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ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 10:45 a.m. by President Robert L. R. Bailey.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Mr. Robert Adams  Mr. Rob Miller
Ms. Britteny Davis  Mr. G. E. Richardson
Mr. Mark Dodson  Mr. Leslie Swanson
Mr. Richard Donahue  Ms. Janice Wilson
Ms. Beverly Jackson  Ms. Laurie Yokota
Mr. Robert Bailey

Chancellor's Office -- Chancellor Thomas A. Bartlett; Virginia Boushey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Francesca Clifford, Assistant Director of Communications; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services and Compliance Officer; Peter Hughes, Director, Internal Audit; Weldon E. Ihrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Susan Johnese, Secretary; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Joe McNaught, Attorney-in-Charge, Education Section; Roger Olsen, Director, OCATE; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; 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; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.

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

Oregon Health Sciences University -- President Peter Kohler; Tom Fox, Vice President, Development and Public Affairs; Lesley M. Hallick, Vice President, Academic Affairs.
Oregon Institute of Technology -- President Lawrence Wolf; Doug Yates, Dean of Administration.

Oregon State University -- Roy Arnold, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs; Kinsey Green, Dean, College of Home Economics and Education; Dale Parnell, Professor of Education.

Portland State University -- President Judith Ramaley.

Southern Oregon State College -- President Joseph Cox.

University of Oregon -- President Myles Brand; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration.

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

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

Others -- Walt Amacher, PSU Vanguard; Ed Dennis, Field Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Dean Dawkins, PSU; Joni James, Register-Guard; Robert Nosse, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Jayne Sowers, PSU; Michele Vowell, PSU Vanguard.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the November 20, 1992, meeting of the Board, and approved them as submitted. The following voted in favor of approval: Directors Adams, Davis, Dodson, Donahue, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, Yokota, and Bailey.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Bartlett welcomed members of the Board and extended New Year's greetings.

IFS Report

Dr. Bonnie Staebler, outgoing president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) was thanked for her leadership to the IFS and
higher education. Chancellor Bartlett observed that Dr. Staebler had served during a very difficult period, and her contributions were recognized and appreciated.

Dr. Staebler, in turn, thanked the Board and members of the Chancellor's staff for support during her tenure. Dr. Marjorie Burns, faculty member from Portland State University, was introduced as the newly elected president of IFS.

Dr. Burns reported that the last IFS meeting had been on December 4-5. Items of primary interest at the meeting included legislative matters, creating and communicating a positive public image, and faculty productivity and workload.

Relative to faculty productivity, Dr. Burns observed that, "In the public eye, higher education is no longer viewed as a public good. The public view of faculty is that they are seen less as people who serve the community and more as people who serve themselves.

"And that is where we're going to have to change people's opinion and show how professors are not removed from the world but working in the world.

"The IFS is ready to work with the Board and Chancellor's Office. In addition, we want to be watchdogs for the students. We have a special perspective, working closely with the students, to track issues such as tuition, access, and enrollment trends. We have the advantages of being an ecumenical group, of 'being in the middle' with the students. We all must work together."

Legislative Update
Dr. Bartlett reported on meetings he had with the Democratic and Republic Caucuses. It is unprecedented to have had an opportunity to meet with these groups this early in the session. The meetings provided an opportunity to hear from legislators and talk with them about higher education concerns.
In addition, higher education was invited to testify at the full Joint Ways and Means Committee, providing an opportunity to present the higher education picture to all members of the Joint Committee.

The Chancellor described the overview he had presented to the Committee. The legislative fiscal office expert on the higher education budget set the stage with great clarity, thoroughness, and skill. "To present a budget of approximately $1.4 billion a year spread over an enormous range of programs under many different headings -- and to get all of that clear and accessible -- is a tour de force. The presentation set the factual basis for discussion."

Four main points were presented to the Committee by the Chancellor. One is the budget, which assumes large efficiency increases, both in administrative changes and in the ways in which we deploy academic teaching resources. Through the Board Administrative Review Committee (BARC) and other review processes, the Board, in varying forms, will continue to press to find efficiencies in the operations of higher education.

Second, there is a projected 40 percent growth in the number of high school graduates between 1992 and 2002. In preparation for that kind of an imminent future, there has been an attempt to maintain balance among teaching, research, and service. As the System has dealt with budget reductions, one of the objectives has been to keep a framework of institutions and programs and a balance in the major functions so that, at such time as the state decides to respond to the growth in number of high school graduates, the System will be in a position to do so.

A third factor in the budget is that it reflects an absolute cut in dollars and not just a cut in current service levels. In the jargon of the legislature, this is a vital difference because budgets are often described (in relation to the previous biennium) as being either increased or reduced from current service
levels. In the case of higher education, the general fund appropriation, in absolute dollars, has gone down about $86 million. The current service level reduction, depending on how it is calculated, is between $120 and $133 million. That is a significant reduction in the resources that can be deployed.

