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ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 10:25 a.m., Friday, October 23, 1992, by President Robert L. R. Bailey.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Mr. Robert Adams          Mr. G. E. Richardson, Jr.
Ms. Britteny Davis        Mr. Les Swanson, Jr.
Mr. Mark Dodson           Ms. Janice Wilson
Ms. Beverly Jackson       Ms. Laurie Yokota
Mr. Rob Miller            Mr. Bob Bailey

Mr. Richard Donahue was absent due to a conflict of schedule.

Chancellor's Office -- Chancellor Thomas A. Bartlett; Virginia Boushey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Francesca Clifford, Assistant Director of Communications; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services and Compliance Officer; Dale Hess, Special Assistant to the Director of Governmental Relations; Peter Hughes, Director, Internal Audit; Weldon E. Ihrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Susan Johnese, Secretary; Steve Katz, Controller; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Joe McNaught, Attorney-in-Charge, Education Section; Greg Parker, Director, Communications; George Pernsteiner, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies; Virginia L. Thompson, Board Secretary.

Eastern Oregon State College -- President David Gilbert; Bob Evans, Information Specialist, College Relations; Lori Harris, Accounts Payable Supervisor; James Hottois, Provost/Dean of Academic Affairs; Jack Johnson, Director, Financial Aid; Tom Johnson, Campus Safety; Sheryl Jonasson, Director of Personnel; Darlene Morgan, Assistant Director, Business Services; Carolyn Schmidt, Secretary to the President; Richard Stenard, Dean of Students;
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Lorie Williams, Administrative Specialist, Student Affairs; Peggy Young, Assistant to the President.

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

Oregon Institute of Technology -- President Lawrence Wolf; Martha Anne Dow, Provost; Jim McAtee, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs; Doug Yates, Dean of Administration.

Oregon State University -- President John Byrne; Roy Arnold, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs; Andy Huber, Agriculture Program at Eastern Oregon State College; Larry Larson, Agriculture Program Coordinator at Eastern Oregon State College; Lee Schroeder, Vice President, Finance and Administration.

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

Southern Oregon State College -- President Joseph Cox; Stephen J. Reno, Provost/Dean of Faculty.

University of Oregon -- President Myles Brand; Gerald Kissler, Senior Vice Provost for Planning and Resources, Academic Affairs.

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

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate -- Colleen Johnson, Eastern Oregon State College; Herb Jolliff, Oregon Institute of Technology.

Others -- Vince Albers, Student Senator, EOSC; Dick Cockle, The Oregonian; George Corey, Personal Representative, Jessie M. Bell estate; Ed Dennis, Assistant Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Greg Light, Student Body President, EOSC; Nick Mason, The Observer.
The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on September 25, 1992, and approved them as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Davis, Dodson, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, Yokota, and Bailey. Those voting no: none.

President Bailey acknowledged the presence of Christopher Halsey, former Board member and student body president at Eastern Oregon State College.

President Bailey introduced Senator Scott Duff, District 29, who welcomed the Board to eastern Oregon. Senator Duff expressed his total support for Eastern Oregon State College and underscored the important role the College plays in the life of this part of the state. At a time when the state is concerned about efficiency in government, Senator Duff indicated that Eastern Oregon State College is an example of effectiveness and efficiency. Continuing, Mr. Duff highlighted the importance of interactive audio and video courses. Of particular importance to the region, Senator Duff pointed out the nursing program (conducted in collaboration with Oregon Health Sciences University) and the agricultural degrees offered cooperatively with Oregon State University. Finally, Mr. Duff remarked that in this region of the state, there still was not agreement on the form that replacement revenue should take, and that it was important for higher education to let the public know the consequences of continued reduction of funding.

Chancellor Bartlett concurred with Senator Duff's expressions of support for Eastern Oregon State College and thanked Dr. David Gilbert, President of Eastern Oregon State College, for the informative visit to the campus and the warm hospitality of the campus community. In particular, Chancellor Bartlett remarked about the sessions with faculty who have major responsibility for implementing a complex and comprehensive distance learning program.

Dr. Bartlett acknowledged the presence of Mr. George Corey, a former president of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, and a long-time resident of eastern Oregon. Chancellor Bartlett indicated that Hoke College Center, site of the Board meeting, had been named for Mr. Corey's father-in-law. In his role as a lawyer for the late
Ms. Jessie Bell, an alumnus of Oregon State University and long-time Umatilla County Clerk, Mr. Corey was instrumental in directing her estate, approximately $111,000, to the Oregon State System of Higher Education for graduate student scholarships. This bequest was recognition of Ms. Bell's belief in higher education.

Mr. Corey thanked Chancellor Bartlett and the Board for the acknowledgement and indicated Ms. Bell would have been very pleased with the recognition.

Chancellor Bartlett formally introduced Dr. Martha Anne Dow, Provost at Oregon Institute of Technology since August. Most of her professional career has been at Northern Montana College in Havre, Montana, where she was Vice President for Academic Affairs and active in environmental matters, both from an instruction and a protection agency point of view. Dr. Dow has a Ph.D. in microbiology from the University of Hawaii.

Vice Chancellor Clark is forming a special committee to work on the complex issue of faculty workload and productivity. Chancellor Bartlett reminded the Board that this is an area of increasing national interest. The public is posing questions: Are we using academic resources in the right way? Are we putting our capacities in the most productive and efficient places? The committee will attempt to more clearly define the questions and propose some responses for Oregon. The Board will be kept apprised of the progress of the committee.

One of the topics on the agenda for the Joint Boards meeting in November is the report of the task force planning implementation of the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM). The Chancellor indicated that it is a very important issue for higher education because the way in which the CAM program is conceptualized and implemented significantly determines the kind of preparation students coming to higher education institutions will have. There is, within the Department of Education and the Board of Education, and, potentially, the Board of Higher Education, a difference of opinion concerning the direction of the report of the task force.
Specifically, Chancellor Bartlett called attention to the appearance that the CAMs do not relate closely to the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and, further, do not seem to provide an adequate framework for the preparation of students for higher education. The CAM, as presently conceived, almost exclusively addresses the school-to-work transitions either directly from high school or through two-plus-two programs. Chancellor Bartlett urged Board members to study carefully the task force report and prepare to discuss the underlying assumptions.

Approximately two years ago, the Board supported the establishment of the Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering, a collaboration of Portland State University, Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and the Oregon Graduate Institute (a private institution). Although there have been occasional reports on the progress of the Council, Chancellor Bartlett indicated that it had been some time since the Board had received an update on the activities.

The Oregon Center for Advanced Technology Education (OCATE), located in Washington County, has been brought under the umbrella of the Council. OCATE is a collaborative arm of the universities to extend advanced technical education in the county. In 1992-93, over 100 graduate engineering classes (15 workshops and 10 colloquia) will be offered. The Lintner Center has been brought under the rubric of OCATE, making it possible for the completion degree in computer science (currently offered jointly by OCATE, the Lintner Center, and Portland Community College) to be offered by Portland State University, as well.

A manufacturing engineering program has evolved from the work of the Council. A new joint degree is being developed between Oregon State University and Portland State University under the aegis of the Joint Schools to create a stronger and larger program in this area. Manufacturing engineering is important to the state as well as the nation.

The Oregon metals initiative has been drawn under the umbrella of the Joint Schools. Funds come from the Oregon Economic Development Department, Department of the Interior, and the budget of the Joint Schools.
Graduate Schools. This initiative represents a collaborative effort among industry, state, federal, and higher education to participate in research in the development of metals capacity in Oregon.

Another area of concentration for the Joint Schools is environmental studies in collaboration with individuals from all aspects of the industry who have a strong interest in this area. A series of conferences has been held between industry and university representatives to define the areas of environmental studies in which there should be joint research and graduate work.

Finally, there is a $4.5 million appropriation in the recent NASA budget to support the development within and among the four university campuses involved in the Joint Graduate Schools. Computer and two-way video communication will be developed to link together the engineering-related programs as if they were a single graduate program. There will be capacity for very high-level, two-way video, and extensive data communications via computer. The target is to have some capacity developed and in operation within the year. This aspect of the work of the Joint Graduate Schools is generating a great deal of interest from companies in Oregon.

Chancellor Bartlett introduced Dr. Colleen Johnson, professor of Economics and Senior Senator from Eastern Oregon State College, to present the report of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS).

Dr. Johnson reported that the last meeting of the IFS was held at Portland State University on October 2-3, 1992 and included guests President Judith Ramaley, Vice Chancellor Shirley Clark, Director of Government Relations Roger Bassett, Alice Dale, Executive Director of Oregon Public Employees Union, and Senator Shirley Gold and Representative Mike Burton of the Oregon State Legislature.

Continuing, Dr. Johnson indicated, "Many of you expressed personal beliefs regarding Ballot Measure 9 at the last Board meeting on the Oregon State University campus. IFS again would like to express its sincere gratitude and appreciation for the strong personal stances. We thought you might be interested in the statement that was developed"
during the regular business session at the last IFS meeting. The statement reads as follows:

The IFS has reviewed Ballot Measure 9 and finds its effects would be to violate the tenets and traditions of academic freedom and nondiscrimination in teaching, course content, learning, and research in college and university settings. This Measure would prescribe what is to be taught, obstruct the free flow of ideas, and require discriminatory treatment. The IFS affirms the principles of academic freedom, nondiscrimination, and tolerance, and opposes censorships.

"Finally, I might add that six of the eight OSSHE institutions have adopted a complementary statement which reflects the principles found in the statement, and at Eastern Oregon State College there is a motion before the Assembly, which meets on November 3. Oregon Institute of Technology Faculty Senate's meeting is after the general election."

Chancellor Bartlett asked Rob Miller, Board member and chair of the Board Administrative Review Committee (BARC), to provide an update of the BARC activities. In addition, the Chancellor thanked Mr. Miller for the incredible amount of time devoted to the work of the Committee.

