# MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

April 24, 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLL CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINUTES APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT OF THE SPECIAL TASK FORCE ON ATHLETIC FUNDING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCELLOR'S REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment of OAR 580-40-041, Revolving Charge Accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming of North End Track and Field Facility, University of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Muehlhauser Estate Property, Oregon Health Sciences University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization to Distribute Portion of Arthur H. Devers Quasi-Endowment Fund for the Ophthalmology Department, Oregon Health Sciences University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to OAR 580-11-005, Student Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Audit Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Capital Construction Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC AFFAIRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSSHE's Involvement in Ed-Net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health Sciences University School of Medicine, Redefined Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT'S REPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJOURNMENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 12 noon, Friday, April 24, 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
Mr. Tom Bruggere     Mr. Les Swanson
Mr. Mark Dodson      Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.
Mr. Chris Halsey     Ms. Janice Wilson

Ms. Britteny Davis was absent due to personal emergency.

Chancellor's Office -- Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Roger Bassett, Director, Governmental Relations; Janet Billups, Director, Legal Services; Virginia Boushey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Francesca Clifford, Assistant Director of Communications; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; 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 Perneister, Associate Vice Chancellor for 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; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.

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

Oregon Health Sciences University -- President Peter Kohler; John A. Benson, Jr., Interim Dean, School of Medicine; Lesley M. Hallick, Vice Presi-
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President, Academic Affairs; Peggy Miller, Vice President, Finance; J.S. Reinschmidt, Associate Dean, School of Medicine.

Oregon Institute of Technology -- President Lawrence Wolf; Marla Edge, Executive Assistant to the President; Doug Yates, Dean of Administration.

Oregon State University -- Roy Arnold, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; L.E. Coate, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Bob Frank, Chair, English Department.

Portland State University -- President Judith Ramaley; Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President, Finance and Administration.

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

University of Oregon -- President Myles Brand; Norman K. Wessells, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration.

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

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate -- Marjorie Burns, Portland State University; Herb Jolliff, Oregon Institute of Technology.

Others -- Peggy Archer, Senior Legislative Analyst, Legislative Fiscal Office; Joe Hendricks, Oregon State University Faculty Senate; Kate Menard, Executive Assistant, Oregon Student Lobby; Robert Nosse, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Lynn Pinckney, Outgoing Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on March 27, 1992, and approved them as presented. The following voted in favor of approving the minutes: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: none.
Mr. Richardson indicated there would be a deviation from the published agenda in order to receive the report of recommendations of the Special Task Force on Athletic Funding. In introducing the Chairman of the Task Force, Dr. Herb Aschkenasy, president of Oregon Freeze Dry, Mr. Richardson remarked that the report would be presented to the Board, but action would be delayed until the May Board meeting.

Dr. Aschkenasy presented the following letter, which had been sent to Board President Richardson as a report of the work of the Task Force.

In response to your charge "to find a more acceptable way out of the present dilemma" in funding university intercollegiate athletic programs, the Special Task Force on Athletic Funding met three times, February 25, March 10, and April 14. We explored a number of options as alternatives to use of general fund dollars. To generate savings and new revenue from private resources totaling approximately $2,300,000 in each of the next three years, we offer for consideration of the State Board of Higher Education the following recommendations:

*FOUNDATION/CLUBS
Organizations raising funds for intercollegiate athletic programs will undertake to increase contributions per year for three years by $200,000 each at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University and $50,000 at Portland State University.
Total $450,000

*TICKET SURTAX
Require institutions to impose a surtax on all tickets sold to intercollegiate athletic events to average $1.00 per ticket, the specific increases on tickets to be determined by the respective athletic departments. Since increases on tickets to football and men's basketball games at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University are subject to distribution requirements of the PAC-10 Conference, it is understood this proposal will need discussion and approval of Conference members if any exception to the distribution formula is being requested. It is important
that each institution inform the public that the increase is a surtax to help address the immediate financial crisis in athletic fund-
ing.

Total $300,000 (est.)

without "exception"

*COST REDUCTIONS
The athletic departments at the three univers-
ities are to cut their 1991-92 expenditure
budgets by 2%, it being understood that each
department would best know how to determine
where specific cuts are to be made. Further-
more, university athletic departments could
incurred no increased deficits; however, budgets
could be increased in the amount of any addi-
tional generated revenues (over the $300,000
from ticket surtax). Based on the estimated
budgets for 1991-92, 2% cuts would be approxi-
mately:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Budget Cut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the three university athletic
programs should continue to explore possible
savings through cooperation on purchases of
goods and services.

*CORPORATE SUPPORT
Additional support be sought each year for
three years from major corporations that would
amount to:

Total $1,000,000

*SPORTS LOTTERY
Continued efforts should be made to increase
revenues from the Sports Lottery. Since it is
unclear whether or not increased revenues will
be available from this source, the Task
Force's estimated additional revenue is mod-
est.

Total $50,000

Total from above recommendations $2,300,000 (est.)
*OPERATING DEFICIT*

In addition, it is recommended that the accumulated operating deficit of $6,300,000 be forgiven, since it would leave in the athletic budgets of the three universities the following sum in principal and interest that now goes each year toward retirement of this deficit:

Total $1,100,000

These two recommendations, then, would come to:

Total $3,400,000

Our estimated total of $3,400,000 falls short of the monies needed to cover the projected operating deficits for the years 1992-93, 1993-94, and 1994-95. The difference could be covered by use of institutional funds for one or more of the following:

* support of women's athletic programs,
* support of non-revenue sports, men's and women's,
* pay for coaches' salaries in non-revenue sports, both men's and women's,
* or, to fund tuition for all student athletes on scholarship at the in-state rate.

The proposal made here is a good compromise in the short term and gives the Board time to consider longer-term solutions to the funding problem.

Although there are no guarantees that if the Board accepts this proposal all of its elements can be achieved, those who have accepted responsibility for the individual pieces certainly are committed to making their best efforts.

If this proposal is acceptable to the State Board of Higher Education, please let me know so that we may begin implementation.

Dr. Aschkenasy indicated that his remarks would follow the outline of the letter, and reminded the Board that the recommendations were targeted to athletics at Oregon State University, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon.
Foundation trustees of the three institutions have committed to attempt to raise approximately $450,000 per year in additional funds to offset the athletic deficit.

Second, the Task Force agreed there should be a ticket surtax imposed either by the Chancellor's Office, the Board, or the Governor's office. This surtax would be imposed on all ticket sales. A hurdle to raising sufficient resources through this avenue is that revenues received by institutions in the PAC-10 must be divided with other PAC-10 institutions. One of the presidents on the Task Force indicated a willingness to approach the PAC-10 to discuss the possibility of a waiver to allow retaining all additional revenues collected from an additional surtax.

Third, the Task Force urged the Board to reduce initial costs of athletic budgets by two percent, and hold expenditures at this level for the foreseeable future.

Finally, the Sports Action Lottery should be tapped for additional resources. Dr. Aschkenasy observed that this would have to be part of the longer-term solution since it would take time to work a recommendation of this type through the political system.

In discussing the present accumulated debt, Dr. Aschkenasy indicated that he had gone into the work of the Task Force with preconceived notions that other areas of the universities were supporting athletics. In fact, he observed, far from subsidizing the athletic program with institutional monies, the athletic programs subsidize the institutions. In the end, Task Force members agreed that the present accumulated debt of the athletic programs should be forgiven.

If the recommendations of the Task Force were accepted, ways were suggested for implementation. First, members of the Task Force agreed to assist in raising funds through private and corporate avenues. Second, it was suggested that a person be appointed to track progress on implementation of the recommendations and to assist in communicating results to the public.
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Mr. Miller asked if the Task Force had considered imposing a local motel/hotel/restaurant tax dedicated to funding athletics. Dr. Aschkenasy responded that the Task Force had spent much time studying the option and agreed that it was another solution that would take too long to guide through the legislative and voter processes.

Mr. Bailey asked for clarification regarding forgiveness of the existing athletic debt. Because the Board has ultimate control over the resources in auxiliary student incidental fee accounts, Vice Chancellor Ihrig indicated the Board could make a judgement to use them for athletics rather than for the specific accounts for which the resources were collected originally. Mr. Ihrig indicated that a decision to do this could create problems resulting from changes in the fiscal integrity and relationships with the auxiliary operations that had collected the funds. In the past, cash flow and the planned reserves have been used by the athletic departments, and the interest rate was paid at the same rate as the open market.

