arts and sciences for transfer to other colleges and universities.

4. To provide informational and consulting services to regional, state, national, and international publics in the area of applied research.

5. To ensure that all programs remain current through liaisons with academic colleagues, advisory boards, and industrial leaders.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended that the Board adopt the mission statement for the Oregon Institute of Technology.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In introducing the mission statement, Vice Chancellor Clark indicated that she and Chancellor Bartlett had reviewed the statement and were in agreement that it states strongly the intent of the institution in the following ways: focuses the mission clearly on the niche of the Oregon Institute of Technology; allows for the possibility for degree programs to be recommended at appropriate levels including the master’s degree level; and, recognizes some of the larger roles, specifically with respect to continuing education, that the institution already has begun to play and where one might imagine a larger role being played in meeting the needs of the state.
President Wolf remarked that the institution had attempted to rewrite the mission statement in a way that would be concise, sharp, and reflective of the planned directions. Technology has become more sophisticated over the years, and there are areas that need to be explored and boundaries that may need to be expanded. Therefore, although the mission statement is concise, it does retain the flexibility required to enable the Oregon Institute of Technology to remain a national leader.

Board member Dodson asked if the community was aware of the redefinition of the campus mission. President Wolf indicated he has a president's Industrial Advisory Council that is representative of industry in and, in some cases, beyond Oregon. The Council has reviewed the language and is supportive of the revised mission statement.

In response to questions from Mr. Dodson about any areas that might be changed enough to be controversial, Dr. Wolf indicated that the specificity of continuing education and advanced professional studies was new, but portrayed an important role for the institution.

Mr. Dodson commended President Wolf and his staff on achieving a tightened and clarified mission statement that clearly distinguishes this campus from other campuses. Continuing, he indicated that the State System is going to have to provide focus on how Oregon Institute of Technology, and other institutions as well, fit into private and quasi-private efforts.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.

**Board Discussion and Action**

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

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

Staff Report

The Board was asked to review and approve general admission standards to be effective for admission in the 1993-94 academic year, and a transitional accommodation to educational reform.

Current Admission Policy Update

First-Time Freshman Admission

Beginning with the 1985-86 academic year, first-time freshman admission policy for OSSHE colleges and universities consisted of four basic requirements:

- graduation from an accredited or standard high school;
- receipt of minimum high school grade point averages;
- completion of 14 or more units of subject requirements; and
- submission of SAT or ACT test scores (University of Oregon and Southern Oregon State College additionally require minimum scores on the SAT Test of Standard Written English or the ACT English subtest).

Applicants who are unable to meet the basic admission requirements may be admitted by an admission alternative.

Prior to 1985, students did not have to meet the college preparatory subject requirement. That requirement was adopted by the Board in 1983 for implementation in 1985-86.
Significant developments in freshman admission policy since 1985-86 include increases in the high school GPA required for admission, and the granting of selective admission authority to the University of Oregon in 1987 and to all institutions beginning with the 1989-90 academic year. The reason for these two admission policy developments was the need to limit and better manage OSSHE enrollment in light of decreasing financial and instructional resources and capacity.

The number of first-time freshman students admitted each fall has ranged from 7,044 in 1985, to 7,834 in 1988, and 6,742 in 1990.

Undergraduate Transfer Admission

Admission policy for new transfer students since 1985 has included several changes in the college grade point average and the number of hours required for transfer admission and, specifically, for Oregon State University and University of Oregon the added requirement of satisfactory completion of college-level writing and mathematics courses.

In addition, a major change in transfer admission policy occurred with the establishment of an "Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer Degree Program" jointly developed by OSSHE institutions and Oregon community colleges. Under this policy, students may complete all lower-division graduation requirements for any OSSHE institution at any Oregon community college.

The policy became fully operational at some community colleges during 1989-90, and for all community colleges beginning fall 1990.

In the period from 1989-90 through 1990-91, Oregon community colleges reported 184 A.A. Oregon Transfer Degree graduates. Of that number, 90 (or 49 percent) were admitted and enrolled in OSSHE institutions during the 1990-91 academic year. It is expected that the number of students transferring to OSSHE institutions with an A.A. Oregon Transfer Degree will increase in future years.

The total number of new undergraduate transfer students from Oregon community colleges each fall

**Effects of HB 3565: the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century on OSSHE Admission Policy**

The effects of educational reform for Oregon's public schools and community colleges undoubtedly will be significant for OSSHE admission policies. The traditional requirements for admitting new undergraduate students will need to be examined in the context of new curricula within the programs leading to the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery (the CIM and the CAM), and the new learning outcomes and assessment strategies that will accompany these Certificates.