Mr. Miller remarked that the Committee's process has been as important as the product (report) will be. He commented on the high calibre of people serving on the Committee and publicly thanked them and Ms. Wilson, Mr. Dodson, Vice Chancellor Ihrig, and Roger Bassett. In addition, Mr. Miller acknowledged the participation of Mr. Richardson during the time he was President of the Board.

Mr. Miller reminded the Board that the process of BARC was to include individuals from the various constituents of the higher education enterprise -- legislators and representatives of state government, including the Executive, Budget, and General Services Departments. The process of BARC has included improving public relations, information gathering, and generally gaining credibility throughout the state.
Early in the work of the Committee, BARC members agreed they would produce a three-fold product. First, the study was to be a professional and targeted analysis of the Chancellor's Office; BARC review of how each campus would make 10, 20, and 30 percent reductions in staff; and, finally, study the reduction processes used by other higher education institutions around the country and, focusing on one of the eight institutions in Oregon, implement a review process that could be used on the other campuses.

Oregon State University was the campus selected. One of the important aspects of this particular study was campus buy-in of the process of the study and acceptance of the results of the analysis. Oregon State University has undergone extensive review by the Peat Marwick firm. The study resulted in recommendations for 10, 20, and 30 percent reductions in the institution. The first ten percent reductions were supported by the Oregon State Administrative Review Committee (ARC) as "do-able" and would result in a savings ranging from $7-$10 million on an annualized basis.

The second category of cuts were those labeled "achievable," but ones that might affect the overall mission of the University and, perhaps, efficient operating ability. The 30 percent budget reduction plans were in the $10-20 million range. The University has an implementation team looking at some aspects such as reduction from approximately 60 senior management positions to 22-26 and reduction from five vice presidents to two; unification and consolidation of academic units; identification of duplicative and redundant operations, and consolidation or eliminations.

Dr. John Byrne, President of Oregon State University, observed that Peat Marwick provided the institution with a blueprint or recipe for changes. One of the reasons for the success of the Oregon State University review was the identification of a University-based review committee that, in the present instance, kept the Peat Marwick study on track and assured production of a plan that could be useful to the institution.

President Byrne commented that a review of this magnitude cannot be driven strictly by budget
reductions. One of the primary goals of the review was to assist Oregon State University in becoming more efficient. Three major areas were studied: organizational structure, including the administration and support services of the institution; re-engineering processes; and the potential for outsourcing (or contracting out) certain functions presently performed from within the institution.

"As you begin to re-engineer the processes," President Byrne continued, "you must have a shadow or substitute system in place until the new system is operating. The first step is to obtain the equipment and the software necessary for the system. The second ingredient is to assure resources for training individuals to run the systems. Finally, there are laws, rules, and regulations that must be changed in order for new systems to function effectively."

President Byrne concluded that the review process itself had value in that individuals now recognize that change is going to occur.

Ms. Wilson reported on the preliminary report of the Chancellor's Office, which is almost completed. Two questions were posed: Should there continue to be a Chancellor's Office and, if so, how can the operation be reduced and the focus of work changed from direct service in the business arena to primarily a strategic, long-range planning, advocacy, public relations focus?

Mr. Miller reminded the Board that the BARC process and recommendations will be discussed at the November Renewal Work Session.

Oregon State University requested authorization to offer a Ph.D. degree in Molecular and Cellular Biology. The proposed program builds upon an existing graduate curriculum in molecular and cellular biology. The proposed program is a large, interdepartmental effort involving over 50 faculty from 12 different departments and will be administered jointly by the College of Agricultural Science and the College of Science. A copy of the full proposal is on file in the OSSHE Office of Academic Affairs.
Molecular and cellular biology (MCB) is an interdisciplinary approach to the study of molecular and cellular aspects of biological systems. It is a fundamental tool of biological science. Literacy in the field increasingly depends upon knowledge and understanding of MCB. Under the current program, graduate students in the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Forestry, Pharmacy, Science, and Veterinary Medicine can take courses in MCB but receive their degrees in a traditional discipline from their home department. The proposed program will provide students the additional option of receiving a degree in MCB. The evolution from an MCB curriculum to a Ph.D. program is important if Oregon State University is to maintain a position of leadership in the application of biological science to such areas as forestry and agriculture.

Administration of the proposed program will be collaborative and interdisciplinary. The director of the MCB program will be appointed by the Vice President for Research, Graduate Studies, and International Programs. The Director of MCB will consult with an executive committee composed of faculty responsible for various parts of the MCB program and two administrative advisory boards: one composed of the deans of the associated programs and the other composed of the deans of the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Forestry, and Science, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed program will emphasize molecular genetic techniques and interdisciplinary training with special emphasis on the application of these approaches toward solving problems in the fields of agriculture and forestry, particularly in the plant sciences and virology. These fields and research orientations are representative of the major missions of Oregon State University. As such, the emphasis of this MCB program is appropriate for its mission and necessary for Oregon State University to improve upon these strengths. Biotechnology and molecular genetics are two of the target areas for future emphasis spe-
cifically designated by the University in its long-range planning. Implementation of the MCB graduate program should greatly facilitate accomplishment of this goal.

2. Evidence of Need

The need for the program arises from important, paradigmatic developments in the biological sciences. Molecular and cellular biology approaches rapidly are becoming integral to most, if not all, areas of biological research. Traditional disciplines at Oregon State University (horticulture, botany, zoology, agronomy, forestry, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine) require the new technology that MCB provides if they are to remain at the cutting edge of their fields. Therefore, it is essential that the University offer training in this area in order to continue to benefit basic research, health-related issues, and agriculture.

For a biologist to be prepared to contribute significantly to science, it is no longer appropriate that she or he be trained exclusively in a single discipline. Single discipline training limits future development in a scientific milieu that is, and will become, more and more interdisciplinary.

Significant numbers of highly qualified applicants to Oregon State University specifically seek the MCB program. Graduates of the program should be in great demand because of their capacity to combine training in the traditional disciplines with knowledge of the newest advances in molecular and cellular biology. Employment opportunities are expected to be primarily in the rapidly-growing biotechnology industry, agriculture, forestry, health care professions, and academic research.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The report issued following external review of the proposed program remarked on the high quality of the faculty and noted that all of the affiliated faculty publish annually and several routinely publish in the highest
quality journals in the molecular and cellular field. The publication record is indicative of broad faculty expertise in molecular and cellular biology.

The extensive interdisciplinary involvement of multiple departments and colleges is important to the quality of the proposed program. The impetus for the program was driven by the desire of the faculty to put a program in place that would support the introduction of the new biology into academic training programs as well as to improve the applied areas of agriculture and forestry.

A major support strength of the proposed program is the presence of the Center for Gene Research and Biotechnology, a service facility that provides technical support and training.

Students admitted to the MCB program will be expected to have a 3.3 GPA or better and total GRE scores ranking in the top 10-20th percentile. These standards are higher than for admission into the graduate programs of the traditional departments in the biological sciences.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. MCB faculty will be drawn from 12 departments in the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Forestry, and Science. Most of the proposed courses and seminars have been in place as part of the MCB curriculum for several years. Therefore, implementation of the Ph.D. program and the monitoring of research programs will not require additional hires. Existence of the program is expected to influence future faculty hires within the affiliated departments in the direction of emphasis in the molecular and cellular biology areas.

Library. The library facilities available on campus are sufficient to maintain the proposed program.

Facilities and Equipment. No additional facilities are needed beyond the new construc-
tion designed to house the Center for Gene Research and Biotechnology.

**Budget Impact.** Budgetary impact will be negligible because the program is subsidized primarily by training grants and faculty research grants. The vast majority of affiliated faculty have grant funding, and the funding sources are well balanced. Major peer-reviewed competitive grants from agencies have included five from the Department of Energy, 16 from the United States Department of Agriculture, 17 from the National Science Foundation, 16 from the National Institutes of Health, and 16 from other sources. Over 40 of the 50 faculty have had multiple sources of competitive funding.

5. **Duplication**

Graduate training in molecular and cellular biology is offered at Oregon Health Sciences University and the University of Oregon.

At Oregon Health Sciences University, a Molecular/Cellular Biology program functions as an umbrella, covering and coordinating the individual graduate degree programs of the pre-clinical health sciences. Students receive their degrees through individual departments such as medical genetics, microbiology and immunology, physiology, and pharmacology.

At the University of Oregon, the Institute of Molecular Biology serves as the umbrella organization, coordinating individual research efforts in different departments. Students receive their degrees in biology, chemistry, or physics.

**Program Review**

The proposed program was the subject of an external review including a site visit by nationally and internationally recognized experts: Dr. Robert Lehman of Stanford University, Dr. Jack Morris of the University of Nebraska, and Dr. Ralph Quatrano of the University of North Carolina. The review team was impressed very favorably with the MCB program and strongly recommend that it become a Ph.D. program.
The proposed program has been reviewed favorably by the Academic Council. The proposed Ph.D. program has the support of Oregon Health Sciences University and the University of Oregon. Both institutions have initiated discussion with Oregon State University regarding the possibility of joint meetings and conferences and cooperative presentation of MCB seminars. Faculty at OSSHE institutions have expressed interest in "sitting in" electronically to participate in developments in the field.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon State University to offer a Ph.D. degree in Molecular and Cellular Biology, effective fall term 1992. The approved program will undergo a follow-up review during the 1997-98 academic year in accordance with Board policy.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Roy Arnold, Provost at Oregon State University, introduced the program and explained that it was a move from the graduate curriculum to a Ph.D. authority. In excess of 50 faculty from 12 departments have been the driving force behind the formation of this degree program. One of the incentives for the development of the degree, according to Provost Arnold, was the nonrenewal of a long-term training grant because of the lack of an organized curriculum or degree program in the field of molecular and cellular biology.