Mr. Bailey asked if the funding of athletics at the colleges had been discussed and Dr. Aschkenasy indicated the Task Force had not seen it as part of the charge since the total expenses for the colleges was comparably less, approximately $900,000, and which was part of the total college budgets.

Mr. Bruggere observed that the recommendation for a two percent cut in the athletic department budgets was extremely conservative and indicated that it would be interesting to know how much savings would accrue from a deeper budget reduction.

Mr. Dodson volunteered to assist in the process of generating the funds from external sources.

In closing, Dr. Aschkenasy indicated that the Task Force viewed the recommendations as a package, and that taking one or two components out of the recommendations would not solve the athletic funding deficit problem.

Mr. Bailey remarked that the recommendations implied that intercollegiate athletics would be maintained and asked if the Task Force had studied
the option of dropping out of the PAC-10 Conference or closing some of the revenue producing sports. Dr. Aschkenasy responded that the Task Force understood the charge to be to study and recommend how to eliminate the deficit. Leaving the PAC-10 or dropping down to another league would, in the short term, increase the bill by adding the costs of bonded indebtedness into the year 2021.

Mr. Richardson summed up the discussion by indicating that the Board had reached consensus there would be intercollegiate athletics and that action would be taken at the May meeting with respect to the recommendations to reduce. He thanked Dr. Aschkenasy and the Task Force for their efforts to find solutions to the continuing problems.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Bartlett thanked President Ramaley and staff at Portland State University for a successful campus visit. The visit followed a new format and proved to be informative, providing opportunities for Board members to interact with faculty and students.

The absence of President John Byrne was acknowledged. Dr. Byrne's mother died on April 23 of a massive heart attack. On behalf of the Board and the Chancellor's Office, condolences were expressed to President Byrne and family.

OSL Leadership

The April Board meeting marked the end of Lynn Pinckney's career as Executive Director of the Oregon Student Lobby (OSL). Ms. Pinckney has been with OSL since September 1988, prior to which she had been president of the University of Oregon Student Body and had graduated from the University of Oregon Law School. Ms. Pinckney will be practicing law in Eugene. Chancellor Bartlett and President Richardson thanked Ms. Pinckney for her dedicated leadership.

Mr. Robert Nosse, who has come to Oregon from Columbus, Ohio where he was Executive Director of the Ohio Student Association, has been hired to replace Ms. Pinckney. Both the Chancellor and President Richardson welcomed Mr. Nosse to the leadership of OSL.
The Chancellor indicated that the Board's office had moved into a new phase of preliminary budget development for the 1993-1995 biennium. There have been lengthy conversations with presidents, individually and collectively. Although the budget planning has been ongoing, the timetable has been accelerated in response to current directions of state politics. The immediate challenge is the development of an 80 percent budget -- that is, a budget based on 80 percent of the general revenue running rate.

Budget development is a complex process that must be involve the Board, System, and institutions. Communications with the Executive Office of the Governor, the Governor, the institutions, and the Board must proceed almost simultaneously and on a very fast track.

In describing the magnitude of the budget reductions required, the Chancellor indicated that the base number or running rate used for preliminary budget planning was $760 million, from which 20 percent reductions must be made, an amount in the range of $152 million. For illustrative purposes, that figure translates into $30 million a biennium for each of Oregon State University and the University of Oregon, and $18 million a biennium for Portland State University.

The Chancellor reminded the Board that 80 percent of the State System budget is for personnel, and if reductions in the range of 20 percent are to be made, it follows that there will be fewer people. It is necessary, therefore, to draw a distinction between downsizing and reorganizing. Downsizing consists of having fewer people, and the present order of magnitude results in significantly reduced numbers of people.

If downsizing occurs, changes also begin to occur to the organization. Critical mass is lost, and units get too small. Program implications develop rather quickly. In order to downsize and have the outcome make sense, reorganization, restructuring, and repositioning must occur. Continuing, Dr. Bartlett indicated it is important to keep in mind that some reorganization will not save money, but will be necessary in order to have critical mass and assure effective outcomes.
In addition to the 80 percent budget the System is mandated to create, two ten-percent decision packages are to be developed. The first ten-percent packages should reflect higher education priorities and are an invitation conceptually to a kind of reallocation to fit contemporary priorities as opposed to sustaining priorities that may have been inherited. The ten percent is not guaranteed, but will be put together with requests of other agencies. The second ten-percent decision packages for which higher education can submit requests are related specifically to achieving Benchmark goals. Both additional decision packages provide opportunities to incent the institutions and the Chancellor's Office to look at the way resources are organized and to ask if greater impact from resources could be gained by things such as inter-campus, Systemwide, even inter-agency programs, pooling of resources, and complementary programs and structures.

The budget preparation process will result in the System getting smaller, and part of the response is to reorganize. The budget instructions will have a clear bias that incents inter-campus examination of how business is conducted. The Chancellor indicated there is no guarantee that conducting business in new ways will always result in savings. However, there are areas not yet discovered where there would be significant advantages to operating on an inter-campus, inter-agency basis, and those must be explored. Higher education will be competing with all other agencies in public services for the support of the Governor's office, and then the legislature. There is no entitlement at all for any of the resources, assuming that they exist. Therefore, competition will be intense for the resources.

The timeline for decisions of the 80 percent budget call for an initial review by the Board at the meeting in June in preparation for a July decision. One reason for moving the date to June would be the possibility of a special session of the legislature and the Chancellor indicated it was OSSHE's responsibility to tell the citizens of Oregon in simple, direct, non-rhetorical, non-apocalyptic terms, the implications of an 80 percent budget.
In the June period, the broad parameters of program and budget reductions will be worked out. By June there should be some significant public policy input regarding tuition policies. In addition, some assumptions about size of administrative staff will have to be made that, in turn, have to be done in a way that build on the outcomes Board Administrative Review Committee (BARC), which are extremely important in the reorganization and restructuring that flows from downsizing in administrative services. Predictions also will need to be made about the level of enrollment, a vital part of the public debate concerning tuition policy development.

A critical and wrenching part of downsizing will be related to people -- downsizing means people and, therefore, it is absolutely the most central concern. Personnel decisions must be made as early as reasonably possible.

Because of the lack of people resources in the Chancellor's Office to move all of the policy development processes forward, some of the efforts have been spread to the campus administration and to the presidents. Chancellor Bartlett indicated that he, the Council of Presidents, and the vice chancellors are working as a corporate body trying to get through the policy issues that must be presented to the Board. The System leadership group is beginning to divide up some of these responsibilities as illustrated in the following examples.

President John Byrne has been asked to examine the present Extension Service programs and ask questions such as: should there be a System-wide extension service that goes beyond the concept of the Extension Service at Oregon State University? Should this be addressed in the face of downsizing? Working with colleagues, President Byrne will provide policy assistance in building recommendations for the Board.

Significant state policies are being related to Benchmarks, in theoretical as well as in budget and resource arenas. President Ramaley has been asked to take responsibility for developing policy, working with representatives from the other campuses and for developing strategies for addressing the Benchmarks as a System.
In the area of engineering, the work of the Engineering Council is moving forward. Presidents Byrne, Brand, and Ramaley are on the Council and Vice Chancellor John Owen has the responsibility of keeping that process integrated into other policy development efforts and, finally, moving it to implementation.

President Kohler has been asked to coordinate policy decisions around the area of nursing education. He will work with Presidents Cox and Wolf, whose institutions also have nursing programs, to develop a state-wide nursing academic program. Similarly, President Brand has been asked to work with presidential colleagues in the area of business beyond the baccalaureate degree.

President Gilbert will work on policy development in the area of continuing education, which has been a priority identified for some time and put aside under the pressure of Measure 5. The Chancellor indicated that it was important to integrate the best thinking into budget planning. Areas of Ed-Net activities also will be explored.

President Larry Wolf, along with President Ramaley, will develop a proposal related to technology education in Portland. Finally, Vice Chancellor Clark has responsibility for leading policy formation program proposals in the educator professions.