In the context of development of new educational policies and programs for elementary and secondary education, the Chancellor's staff and the faculty of OSSHE institutions will work with representatives of the Department of Education and the Office of Community Colleges toward development of an admission policy and process that is responsive to the educational reform goals, including better preparation of high school students for college-level work.

To begin to accommodate the transitional process of Oregon educational reform, OSSHE will undertake efforts described in the OSSHE Plan for Responding to Joint Boards' Interest in Teacher Education (approved by the Board in January 1992), HB 3565, and Measure 5. The Plan includes formation of intersegmental applied academics review committees to evaluate the appropriateness of including applied academic courses in the college preparatory course lists currently used for freshman admission. Also, OSSHE faculty and staff will work with the other sectors and schools to develop Certificate of Initial Mastery and Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs, including new learning outcomes and assessment strategies. Subsequently, an appropriate admission policy for students experiencing these education reforms will be developed.

**Admission Policy Changes for 1993-94**

Two changes in current admission policy were requested for the 1993-94 academic year:
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- For transfer admission at Oregon State University, (1) lower the college grade point average required for nonresidents from 2.50 to 2.25; and (2) for the two college-level writing and mathematics courses required for transfer admission, change the minimum grade requirement from C to C-.

- In response to early implementation of the CIM and CAM educational curricula, and new learning outcomes and assessment strategies by schools, OSSHE will work with these schools on a case-by-case basis to establish transitional admission policies and procedures.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended (1) that the 1992-93 general admission policy be continued for the 1993-94 academic year as amended by the requested changes in the transfer admission policy at Oregon State University; and (2) that staff work with schools achieving early implementation of restructured curricula and assessment strategies as part of HB 3565 on a case-by-case basis to establish transitional admission policies and procedures.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Vice Chancellor Clark commented that because of the educational restructuring that has just begun as a consequence of the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, staff recommended that for the most part, the State System continue in the same direction as the past year. One exception to that direction is permission by the Board for flexibility to accommodate some of the early changes that are anticipated in graduation requirements from high school. Specifically, Dr. Clark mentioned curricular changes that are anticipated in the secondary schools in applied academics areas. There are cross-sectional meetings set for the middle of March at which six of the areas will be reviewed. Participants include staff of OSSHE, community colleges, the Department of Education, faculty of higher education institutions, and high school discipline-based faculty. There is a great potential that change will be required -- it is not clear what the nature of these changes will be.

110
Therefore, the recommendation included permission for a transitional accommodation.

Provost Roy Arnold from Oregon State University explained the two policy changes being requested. The first change is to lower the grade point average of nonresident transfer students from 2.5 to 2.25. Part of the rationale for lowering the grade point average is to coordinate better with the other land grant institutions in the northwest area to facilitate transfer among institutions.

The second change requested by Oregon State University is to bring policy into compliance with a technical correction passed by the Oregon State University Faculty Senate a year ago. This change added plus and minus to the grading structure, thus making a "C," three grades, not just one and, therefore, necessitating the technical change.

Mr. Dodson asked what impact there had been on quality since the change in admissions standards. Mr. Christensen reminded the Committee that the standards were changed in spring of 1989 and implemented for the 1989-90 academic year. Reduced enrollments and increased standards result in a kind of selectivity; therefore, the performance of freshmen has been higher than previous years.

In response to a question from Mr. Bailey concerning whether admission standards and policies were used as tools in enrollment management, Mr. Christensen responded that they were. Continuing, Mr. Bailey asked for a description of the makeup of the five percent special admissions group of students. Typically, working with schools around the state, Mr. Christensen indicated that all kinds of students are admitted: students who might have left school early, older students, and students who have an academic record that does not fit neatly into any admissions alternatives.

Vice Chancellor Clark remarked that the institutions would like to continue the five percent special admissions and also be permitted case-by-case review of students whose high schools are beginning implementation of the school reform changes. Once the parameters of the new graduation requirements are known, a revised policy can be
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submitted to the Board for approval, thus negating the need for a case-by-case evaluation.

With reference to the quality of students, Dr. Clark continued that the State System is deeply concerned about the quality of the educational preparation of students. Students must have the fundamentals needed to succeed in higher education. Staff are concerned about the questions of quality and standards of performance, and are working closely with the Department of Education in implementation of the legislation.

Dr. Clark indicated that a month ago the Board of Education received a report relative to increasing global education in the schools that focused on the constraints on the capacities of public schools to provide foreign languages. She suggested that this document will be reviewed and implications drawn from it for higher education.