Continuing, Dr. Arnold indicated that there would be 10 to 20 students admitted per year into the program. The program will emphasize molecular genetic techniques and interdisciplinary training with specific emphasis on applications to agriculture, forestry, plant sciences, and virology.

There has been strong support for the proposal and recognition that this is the future direction of the field of science. The program is complementary, not duplicative, to other programs. Mr. Dodson asked for clarification on that point since the University of Oregon has a microbiology program. Dr. Arnold pointed out that there are differences in the applied focus of the program that, at Oregon
State University, is in the natural resources-related industries.

In clarifying his point, Mr. Dodson said his sense was that the particular aspect of biological science had become so fundamental that, if it were to be applied to areas such as forestry and agriculture, Oregon State University needs it to make a complete program. Dr. Arnold responded that was a correct interpretation of one of the needs for the program.

The only additional funds required for the program are resources for coordination.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Board

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

Introduction

Oregon State University requested authorization to offer a Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Sciences. The proposed instructional program evolved from Oregon State University's reorganization and re-evaluations initiated by the elimination of the Department of General Science. Environmental science had become a principal focus of the Department of General Science. The General Science/Environmental Sciences option will be replaced by the proposed interdisciplinary baccalaureate degree program. Faculty from six colleges have collaborated in improving and restructuring the degree program, and all six colleges are committed to the program. Board approval authorized Oregon State University to offer a baccalaureate degree in Environmental Sciences that will develop scientists with the ability to analyze and understand environmental systems, to predict environmental change, and to participate in management of the environment.
Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

Oregon State University, officially recognized as a Land, Sea, and Space Grant institution, considers the environmental sciences programs to be central to its role and mission of providing quality instruction in disciplines required for studies in areas related to the environment and use of natural resources. Faculty members from the Colleges of Science, Agricultural Sciences, Engineering, Forestry, Liberal Arts, and Oceanography have developed the program to strengthen and broaden it across disciplinary boundaries not only among the traditional physical and biological sciences in the College of Science, but across a wide range of disciplines throughout the University.

The proposed program in environmental sciences contributes directly and indirectly to Oregon State University's strategic plan (Creating the Future, 1990). It directly contributes through strengthening interdisciplinary studies among students and faculty and by improving the quality and rigor of an existing academic program. Also, the program contributes to the general goals of increasing enrollment of outstanding students and of improving the University's relations with its many constituencies by increasing the visibility of programs in which Oregon State University has exceptional strength. Finally, the program supports and strengthens the University's international focus through interdisciplinary study of global environmental problems.

2. Evidence of Need

The Environmental Sciences degree program responds to the demonstrated academic interests of students and to the state's need for scientists having the ability to analyze, model, and participate in manag-
ing environmental systems. The present B.S. degree with an environmental sciences option was established in 1988-89 and has grown to 68 students. Enrollment is projected to remain steady during the first three years of the proposed program due to rigor in science requirements, and to grow to 100 students by the end of five years.

Students who received B.S. degrees with an option in General Science/Environmental Sciences have been successful in finding employment. This success is expected to continue with an approved environmental sciences major. Graduates may obtain jobs in governmental agencies charged with monitoring and managing the environment, industrial and agricultural businesses with major financial interest in maintaining a proper relationship between their activities and the environment, and with private consulting firms providing services to government and the private sector in the environmental area. The proposed program also provides an ideal background for students interested in teaching natural sciences at the K-12 grade level; a fifth year of study in education would be required. Outstanding students will be well prepared to pursue advanced degrees in the sciences.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The B.S. degree in Environmental Sciences will be offered by the Environmental Sciences Interdisciplinary Degree (ESID) program through the College of Science. An ESID committee of faculty will have general advisory and curricular oversight responsibilities. A program coordinator will be appointed with responsibility for promotion and administration of the instructional and advising activities. The program has been designed to complement disciplinary degree programs in the physical, biological, and social sciences as well as the interdisciplinary degrees and minors in the broad area of environmental
studies. The proposed curricula for the B.S. degree and minor in environmental sciences have been coordinated with existing and emerging programs through joint membership on curriculum planning committees and the University Committee to Coordinate Environmental Programs.

The 192 credits required for the program are organized in five categories: (1) university baccalaureate core courses (30 credits); (2) basic science, humanities, and skills core courses (70 credits); (3) environmental sciences and humanities core courses (28 credits); (4) specialization courses (27 credits); (5) elective courses (37 credits). Opportunities for hands-on experience in design and collection of observations in the physical, biological, and social environment can be found in courses throughout the ESID curricula. Each student in the program must complete at least one course with observational experiences.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. No additional faculty members will be required to initiate the program and to continue operations during the next four years. Currently, 16 faculty serve as members of the ESID committee responsible for providing instructional oversight for the program.

Library. The current library holdings are adequate for the proposed program.

Facilities and Equipment. The undergraduate ESID program requires only existing classrooms, instructional laboratories and equipment used in the environmental and related sciences, and administrative office space. The College of Science will provide the space required for program administration. The arrangement will be sufficient to provide a clear identity for the program and to establish the ESID program as a functional academic home for
Budget Impact. The ESID committee estimated that the full ESID program, including undergraduate and graduate components, will require a program coordinator at .5 FTE and classified staff support of between .5 and 1.0 FTE at the level of Office Specialist 1. Support for the program coordinator and the classified staff will be provided by the College of Science through transfer or reassignment of FTE from existing positions.

5. Duplication

The undergraduate component of the ESID program is unique in quality and scope for the environmental sciences. Related programs at the University of Oregon are the Environmental Studies program and the General Science program. The University of Oregon's Environmental Studies program offers an interdisciplinary minor that requires 30 credits of courses selected from a broad range of disciplines in the sciences, the humanities, management, public policy and design. The General Science program at the University of Oregon has no curriculum in environmental sciences, but has flexibility to take advantage of relevant courses in biology, chemistry, geography, and physics. Portland State University offers a doctoral degree in Environmental Sciences and Resources but does not offer undergraduate degrees in the environmental sciences.

Program Review

Each campus in the State System has reviewed the proposed program and offered input. The Academic Council reviewed the proposal in September 1992 and recommended it be forwarded to the Board for final approval.
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Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon State University to offer a B.S. degree in Environmental Sciences, effective winter 1993. The approved program will undergo a follow-up review during the 1997-98 academic year in accordance with Board policy.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Provost Roy Arnold, Oregon State University, reviewed the history of the degree program. The program would replace the environmental sciences option presently available through the general sciences program. This proposal is an interdisciplinary baccalaureate degree in which seven colleges of the University are working collaboratively.

The program request is being created out of the existing strengths of the University and represents the new trends within the discipline.

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, Davis, Dodson, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, Yokota, and Bailey.

Introduction

Oregon State University requested authorization to offer a Bachelor of Science degree in Natural Resources. The proposed Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree in Natural Resources takes advantage of the institution's strengths in agriculture, forestry, oceanography, wildlife, fisheries, and air, water, and land science and management. Although the development of the proposal was prompted by an earlier round of budget cutting and an effort to reduce the number of majors in the College of Agricultural Sciences, it has created an opportunity for cooperation and interdiscipli-
plinary collaboration among the Colleges of Agricultural Sciences, Forestry, Liberal Arts, and Science. Board approval authorized Oregon State University to initiate a new undergraduate major in Natural Resources that will accommodate emerging discipline areas and interests. Also, Board approval will allow the institution to streamline further and consolidate its operations both academically and administratively.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed program in Natural Resources is related directly to Oregon State University's mission as a Land, Sea, and Space Grant institution. The interdisciplinary focus of the program is responsive to the institution's strategic plan (Creating the Future, 1990), which calls for strengthening interdisciplinary studies among students and faculty and for improving the quality and rigor of existing programs. The program will allow students to combine more effectively the natural and social sciences within the major and offers a broad base of study in the natural sciences, as well as providing a background for students' understanding of natural resource issues and problem solving.

2. Evidence of Need

After public meetings across the state and a survey of extension agents, the proposed program addresses the emerging nature of new positions in both private and public sectors calling for less specialization and more overall understanding of natural resource issues. These positions range from resource and policy analysts to resource management administrators. Long-standing natural resource programs, such as the one at Colorado State University, have placed students with a variety of local, state, and federal natural resource and environmental
organizations. Graduates of such programs also pursue graduate studies and enter more traditional natural resource and environmental fields with advanced degrees.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The proposed major in Natural Resources was designed to provide undergraduates with an understanding of the broad range of natural resource problems and the opportunity to work with experts in a variety of natural resource fields. Also, the program will expand students' capacity to deal effectively with social and political components of resource management. More specifically, the program, which requires a total of 192 credits for degree completion, will: (1) provide a broad education in natural resource management as an alternative to the "one resource" emphasis currently available through the University's college/department structure; (2) provide for specialty areas organized around common themes; (3) develop skills related to people, values, and politics, as well as the natural sciences in the natural resources field; and (4) develop a program that is compatible with existing departmental structure and majors, yet allows flexibility and interdisciplinary work that encourages departmental affiliation from any discipline wishing to have a specialty in the program. A Natural Resources Program Committee of five faculty members, with at least one member from Agricultural Science, Forestry, Liberal Arts, and Science, will have decision-making and administrative authority for reviewing and approving proposed specialties related to the general direction of the program. In addition, the committee will be responsible for advising students who have not yet selected their specialty. Advising and files for students who have chosen a specialty will be handled by the student's "home" department (the department
with the largest number of hours in the specialty).

There are no admission requirements for this program in addition to admission to Oregon State University. Potential students will be advised that the program is rigorous and demanding, calling for some student independence in planning and ability to work across disciplines. Approximately 35 students are expected to enroll in the first year, and that number is projected to grow to a maximum of 150 students by the fifth year of the program.