Continuing, the Chancellor remarked about the critical role BARC will play as attempts are made to arrive at a disproportionate amount of cuts resulting from downsizing of administrative services. The Chancellor sounded a note of caution by indicating that it is currently fashionable to think that budget reductions can be dealt with by cutting out administrative overhead costs. That is not true, since those costs are not great enough to solve the problem. Far from creating additional efficiencies, there are some serious risks of creating dis-efficiencies in the way and extent to which administrative cuts are made and, therefore, the challenge to the BARC process will be all the greater. Dr. Bartlett indicated by way of example that if the net result were to be a shift from administrative support and service people workload to faculty, just in sheer dollar terms, this would be shifting work from people who, in most cases,
are paid less but who are well qualified to do what they do, to people who are less qualified to do the same work but are paid more.

Finally, the Chancellor indicated the importance of the State System relationships with other sectors. At almost every point, decisions will have some impact on the community colleges or the K-12 system. In turn, decisions in these arenas will have significant impacts on the State System, which dramatizes the importance of the pioneering way of looking at education as one continuous, interactive process.

The Chancellor indicated that the stark reality begins to emerge that, through this process, some very good students are going to be scared away. He reassured the Board that there still will be a higher education system in Oregon with a very wide range of programs, with very talented faculty. A serious concern through the process of downsizing, which in the Chancellor's view is very bad for the state, is to inform the public about the plans. This is a difficult process and requires formulating the general shape of plans fairly quickly so people will know what is remaining.

The Chancellor added one qualification. "Last time, when we went through this in the beginning of 1991, we concentrated on program reduction. We were trying to avoid across-the-board cuts by targeting program and unit reductions. This time I think we should take a different approach and ask ourselves what public and higher education services should be protected in the state of Oregon. This is required because the state is going to need those services, and because we're not going to stay at the level that the 80 percent budget would postulate. One reason we aren't is that the population of the state is going to grow, and the economy is going to change. Therefore, we have to protect the cadre services capacities that we have at the very time that we consolidate and get smaller."

Mr. Dodson asked if sufficient attention was being given to the teacher professions and coordinating planning with the Joint Boards. Chancellor Bartlett responded that his reason for designating Vice Chancellor Clark as lead on this coordinating group was to underscore the importance of continuing
conversations with the Department of Education and the Office of Community Colleges.

**Introduction**

Oregon Administrative Rule 580-40-041, Revolving Charge Accounts, was approved by the Board in July 1990 as a temporary Rule, and adopted as a permanent Rule in September 1990. The Revolving Charge Accounts (RCA) program was developed in order to capitalize on opportunities presented by the then-new decentralized Student Information System -- in particular, the BANNER accounts receivable component. The advent of the BANNER system enabled institutions to streamline accounts receivable processes -- to consolidate several manual credit programs into one, more efficient, computerized system.

The Board adopted the Revolving Charge Accounts Rule with the understanding that staff would review the program after a year. This has been accomplished in the form of a management review conducted by the Office of Finance and Administration's Internal Audit Division.

Conclusions developed by the Internal Audit Division (IAD) in their review of the Revolving Charge Accounts Policy were extremely useful to staff in producing a revised policy which was presented to the Board for approval, and a better, more streamlined RCA program.

**Issues Addressed by IAD report**

1. **Management Controls Pertaining to Planning, Implementing, and Monitoring the RCA Policy**

   The IAD found that the RCA program lacked, at the outset, a formal statement of objectives, an assessment of program capabilities and effects, and a comprehensive study of fiscal impact, all of which the IAD felt should have been presented to the Board prior to adoption. Staff acknowledge this lack and will note these requirements in development of future Administrative Rules having significant financial or administrative consequences.
Additionally, specific procedures for monitoring the implementation of the Revolving Charge Accounts, as well as ongoing review of these accounts, were not in place. Formalized procedures now have been developed.

2. Clarity of OAR 580-40-041, Revolving Charge Accounts Policy

The IAD identified several areas of ambiguous wording in the Administrative Rule. The policy was intended to be broad at the outset to allow institutions latitude in setting up their systems; it was also staff's intent to review the policy after a year and make changes as necessary. The policy now has been reviewed and rewritten. The revised Administrative Rule, presented below, contains clear, unambiguous language setting forth specific definitions and parameters.

3. Institutional Compliance with the Revolving Charge Accounts Policy

The IAD's review indicated that information to institutions regarding submission of materials to OSSHE legal counsel was not provided. Guidelines now have been set forth. IAD also suggested implementation of a standardized "terms and conditions" agreement for common use by all institutions; this has been developed. In addition, the revised Rule requires that institutions secure a signed Revolving Charge Account agreement from all users.

The report posed questions pertaining to the RCA programs at Eastern Oregon State College and Southern Oregon State College, which were in progress before the Board adopted the Administrative Rule, thus not allowing these institutions enough time to bring their programs into compliance with the new Rule. Staff note this problem in timing and will endeavor, in the future, to coordinate timing of adoption of Rules and implementation of programs. Eastern Oregon State College and Southern Oregon State College are making appropriate adjustments in their programs to bring them into compliance with the Rule.
4. **Institutional Implementation of the Revolving Charge Accounts Policy**

The IAD conducted fieldwork at Southern Oregon State College and found the Revolving Charge Accounts program to be generally in compliance with OAR 580-40-041. Items found to be in variance include a requirement for a signed "terms and conditions" agreement, not always obtained at Southern Oregon State College, and specifics regarding calculation of interest. Southern Oregon State College currently is making adjustments to their program to correct these variances.

**Revised Rule**

Staff recommended Board approval of revised Oregon Administrative Rule 580-40-041, presented below. This revision was a joint effort of the Interinstitutional Fee Committee, which included Business Office representatives from OSSHE institutions, working in conjunction with the Chancellor's Office and Department of Justice staff. The revised Rule also took into account recommendations from the Office of Finance and Administration's Internal Audit Division. (Note: [ ] = indicate portion to be deleted; ___ = indicate portion to be added)

**Revolving Charge Accounts Policy 580-40-041**

[(1) Institutions may adopt rules for Revolving Charge Accounts. Such rules shall include:
   (a) The criteria used to determine eligibility for participating in the revolving charge account.
   (b) An institution may require a written credit application in order to determine if the criteria are met and which shall include a separately signed repayment agreement, describing the terms and conditions applicable to the transaction.
   (c) All charges incurred by students and others may be eligible for revolving charge account terms. Such charges may include, but are not limited to, instruction fee, health service fee, building fee, residence hall and family housing charges, library fines, parking fines, late registration fees, and special]
course fees.

(d) Due dates for repayments to the institution. Unless extended, tuition and fees incurred as a result of class registration are due in full no later than the beginning of each term, but in no case will an extension be made beyond the end of the current term.

(e) The institution shall adopt rules describing to students and the eligible public customers the terms and conditions for granting credit for payment of institutional charges, including the following:

(A) A minimum of one-third of the current term's tuition and fees must be paid at the date designated by the institution prior to or at the beginning of each term. The institution may establish provisions for financial aid recipients and third party sponsored recipients to satisfy the minimum payment by application of approved aid. The institution may establish minimum payment requirements for other institution charges. The option of payment in full always exists.

(B) The institution may assess a service charge up to $12.00 per term.

(C) Interest is charged each month on the outstanding past-due balance forward in a revolving charge account. The interest rate charged is to be determined by the institution, but shall be no less than 9% nor higher than 12% annual rate.

(D) The institution may charge a collection fee to the account of each student who has not paid the prior term's charges in full prior to the beginning of the subsequent term. The institution may charge a collection fee to the account of other public customers who have not paid their accounts in full prior to the final due date designated by the institution.

(E) Credit accounts may also be assessed all costs and charges necessary to collect any amount not paid when due, including, but not limited to, Oregon Department of Revenue, outside collection agency costs, reasonable attorneys' fees, and court filing fees.

(2) The institution may deny or cancel registration of any student who has not paid in full his/her entire accounts receivable balance prior to the designated due date for payment prior to or at the beginning of the
subsequent term. The institution may suspend credit and services, and withhold grade reports and transcripts, if an account is delinquent.

(1) Institutions offering extended payment terms utilizing a revolving charge account method shall adopt rules creating the Revolving Charge Account Plan, and describing the terms and conditions applicable to the Plan.

(2) Transactions covered by the Plan may include (by way of description and not limitation) tuition, fees, housing charges, and other obligations primarily involving students; facilities rentals, lease agreements, program user charges, and other transactions with non-students; and fines and penalties, incurred by anyone.