The last point in the budget is the difference between higher education's overall budget (the total of all operations) and that portion of activities funded by the general fund (state dollars). "It is important to distinguish between OSSHE's overall budget and that portion of activities funded by the general fund (state resources)."

Continuing, the Chancellor remarked, "The reason it is important to separate those two numbers is that the total budget will continue to go up when you include such things as patient care, dormitory and food service budgets, increases in obtaining grants and contracts, and growth in service activities.

"The portion of the budget from state funds that applied to education-in-general purposes, the core of instructional programs for students, is going down. It is important that people understand that the entrepreneurial activities of faculty and staff do not fund direct instruction and teaching."

The Chancellor continued by referring to the changing economy and the role of higher education in it. Approximately 22 percent of the present workforce of Oregon requires education beyond the community college level. Economic trends indicate this percentage will continue to grow. If Oregon is to achieve the Benchmarks of increasing average income and, if we are to develop a stable economy, higher education has to expand, not get smaller.

"I would end by pointing out that it takes $30,000 a year in income for a person to be at the point where that person is paying as many taxes as he/she is receiving in services from the general fund. Higher education is in the middle of a major transition that began in the
last biennium. We have trimmed a very large number of programs, thus focusing much more tightly on the core missions of the institutions. Secondly, we are going through the process of looking for efficiency at every point -- in administration and in the deployment of academic resources.

"The third sign of the transition is the development among institutions of statewide programs. And finally, there has been a shift of the cost burden to the students.

"We face tremendous population growth, and we will need to be prepared to respond. In higher education, we have to be very conscious, as responsible stewards that we are, in fact, anticipating and preparing for the growth."

**Introduction**

Oregon State University requests authorization to establish a graduate program leading to the M.S., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in Apparel, Interiors, Housing, and Merchandising (AIHM). This request results from administrative reorganization and previously established long-range planning commitments. It is the product of a thorough rethinking of the most appropriate ways to organize and provide graduate level training in AIHM. A copy of the full proposal is on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.

Oregon State University, within the College of Home Economics and Education, currently offers M.A. and M.S. degrees in Apparel, Interiors, and Merchandising and offers a housing concentration in the master's and doctoral degree programs of Family Resource Management.

In a 1989 restructuring of the College of Home Economics previously approved by the State System, the undergraduate housing major, all undergraduate and graduate courses in housing, and the associated faculty and graduate assistance FTE were moved to the Department of Apparel, Interiors, and Merchandising, and the unit became the Department of Apparel, Interiors, Housing, and Merchandising. These struc-
tural shifts provide part of the impetus for restructuring graduate programs in the renamed department.

The specific objective of establishing a doctoral program in clothing and textiles first appeared in the department long-range plan in 1985. Strategies designed to accomplish this objective included reallocation of personnel toward research and graduate teaching, implementation of a hiring strategy to build the faculty base necessary to support a doctoral program, revision of existing graduate courses, and development of new graduate courses necessary to support a doctoral program, an increase in enrollment in the existing master's degree program, and development of national visibility as a base for recruiting top quality doctoral students. All of these strategies have been implemented. This proposal is the final step in a long-term plan to reorganize and enhance graduate education in AIHM.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

As the state's designated land grant institution, Oregon State University has a mandate to help the people of Oregon develop and utilize human resources. The proposed endorsement is also consistent with the Board's approved role for Oregon State University of providing comprehensive high-quality instruction, research, and service programs associated with selected professions.

The mission of the Department of AIHM is to promote the social, psychological, and physical well-being of individuals and families through the discovery, interpretation, and dissemination of information related to the basic human needs of clothing and shelter. The proposed program is directly related to the mission of the department and to the mission of the College of Home Economics and Education, particularly with respect to pro-
motoring the well-being of individuals and families and enhancing interactions of families with other social institutions and the physical environment.

2. **Evidence of Need**

There is an existing need for qualified individuals to teach and conduct research at institutions of higher education in the areas of apparel, merchandising, and housing. A nation-wide shortage of Ph.D.s in these areas is expected to continue into the 21st century. Anticipated faculty retirements will contribute to the shortage. It is estimated that 46 percent of current full-time faculty teaching apparel and merchandising courses will be retiring before the year 2000. At the same time, there is current and growing demand by students for the existing graduate program. Baccalaureate programs in apparel design and merchandising are among the fastest growing programs in home economics nationally. Qualified faculty are needed to teach in these programs.

Career placement is excellent. A 1985 United States Department of Agriculture national assessment indicates that demand for graduates will remain high. In addition to careers in academic institutions, employment opportunities for program graduates exist in the areas of retailing, consumer science, marketing, housing, and human environment.