The committee will meet before the program is initiated to clarify objectives and criteria for evaluating the program and to devise monitoring procedures. A workshop for all participating faculty will be held before the program begins in order to recommend procedures to the committee. A faculty workshop will be held at the end of each year of the program to discuss progress and make needed changes. A chairperson will be recommended by the committee for appointment by the deans. The term of the chair will be reviewed every two years, with the possibility of rotating among the different colleges.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. Faculty involved in the program will be those teaching existing courses. Present faculty also will teach core seminars and the new course in Decision Making/Problem Solving. This would require some reassignments within the colleges. No new faculty will be needed.

Library. Existing library support is adequate. No additional library resources are needed to initiate the program.

Facilities and Equipment. No new facilities will be required.
Budget Impact. A .25 FTE faculty member will be needed for the Chair of the Natural Resources Program Committee. There will be no adverse impact on any other academic program due to the start-up of this program. The program will be implemented by shifting existing programs and resources. Specifics of such shifts are yet to be determined.

5. Duplication

There are no similar programs in the State System or the state in general.

Program Review

The proposed B.S. degree in Natural Resources was reviewed by each campus in the State System. The Academic Council reviewed and discussed the proposal at the September 1992 meeting and recommended that the proposed program be forwarded to the Board for final approval.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon State University to offer a B.S. degree in Natural Resources, effective fall 1993. The approved program will undergo a follow-up review during the 1997-98 academic year in accordance with Board policy.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Arnold pointed out that the program provides a broader breadth of exposure for students and links the natural resources and the social sciences and humanities interests in unique ways. One of the rationales for the integrated program is that many agencies, at both the federal and state levels (such as the Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service), increasingly are hiring people who play integrating roles. Graduates must be able to work with people who have in-depth content knowledge in the policy and political processes and integrate information in ways that have not occurred in the past.
The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Adams asked if the program would be unique or distinctive within the United States.

Provost Arnold indicated that it would not be unique to the United States, but it would be in Oregon since there are relatively few interdisciplinary undergraduate programs involving faculty expertise from such a wide spectrum of disciplines. Dr. Arnold reminded the Board that the 1993-1995 budget request contains a decision package that would extend the program at Eastern Oregon State College in a similar way, should resources become available.

Chancellor Bartlett indicated that, even in the face of downsizing, there continues to be a great deal of dynamism, change, and the addition of new programs that indicate vitality and the need to continue to adapt, even in the face of severe budget constraints.

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

Introduction

Oregon State University requested authorization to offer a Second Level Endorsement in Adapted Physical Education. Standards for the proposed endorsement were established by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) in September 1991. Adapted physical education is a service delivery system within physical education designed to meet the unique needs of children who may not participate safely or successfully in regular physical education programs. The intent of the endorsement is to prepare physical educators to better serve the needs of children with disabilities, ages 3 to 21.
The proposed endorsement will be offered through the Department of Exercise and Sport Science in the College of Health and Human Performance. The department has faculty and resources committed to the professional area of adapted physical education. A specialized area of study, titled Movement Studies for the Disabled, is part of the graduate program offerings in the department. A copy of the full proposal is on file in the OSSHE Office of Academic Affairs.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The proposed endorsement is consistent with the Board's approved role for Oregon State University of providing comprehensive, high-quality instructional research and service programs associated with selected professions. As the state's designated Land, Sea, and Space Grant institution, Oregon State University has a mandate to help the people of Oregon develop and utilize human resources. In the Plan for an OSSHE Coordinated Program of Education Professions, Oregon State University has been proposed for a leadership role in the area of physical education and has a national reputation in adapted physical education. Faculty in the Movement Studies for the Disabled program worked closely with TSPC in development of the standards and guidelines for the proposed endorsement.

2. Evidence of Need

Adapted physical education is a federal priority as established in PL 101-476, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which identifies physical education as an important part of education of children with disabilities. Section 121a.14 of the Federal Register specifically identifies physical education as part of the definition of special education.
Prior to establishment of the endorsement in Adapted Physical Education, Oregon had no certification, credential, endorsement, approval, or other type of official designation for those responsible for providing physical education services to students with disabilities. Therefore, many teachers currently responsible for delivery of service are not qualified to do so. Availability of the Second Level Endorsement in Adapted Physical Education will provide a mechanism for preparing and recognizing teachers with the requisite level of competency in adapted physical education and increase the likelihood that children with disabilities will receive developmentally appropriate physical education in the least restrictive environment.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

Oregon State University has a national reputation in adapted physical education. The graduate program in Movement Studies for the Disabled is one of only three programs in the United States with federal funds for the training of both master's and doctoral level personnel in this field.

The proposed Second Level Endorsement in Adapted Physical Education will require 18 credit hours of graduate level coursework beyond that required for basic certification in education, physical education, or special education.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. The courses needed for the proposed endorsement already are offered by the Departments of Exercise and Sports Science and Special Education. Faculty teaching the courses required for the endorsement are already on staff. No additional hires are needed or anticipated.
Library. Current library holdings meet the requirement for the proposed program.

Facilities and Equipment. No additional physical facilities will be needed to accommodate the program.

Budget Impact. The proposed endorsement program will not require additional financial support beyond that currently provided in the Departments of Exercise and Sports Science and Special Education.

5. Duplication

The Second Level Endorsement in Adapted Physical Education currently is not available at any other institutions in Oregon.

Program Review

The proposed program has been reviewed by the Academic Council and approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon State University to offer a Second Level Endorsement in Adapted Physical Education, effective fall term 1992.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Vice Chancellor Clark pointed out to the Committee that the proposed endorsement was a new one under the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC), and one for which Oregon State University took leadership to develop.

Provost Arnold indicated that this is an area of federal priority as established in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The purpose of the endorsement is to prepare physical educators to serve better the needs of children with disabilities and defines it in terms of ages three through 21. In this particular request, the second level endorse-
ment in adapted physical education would be offered through the Department of Exercise and Sports Science in the College of Health and Human Performance.

The program does not duplicate any other offerings within the State System and has been endorsed by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

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, Davis, Dodson, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, Yokota, and Bailey. Those voting no: none.

Introduction

Early in the process of developing a "plan for planning" in anticipation of the second round of Measure 5 budget reductions, and in response to new opportunities to serve the agendas of the state, the State System implemented System-level collaborative planning efforts. Several specific academic and professional program areas were designated for this process of review and restructuring: engineering, education, business, nursing, and continuing and extended higher education.

At the June 25-26, 1992, meeting of the Board, a conceptual plan to coordinate nursing programs in the State System was presented. As conceptualized, baccalaureate and graduate degree nursing education at Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology, Southern Oregon State College, and Oregon Health Sciences University would be integrated into a single statewide system administered and coordinated by the School of Nursing at Oregon Health Sciences University. The plan would expand the successful and effective collaborative model developed by Oregon Health Sciences University and Eastern Oregon State College in 1977 to include the nursing programs at Oregon Institute of Technology and Southern Oregon State College. The plan also would be designed to enable better planning of needed outreach programs to
the entire state, thereby more effectively addressing workforce shortages.

In June Board members encouraged the further development of the conceptual plan, emphasizing that the plan should optimize the investment as well as meet the needs of local communities. It was acknowledged that multiple sites for the training of nurses will be required to meet regional needs, and that model should be retained in the plan that develops.

**Progress on Development of the Nursing Plan**

Considerable planning has occurred in the last several months to develop a coordinated approach to nursing education in State System institutions. Faculty on all four campuses now have approved in concept an administrative structure and curriculum. Each campus will have an associate dean and a clinical advisory board. There will be a common support structure for all four campuses. The program will involve a conversion from a three- to a two-year curriculum.

Participants in the new nursing education structure have agreed upon 13 principles/values for the creation of an integrated statewide structure. The overall principle is to "think globally, act locally." The 13 principles cover items such as cost effectiveness, accessibility of programs statewide, local autonomy, maximization of resources, parity among the programs, communication, community-base, user-friendly systems, and others.

Two key characteristics differentiate the proposed statewide program from current OSSHE programs. The first is the designation of the upper division nursing major. The plan calls for students to complete their lower division requirements prior to admission to the upper division nursing major. After admission to the upper division nursing major, students will complete six academic quarters plus two half-quarter summer sessions rather than the previous nine academic quarters. The second characteristic is a common set of degree requirements for the nursing student achieving a bachelor's degree. The plan includes proposed common agreements on the curriculum at all participating campuses in the areas of lower division, upper division, non-nursing courses, nursing courses, didactic courses, and practica.
The statewide integrated nursing education structure would be comprised of a variety of programs:

- Permanent baccalaureate programs would be available in Portland at Oregon Health Sciences; in La Grande at Eastern Oregon State College; in Ashland at Southern Oregon State College; and in Klamath Falls at the Oregon Institute of Technology.

- Master's, Nurse Practitioner programs, and a Ph.D. would be available at Oregon Health Sciences University in Portland.

- The Rural Frontier Delivery Baccalaureate program would be available in Enterprise, Baker City, John Day, Burns, and Lakeview.

- A number of additional sites will be considered for the master's program by utilizing Ed-Net and on-site faculty as resources permit.

- The Primary Care Nurse Practitioner program would be available in La Grande.

- The RN/BS Educational Advancement program would be available at Ed-Net sites in Salem, Albany, Newport, and Eugene (in cooperation with community colleges and local hospitals). A number of additional RN/BS sites would be considered for 1993, such as Bend, Coos Bay, Roseburg, and The Dalles. It should be noted that the RN/BS Educational Advancement program at Ed-Net sites was implemented in fall 1992 and already has over 100 students participating.

**Staff Analysis**

Because the plan will involve a conversion from a three- to a two-year curriculum, there is an immediate need to meet with admissions directors about this change. There is currently considerable misunderstanding among many students and faculty about what a change from a two- to a three-year program entails. Students, including potential transfer students, need to know as soon as possible about these changes. The conversion will mean that no students will be admitted
formally to the nursing program per se next year. The conversion transition does not mean, however, that students will not be enrolled and taking the prerequisite courses they need. The transition will be such that there always will be a graduating class of nursing students.