(3) If adopted, institutional rules shall:

(a) describe the interest to be charged, as well as service charges, collection and other fees and costs, if any, and penalties that would apply should an account become delinquent;

(b) provide for an agreement to be signed by the obligor, the form of which shall be approved by the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration; the institution shall use its best efforts to have the agreement signed, except for debts arising from fines, penalties and the like; and

(c) provide that tuition and fees incurred in any given term be paid in full prior to enrollment in any subsequent term.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Committee approve amendment to OAR 580-40-041, Revolving Charge Accounts.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Vice Chancellor Ihrig reviewed the history of the Revolving Charge Accounts Policy and procedures, and the recommendations of the Internal Audit Division from review of the current practices as they relate to the policies.
Mr. Halsey asked if there were specific guidelines for the institutions that would be enforced in the range of interest and fees assessed by the institutions. Vice Chancellor Ihrig indicated that the interest rate would be between nine and 12 percent. Through a standardized agreement, a formal decision will be made.

Ms. Jackson raised a question regarding the additional volume of work required for the Revolving Charge Accounts. Since these are handled through a multiple campus system, work actually has been consolidated and reduced through the ability to do billing in one monthly statement for students. In response to Mr. Adams' inquiry as to whether the transactions applied to non-students as well as students, Mr. Ihrig explained that it applies to non-student fees such as parking and library fines, facility rentals, and other services for which there might be a fee.

Ms. Wilson indicated there were two issues not covered in the revisions. The first centered on potential problems that might arise from a cash flow problem. When the policy was first adopted, there was no experience record to determine the level of use of the accounts. The range of use currently varies from 25 percent of students at one institution to a high of 50 percent at another. The question the Board must address is "what business are we in?" Ms. Wilson requested that Vice Chancellor Ihrig have an analysis conducted to determine the potential impacts of cash flow.

Second, Ms. Wilson expressed concern with allowing the institutions leeway in determining the rate of interest charged. Ms. Wilson indicated that a better approach might be to have the rate determined by market rates, and asked Mr. Ihrig to explore this aspect of the policy.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

In November 1990, the Board authorized the lease to the University of Oregon Foundation of a parcel of land within the boundaries of Hayward Field at the University of Oregon. The purpose was to facilitate the construction of a 15,000-square-foot facility to house track and cross country team locker rooms, offices for the track coaching staff, men’s and women’s showers and lockers for visiting teams and University of Oregon faculty and staff, treatment facilities, a training room, a meeting room, and offices for the International Institute for Sport and Human Performance. The building was to be funded entirely by a gift from the Bowerman Foundation.

The University of Oregon Foundation will donate the facility to the Board upon completion of construction. Completion and dedication of the building are scheduled for May 1992.

The University of Oregon requested the Board name the building the "Bowerman Building" in grateful recognition of a lifetime of contributions to the University by William J. Bowerman and members of the Bowerman family.

The names of Bill Bowerman and the University of Oregon are inextricably linked in the minds of track and field enthusiasts throughout the world. During his 25-year career as head track and field coach at the University, Mr. Bowerman helped revolutionize the sport and mentored numerous Olympians, American record holders, and NCAA champions. He also coached the United States Olympic track and field team in 1972, and was inducted into the National Track and Field Hall of Fame in 1981.

Although he may be best known as a superlative coach, Mr. Bowerman also helped create Nike, one of Oregon’s best known and most well-respected corporations. Long a friend of the University of Oregon, Mr. Bowerman most recently has shown his support by donating the funds to construct the North End Track and Field Facility.
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Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff concurred with the request of the University of Oregon, and recommended the Board name the North End Track and Field Facility at Hayward Field at the University of Oregon the "Bowerman Building."

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Vice Chancellor Ihrig indicated that there was a correction to the recommendation. The name of the building was recommended to be the "Bowerman Family Building," not the "Bowerman Building" as indicated in the docket materials.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the amended staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

The Oregon Health Sciences University is the recipient of the estate of Mr. Monroe Muehlhauser. Valued at approximately $161,000, the estate includes two parcels of land with improvements in Milwaukie, Oregon. University officials requested permission to dispose of the two parcels of land as surplus to the needs of the institution. They intend to use all net proceeds of the estate for equipment for the new School of Nursing building as part of the $3.3 million capital equipment campaign for this new building. The estate was an unrestricted gift to the University. The two parcels are improved with small two-bedroom residences, and have an approximate total value of $111,000. The parcels are to be appraised to determine their estimated market value before proceeding with the sale. Other state agencies have been notified of their availability, but it is not anticipated that any other agency would have an interest in the parcels.
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Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Board accept the bequest of Mr. Muehlhauser, and that the Office of Finance and Administration be authorized to advertise and sell the Muehlhauser estate properties at 3725 and 3756 SE Harvey Street, Milwaukie, Oregon in accordance with state law. Staff also recommended that authority to expend this quasi-endowment be transferred to the president of the Oregon Health Sciences University.

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, Bruggere, Dodson, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: none.

Staff Report to the Board

The Oregon Health Sciences University requested authorization to distribute $184,000 from the Arthur H. Devers quasi-endowment fund (Account 70-432-1013) and to amend future distribution authority to conform with Board IMD 6.140(6).

Transfers of quasi-endowment funds in excess of $100,000 require approval by the Board. Transfers of less than $100,000 can be authorized by the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration.

The quasi-endowment was established in 1959 to support eye, ear, nose, and throat research. The Board approved distributions of up to two percent of the original principal per year up to $20,000 of the corpus. Only nine distributions have been made, leaving 24 years at $20,000 ($480,000), which could have been made previously, but were not. The Oregon Health Sciences University requested that $184,000 now be distributed to support research staff at the new Casey Eye Center. The University further requested that the $20,000 limit on annual distributions be increased to $30,000 per year, and up to
$100,000 per year upon approval by the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. This is in accordance with Board policy [IMD 6.140(6)].

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Board approve the distribution of $184,000 from the Arthur H. Devers quasi-endowment fund. Staff further recommended that future distribution authority be increased to $30,000 per year without further approval authority, and up to $100,000 per year with the approval of the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Ms. Wilson asked if the donor of the property had requested the provision or if it had been a Board approved decision. Ms. Peggy Miller, Vice President for Finance, Oregon Health Sciences University, indicated that it was a Board policy established in the late 1950s or early 1960s.

Mr. Ihrig, in response to an inquiry by Ms. Wilson, indicated that the present request for $184,000 was due to the fact that the Casey Eye Institute opened in September 1991, and recruitment of new faculty to expand the program was underway. The funds would be associated with further start-up of the Institute.

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, Bruggere, Dodson, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Wilson, and Richardson. Those voting no: none.

Staff Report to the Board

All State System colleges and universities requested authority to offer student health services during the summer to students who were registered and paid the health fee the previous spring term and who intend to register for the upcoming fall term. The service would be offered even though the
student is not registered for summer term. The Board previously authorized the fee, which will be charged for this service (by adoption of the fee handbook). However, the substantive Administrative Rule on the subject of student health services does not allow the service to be extended to non-registered students without specific Board approval. A public hearing regarding the Rule amendment was held on April 17, 1992. Public comments were discussed at the Committee meeting. (Note: [ ] = indicate portion to be deleted; ____ = indicate portion to be added)

Student Health Services
580-11-005

(1) The institutions shall operate or provide student health services to safeguard the health of their students through health education, medical treatment of injuries and diseases, and limited counseling services.

(2) Student health services supported by student fees shall be made available to full-time and part-time students who are enrolled in courses taught by institution faculty and who have paid the health service fee adopted by the Board.

(3) An institution may also provide health services to:

(a) [P]articipants in on-campus, non-credit workshops and programs sponsored by the institution[.]

(b) [P]articipants in off-campus, non-credit workshops and programs sponsored by the institution under contract with an off-campus organization[.]

(c) [P]articipants in on-campus workshops and programs sponsored and taught by off-campus organizations under a lease or contract with the institution[.]

(d) [O]ther persons on an emergency basis[.]

(e) persons, during the summer, who were registered and paid the health fee the previous spring term, intend to register for the upcoming fall term, and pay a fee equal to the fee charged to regularly enrolled summer term students. Sign-ups shall be during a period in spring term designated by the director of health services.
Health service fees charged to these categories of users shall not be less than the current fees charged full-time and part-time students prorated according to the period of use.