Ms. Davis asked why there was a difference in grade point average between high school entrance and college transfer. Mr. Christensen explained that high school grade point average was used as a predictor of success in college while college grade point average was reflective of ability to perform at the college level from one college setting to another.

Mr. Richardson inquired as to why there was a difference of grade point average between the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. Provost Wessells of the University of Oregon responded that the University of Oregon changed the requirement to a 2.5 grade point average as an enrollment management plan. Dr. Wessells indicated that an interesting phenomenon seems to occur. When grade point average, SAT, or other indicators of ability go up, so do the number of individuals applying for entrance.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

Chancellor Bartlett recalled for the Board that over a year-and-a-half ago, the State System was prepared to bring a recommendation before the Board
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to intensify the admission requirements as a means of responding to the need to raise the level of academic performance in the educational system, in particular at the secondary level. With the passage of Measure 5 and the reform legislation, it appeared wiser to hold standards where they were until the effects of these two outside forces were known. Therefore, although the current policy appears to hold the status quo, the proposal is in anticipation of significant changes that are just on the horizon.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and, on roll call, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Davis, Dodson, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: none.
### ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS AS ADOPTED FOR 1993-94 ACADEMIC YEAR

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

* Minimum SAT scores are not required but scores may be used for alternative or selective admission.

** Courses Required: One writing course beginning with WR 121 and college algebra or above or the equivalent of Math 105.
ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS EFFECTIVE 1993-94

OREGON RESIDENT STUDENTS

FRESHMAN ADMISSION

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

1. High School Graduation
   a. Public high school graduates must have graduated from a standard or accredited high school. Private high school graduates must have graduated from an accredited high school.
   b. Nongraduates to be admitted must have:
      - a minimum score of 40 on each of the five subtests of the test of General Educational Development (GED); and
      - an average score for the five subtests of 58 (UO, OSU, SOSC); 55 (WOSC), 51 (EOSC); 50 (OIT); 46 (PSU).
   c. Graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools must have:
      - a minimum score of 970 SAT or 22 ACT (UO, OSU); 890 SAT or 21 ACT (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC); and
      - an average 410 or above (1,230 total) on three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and a third of the student's choice); or meet the summer qualifying alternative (4b).

2. Admission Tests
   a. Must submit scores of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or American College Test (ACT).
   b. Achievement tests are required for applicants who are graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools.

\(^1\)Students with any college credit note Section 2 of "Transfer Admission" requirements.
c. Test scores are used:

- as an alternate means of meeting the GPA requirement;
- to comply with the admission policy for graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools;
- in selectively admitting qualified applicants;
- for advising and guidance purposes; and
- as noted directly below:
  - to enroll at UO, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT Test of Standard Written English or 15 on the ACT English subtest.
  - to enroll at SOSC, students must: score a minimum of 30 on the SAT Test of Standard Written English, 15 on the ACT English, or take Writing 40 at an extra fee.

3. **Subject Requirements.** Must satisfactorily complete 14 units (one year equal to one unit) of college preparatory work in the following subject areas:

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

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

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

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

e. **Other College Preparatory (2 units).** May be a foreign language (highly recommended), computer science, fine and performing arts, or other college preparatory electives including advanced-level vocational-technical courses. (Units need not be in same subject.)
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f. Alternatives to the Subject Requirements (any one of the following):

For All Institutions

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

- Take makeup course work (high school or college-level) for specific subject requirements missed in high school, and achieve a passing grade. (One three-hour college-level term course is equal to one unit of high school work.) For mathematics, satisfactory completion of college algebra or above, or the equivalent of Math 105, fulfills (in total) subject requirements in mathematics; or

For EOSC, OIT, PSU, SOSC, WOSC Only

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

4. Grade Point Average Requirement

a. To be admitted, students must have a grade point average in all graded subjects taken towards graduation in four years of high school of: 3.00 (OSU, UO); 2.75 (WOSC); 2.50 (OIT, PSU, SOSC); or 2.50 (EOSC, except 2.00 for students from Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Union, Wallowa, Wheeler, and non-community college portions of Baker and Malheur counties).

b. Alternatives to the GPA Requirement (either of the following):

For All Institutions

- SAT or ACT scores and high school grades to predict a 2.00 college GPA (UO, OSU); 890 SAT or 21 ACT (PSU, OIT); 890 SAT, 21 ACT, or 2.00 predicted college GPA (EOSC, SOSC, WOSC); or

For EOSC, OIT, PSU, SOSC, WOSC Only

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

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

   University of Oregon:
   - a minimum GPA of 2.25 or better in 36 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work; and
   - all transfer applicants must complete a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121; and college algebra or above, or the equivalent of Math 105. Each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C- or above.