Plan Review

The Nursing Education Plan was reviewed by the Academic Council at the meeting on September 24, 1992. The Council noted that the institutions and communities that participated in the intensive planning to date should be commended for their progress in developing the conceptual plan to this current stage of development.

Committee Discussion

Vice Chancellor Clark commended the group involved in planning and indicated that they had worked intensively in August and September, having made a substantial investment in planning and working toward consensus.

Provost Lesley Hallick, Oregon Health Sciences University, explained that the first task of the planning group was to develop and agree to basic principles that the programs would be cost effective and serve the needs of each local community. The direction of the integrated programs is toward transitioning from a three- to a two-year program sequence. This model allows, Dr. Hallick observed, for greater flexibility in terms of articulation with community colleges. A well-prepared associate degree student with a solid science background would be in an ideal position to enter either nursing or a number of allied health professions. The program lends a consistency to the curriculum across all four campuses.

Administratively, each of the four campuses will have an associate dean and a local clinical advisory board to advise the local faculty as to the local needs and, in particular, the marketplace of that community.

Dr. Steve Reno indicated that he and others of the planning group had been gratified by the cooperation of the faculties and the speed with which they moved to the concept of statewide programming. What the program accomplishes is a statewide initiative that
moves to eliminate duplication, but still allows for some variations on the local level. Provost Hottois of Eastern Oregon State College echoed the same sentiment and indicated that the speed with which the curricular changes were agreed to was encouraging. He observed that the integrated program would generate a great deal more access to nursing education.

Dr. Hallick pointed out to the Committee that the transition to the two-year statewide program would occur at midnight, June 30, 1993. No students would be admitted into the nursing program in the fall of that year. However, this will not result in a year when no nursing students graduate.

Chancellor Bartlett congratulated the institutions on the speed and efficiency with which the strategy for nursing education was developed. The key, he continued, has been the acknowledgement of need for local flexibility and local variation within the context of a statewide plan.

(No Board action required)
KEY Current Programs for the Oregon Health Sciences University School of Nursing

Permanent Programs
- Portland
  - Baccalaureate
  - Master's
    - Includes Nurse Practitioner Pgm
  - Ph.D.
- La Grande, Eastern
  - Oregon State College
    - Baccalaureate
- Ashland, Southern
  - Oregon State College
    - Baccalaureate
- Klamath Falls, Oregon Institute of Technology
  - Baccalaureate

Rural Frontier Delivery Program
- Enterprise
- Baker City
- John Day
- Burns
- Lakeview

Rotating Master's Program
- Eugene
- Medford
- La Grande

RN/BS Educational Advancement Program (ED-NET Sites)
- Salem
- Albany
- Newport
- Eugene

Additional RN/BS Sites Proposed 1993
- Bend
- Coos Bay
- Roseburg
- The Dalles

Primary Care Nurse Practitioner Program
- La Grande
**Statewide Bachelor of Science Program for Nursing Students**

The Statewide Baccalaureate Curriculum Task Force, composed of teaching faculty from Oregon Health Sciences University, Oregon Institute of Technology and Southern Oregon State College, has mutually constructed a statewide program for the Bachelor of Science degree for nursing students. The proposed statewide curriculum reflects approval by the respective faculties.

Two key characteristics differentiate the proposed statewide program from current programs. First is the designation of the upper division nursing major. The proposal is that students will complete their lower division requirements prior to admission to the upper division nursing major. After admission to the upper division nursing major, students will complete 6 academic quarters, plus two half-quarter summer sessions, rather than the previous 9 academic quarters. The second characteristic is the common set of degree requirements for the nursing student achieving a bachelor's degree.

The specifications of the current and proposed programs with degree requirements are summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEGREE REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL HOURS</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER DIVISION*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER DIVISION*</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-NURSING</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>88-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIDACTIC</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRACTICUM</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Minimums required

Several issues have been identified regarding this proposed Bachelor of Science degree program, and they are:

1. Not more than twelve hours of chemistry, including Biochemistry with a lab, is required.
2. Not more than twelve hours of Biology, including human anatomy and physiology is required.
3. Eighteen hours of arts and letters, including 6 hours of humanities is required.
4. Three hours of clinical pharmacology are required at the upper division level.
5. The lower division courses need to be attainable in two academic years.
# OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY

## SCHOOL OF NURSING

### October 23, 1992

## STATEWIDE BACCALAUREATE NURSING CURRICULUM

### PROPOSED LOWER DIVISION REQUIREMENTS

#### NATURAL SCIENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Minimum Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology to include Human Anatomy and Physiology</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry to include Biochemistry</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra (College level)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math as Statistics (Descriptive and Inferential)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours for Natural Sciences** 40

#### ARTS AND LETTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Minimum Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language*, Intercultural Appreciation, Linguistics, Sign Language</td>
<td>6-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts, Art/Music Appreciation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Humanities Elective if Needed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours for Arts and Letters** 18

*Foreign Language is Humanity if at 200 level or above

#### COMMUNICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Minimum Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written English/English Composition</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal and Small Group Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours for Communication** 15

#### SOCIAL SCIENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Minimum Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development (Life-Span)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives (Recommended Political Science, Economics, Business Sciences)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours for Social Sciences** 18

**Total Lower Division Hours** 91
OREGON HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF NURSING  
STATEWIDE BACCALAUREATE NURSING CURRICULUM  
PROPOSED UPPER DIVISION NURSING MAJOR  

SAMPLE PROGRAM (Course Descriptions attached on the following pages)

**JUNIOR YEAR**

*August*

*Introduction to Nursing Care 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Cl Dec Makg 3</td>
<td>Adult Ill 11</td>
<td>Family 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Health Asses 5</td>
<td>Ethics 3</td>
<td>Gero 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pathophys 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cl Pharm 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SENIOR YEAR**

*August*

*Clinical Focus 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community 10</td>
<td>Policy 3</td>
<td>Ldrshp &amp; Mngment 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research 3</td>
<td>Mental H 10</td>
<td>*Reflective Practice 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elective** 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Upper Division Hours: 97            
Total Lower Division Hours: 91            
Total Nursing Hours: 94                  
Total Non-Nursing Hours: 94               
Total Hours: 188                          
Maximum Total Didactic Hours: 50          
Minimum Total Practicum Hours: 44         

*denotes courses that are not movable in the sequence

**If Pharm is offered as a non-nursing course, elective must be a nursing course; if Pharm is offered as a nursing course, elective must be a non-nursing course.
Staff Report to the Committee

The Investment Report for the year ending June 30, 1992, has been submitted to members of the Board of Higher Education and the Chancellor. Additional copies are on file in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration.

Committee Report to the Board

Ms. Wilson, chair of the Finance and Administration Committee, indicated to the Board that the Annual Investment Report focused specifically on the $57 million in endowment funds the Board has invested. The Committee recommended to staff that, because of the level of yields in the equity fund in the last six months, an investigation be undertaken of investment alternatives available in the market, and report back to the Committee at the time of the next quarterly report in January 1993.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Committee

The Internal Audit Division's Quarterly Report: September 30, 1992, summarizing the status of audits completed as of September 30, 1992, and the status of the 1992-93 Annual Audit Plan, was submitted to members of the Board, the Chancellor, and to the State Department as required by Executive Department Administrative Rule 15-001-03.

Committee Report to the Board

Ms. Wilson, Chair of the Finance and Administration Committee, reported that the 1991 State of Oregon Audit Report indicated that, of $200 million in federal funds reviewed, there were questionable items only for $2,000. Based on that excellent report, the Committee recommended approaching the Secretary of State's office to determine if, in light of the 12,000 hours at a cost of $500,000 to reach these conclusions, the scope of the audit could be reduced in the next audit. Second, it was recommended that, through the internal audit process and management directives, an examination be undertaken to determine if there are ways to reduce
the internal processes while at the same time increasing efficiencies of the audit processes.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Committee

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

Five projects reached this stage during the past six months: the Architecture and Allied Arts improvements at the University of Oregon, the track and tennis court improvements at Southern Oregon State College, the acquisition and improvement of office space for the Oregon Health Sciences University (Marquam), and the acquisition and improvement of the Mill Street Building and the Millar Library Addition (both at Portland State University). In addition, the University of Oregon began using the new Bowerman Family Building. These projects will not appear in subsequent reports. The expenditure balances in the table are as of September 11, 1992.

The status of 22 other projects has changed since the last report. The Board authorized two new Oregon Health Sciences University projects in September: the expansion of the Dotter Institute and an addition to the University Hospital C-Wing. These projects await review and approval by the Emergency Board. The C-Wing project limitation was transferred from four existing Oregon Health Sciences University projects. This has eliminated the limitations for the hospital utilities (1991-1993) and outpatient clinic projects, and reduced the limitations for both the 1989-1991 and 1991-1993 hospital renovations projects.

The status of other Oregon Health Sciences University projects changed including the 1987-1989 utility improvements project that was tied to Parking Structure V (which opened earlier this year) and the Basic Science Addition and Center for Radiological and Environmental Toxicology that opened in September. In addition, the Board decided in July to seek reauthorization of the Oregon...
Health Sciences University Student Activities Building.

Changes at Oregon State University included the opening of the new Agricultural Sciences II Building, the Dixon Aquatic Center, and improvements to Parker Stadium. Both the Environmental Computing Center and the Mitchell Gymnasium Rehabilitation projects now are under construction. Part of the Other Funds authorization for repair and modernization (1989-1991) is funding work at Oregon State University as well.