(4) Charges may be made for prescriptions, laboratory services, immunizations, and other special services in accordance with regulations adopted by the institutions. The institutions may deduct such charges from breakage fees or make other arrangements for payment.

(5) The student health services will not pay or be responsible for bills from private physicians or private hospitals, except in cases of advance contractual arrangements made by the institutions.

(6) Except as permitted by this rule, faculty and staff (other than residents, interns, and graduate assistants) are not eligible to use student health services operated or provided by the institutions. Institution executives may authorize that limited services, such as immunizations and injections, and emergency services be provided faculty and staff on a full cost reimbursement basis.

All institutions are in agreement that this is a service they would like to extend to students who remain in the area between spring and fall terms even though they are not registered. The Board has endorsed the proposal by authorizing the fee for this service.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Board approve the amendment to the Rule.

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 and, on roll call, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Dodson, Halsey,
Ms. Wilson called on Dr. Peter Hughes, Director of the Internal Audit Division, to present the Third Quarterly Report to the Committee.

Dr. Hughes indicated the Unit has completed approximately 80 percent of the items included in the annual plan for this time in the year. One of the reasons that percentage is not higher is that the Audit Division has completed five special requests that originally had not been scheduled.

Financial audits of the three universities in Division I and IA have been completed. The work on these projects was accelerated because the Special Task Force on Athletic Funding requested specific information.

Mr. Adams raised a question about the accounts receivable write-offs for Oregon Health Sciences University, which is occurring at a rate of over one million dollars per month, and whether this reflected an increased or decreased amount. In addition, he asked what kinds of controls were in place on these accounts. Ms. Miller indicated these represented charitable write-offs for which economic criteria have been established for receiving charity patients versus bad debt. The rate has been fairly consistent over time and is managed because of the special role of the hospital in establishing charity qualifications.

Mr. Halsey asked Ms. Miller how closely Oregon Health Sciences University compared to similar institutions in the state and nation. Ms. Miller responded that in terms of indigent and charity care and Medicaid patients, Oregon Health Sciences University is number one. In relation to the national standard in terms of charity and indigent care, Oregon Health Sciences University is three times the national standard. Mr. Ihrig indicated that it is commendable that the Oregon Health Sciences Hospital is operating as close to a balanced budget as it is in light of the indigent care being provided.

Ms. Wilson indicated that the kind of services being provided by the Oregon Health Sciences Uni-
versity is a matter of public policy, and attention should be given to ways to present this in the overall System legislative strategy.

Ms. Wilson thanked Dr. Hughes for the report and for an attitude that reflects a management style of cooperation.

**Staff Report to the Committee**

The following table portrayed the status of all active capital construction projects. A few are listed as complete, meaning that they are occupied and that all artwork, accounting, construction claims, and other transactions have been finished.

Five projects reached this stage during the past quarter -- the land acquisition allowances for 1985-1987 and 1987-1989, the Stevenson Union Addition at Southern Oregon State College, the storage and landscaping efforts at Eastern Oregon State College, and Oregon State University’s Child Care Center. These projects will not appear in subsequent reports. The expenditure balances in the table are as of February 29, 1992.

The nine other projects for which status changed are designated with an asterisk, and include the Mitchell Gymnasium project approved by the Board in February 1992. Three projects shown as complete in January no longer appear on the list.

Construction claims with regard to Portland State University’s Millar Library Addition have been resolved.

Oregon State University’s Mitchell Gymnasium Rehabilitation project is scheduled for discussion with the Emergency Board on April 16, 1992. Bond proceeds not being used for parking at the University of Oregon have been committed for design expenses for Hoke Hall at Eastern Oregon State College, for the rehabilitation of Parking Structure I at Portland State University, and for Utility Rehabilitation at the University of Oregon. Efforts are underway to fund 1991-1993 projects for health and safety from existing bond proceeds. This is in response to the State Treasurer’s continued moratorium on the issuance of bonds for projects other than those for the University Hospital.
## CURRENT CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

($ in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coll/Univ</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Limit/Appn</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1983-1985 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Inst for Adv  Biomed Rsrch</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$ 21,011</td>
<td>$ 221</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1985-1987 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Land Acquis  Various</td>
<td>$ 1,250</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Science Facils Fed, Lott</td>
<td>33,579</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Casey Eye Inst Gift</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>BICC         Fed</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Hosp/Clinic  Hospital</td>
<td>17,195</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1987-1989 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Land Acquis  Various</td>
<td>$ 1,510</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Handicapped Access GF</td>
<td>3,810</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Utility Imps GF</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Outdoor Activ Area BF</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Admin Svcs Expan BF</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Parker Stadium Imps Athletic</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Ag Sciences II GF, Fed, Gift</td>
<td>26,360</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Ag Exp Stn Imps Lott, Fed, Gift</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>SELP Energy Imps SELP</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>Part compl; Rest avail (PPL Agmt Superseded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Computer Svcs Bldg GF</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Stevenson Union Add BF</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Southbank Imps Aux</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>On Hold—Riverfront</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Parking Imps Parking</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>2,452</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Bicycle Facils Aux</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Architecture/ Allied Arts Aux</td>
<td>8,555</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Utility Imps GF, Aux</td>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Basic Sci/ GF, Fed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
<th>Budgeted Amount</th>
<th>Actual Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CROET</strong></td>
<td>Wrk Comp</td>
<td>28,100</td>
<td>7,663</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHSU</strong></td>
<td>Student Activ Bldg</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>6,925</td>
<td>Ph II compl;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHSU</strong></td>
<td>Univ Hosp/Clinics Hosp</td>
<td>12,096</td>
<td>5,393</td>
<td>Ph II in Ping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSU</strong></td>
<td>Millar Libr Add GF</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1989-1991 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Project Details</th>
<th>Budgeted Amount</th>
<th>Actual Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYS</strong></td>
<td>Land Acquis Aux</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>Bal.Avail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYS</strong></td>
<td>Asbestos Abatemnt GF</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYS</strong></td>
<td>Repr &amp; Moderniztn GF</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYS</strong></td>
<td>Repr &amp; Moderniztn Aux</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Awaits Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOSC</strong></td>
<td>Storage/Landscapg BF</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OIT</strong></td>
<td>Parking Imps Parking</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OIT</strong></td>
<td>Cornett Reroof Lottery</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OIT</strong></td>
<td>Metro Ctr Lott, Sys</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOSC</strong></td>
<td>Exec Confs/ Trng Ctr</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOSC</strong></td>
<td>Bldg Planning GF</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Des. on Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU</strong></td>
<td>Kerr Library GF, Gift</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>Des. on Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU</strong></td>
<td>Dixon Aquatic Ctr BF, SELP</td>
<td>5,548</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU</strong></td>
<td>Fam Studies Ctr Gift</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU</strong></td>
<td>Child Care Ctr BF</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU</strong></td>
<td>Sci Facs Rehab Lottery</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU</strong></td>
<td>Cold Storage Add Lott, Gift</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Ph II Under Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOSC</strong></td>
<td>Track/Tennis Facs BF</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOSC</strong></td>
<td>KSOR Satellite Fed, Gift</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>Some eqpt inst; Some on order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOSC</strong></td>
<td>Computer Eqpt Lottery</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOSC</strong></td>
<td>Cascade Cafeteria Housing</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UO</strong></td>
<td>Knight Lib Addtn GF, Gift</td>
<td>26,620</td>
<td>18,676</td>
<td>Ph I in castr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UO</strong></td>
<td>EMU Outdoor Strg BF</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UO</strong></td>
<td>Hamilton Kitchen Hsg, Fed</td>
<td>1,940</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UO</strong></td>
<td>Parking Imps Parking</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UO</strong></td>
<td>Autzen &amp; Cas Ctr Ath/SELP</td>
<td>9,129</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UO</strong></td>
<td>Student Housing Housing</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>9,830</td>
<td>In design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UO</strong></td>
<td>Science Facils Lottery</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Und.Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHSU</strong></td>
<td>Child Hosp Study GF</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHSU</strong></td>
<td>School of Nursing GF, Fed</td>
<td>13,825</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Now Open*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHSU</strong></td>
<td>Parking Struc #5 Parking</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>Now Open*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHSU</strong></td>
<td>Hospital Renovs Hospital</td>
<td>12,685</td>
<td>12,075</td>
<td>Some under Cnstr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHSU</strong></td>
<td>Util Syst Imps Hospital</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>In planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHSU</strong></td>
<td>Hematology/ Oncology Federal</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OHSU</strong></td>
<td>Office Space Auxiliary</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSU</strong></td>
<td>Smith Ctr Rehab BF</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PSU Mill Street Bldg Auxiliary 1,400 52 Now Open
PSU PCAT Remodel Federal, Inst Funds 240 205 Some under Cnstr