   Oregon State University:
   - a minimum GPA of 2.25 or better in 36 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work; and
   - all transfer applicants must complete a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121; and college algebra or above, or the equivalent of Math 105. Each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C- or above.

   Portland State University:
   - a minimum GPA of 2.00 or better in 30 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work.

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

2. All Transfer Applicants. Students who have accumulated 12 or more quarter credit hours of college-level work, but fewer than 36 (OSU, UO); 30 (PSU); or 24 (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC), must meet freshman admission requirements and have a minimum GPA of 2.25 (OSU, UO) or 2.00 (EOSC, OIT, PSU, SOSC, WOSC) in all college work attempted.

FIVE PERCENT SPECIAL ADMISSION

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

FRESHMAN ADMISSION

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

1. High School Graduation

   a. Public high school graduates must have graduated from a standard or accredited high school. Private high school graduates must have graduated from an accredited high school.

   b. Nongraduates to be admitted must have:

      - a minimum score of 40 on each of the five subtests of the test of General Educational Development (GED); and

      - an average score for the five subtests of 58 (UO, OSU, SOSC); 55 (WOSC); 51 (EOSC); 50 (OIT); 46 (PSU).

   c. Graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools must have:

      - a minimum score of 970 SAT or 22 ACT (UO, OSU), 890 SAT or 21 ACT (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC); and

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

2. Admission Tests

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

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

---

2Students with any college credit note Section 2 of "Nonresident Transfer Admission" requirements.
c. Test scores are used:

- as an alternative means of meeting the GPA requirement;
- to comply with the admission policy for graduates of nonstandard and unaccredited high schools;
- in selectively admitting qualified applicants;
- for advising and guidance purposes; and
- as noted directly below:
  - to enroll at UO, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT Test of Standard Written English or 15 on the ACT English subtest.
  - to enroll at SOSC, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT TSWE, 15 on the ACT English, or take Writing 40 at an extra fee.

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

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

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

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

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

e. **Other College Preparatory (2 units).** May be a foreign language (highly recommended), computer science, fine and performing arts, or other college preparatory electives including advanced-level vocational-technical courses. (Units need not be in same subject.)
Meeting #605

February 28, 1992

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

For All Institutions

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

- Take makeup course work (high school or college-level) for specific subject requirements missed in high school and achieve a passing grade. (One three-hour college-level term course is equal to one unit of high school work.) For mathematics, satisfactory completion of college algebra or above, or the equivalent of Math 105, fulfills (in total) subject requirements in mathematics; or

For EOSC, OIT, PSU, SOSC, WOSC Only

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

4. Grade Point Average Requirement

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

b. Alternatives to the GPA Requirement (either of the following):

For All Institutions

- SAT or ACT scores and high school grades to predict a 2.00 college GPA (UO, OSU); 890 SAT or 21 ACT (PSU, OIT); 890 SAT, 21 ACT, or 2.00 predicted college GPA (EOSC, SOSC, WOSC); or

For EOSC, OIT, PSU, SOSC, WOSC Only

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

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

   **University of Oregon:**
   - a minimum 2.50 GPA or better in 36 quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work; and
   - all transfer applicants must complete a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121, and college algebra or above, or the equivalent of Math 105. Each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C- or above.

   **Oregon State University:**
   - a minimum GPA of 2.25 or better in 36 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work; and
   - all transfer applicants must complete a minimum of one term of college-level writing, beginning with WR 121, and college algebra or above, or the equivalent of Math 105. Each of the required courses must be completed with a grade of C- or above.

   **Portland State University:**
   - a minimum 2.25 GPA or better in 30 quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work.

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

2. **All Transfer Applicants.** Students who have accumulated 12 or more quarter credit hours of acceptable college-level work, but fewer than 36 (OSU, UO), 30 (PSU), or 24 (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC), must meet the freshman admission requirements and have a 2.50 (UO, OSU), 2.25 (PSU), or 2.00 (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC), in all college work attempted.

**FIVE PERCENT SPECIAL ADMISSION**

Institutions are authorized to admit a quota of freshmen totaling no more than five percent of the institution’s first-time freshman class for the previous academic year as exceptions to the stated admission requirements. To qualify for five percent special admission, applicants are considered on a case-by-case basis.
AMENDMENT TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL LEASE AGREEMENT WITH OREGON MILITARY DEPARTMENT, EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

Staff Report to the Committee

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education, at its January 24, 1992 meeting, approved a request by Eastern Oregon State College to enter into a long-term lease with the Oregon Military Department. The lease of approximately 7.5 acres at Eastern Oregon State College would permit the construction of an armory that would contribute to the institution's Guard Officer Leadership Development Program. Excluded from the lease was a house and the land upon which it is situated. That house is rented by the College for about $400 per month.