Other changes included the opening of the rehabilitated and expanded Cascade Cafeteria at Southern Oregon State College and of the EMU Outdoor Storage facility and further improvements to science facilities at the University of Oregon. The Easterly Bypass at Western Oregon State College and the rehabilitation of Parking Structure I at Portland State University moved into construction, while planning accelerated for two projects that should receive bond funds later this year -- the Health Services Addition at Western Oregon State College and the Residence Hall Storage facility at Southern Oregon State College.

One construction claim has been received and several more suggested by year's end associated with the Basic Sciences/CROET project at Oregon Health Sciences University. Claims associated with Oregon Health Sciences University's Biomedical Information and Communications Center (BICC) were resolved.

### 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>OHSU</td>
<td>Inst Adv Biomed Research</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$21,011</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Science Facilities</td>
<td>Federal, Lottery</td>
<td>33,579</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Casey Eye Institute</td>
<td>GF, Federal, Gift</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>BICC</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Hosp/Clinic Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>17,195</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1987-1989 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Handicapped Access</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>$3,810</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Utility Improvements</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Outdoor Activity Area</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Admin Services Expansion</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Parker Stdm Improvements</td>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Ag Sciences II</td>
<td>GF, Federal, Gift</td>
<td>26,360</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Ag Exp Stn Improvements</td>
<td>Lottery, Federal, Gift</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>SELP Energy Improvements</td>
<td>SELP</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>1,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1989-1991 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Repair &amp; Modernization</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Repair &amp; Modernization</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Parking Improvements</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>2,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Cornett Reroofing</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Metro Center</td>
<td>Lottery, System</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSCC</td>
<td>Exec Conf/Training Center</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSCC</td>
<td>Building Planning</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Kerr Library</td>
<td>GF, Gift</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Dixon Aquatic Center</td>
<td>BF, SELP</td>
<td>5,548</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Family Studies Center</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Science Facilities Rehab</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Cold Storage Addition</td>
<td>Lottery, Gift</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes

- Some equipment installed; some on order
- Complete*
- Under Constr.
- Bal. Available
- Under Constr.*
- Des. on Hold
- Under Constr.**
- Now Open*
- In design
### 1991-1993 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoke Hall Addition</td>
<td>BF, Housing</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services Addition</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Bypass</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Computing Center</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt Hall Lab Renovation</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRL Lab Renovation</td>
<td>Inst. Funds</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Gymnasium Rehab</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Storage</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Pedestrian Safety</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Expansion</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Natural History</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longhouse</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Campus Relocation</td>
<td>Riverfront</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Services Building</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities System Rehab</td>
<td>BF, Housing</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeuroSensory Center</td>
<td>Federal, Gift</td>
<td>25,400</td>
<td>25,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Utilities</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure #5</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Clinic</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Renovations</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>8,256</td>
<td>8,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Wing Addition</td>
<td>Hospital, Gift</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dotter Expansion</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>19,450</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure I Rehab</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(No Board action required)
DONATION OF PARCEL OF LAND, WOSC

Staff Report to the Committee

Officials at Western Oregon State College have reported to the Board's Office of Finance and Administration the donation of a small parcel of land by the City of Monmouth. The parcel consists of approximately one-tenth of an acre located east of the Education Building. Formerly, the parcel was a Bonneville Power Administration substation that was abandoned many years ago. The property has an estimated value of $7,000.

(No Board action required)

RESIDENCY CLASSIFICATION

Staff Report to Board

Residency classification rules are used in making admission decisions and in assessing instructional fees. On January 19, 1990, in an attempt to reduce the number of students being classified as "residents," the Board amended the former rules.

Despite the changes, nonresidents who have come to Oregon for the primary purpose of attending college still continue to attain residency classification status after living one or two years in Oregon, resulting in loss of tuition revenue.

Consequently, over the past academic year, staff has been re-evaluating the System's current residency rules to make certain that only those students who indeed have evidenced their intent to establish Oregon domicile are eligible for resident tuition. Though the net effect of the proposed new rules on current and future nonresident enrollment cannot be predicted with great precision, the rule change is expected to increase System tuition revenue.

As a result of the review and analysis of residency rules in Oregon and other states, staff recommended several changes in the System's residency classification policy. In addition to a number of minor wording and technical clarifications, the amendments:

- Define "financial independence";
- Expressly provide that a person coming to Oregon primarily for the purpose of ob-
taining an education will be considered a nonresident; and

- Establish that, although residency of dependent students is usually that of the person upon whom the student is financially dependent, students of divorced parents also may be considered residents if, for 24 months prior to requesting residency, they have resided with a parent who is an Oregon resident.

The amendments presented to the Board reflected extensive review by institution staff and assistance from the Department of Justice.

A public hearing on the rules was held on October 20, 1992, on the University of Oregon campus. The results of the hearing were reported to the Board at the October 23, 1992, meeting.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt, as set forth below: Oregon Administrative Rules 580-10-029, 580-10-031, and 580-10-033, and amendments to Oregon Administrative Rules 580-10-030 and 580-10-040, to be effective November 1, 1993; and amendment to Oregon Administrative Rule 580-10-041, to be effective upon filing of the rule with the Secretary of State.

Note: Underlining indicates proposed new language, [Brackets indicate proposed deletions.]

Definitions

580-10-029. For the purpose of rules 580-10-030 through 580-10-045, the following words and phrases mean:

(1) "Domicile" denotes a person's true, fixed, and permanent home and place of habitation. It is the place where a person intends to remain and to which the person expects to return when the person leaves without intending to establish a new domicile elsewhere.

(2) "Financially independent" denotes a person who has not been and will not be claimed as an exemption and has not received and will not receive financial assistance in cash or in kind of an
amount equal to or greater than that which would qualify him or her to be claimed as an exemption for federal income tax purposes by another person except his or her spouse for the current calendar year and for the calendar year immediately prior to the year in which application is made.

(3) A "dependent" is a person who is not financially independent.

Determination of Residence

580-10-030 (1) For purposes of admission and instruction fee assessment, OSSHE institutions shall classify a [all] student[s (except students attending a summer session)] as an Oregon resident or nonresident. In determining resident or nonresident classification, the primary issue is one of intent. If a person is in Oregon primarily for the purpose of obtaining an education, that person will be considered a nonresident. For example, it may be possible for an individual to qualify as a resident of Oregon for purposes of voting or obtaining an Oregon driver's license and not meet the residency requirements established by these rules.

(2) For this purpose an] An Oregon resident is a financially independent person [with] who, immediately prior to the term for which Oregon resident classification is requested:

(a) Has established and maintained a domicile [bona fide fixed and permanent physical presence established and maintained] in Oregon of not less than [twelve] 12 consecutive months; and

(b) Is primarily engaged in activities other than those of being a college student. [immediately prior to the term for which residence status is requested.]

(i) A student may be considered primarily engaged in educational activities regardless of the number of hours for which the student is enrolled. However, a student who is enrolled for more than seven hours per semester or quarter shall be presumed to be in Oregon for primarily educational purposes.

(ii) Such period of enrollment shall not be counted toward the establishment of a bona fide domicile of one year in this state unless the student proves, in fact, establishment of a bona fide domicile in this state primarily for purposes other than educational.

[ Determination of residence includes finding it to
be the place where the person intends to remain and to which the person expects to return when leaving Oregon without intending to establish a new domicile elsewhere and shall be based on consideration of all relevant objective factors including but not limited to:

(a) Abandonment of prior out-of-state residence;
(b) History, duration and nature of noneducational activities in Oregon;
(c) Sources of financial support, including location of source of support and amounts of support; (Receipt, from a non-Oregon resident of support greater than the difference between resident and nonresident tuition at the institution where residence is sought, whether or not the student is actually claimed as a dependent for tax purposes, is a strong inference of nonresidency.)
(d) Location of family;
(e) Ownership of real property in Oregon;
(f) Location of household goods in Oregon;
(g) Filing of Oregon income tax return as an Oregon resident; and

(h) State of vehicle and voter registration. Residence is not established by mere attendance at an institution of higher education and physical presence in the state while attending such an institution.

(3) An Oregon resident is also a person who is dependent on a parent or legal custodian who meets the Oregon residency requirements of these rules.

(4) The criteria for determining Oregon resident classification [established in section (2) of this above rule] shall also be used to determine whether a person who has moved from Oregon [the state] has established a non-Oregon residence.

(5) If institution records show that the residence [as defined in section (2) of this rule] of a person or the person's legal custodian upon whom the person is dependent is outside of Oregon, the person shall continue to be classified as a nonresident until entitlement to resident classification is shown. The burden of showing that the residence classification should be changed is on the person requesting the change.

Residency Consideration Factors

580-10-031 (1) The following factors, although not necessarily conclusive or exclusive, have probative value in support of a claim for Oregon
resident classification:
(a) Be primarily engaged in activities other than those of a student and reside in Oregon for 12 consecutive months immediately prior to the beginning of the term for which resident classification is sought;
(b) Reliance upon Oregon resources for financial support;
(c) Domicile in Oregon of persons legally responsible for the student;
(d) Acceptance of an offer of permanent employment in Oregon; and
(e) Ownership by the person of his or her living quarters in Oregon.
(2) The following factors, standing alone, do not constitute sufficient evidence to effect classification as an Oregon resident:
(a) Voting or registration to vote;
(b) Employment in any position normally filled by a student;
(c) The lease of living quarters;
(d) Admission to a licensed practicing profession in Oregon;
(e) Automobile registration;
(f) Public records, for example, birth and marriage records, Oregon driver's license;
(g) Continuous presence in Oregon during periods when not enrolled in school;
(h) Ownership of property in Oregon, or the payment of Oregon income or other Oregon taxes; or
(i) Domicile in Oregon of the student's spouse.
(3) Reliance upon non-Oregon resources for financial support is an inference of residency in another state.
(4) The resident classification of a dependent person shall be that of his or her parents or legal custodians, or, in case of divorce or other similar circumstances, the parent or legal custodian upon whom the person is financially dependent, unless the dependent has been in Oregon with the other parent or a legal custodian and established Oregon residency under these rules 24 months prior to the term for which Oregon resident classification is requested.