1991-1993 Projects

SYS Land Acquis Various $ 600 NA None Sched.
EOSC Hoke Hall Addtn BF, Hsg 2,090 2,090 In design
WOSC Health Svcs Addtn BF 260 NA No Activity
WOSC Eastern Bypass GF 180 NA Scheduled for Spring

OSU Envirn Comptg Ctr Gift 2,000 NA In design
OSU Burt Hall Lab Ren Fed 250 250 On Hold
OSU FRL Lab Ren Inst Funds 230 230 In Design*
OSU Mitchell Gym. Rehab Gift 750 NA Await EBoard*
SOSC Residnc Hall Strg Housing 965 NA No Activity
SOSC Campus Ped Safety Housing 235 NA In design
SOSC Parking Expansion Parking 150 NA No Activity
UO Museum Nat Hist Gift 1,570 NA No Activity
UO Longhouse Gift 545 NA No Activity
UO N. Campus Reloc Riverfront 2,225 NA On Hold -- Riverfront

UO Comm Svcs Bldg Auxiliary 5,200 NA Await bonds
UO Util Syst Rehab BF, Hsg 800 800 Und.Cnstr*
OHSU NeuroSensory Ctr Fed, Gift 25,400 25,400 Contract awarded

OHSU Hospital Uils Hospital 2,250 NA No Activity
OHSU Parking Struc #5 Parking 3,345 NA No Activity
OHSU Outpatient Clinic Hospital 7,000 7,000 In Design*
OHSU Hospital Renovs Hospital 10,000 10,000 In Design*
PSU Student Housing Housing 19,450 19,450 NA Await Bonds
PSU Parkg Struc I Rehab Parking 1,110 1,110 In Design*

Abbreviations: BICC=Biomedical Information Communications Center; BF=Building Fee; CROET=Center for Research on Occupational and Environmental Toxicology; GF=General Fund; SELP=State Energy Loan Program

Discussion by the Committee

Mr. Miller asked for an explanation of the issues around the Oregon Health Sciences construction project. Mr. Pernsteiner indicated that there were questions between the contractor and the architect about the design of some of the exterior plating systems and about the foundation. In addition, scheduling issues have arisen during the course of
the project. The range of the issues has not yet been clarified, but the project is two to three months behind schedule, and efforts are being directed to regain ground.

In response to Ms. Jackson's inquiry regarding the name of the contractor, Mr. Pernsteiner replied that it was the Donald M. Drake Company. Ms. Jackson indicated that the Rogue Valley Medical Center in Medford has the same contractor and, likewise, is running behind in the construction schedule.

Mr. Adams asked if there were any new indications regarding the moratorium imposed by the State Treasurer on construction. Mr. Pernsteiner indicated that, at this time, there was no change and the item would be brought to the Board in the summer with a discussion of the bond needs for FY 92-93. It is hoped that a decision will have been reached by that time.

Update on Ed-Net Installation

Oregon Ed-Net, the new statewide telecommunications system, is now partially operational, allowing OSSHE institutions to deliver courses and other resources to underserved areas of the state. Ed-Net interconnects all public two- and four-year colleges and universities as well as many other locations in the state. Unlike other forms of television, Ed-Net is interactive. Most programs transmitted over the Ed-Net system are transmitted in "real time," and participants at the remote sites are able to interact with the person who is presenting from the origination site. Progress on the installation of the network's three systems was summarized:

- Network 1. At the present time, 120 sites ("real time," one-way video, two-way audio) have been installed. Most of the Network 1 sites are high schools, but state governmental offices, community colleges, and OSSHE institutions are included as well. Ed-Net has recently initiated a project to install 20 dedicated state agency downlinks throughout the state to better serve state government. These new facilities are expected to improve scheduling and access to state training and information services by regional sites.
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Network 2. At the present time, there are 25 operational sites (compressed video at 15 frames per second, two-way video, two-way audio), with an additional 16 sites in progress. A compressed video upgrade from 15 to 30 frames per second will occur this summer, with full implementation expected by fall classes. All OSSHE institutions recently completed Network 2 hardware installation but not all have fully functioning classrooms. New distance learning classrooms are being developed at the University of Oregon (library addition), Oregon Health Sciences University (new nursing building), and the Oregon Institute of Technology is equipping an existing classroom that is well suited for Ed-Net origination. Other OSSHE institutions have classrooms readily accessible to the Network.

Network 3. Network 3, the statewide computer conferencing network, recently has been renamed Oregon Compass. Oregon Compass is a data network that will allow computer conferencing, electronic mail, access to library catalogs, and the like. An Oregon Compass pilot system has been installed between the State Library in Salem and Eastern Oregon State College for testing and demonstration. A special nine-week computer conferencing class has been made available from Ed-Net to a small number of faculty to familiarize them with EIES II, the system’s software. This will help faculty who wish to use the system learn how to teach over Oregon Compass or to supplement instruction to students along with their broadcasted Ed-Net courses.

OSSHE’s Planning for Ed-Net Use in 1992-93

Courses. Even though most of the OSSHE institutions only recently received Ed-Net equipment and the ability to send and receive classes and meetings, a significant number of requests to originate courses have been made for the 1992-93 academic year. During popular time slots, especially in the late afternoon and evenings, the access to certain Ed-Net sites is already somewhat restricted by demand.

In order to facilitate the maximum use of this limited resource and coordinate the offerings,
OSSHE institutions' course offerings are being coordinated by the Academic Affairs Office of the Chancellor's Office.

The Chancellor's Office will be submitting requests from institutions to the Ed-Net office for scheduling in 1992-93. At the present time, OSSHE institutions have requested more than 65 courses; more are expected. Most of the courses are integral to programs that are either extensions of present distance learning offerings by institutions, or the institutions are considering developing programs in the areas the courses are being offered. Those currently on OSSHE's proposed schedule request to Ed-Net include:

- Nursing from Oregon Health Sciences University
- Liberal Studies from Oregon State University
- Agribusiness from Oregon State University
- Master's of Teacher Education from Eastern Oregon State College
- Social Work from Portland State University
- Library/Media Certification from Portland State University and Western Oregon State College
- Corrections from Western Oregon State College.

Other courses, such as those at Southern Oregon State College, are proposed to be offered to the regional area. These include courses in Humanities, Business, and Education (Exceptional Children). Other programs are expected to be added to the list: for example, selected engineering and computer science courses from Oregon State University and the University of Oregon offered through the Oregon Center for Advanced Technology Education.

Many of these programmatic developments are occurring as a result of the OSSHE Annenberg/Corporation for Public Broadcasting "New Pathways to a Degree" grant received by the State System in 1991. With this funding, a number of faculty from Oregon Health Sciences University and Oregon State University in the discipline areas of Nursing, Agribusiness, and Liberal Studies have received training to complete curriculum redesign for delivering courses over Ed-Net. In this project, Eastern Oregon State College is addressing student service policies and practices that need to be in place to offer effective programs via distance education.
Teleconferences/Meetings. In addition to the origination of courses for academic credit, OSSHE institutions also are becoming very involved in originating teleconferences -- interactive video and audio meetings. Some of these meetings are undertaken to save time at the college or university for those who are involved. Others are collaborative efforts among the OSSHE institutions and other state agencies who do not have the Ed-Net origination capability and must, therefore, contract for television production services. Oregon State University, for example, reports that activity in teleconferencing is up 400 percent over last year; many of these are from collaborative efforts with other organizations and agencies such as the Oregon Business Council and Adult and Family Services. Examples of teleconferences/meetings held over Ed-Net in 1992 include:

- Volunteer Training Program in Hazardous Waste, the Department of Environmental Quality
- Traumatic Head Injury, the Department of Education
- Governor's Workforce Quality Council Meeting
- Preferred Worker Training, the Department of Insurance and Finance/Oregon Worker's Compensation Division
- Privacy, the Bill of Rights and American Life, Oregon State University
- Animal Rights, Oregon State University College of Agriculture
- Nursing Research, Southern Oregon State College
- Community Health Nursing, Oregon Health Sciences University
- Health Care Teleconference, Oregon State University Extension Service
- Safety Training, Oregon State Health and Safety Administration
- Contract Training Teleconference, the Oregon State System of Higher Education
- Children's Summer Reading Workshop, Portland State University
- Financial Aid for Migrant Students, Educational Opportunity Program
- Adult and Family Services Changes, Adult and Family Services.
Policy Development to Support OSSHE Ed-Net Uses

In order to provide policies and guidelines for efficient operations, the Office of Academic Affairs has developed a series of working papers ("Extended Education in OSSHE: Continuing Education and Ed-Net") addressing many issues related to extended learning and uses of Ed-Net. These working papers have been distributed widely within the institutions for comment and are moving to the implementation stage.