At the time of the Board meeting, both Military Department and Eastern officials agreed that the land with the house was not needed for armory purposes and that the College wished to keep the rental revenue.

However, the Military Department now believes that it needs the parcel with the house for future expansion, and that control of the property for expansion is needed to obtain federal approval of the site.

In order to permit the College to continue to receive the rental revenue, the Military Department proposed that it lease the entire property (including the house) but that the College be permitted to continue to manage the house and receive rent from it until such time as the armory must be expanded. College officials agree with this proposal.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff concurred with the request of Eastern Oregon State College and recommended that the Board permit the addition of the house and property adjacent to the presently approved lease site to the lease with the Oregon Military Department, under the condition that Eastern Oregon State College be permitted to manage the rental house and receive the income from it until such time as the house must be removed to permit construction of an armory facility.

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 to the Committee

The Clackamas County Development Agency requested permission to purchase a portion of the Oregon Institute of Technology, Metro Center campus. The acquisition of the Metro Center campus was reported to the Board at the February 17, 1988, meeting. The Agency proposed to enter into an agreement with the North Clackamas Park and Recreation District to develop an aquatic and recreation center on the property.

The land that would be sold to the Agency is undeveloped and is surplus to the needs of the Institute's Metro Center. The parcel contains approximately 3.337 acres. Part of the agreement between the Oregon Institute of Technology and the Agency is the intent of the two parties to provide shared parking. This will require granting of mutual easements.

The Agency will purchase the property for $200,000 -- slightly above the August 1991, appraised value.

Disposition of the property will be in accordance with existing state rules and regulations, including offering the property to other state agencies before entering into the agreement with the Clackamas County Development Agency.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the property be declared surplus to the needs of the Oregon Institute of Technology Metro Center and offered to other state agencies as required by law. It was recommended further that the Board authorize preparation and signature by appropriate Board officers of an AGREEMENT FOR SALE OF REAL PROPERTY and appropriate easements in order to facilitate the sale of the property to another state agency or to the Clackamas County Development Agency.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Adams asked if there were any long-term uses for the parcel of land. Mr. Pernsteiner indicated that the Oregon Institute of Technology’s long-term use had been for parking, and there is general agreement that if the park district is willing to put in the parking and let the Oregon Institute of Technology use it, the State System would end up obtaining use of the land without the burden of owning it.

Mr. Halsey inquired how disagreements would be solved, if any were to arise. Mr. Pernsteiner explained that the standard approach is to enter into a use agreement with a party detailing, in this case, the rights and responsibilities of the parties involved and a mechanism for resolving disputes.

Continuing, Mr. Adams questioned if there was room for expansion in the event that was necessary. There are, according to Mr. Pernsteiner, six acres remaining, and there are no current plans for expansion.

Ms. Jackson asked for clarification as to the original purchase price of nine acres in 1988. For the nine acres and the building, Mr. Pernsteiner indicated that $970,000 was spent in 1989-91 and about $200,000 or so the previous biennium for a combined total of approximately one million dollars.

Mr. Pernsteiner introduced Dr. Richard Moore, Director of the Oregon Institute of Technology Metro campus, and Dr. Doug Yates. Regarding questions concerning future plans for the Metro campus, Dr. Moore responded that when the present facility is remodeled, approximately 10,000-square-feet of building remain for future expansion. He indicated that should be sufficient for at least the next 15 years.

In the interest of keeping all options open, discussion centered on the potential for the Oregon Institute of Technology to "reclaim" the land once it was sold. Dr. Moore and Mr. Pernsteiner both agreed that future expansion could be done by building additional floors, and using existing land
for parking, should that be required. Likewise, there is flexibility for the facilities to be consolidated, should there be downsizing.

The enrollment history of the Metro campus has shown a slight decline over the past two years. This decline has been a result of the current economic situation that has slowed down enrollments; however, interest in continuing education has been increasing and that is where some of the strengths of the campus reside.

Mr. Miller asked if it were possible to enter into agreements for reduced membership fees for use of the forthcoming aquatic center. Dr. Moore responded that there have been discussions about this point and the Clackamas County Development Agency sees advantages to them for working out a mutually agreeable plan. However, the County Development Agencies legal counsel is not willing to have specific language put into the contract at this time.