3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

The report issued following external review noted that a major strength of the proposed program is the educational qualifications of the faculty. The AIHM faculty hold degrees from a number of institutions, contributing to faculty diversity. Most have experience with graduate instruction and advising, research, and scholarly contributions. Several have fostered networks with colleagues both...
inside and outside their department and across the nation indicating that the spirit of collaboration is already well instilled. The review team commented on the high level of faculty commitment and their energetic and enthusiastic motivation to take on the challenge of a doctoral program.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. Faculty required for the proposed graduate program are already on staff in the Department of AIHM and the Department of Human Development and Family Sciences. No additional hires are needed or anticipated.

Library. Current library holdings are adequate to meet the needs of the proposed program.

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

Budget Impact. The total recurring cost of the proposed program when fully implemented will be $75,685. These funds will come from a combination of internal reallocation and new external resources. External funds, including grant funds, will be solicited through the College development program. No new state funds will be required.

5. Duplication

No other graduate programs in apparel, interiors, housing, and merchandising exist in the state. Only ten universities in the entire United States offer doctoral programs in apparel, housing, and/or merchandising. At the present time, there are no doctoral programs with areas of concentration in merchandising management, human behavior and the near environment, or historical/cultural aspects of the near environment in the western
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United States. Virtually all the existing doctoral programs are found at the large land grant institutions in the mid-western states.

Program Review

The proposed program has been the subject of an external review including a site visit by a team of three internationally recognized scholars. Their report concluded that the proposal is sound and that it should be implemented. The proposed program has also been reviewed positively by the Academic Council.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon State University to offer a graduate program leading to the M.S., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in Apparel, Interiors, Housing, and Merchandising, effective winter term 1993, with a follow-up review to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs during the 1997-98 academic year. The proposal will be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the February Board meeting.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Roy Arnold, Provost, Oregon State University, introduced Dr. Sally Francis, Chair of the Department of Apparel, Interior, Housing, and Merchandising, who in turn introduced the program.

The proposal represented a long-term plan to deal with the increased demand and relatively few programs producing doctoral graduates in these fields. One of the unique features of the program is the integrative nature and the areas of concentration. This has required collaboration and interdisciplinary work among students and faculty, both within the department and across department lines. Dr. Francis underscored that the cost of implementing the program was modest, and plans were being developed to raise the funds from external sources.
A major goal in implementing the program, according to Dr. Francis, is to train new faculty members for future college teaching positions. Oregon State University has written a grant to the United States Department of Agriculture proposing that, along with implementation of the academic program, there be the development of a model that can be used on a national basis for supervision and development of college teaching skills.

To Mr. Swanson's question of how many doctoral students would be enrolled, Dr. Francis responded it would be a small number -- initially two, with five or six in the program at any one time. In addition, there would be 15 - 16 master's degree students.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation and place the item on the Consent Agenda for the February Board Meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and voted to place the item on the consent agenda for final action at the February Board meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Davis, Dodson, Donahue, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, Yokota, and Bailey. Those voting no: none.

Introduction

Western Oregon State College requests authorization to offer a B.S. in Education with a major in American Sign Language/English Interpreting (BSI).

The BSI program is designed to prepare graduates to enter the interpreting field as professionals who make significant contributions to education and rehabilitation service delivery teams serving deaf children and adults. The curriculum combines classes in language development, linguistics, sociology, education, and professional practices, as well as interpreting theory, technique, and application. Through a series of core classes, gradu-
ates are prepared for a vital role in enabling
deaf children and adults to participate in
basic education, job transition programs, and
adult learning. A copy of the full program
proposal is on file in the State System Office
of Academic Affairs.

Since 1975, Western Oregon State College has
offered a one-year certificate program in
Interpreter Preparation: Deafness. This
proposal will expand that program into a non-
teaching major offered through the Special
Education Division of the School of Education.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The preparation of education profession-
als has been central to the mission of
Western Oregon State College since its
approval as a teacher training school in
1882. Within that general focus, the
Regional Resource Center on Deafness
(RRCD) was established in the Department
of Education in 1973 and is now part of
the Division of Special Education. The
RRCD is the U.S. Department of Education
Region X site for the preparation of
education and rehabilitation profession-
als specializing in the field of deaf-
ness. Region X includes Alaska, Idaho,
Oregon, and Washington.