Committee Presentation and Discussion

A presentation on OSSHE’s delivery of programs over Ed-Net was provided to the Committee by Jon Root, Ed-Net Coordinator. Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and faculty involved in the Annenberg/CPB grant described how faculty have been retrained to use Ed-Net; faculty from Eastern Oregon State College reviewed delivery of the MTE degree over Ed-Net.

Dr. Mike Martin from the Oregon State University Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics described an agri-business program that links the Oregon State University campus at Corvallis with the program jointly offered at Eastern Oregon State College. He indicated that the Annenberg/Corporation for Public Broadcasting grant allowed experimentation to improve the nature of instruction. Curriculum challenges are to bring a greater international sense to the agri-business community of La Grande. Additional seminars are being developed on animal rights to be used state-wide both by students in the program and others throughout the state.

Dr. Henry Sayre, professor in the Art Department at Oregon State University, discussed the Liberal Studies Program created to offer an integrated degree for students at remote sites throughout the state. The eventual plan is to offer 18 courses on a three-year cycle, totalling a degree program of 54 hours. Class sizes have ranged from 20 to 120, and distribution of courses will include Bend, Newport and, eventually, Hood River and Umpqua. Faculty have discovered that the technology is an extraordinary teaching tool. Another interesting aspect of the offerings is the students. Courses
have attracted students who are, in the main, older, more self-directed, and serious about the course of study.

Mr. Bruggere inquired if consideration had been given to a computer drawing course. Dr. Sayre indicated that he hoped to offer a surrealism course and this would include a computer drawing project.

Dr. Mary McFarland from Oregon Health Sciences University discussed the Ed-Net 2 program offering a baccalaureate nursing program. In addition to the courses, students will be taking practicum clinical courses in local hospitals. There is a baccalaureate program at Eastern Oregon State College for non-nurses that will be delivered to rural parts of eastern Oregon including Baker City, Burns, John Day, Enterprise, and Lakeview. Next year a course in educational psycho-pharmacology will be added and sent by Ed-Net to Damasch State Hospital, Oregon State Hospital, and the Eastern Oregon Psychiatric Center.

Mr. Bailey asked what the reactions of students had been regarding the programs. Dr. Sayre indicated that students at Oregon State University appear to prefer the Ed-Net programs over the usual classrooms. Dr. Martin indicated that courses are better received when they are less well packaged -- not too slick.

Mr. Bruggere was curious about the reaction of professors to participating in a new technology. There have been, according to Dr. Sayre, interesting side-benefits from the use of Ed-Net. One is that professors are able to see themselves repeatedly, and the reinforcement of this has led to improved teaching. In addition, Ed-Net requires better preparation of the lecture and a far greater degree of attention to teaching strategies.

(No Board action required)
On April 6, 1992, the Faculty Council of the Oregon Health Sciences University School of Medicine approved the redefined curriculum for the preparation of physicians that has been in the planning process for some time. The need for major curricular revision in an already highly ranked program (in the March 23, 1992 issue of U.S. News and World Report, Oregon Health Sciences University was reported as receiving a reputational ranking of third among comprehensive medical schools) was indicated by a number of interrelated factors. Among these are: the evolution in health care characterized by an exponential increase in technology and shorter patient hospitalizations; the related need for medical students to have clinical experiences with ambulatory care in primary care settings; the changing demography of society and changing expectations of health care and professional-client relations; increasing ethical dilemmas; escalating costs of health care as these and other factors emphasize greater focus on health promotion and disease prevention; and the accelerated rate of knowledge expansion in the sciences and students' needs to become self-directed, sophisticated learners to assure career competency.

Deliberations of faculty task forces produced consensus on the principles that would guide the revision of the curriculum. The early part of the planning process was supported, in part, by a grant from the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation, Inc. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation is providing funds in support of the continuing development and implementation of the curriculum. There are numerous important features in the redefined curriculum in content and structuring, in undergirding educational precepts, and in faculty and administrative involvement in implementing and sustaining the changes. Content and structuring changes focus on more integration of subject matter across departments and across basic sciences and clinical studies; attention to transitional experiences from academic to clinical experiences and from student to physician roles; and changes in the nature, timing, and organization of clerkships and rotations. Important educational precepts in the redefined curriculum include the goal of preparing students to become life-long independent learners.
A Paradigm for Educating Physicians for the Future

Redefined Curriculum for the School of Medicine
Oregon Health Sciences University

Goals of Curricular Revision

- Develop a four-year curriculum in the School of Medicine with a logical sequence of knowledge acquisition integrating the basic and clinical sciences.

- Enhance the processes by which medical students acquire the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values requisite for physicians in the rapidly changing health care milieu.

The last major curriculum revision of the School of Medicine was over twenty years ago. A number of factors dictated the need for the thorough review that has led to the revision of the current curriculum. Among these are the evolution in health care in this nation that is characterized by a phenomenal expansion in health care technology coupled with shorter, more intense hospital episodes. The combination of increased patient complexity and shortened hospital stays makes medical student education difficult and unbalanced if it is confined to the tertiary care hospital environment. Consequently, there is a need to address the educational imbalance through increased ambulatory care experiences in primary care settings that more realistically reflect clinical practice.

Factors such as the aging of the population, societal expectations, and conflicting mores also point to the need for change in medical education. Increasing ethical dilemmas in medical decision making, accentuated by the rapid expansion and utilization of technology in health care, underline the importance of emphasizing humanism in the doctor-patient relationship. These issues, coupled with high costs of health care, require that health
promotion and disease prevention receive stronger emphasis in the curriculum.

The sciences basic to medicine must be linked more directly to the needs of clinical practice in the curriculum in order to enhance understanding of normal and abnormal function and disease processes. The vast and rapidly expanding scientific and clinical bases of medicine mandate that students become familiar with modern methods of accessing, sorting, and utilizing information. Consequently, students must become self-directed learners in order to enhance competency through a lifetime of clinical practice.

Consideration of these aforementioned issues led to development of 19 principles for redefined curriculum. Faculty task forces used these principles to design the structure and content of the revised curriculum.

Principles for a Redefined Curriculum

1. The redefined curriculum shall involve all students rather than separate innovative and traditional tracks.

2. The educational process shall foster independent learning and promote investigative and problem solving skills.

3. Transition courses are needed at three strategic times to facilitate the progression from undergraduate to professional school, from predominantly basic science to clerkship experiences, and from medical student to resident physician.

4. The curriculum will be enhanced by providing electives/selectives throughout the four-year curriculum.

5. Societal and behavioral issues in health care must be addressed better.

6. The evaluation of student performance must be improved.
7. The basic science content needs careful scrutiny for appropriate depth, breadth, and integration.

8. The basic science curriculum should be organized into units of structure and function progressing from normal and abnormal cells and behavior to the pathophysiology of disease and psychopathology along a continuum.

9. Longitudinal clinical experience will begin early in the first year.

10. There will be increased experiences in non-tertiary settings.

11. The clinical sciences need careful scrutiny for appropriate depth, breadth, and integration.

12. The core clerkships curriculum will be delineated for the third year.

13. The fourth year will be redefined to enhance the educational value.

14. Students are expected to participate fully in the education programs.

15. Faculty will define specific course content.

16. Criteria for promotion and tenure will be developed to assure equity and balance of teaching activities with research, patient care, and service.