President Wolf agreed that it would be advantageous for Metro Center students to have access to the facility, but does not want to delay sale of the land on this particular issue.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation and strongly urged the Oregon Institute of Technology to attempt to negotiate into the contract a provision to allow for either free or reduced services at the aquatic center for faculty and students.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

Following an inspection by the Corvallis Fire Marshall in fall 1990, Oregon State University was forced to close the theatre in the Mitchell Playhouse. The Board and the State's Emergency Board authorized the renovation of Withycombe Hall to
accommodate the theatre, a project that is now complete.

Mitchell Playhouse, constructed in 1898, is one of the oldest buildings on the Oregon State University campus. This 20,250-square-foot facility has served the University under many guises since construction, including use as a classroom and as a gymnasium. The cost to rehabilitate Mitchell Playhouse as a theatre was estimated to be three to four million dollars.

Since vacating Mitchell, Oregon State University officials have considered alternative uses for it. Using the facility for student activities rather than use by the general public would require less expensive improvements.

Over the years, the women's gymnastics program (part of intercollegiate athletics) has grown. Participants currently utilize the women's gymnasium facilities in Langton Hall, competing with instructional and intramural activities for use of that space. The Langton facility does not provide required clearances for various gymnastics equipment used and exercises performed, thereby causing University officials concern about safety.

Recently, a donor offered to pay for the design, construction, and outfitting of adequate facilities for the women's gymnastics program at Oregon State University. The $750,000 gift will permit the renovation of the Mitchell Gymnasium (a major portion of the Mitchell Playhouse facility) for use as a women's gymnastics facility. Because it will not be used for public assembly, and because a return to gymnasium use will permit the demolition of partitions that violate current codes, the gift will be sufficient to meet the cost of the project while, at the same time, permitting the re-use of Mitchell. Although most of the improvements are interior, some exterior repair work also can be accomplished using the gift funds.

No addition to the operating budget is required since the program is being moved from another Oregon State University facility, and operating costs for both facilities are included in the University's budget. Additional intramural activities, supported by fees, could be scheduled into
the Langton Gymnasium if more time were available at that facility.

Construction is expected to occur in 1992.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended that the Board approve the request of Oregon State University to gratefully accept the gift, and authorize staff to request the State Emergency Board to establish an Other Funds Limitation of $750,000 and authorize the expenditure of that amount for the renovation of Mitchell Gymnasium.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Adams inquired if the plan was to make the building a single-use facility. Dr. Edwin Coate, Vice President for Finance and Administration, indicated that the plan calls for a single-use building, but if the facility is underutilized, changes will be made.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

The BAS Model projects the budget requirement for each institution based on a mix of enrollment and programs offered. The percentage shown in the following table represents the percent actual funding is of the BAS Model project funding for each institution, if it were at the average support level for like colleges or universities used in developing the Model. For example, if an institution's percentage is 78.1 percent, that means it has 78.1 percent of the dollars the BAS Model calculates it should have based on its mix of enrollment and programs offered.
BAS Model Funding Comparisons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targeted three-term FTE enrollment (with a range of variance) is used to calculate the BAS Model budget requirement for each institution. If an institution’s enrollment falls outside its defined range, the BAS Model budget requirement is recalculated to indicate actual funding level compared to budgeted funding level.

Budgeted vs. Estimated Actual 1991-92 Three-Term FTE Enrollment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Est. Actual</th>
<th>Diff. Budget vs. Actual</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Actual*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>14,723</td>
<td>14,145</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>13,226</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>9,128</td>
<td>8,862</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>3,624</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,433</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Actual" represents estimated actual three-term FTE enrollment and actual budget for those institutions outside the range of enrollment for 1991-92.

In the initial planning for 1991-92, it was estimated that BAS funding systemwide would be at 78.2 percent of the BAS average. However, due to a reduced entering freshman class, the mix of enrollment changed in 1991-92, with a larger percentage of students at the upper-division and graduate levels. Therefore, due to this more costly mix of students, funding for 1991-92 is only at 77.3 percent.
Committee and Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Ihrig began the presentation of the BAS Model by indicating that it provides a way to compare System institutions to peer institutions. The Model, developed in the early 80s, is an "Oregon model," jointly developed with the institutions. Nationally, there continues to be a great deal of interest in the way the Model works.

Mr. Quenzer pointed out that there are four goals for using the Model. The first goal is to provide information to the Board and the governor to determine the level of funding required for support of the System. The second goal is to allocate resources in order to maintain quality in our institutions. Third, the BAS Model recognizes the diversity that exists among institutions, and allocates resources equitably to fund them. Mr. Quenzer stressed that the Model does not focus on equality -- but rather on equity. The final goal is to use the Model as a management incentive. The Model does not detail and lock-step resource allocations within institutions but rather allocates resources to institutions on a formula, and then allows for insitutional discretion.