Evidence of Financial Dependency
580-10-033 (1) In determining whether a student is financially dependent and whether his or her parent, or legal custodian has maintained a bona fide domicile in Oregon for one year, a student
must provide:
(a) Legal proof of custodianship;
(b) Evidence of established domicile of parent or legal custodian;
(c) The identification of the student as a dependent on the federal income tax return of the parents, or legal custodian.
Additional documentation to substantiate dependency during the current calendar year may be required at a later time if deemed necessary by the institution.

(2) A student who provides evidence that he or she is a dependent of a parent or legal custodian who has maintained a one-year domicile in Oregon shall not be required to establish a one-year domicile prior to classification of resident status, provided such a student may not be classified as a resident while receiving financial assistance from another state or agency thereof for educational purposes.

Residence Classification of Aliens
580-10-040 (1) An alien holding an immigrant visa or an A, E, G, I, or K visa, or otherwise admitted for permanent residence in the United States is eligible to be considered an Oregon resident if OAR 580-10-030[(2)] is otherwise satisfied. The date of receipt of the immigrant visa, the date of approval of political asylum or refugee status, or the date of approval of [an alien's application for] lawful permanent residence, whichever is earlier, shall be the date upon which the 12 months and other residency requirements under OAR 580-10-030 shall begin to accrue.
(2) Notwithstanding any other rule, an alien possessing a nonimmigrant or temporary, i.e., B, C, D, F, H, J, L, or M visa cannot be classified as a resident.

Changes in Residence Classification
580-10-041 (1) If an Oregon resident student [transfers to] enrolls in an institution outside of Oregon and later seeks to re-enroll in an [Department] OSSHE institution, the residence classification of that student shall be reexamined and determined on the same basis as for any other person.
(2) A person whose nonresident legal custodian establishes a permanent Oregon residence as defined in OAR 580-10-030[(2)] during a term when the dependent is enrolled at an [Department] OSSHE
institution, [the enrolled person] may register as a resident at the beginning of the next term.

(3) Once established, classification as a resident continues so long as the student remains in continuous academic year enrollment in the classifying institution.

(4) A person who seeks classification as a resident under these rules shall complete and submit a notarized Residence Information Affidavit. The affidavit must be submitted by the last day to register for the term in which resident status is sought.

(5) No OSSHE institution is bound by any determination of residency except by duly authorized officials under procedures prescribed by these rules including timely submittal of the notarized affidavit.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Clark provided background for the present proposal and indicated that tuition at the public four-year higher education institutions is higher for nonresident students than for resident students. Through payment of taxes, Oregon residents contribute to the General Fund of the state from which the legislature appropriates resources for higher education.

The principle is that nonresident students are assessed instructional fees that approximate the full cost of the education they receive. The rules used in classifying the residency status of students are intended to assure that only bona fide Oregon residents are assessed the resident fee. In January 1990, the Board approved tighter residency rules. Despite these changes, however, nonresident students who have come to Oregon for the primary purpose of attending college continue to obtain Oregon residency after living one or two years in Oregon. This results in a loss of tuition revenue. In academic year 1991-92, approximately 2,600 students petitioned for Oregon residency status and of that number, about 75 percent were able to attain it.

Since the last legislative session in 1991, there has been a growing view in the administrative leadership of the State System institutions, the Chancellor's Office, and within the legislative leadership that the rules need to be clarified and tightened to bring Oregon's rules into line with
those of other states that have strong residency regulations.

For the past year or so, staff has been re-evaluating the residency requirements and the ways in which they are applied within the institutions. Extensive research and redrafting of regulations have occurred by legal advisors with input from various interinstitutional bodies.

Ms. Grier remarked that the changes proposed to the Board would enable clearer definition of residency and enable determination that those students whose primary intent is to come to Oregon for education purposes will not be considered residents. The new rule more clearly defines financial independence and, further, establishes provisions for students whose parents are divorced.

Continuing, Ms. Grier indicated, "The most controversial proposal is the one that would establish that students who are primarily engaged in educational activities may not use the time during which they are thus engaged to meet the durational residency requirement. There are two requirements students must meet when they come from out-of-state to become residents. The first is that they must be in Oregon for 12 months, and the second is that they must establish their intent to live and reside in Oregon, both during their education and beyond. In other words, they must establish domicile in the state.

"In the past, students could establish the 12-month durational requirement during a time they were primarily engaged in educational activities. The new rule, if adopted, would determine that if the primary activity is educational, they could not apply and would not qualify. The other controversial issue is the effective date of the new rule, which is proposed to be July 1, 1993. The effect of that date is that students who arrived in fall of 1991 would be considered under the current rules. But students who arrived fall of 1992 would be considered under the new rules when they apply. Therefore, they would not be able to use a 12-month period in which they were primarily engaged in educational activities to meet the 12-month durational requirement."

Ms. Grier reported on the testimony, both written and oral, from the public hearing concerning the
rules. All testimony has been in opposition to the proposed rule changes. Fifty-eight individuals attended the hearing held on the University of Oregon campus October 20, 1992. Of that number, it is estimated that 30 were law students at the University of Oregon; 18 gave oral testimony. Unanimously, students objected to the change in the rule that would eliminate their ability to meet the durational residency requirement if they were primarily engaged in educational activities.

Students indicated that, for those coming from out-of-state, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to establish residency. Law students reported that they had been assured before they enrolled at the University that they would be able to achieve residency status. Many had given up scholarships to go to other schools or given up residency in their home state to come to Oregon. Further, they indicated it would create extreme financial hardship if they were forced to pay out-of-state tuition for the balance of their educational programs.

Many students indicated they should have had an opportunity to present their concerns to the Board. The Chancellor received 33 letters, a petition signed by 64 architecture students, a petition signed by 50 nonresident and 25 resident law students, written testimony by the University of Oregon student body president, and written testimony on behalf of the Oregon Student Lobby.

The majority of dental students who contacted the Chancellor's Office indicated that the number of nonresident students at the Dental School will decline, thus, in their view, reducing the overall quality of the program. Further, the dental students reported that they had been assured they would qualify as residents before they enrolled and believed they had been misled.

The Oregon Student Lobby requested that the Board delete the language that relates to the durational residency requirement and the requirement that dependent students must rely on their parents' residency status. The Oregon Student Lobby is on record supporting the position that leasing property should be as good an indicia of residency as ownership of property.
Mr. Edward Dennis, assistant director of the Oregon Student Lobby, presented the position of that organization. "The students understand the situation facing higher education. We are sympathetic to the pressure being put on the State System by the legislative leaders of Oregon.

"We believe that the State Board and the Oregon Student Lobby are trying to find the most equitable solution to the present crisis. The residency requirement rule change before us goes too far. Oregon used to have a system of establishing residency that was far too easy. Then it was changed and Oregon is right now at the national norm for residency restrictions. The adoption of the new rule language could hurt instead of help.

"It (the rule) will hurt higher education's ability to promote and encourage geographic and multicultural diversity. It will especially impact nontraditional students who move to the state with their families. The rule will discourage traditional, independent students who desire to come to Oregon. Studies suggest that the students who fit either of these descriptions stay in Oregon and become tax-paying citizens.

"Our intent here is to make more money. But will this rule really achieve that goal? Will an independent student come to Oregon if he or she can never gain residency? Could the State System lose money because fewer out-of-state students actually attend our institutions? Could Oregon lose potential revenues from higher educated, and therefore higher-paying, taxpayers? The staff reports indicate that the economic impacts are unclear.

"We realize the legislature is breathing hard down our necks, but the legislature would not enact similar legislation without numerous public hearings and without learning from the experts in many fields. We need to hear from the other trusted state leaders. What will the economic and social costs be? We should hear from those states that have tried this already. What has happened there? Before we make any decision that we might later regret, let's get the facts, present them to the legislative leaders and the students, and then make our decision."

Mr. Dodson asked Mr. Dennis if changing the implementation date would mitigate many of the concerns.
Mr. Dennis indicated that it would help, but that there were other questions that might need to be addressed.

Mr. Richardson asked for clarification regarding the phrase, "engaged in other activities." Ms. Grier responded that it included the other things in an individual's life such as jobs, transfer of a spouse, or moving to Oregon because a family moved. The definition of the "other activities" is very broad.

Continuing, Mr. Richardson asked what the impact would be in terms of the number of students who might drop out of school if the new rule took effect and the potential loss of revenue that would result. Ms. Grier and Vice Chancellor Ihrig replied that the question is very difficult to answer since the number of students who will withdraw or decide not to come to Oregon as a result of the change is not known.

Mr. Miller asked why 1993 had been selected as the cutoff date and if the impact on graduate research assistants had been calculated.

Ms. Grier responded that the effective date was a matter of choice. July 1 was chosen because it is the start of the fiscal year, and that date treated all students equally within the next fiscal year. However, she continued, another date could be selected. Staff has studied extensively the legal implications of the rule change. Catalogues state clearly that rules and tuition may change and, in effect, provide prior notice to students. The one legal prohibition the State System must avoid is the creation of an irrebuttable presumption. That is, you cannot say that, once someone comes to Oregon as a nonresident, they will forevermore be a nonresident.

Mr. Miller asked if there would be a serious impact of not being able to attract graduate students for research projects and grants, and Ms. Grier indicated there are special provisions for students from out-of-state who come as graduate students to work on research programs or as graduate teaching assistants. They would continue to pay in-state tuition under the new rules.

Mr. Adams pointed out that the difference in tuition for undergraduate students was from $3,500 to
$5,100 (depending on whether it was a college or university), and for a graduate student from $2,000 to $3,000 more per year. He asked if it is possible to get a sense of how many current classifications might change under the proposed rule. Further, Mr. Adams pointed out that as he read a portion of the rule, if a parent or custodian moved to the state, established residency and then moved out-of-state and the student remained, he/she would still be considered a resident. Mr. Adams indicated that he saw that as a loophole.