17. All faculty are expected to participate in the educational programs.

18. The Associate Dean of Education and Student Affairs, under supervision of the Dean, will have the responsibility for all aspects of the medical education programs.

19. The Curriculum Committee, through the Office of Education and Student Affairs, chaired by the Assistant Dean for Curriculum, will have the responsibility for
implementation, evaluation, and coordination of the curriculum and for assuring appropriate curriculum evolution.

The initial phase of the endeavor, including development of the principles, was supported enthusiastically by a grant from the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation, Inc. This grant permitted a detailed curriculum review including: a "keyword" content inventory, study of curricular innovations, site visits to selected institutions with innovative curricular components, delineation and reduction of barriers to change, and elaboration of substantial curricular issues.

**Proposed New Curriculum**

Following is a summary of the most salient features of the curriculum redefinition and related issues:

**Content**

- The basic sciences will be integrated across departments, resulting in significant reduction of lecture time, and increased student-centered, problem-related learning.

- The Principles of Clinical Medicine track through years one and two will provide the opportunity for clinical correlations to the basic sciences and early, continued patient interaction for students.

- Emphasis will be placed on preventive aspects of health throughout the curriculum.

- The transition course from years one and two to clinical services is intended to familiarize students with records, laboratory services, presentation skills, phlebotomy, catheterization, ethical considerations, working with difficult patients and events, etc.
The third year clerkship of six weeks' duration in Family Medicine will be required.

Community-based Primary Care rotation of six weeks (Family Medicine, General Internal Medicine, General Pediatrics) in Clinical Practice units will be required. Students will be expected to experience and become familiar with the health care system as it functions in the communities and appreciate the satisfaction of the "generalists'" approach to medicine. These rotations will be largely in rural and underserved locations, not in tertiary care centers.

The core clerkships are revised to include an emphasis on ambulatory care and integration of a number of areas (pediatrics-obstetrics, psychiatry, and other clerkships).

The Colloquia on Medical Science and Practice throughout the third year will provide linkage between clinical and basic science, and behavioral and ethical issues of broad application and transcendent importance. All students will be required to participate and group problem-based learning techniques will be utilized.

There will be advanced clerkships in medicine, pediatrics, and surgery in year four.

Integrated basic science/clinical sciences will be required selectives in year four.

There is an elective/selective program throughout the curriculum.

The addition of a four-week transition course from student to physician will be required at the end of year four, to prepare better graduates for the role of physician/resident and the accompa-
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nerving stresses, ethical issues, and role as teachers.

Educational Precepts

• The importance of students becoming life-long independent learners, acquiring skills in accessing, sorting, and integrating information, is a major tenet of the curriculum revision. This will be accomplished by vesting the students with greater responsibility for their learning, emphasizing the use of computers and other techniques to enhance these skills, and protecting their study time to develop independent learning skills. The new Biomedical Information Communication Center (BICC) on campus provides outstanding resources in this area. Students in off-campus preceptorships will utilize these facilities since the clinical practice sites will be equipped with linkages to the BICC for conferencing and information retrieval.

• The use of a diversity of teaching and learning techniques, emphasizing the best attributes and placement of each, but with a much greater reliance on student-centered learning, small group exercises, and problem-solving.

• The use of more comprehensive summative examinations and evaluations that emphasize reasoning and integration of knowledge and skills rather than largely memory-based, frequent testing will be stressed as integral to re-organization.

• A process for orderly curricular evolution will be established.

Academic Epiphenomena

• The revision of promotion and tenure policies will be undertaken to assure equity for teaching and educational activities with research and service.
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- A system of following and encouraging the progress of a student through the integrated curriculum will be reconceptualized.

- Leadership for the curriculum and its evolution will be established in the Office of the Dean, under a newly established position of Associate Dean for Education and Student Affairs.

It is important to emphasize that, in the required community-based primary care rotations in the third year, students will be assigned to a preceptor "captain" but also will have the opportunity to experience and learn about the functioning of the primary care system in the communities where their preceptorships take place. We have specific definitions for Clinical Practice units and the responsibilities of the preceptors in those units. While on these rotations, the students will be required to have a community project in which they will learn about and report on how some of the health care issues are addressed. It is intended that some of the Colloquia on Medical Science and Practice in the third year be based upon selected experiences involving these community projects.

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation initiative, "Preparing Physicians for the Future: A Program in Medical Education," has been especially timely and appropriate for the continuing development and ultimate implementation of the curriculum.

Obviously, the Oregon Health Sciences University is excited about the new curriculum. It incorporates a number of principles that have been demonstrated to be effective by others, modifications that will improve those, as well as a number of concepts and innovations that we have developed. It will restore the balance of emphasis in primary care in the curriculum. This has been an extraordinarily time-consuming, challenging, exciting, and satisfying experience for those who have been intimately involved.

Discussion by the Committee

Oregon Health Sciences University Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. Lesley Hallick, Interim
Dean of the School of Medicine John A. Benson, Jr., and Associate Dean J.S. Reinschmidt presented the new curriculum and responded to questions.

Dr. Hallick indicated that Dr. Benson has played a national leadership role in medicine and medical education by serving as president of the American Board of Internal Medicine.

Dr. Benson said that any school of medicine has a particular obligation to create life-long learners. Within the new curriculum, students will have to learn how to access information from a wide variety of sources, assess it, and reconfigure it for use. Problem solving is a basic approach in any clinical encounter, and students must learn how to function in this manner. One of the structural changes within the new design is integration of the curriculum across 24 departments. In addition, there has been a revision of the promotion and tenure committee and the policies and procedures to assure that teaching gets the highest priority in these considerations. Finally, the "promotion board" concept has been replaced by a concept of a student's progression through an integrated curriculum.

Dr. Julian Reinschmidt, the architect of the curriculum, continued the discussion by reminding Board members that the rate at which new knowledge is developed in medical and health science is overwhelming and that, basically, the curriculum represents an integration of content and the mode in which courses are taught.

Additionally, the curriculum restructuring represents a move from a previously faculty centered-curriculum to student-centered mode. Finally, the curriculum restores a balance in the primary care emphasis away from the present over-specialized approach.

Mr. Swanson asked if the curriculum would also include new courses or include new components to the existing courses. Dr. Reinschmidt indicated it includes both. There will be a staged introduction of the curriculum so that by the summer of the third year, the curriculum will be fully integrated. Oregon Health Sciences, through a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, is one of eight
schools in the country chosen to work on the redefined curriculum.

Mr. Bruggere wondered, after reviewing the materials, how the revolutions and changes in biotechnology and medicine were factored into courses. What, he inquired, is being done to assure that doctors are able to keep up and remain informed about the advances which are being made. Dr. Reinschmidt indicated this was a constant challenge, and one of the ways in which Ed-Net will be beneficial in the future.

(No Board action required)

Board members joined in thanking President Ramaley for an interesting campus visit.

Mr. Halsey reported that he had attended an Incidental Fee Committee meeting, which was the last formal function of James Lundy as Dean of Administration at Eastern Oregon State College. At that time, he symbolically passed the torch to Ms. Mary Voves as the new dean.

Mr. Adams attended a choral festival involving 16 choirs from colleges and universities in Oregon. Each school had a 20-minute presentation, and four of the participants (Western Oregon State College, Portland State University, Oregon State University, and the University of Oregon) were from the State System. The music was excellent.

Mr. Swanson shared with fellow Board members information about an initiative being circulated that would change the state constitution with effects on higher education. He asked that a copy of the materials be shared with the Board.

Mr. Miller reported that BARC is on schedule and that Peat Marwick is doing an excellent job in the review of Oregon State University. Individual members of BARC are beginning visits to the campuses.

The Tuition Policy Committee, according to Ms. Jackson, is organized and has held three work sessions. The Tuition Tours will begin in the near future, and Ms. Jackson urged Board members to participate in the public hearings.
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Mr. Bailey indicated that the Joint Boards Planning Group had met to assess the March Joint Board meeting. There were very positive reactions and a sense that activities were focused on achieving the intent of the Executive Order.

Mr. Richardson added his thanks to President Ramaley. In addition, he applauded the continuing efforts Board members were directing to the various Board Committees.

The next regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education is scheduled for May 22 at Oregon Institute of Technology in Klamath Falls. The meeting will be preceded by a campus visit on Thursday afternoon.

The Board adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

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

George E. Richardson, Jr.
President