The table provided to the Board shows actual budgets compared to what the budgets should be, based on the BAS Model. When the data indicate that the institutions are about 77.3 percent of the Model, that is down from 78.3 percent last year, and from 79.1 percent the year before that. Using the Model as the benchmark, this means that the institutions are underfunded by 22 or 23 percent. According to Mr. Quenzer, the goal of the Board over the last few years has been to bring these two figures more in line with each other.

Mr. Adams observed that if the Model is accurate, it is a clear indication of the austerity of programs, and not a good sign. He asked if this message was clear to the legislature. Mr. Quenzer responded that there was increasing understanding as exhibited by the legislature's interest in improving faculty salaries.

Mr. Miller and Ms. Wilson questioned the wisdom of committing resources to development of the BAS Model if the message was not clear. Mr. Ihrig and
Mr. Quenzer agreed that without the BAS Model, it would have been very difficult to sustain equitable funding to the institutions during the recent severe budget reductions. The Model provides a way to project funding and weigh various elements in the decision-making process.

(No Board action required.)

Introduction

The Board's Finance and Administration Committee requested that the Chancellor's staff report, on a quarterly basis, the status of resources and expenditures. The following report covers the quarter ending December 31, 1991.

Staff Report to the Committee

Education and General:

Resources\Board Income -- The income for Portland State University, Southern Oregon State College, Eastern Oregon State College, and the Oregon Institute of Technology is already 70 percent of the total amount budgeted because the BANNER System recorded winter term 1992 preregistration income into the December 1991 report.

Resources\Institutional Income -- Summer Session 1991 income is recorded against fiscal 1991-92. Summer session represents a large portion of the institutional income and explains why the percent of realized income is so large at most institutions. At Eastern Oregon State College, the percent of actual income is low because a large portion comes from the local school district for the Laboratory School for which payment is received later in the year.

Continuing Education:

For some institutions, expenses exceed income. However, some had beginning balances that are being expended, while for others (Western Oregon State College), historical expenditure pattern is heavier in the first part of the year.

Direct Charge and Service Accounts:

This category contains a large number of very diverse accounts. Many of these accounts (such
as car pools, printing, and telecommunications) are operating in a deficit situation at this time. However, that does not mean they will be in a deficit at the end of the year. Many accounts have a lag in billings and some have beginning balances to help in cash flow. In any event, year-end deficits in these accounts must be made up by Education and General funds so institutions are motivated to bring them into balance before year end.

Auxiliary Enterprises:
Some institutions show expenditures exceeding income. In part, that is because some transfers from sinking funds to cover expenditures for equipment replacement and capital repair were not recorded before the end of the quarter. However, institution administrators have been advised to monitor closely the auxiliary activities to ensure that operations will be in balance before the end of the fiscal year.

Committee and Board Discussion
Committee members, after reviewing the report, indicated that what they needed was an "early warning" system providing indicators of potential problems in cash flow in the course of the fiscal year. The challenge is to provide sufficient data without getting into micro-examination of line-item expenditures.

Mr. Miller asked if the report could be presented in a way that would permit Board members to look at expenditures to date as a percentage of the projections.

It was agreed that staff would continue to explore ways to present the material as clearly and concisely as possible.

(No Board action required.)
# Education and General Services

## Budget vs Actual Y-T-D Resources and Expenditures

For The Quarter Ended December 31, 1991  
(In thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources:</th>
<th>OSSHE</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>OTHER (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Income (1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>409,435</td>
<td>38,472</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>21,781</td>
<td>6,146</td>
<td>7,665</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>4,021</td>
<td>4,972</td>
<td>292,533</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>186,693</td>
<td>12,825</td>
<td>11,091</td>
<td>16,274</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>131,338</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Realized</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Income (2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>60,607</td>
<td>15,555</td>
<td>19,936</td>
<td>6,362</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>14,587</td>
<td>(793)</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>32,373</td>
<td>9,069</td>
<td>8,449</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Realized</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources:</th>
<th>OSSHE</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>OTHER (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>476,370</td>
<td>115,830</td>
<td>126,114</td>
<td>70,298</td>
<td>21,474</td>
<td>23,583</td>
<td>12,520</td>
<td>17,846</td>
<td>60,435</td>
<td>25,911</td>
<td>2,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>210,119</td>
<td>54,984</td>
<td>53,226</td>
<td>32,946</td>
<td>8,897</td>
<td>10,332</td>
<td>6,016</td>
<td>7,151</td>
<td>28,573</td>
<td>7,108</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Expended</strong></td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) System Income allocated per Board approved budget
(2) Dedicated income to finance Education & General Expenditures
(3) Includes OCATE & Teaching Research
### Statewide Public Services