Mr. Swanson continued by asking how much increased revenue might accrue from the change. Chancellor Bartlett responded that it was extremely difficult to answer the question directly, but that it was in the range of $3-$5 million. Continuing, Mr. Swanson expressed concern about applying new rules to individuals who have come to Oregon under another set of rules and residency requirements, and indicated that he would be inclined to have the rules state that as of July 1, 1993, the new rules would be in effect and would apply to every new student who comes in after that. However, they would not apply to students already in Oregon until July 1, 1995, which would give students a few years to obtain residency.

Chancellor Bartlett expressed concern that Oregon continue to have at least as many out-of-state students as there are at the present time, and possibly more. However, he questions whether the State System will be allowed to increase the number of out-of-state students if it produces a situation in which there is a major transfer of resources to support them. "I think the political reality is that, if we do not control the problem, it will be controlled for us. I am apprehensive, therefore, that we could very easily get ourselves into a situation where, in the understandable spirit of trying to protect out-of-state students, we in fact raise insurmountable barriers in the form of quotas or limitations.

"I think we have 'sold' the notion of increasing our out-of-state enrollment for reasons that are absolutely correct by saying that they (students) will pay their way. And, if they don't pay their way, I suspect we are going to run smack into a political position that says we can't afford, in the present straits in Oregon, to keep those doors open. I am very apprehensive about anything that
appears to be compromising the proposition that we have used for two years now in Salem that out-of-state students pay the full costs. We will have a lot of explaining to do that can call into question what I think is a very desirable objective, which is to hope to stay available to out-of-state students with a very clear and very decisive residency/tuition policy.

"I'm not sure that the notice of change of rule is short. It's an academic year. There is no subject that has been talked about more and on which more attention has been focused over the recent weeks. It is hardly a matter that people have brushed off the concerns of the students nor is it a matter about which any of us feels comfortable.

"I think changing the July date runs both the risk that we will have to take budget actions to offset it, which will be conspicuous and call attention to themselves; and that the corollary -- the questioning of the use of General Fund resources to continue to subsidize large numbers of out-of-state students -- will then become obvious and be called into question and raise some serious problems."

Ms. Wilson responded that she understood the political and financial issues at stake and the basic concept that nonresident students should pay full tuition. However, she indicated she could not support the rule change with the date as proposed.

Several Board members raised a question concerning grandfathering those students currently enrolled. Ms. Grier indicated that if the effective date were changed to October 1993, students who came to Oregon this fall would have an opportunity to qualify under the existing rule.

Mr. Richardson observed that changing the residency rule was much like the situation of an in-state student who enrolled in one of the institutions one year under a certain tuition level, and that level was changed the next. In addition, Mr. Richardson remarked that there could be a substantial financial loss if all nonresident students currently enrolled in the System were grandfathered so that the new rules did not apply to them.

Ms. Grier reminded the Board that the new residency rules would not affect those students who have already qualified for residency; it would only
affect students who want to apply for residency. Therefore, there would be no need to look at a retroactive waiver.

Mr. Swanson indicated he was in agreement with the new rules as presented, with the exception of the date of implementation. He commented that he could not support a start date of July 1993 and preferred either January or July of 1994. Ms. Davis expressed support for Mr. Swanson's proposed change of date.

Ms. Davis questioned the portion of the rule relative to ownership of property as an indicator of residency. Ms. Grier explained that the rule includes aspects generally considered part of establishing residency. They are not requirements in that an individual does not have to meet all of them. Continuing, she explained that domicile is a legal term that has been incorporated into the language of the residency rules.

Chancellor Bartlett reminded the Board that it was in a curious moral position concerning changes it makes during the course of time a student is enrolled. In particular, he pointed out that tuition increases have been made over the last two years, with the potential for another in the next biennium. None of the students had been grandfathered, since that is not possible. "My concern," the Chancellor continued, "is that we think very carefully about the argument of grandfathering the current students (regarding the residency rule) because we could very well be going into a period when we will be faced with very dramatic changes -- changes for which we will have no choice -- and it would be extremely difficult to maintain the proposition that we can't change the rules as we go."

Mr. Dennis remarked the Board had set a good example for leaders in Salem. They were given a job to do, and they did it quickly. "I hope there is agreement that this rule change is going to make more money in the short, medium, and long term. The Oregon Student Lobby is afraid that if the rules were changed halfway through the game, the out-of-state students may just take their money and leave."

It was moved and seconded to table the proposed residency rules changes and to appoint an ad hoc Board committee to study the issues and propose a change. The following voted in favor: Directors
Adams, Davis, Dodson, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, Yokota, and Bailey. Those voting no: none.

President Bailey asked Mr. Richardson to chair the committee and asked Ms. Davis and Mr. Swanson to work with him.

Staff Report to the Board

The Industrial Security Manual issued by the U.S. Department of Defense requires that owners, officers, and executive personnel of corporations and regents or trustees of colleges and universities whose employees have access to classified material in the course of working on Department of Defense contracts delegate to others the authority for fulfilling the requirements of the Industrial Security Manual and exclude themselves from access to classified information.

The resolution recommended for adoption is that required by the Manual and is, except for changes in the date, names of Board members, and the title of two vice presidents, identical to that which has been adopted previously by the Board.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following resolution regarding access to classified information related to the Department of Defense material.

Resolution

At a meeting of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education on October 23, 1992, with a quorum present, it was voted:

That those persons occupying the following positions for Oregon State University shall be known as the Managerial Group as described in the Industrial Security Manual for Safeguarding Classified Information:

President
Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies
Vice President for Finance and Administration
Director of Business Affairs
Security Officer
That the chief executive and members of the Managerial Group have been processed or will be processed for a personnel clearance for access to classified information, to the level of the facility clearance granted to this institution as provided for in the aforementioned Industrial Security Manual.

That the said Managerial Group is hereby delegated all of the Board's duties and responsibilities pertaining to the protection of classified information under contracts of the Department of Defense or User Agencies of its Industrial Security Program awarded to Oregon State University.

That the following named officers and members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education shall not require, shall not have, and can be effectively excluded from access to all classified information in the possession of Oregon State University and do not occupy positions that would enable them to affect adversely the policies and practices of Oregon State University in the performance of contracts for the Department of Defense or User Agencies for the Industrial Security Program to Oregon State University.

**Officers and Board Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert L. R. Bailey</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice J. Wilson</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Adams</td>
<td>Member, Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter R. (Rob) Miller</td>
<td>Member, Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George E. Richardson, Jr.</td>
<td>Member, Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark S. Dodson</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard K. Donahue</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Jackson</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britteny S. Davis</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie M. Swanson, Jr.</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurie Yokota</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas A. Bartlett</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia L. Thompson</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board approved the staff recommendation with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Davis, Dodson, Jackson, Miller, Richardson,
Swanson, Wilson, Yokota, and Bailey. Those voting no: none.

Board members thanked President Gilbert and his staff for the informative visit and warm hospitality.

Mr. Richardson reported that on October 20, 1992, he, President Ramaley, Vice Chancellor Clark, and Ms. Virginia Boushey, appeared before the Oregon Progress Board. A presentation was made on outcome assessment and accountability in the State System. He indicated that the Governor and other members of the Progress Board engaged in a very productive discussion and that there is a better appreciation of the challenges the System faces in addressing the Oregon Benchmarks items.

President Bailey added his compliments to President Gilbert and remarked that it was very helpful for the Board to meet on the campus.

The Joint Boards Planning Committee is coming to final agreement on the agenda for the November meeting of the Joint Boards. Two major topics for the meeting will be foreign language and education reform.

On the same day, November 20, there will be a regular meeting of the Board, followed by a Board Renewal Work Session.

A summary of facilities contracting activities within the Office of Finance and Administration is presented below:

Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

An Agreement was negotiated with J. Thomas Clark, Architect, Portland, for architectural and consulting services not to exceed $75,000.00. Financing will be provided from state funds.
An Agreement was negotiated with James E. Hagerman, Architect, Portland, for architectural and consulting services not to exceed $75,000.00. Financing will be provided from state funds.

An Agreement was negotiated with ACR Engineering, Inc., Engineers, Portland, for engineering and consulting services not to exceed $75,000.00. Financing will be provided from state funds.

An Agreement was negotiated with Devco Engineering, Inc., Engineers, Corvallis, for engineering services not to exceed $57,800.00. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Award of Construction Contracts

On August 28, 1992, Capital Communications Industries, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $87,795.00. Financing for this project will be provided from athletics operating funds.

On September 21, 1992, Rubenstein's Contract Carpet was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $257,500.00. Financing for this project will be provided from state funds.

On August 17, 1992, Baugh Construction Oregon, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $592,600.00. Financing for this project will be provided from hospital funds.

On September 17, 1992, Acme Roofing Co., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $178,217.00. Financing for this project will be provided from funds available to the institution.

On September 16, 1992, Glas-Shield Roof Systems was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $25,662.00. Financing for this project will be provided from funds available to the institution.
Acceptance of Projects

Toxicology Lab Relocation
Marquam Plaza Bldg
A Phase I, OHSU
University Hospital North,
Chiller Plant Mod., OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on May 15, 1992. The estimated total project cost remains at $195,543.00. Financing was provided from hospital funds.

University Hospital North,
Chiller Plant Mod., OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on August 18, 1992. The estimated total project cost remains at $387,882.61. Financing was provided from hospital funds.

Bowerman Family Bldg, UO

This project, constructed with gift money under the auspices of the University of Oregon Foundation, is complete. The lease between the Board and the University of Oregon Foundation was terminated on October 6, 1992, and the facility became the property of the Board.

(No Board action required)

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

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

Robert L. R. Bailey
President