**Budget vs Actual Y–T–D Resources and Expenditures**

**For The Quarter Ended December 31, 1991**

(in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ag</th>
<th>Ext</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>Hospital</th>
<th>CDRC</th>
<th>Dental Clinics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>23,799</td>
<td>22,319</td>
<td>4,826</td>
<td>221,764</td>
<td>10,437</td>
<td>2,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>10,771</td>
<td>7,426</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>118,585</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>1,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Realized</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>24,405</td>
<td>22,325</td>
<td>5,614</td>
<td>211,082</td>
<td>10,688</td>
<td>2,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>10,539</td>
<td>10,190</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>114,408</td>
<td>4,603</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Expended</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grants and Contracts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Non-Limited Activities (1)
### Budget vs Actual Y-T-D Resources and Expenditures
#### For The Quarter Ended December 31, 1991
#### (In thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSSHE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>WOSC</th>
<th>SOSC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>OTHER(1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>12,425</td>
<td>3,220</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>5,181</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>6,293</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Realized</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>240.0%</td>
<td>124.2%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>5,033</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>5,446</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Expended</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>201.6%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Charob and Service Accounts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>60,494</td>
<td>12,529</td>
<td>20,159</td>
<td>6,011</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>15,966</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>31,337</td>
<td>6,838</td>
<td>10,999</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7,088</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Realized</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>35.8%</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>61,238</td>
<td>12,747</td>
<td>20,477</td>
<td>6,023</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>2,439</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>15,822</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>33,547</td>
<td>6,838</td>
<td>12,423</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Expended</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Not under legislative expenditure limitation
Non-Limited Activities (1)
Budget vs Actual Y-T-D Resources and Expenditures
For The Quarter Ended December 31, 1991
(in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources:</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>% Realized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>108,231</td>
<td>45,923</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>35,471</td>
<td>16,701</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Realized</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures:</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>% Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>101,157</td>
<td>46,400</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>36,119</td>
<td>17,869</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Expended</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures:</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>132,489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Not under legislative expenditure limitation
Board members Adams, Halsey, and Jackson thanked President Meyers and members of the family of Western Oregon State College for the well-planned campus visit.

Mr. Halsey congratulated President David Gilbert who was named the LaGrande Union County Chamber of Commerce Man of the Year, a well-deserved honor.

Ms. Jackson suggested that the people responsible for the BAS Model should get together with the individuals working on teacher effectiveness to create another generation of the Model.

Mr. Swanson reported that he and Ms. Davis had participated in the first meeting of the Special Task Force on Athletic Funding. During a three-hour meeting, the Task Force oriented itself to the range of issues facing them, and laid out a tentative schedule for completing the work.

Mr. Miller updated the Board on the progress of the Board Administrative Review Committee (BARC) and reminded them of the three goals of the Committee: to respond to the legislative budget note; to put in place a review of the central administration structure and how it interacts with the institutions; and, finally, to review how business is conducted at the institutions.

President Byrne, at the invitation of Mr. Miller, reported on the developments at Oregon State University. After issuing a Request for Proposals, Oregon State University has contracted with Peat Marwick Accounting firm. That team will work with the Oregon State University Administrative Review Committee (ARC) to review the organization, structure, and functions of the institution. The work of this group will be closely related to the work of the Board Administrative Review Committee.

Mr. Richardson added that he and Mr. Dodson are identifying an external person from the academic community who is familiar with multi-campus systems to assist on a consultative basis, both with the evaluation of the Chancellor, and the BARC activities.

Mr. Bailey reported on the work of the Joint Boards Committee, indicating that their work was centered
on building the agenda for the Joint Boards Meeting in March. The group has been meeting monthly and has focused on major issues: articulation, teacher education, and governance. Mr. Bailey asked Board members to study carefully the recent press release from Marilynne Keyser on governance options and urged them to respond directly to Ms. Keyser with comments, questions, and suggestions for changes or revisions.

President Richardson thanked the Chancellor and vice chancellors for the excellent ways in which they were keeping Board members informed on the fast moving state agenda and impacts on the State System. In particular, Mr. Richardson thanked Roger Bassett for his efforts in working with the governor’s office and the legislators.

In the next few weeks, Mr. Richardson indicated that he would be announcing the formation of a Board Committee on Tuition Alternatives.

The next Board meeting is scheduled for March 27, 1992, at Oregon State University. The afternoon of that day will be a meeting of the Joint Boards.

The Board adjourned at 12 noon.

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

George E. Richardson, Jr.
President