2. Evidence of Need

The first major increase in the demand
for sign language interpreters was creat-
ed by the passage of the Rehabilitation
Act of 1974 (Section 504). This legisla-
tion assured American citizens who are
deaf that communication barriers to pub-
licly supported human services would be
removed. Passage of PL 94-142 encouraged
a trend toward mainstreaming deaf stu-
dents, thereby creating a demand for
classroom interpreters. Public schools
began to require professionals who could
serve not only as a communication bridge
between the deaf student and the regular
classroom teacher, but also as a teaching assistant trained in the techniques of tutoring and other aide functions with deaf students. Within the last 20 years, the field of interpreter education has expanded to include first and second language acquisition research, bicultural and bilingual studies, interpreter theory, and specialized interpreting. Demand for this baccalaureate program is high. Program staff estimate that 30 to 40 applications will be received annually. According to a recent survey by the Oregon Department of Education, the number of vacant positions for trained educational interpreters between fall 1990 and fall 1992 in the state of Oregon ranged from 19 to 23. As the proposed program becomes fully operational, the projected number of graduates is expected to be 15 per year. That number will provide approximately 75 percent of Oregon's annual need.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

Federal grant funds from the U.S. Department of Education were awarded to plan and develop the transition from a certificate program to a baccalaureate program. These funds were awarded in part on the basis of the high quality of the existing program. This level of quality will be continued and enhanced in the proposed degree program. An evaluation plan has been designed to assess the success and quality of the program and the competency of the graduates.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. Faculty required to provide the proposed major are already in place. No additional hires are needed or anticipated.

Library. Current library holdings are adequate for the needs of the proposed
program. No additional library support is required.

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

Budget Impact. Management, staffing, and associated equipment and supplies will remain as currently assigned. There will be no budgetary impact as the funds necessary to implement the proposed program are exactly those that become available as the current certificate program is phased out.

5. Duplication

Approximately 65 interpreter training programs exist in the United States. Of these, seven offer a bachelor's degree, one offers a master's degree, and four are in the process of developing baccalaureate programs. The remainder, including a program at Portland Community College, are certificate or associate degree programs.

The proposed program will be unique in that it will be the only program in the Northwest and one of only two in the United States that offers specific course work preparing educational interpreter specialists for public schools from kindergarten through post-secondary institutions.

Program Review

The Academic Council has reviewed and approved the proposed program.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Board authorize Western Oregon State College to offer a B.S. in Education with a major in American Sign Language/English Interpreting effective spring term 1993 with a follow-up review to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic
Affairs during the 1997-98 academic year. The proposal will be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the February Board meeting.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Provost Bill Cowart indicated the proposal moved a one-year certification program, in operation since 1974, toward a baccalaureate degree.

Dr. Gerry Girod, Dean of Education, discussed the highlights of the proposal. Dr. Girod indicated there is a national move to face the increasing complexity of teaching interpreting. Students must first have a strong liberal arts foundation as a content basis for communicating. Western Oregon State College has become a leader in this field.

Mr. Dodson asked if this field were uniquely an American one or if there was a move toward internationalization.

In Europe, according to Dr. Girod, there is much more professional interpreter preparation than in the United States, but not in the area of sign language. Interpreter training is on the graduate level in Europe where there is a body of knowledge that is inherent to interpreting and professional issues around interpreting. However, in the area of deafness, the United States is doing more for training interpreting in sign language than any other language. Continuing, Dr. Girod explained there are interpreting skills: the fundamentals of interpreting, processing information, and translating it into the base language.

Mr. Swanson asked about the prospects of employment for those with certificates or degrees. Dr. Girod responded that the federal grant Western Oregon State College received required them to report very carefully the placement rates, which were approximately 80 percent during the first year.

The Committee approved the staff recommendation.
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Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommenda-
tion and voted to place the item on the con-
sent agenda for final action at the February
Board meeting. The following voted in favor:
Directors Adams, Davis, Dodson, Donahue,
Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson,
Yokota, and Bailey. Those voting no: none.

Introduction

Oregon State University proposes the establishment
of the Western Center for Community College Profes-
sional Development to be located in the School of
Education. The Center will involve three Oregon
State System of Higher Education universities:
Oregon State University, Portland State University,
and the University of Oregon. Under the financial
constraints of Measure 5, this cooperative arrange-
ment is intended to leverage available resources
and faculty expertise to meet multifaceted needs
and demands of two-year post-secondary institu-
tions. Board approval will authorize the Center, in
an umbrella arrangement, to focus diverse resources
on providing professional development, research,
and technical assistance needed by community (and
junior) colleges and two-year technical institutes
in Oregon and, prospectively, in the western states
region.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Approved Mission

The proposed Center is consistent with Oregon
State University's land grant mission of
providing comprehensive and high quality
instructional, research, and service programs
associated with selected professions. The
Center, upon approval for operation, will be
committed to increasing the professional
knowledge and competence of community college
instructional, student service, and adminis-
trative personnel to enhance the delivery of
community college education, training, and
student services. The discovery of new knowl-
dge through interdisciplinary research,
dissemination of this knowledge, design and
delivery of professional development programs,
and technical assistance, are primary activities in fulfilling the Center's mission.

2. Evidence of Need

There are only a small number of university programs specifically serving the needs of two-year post-secondary institutions in the western states. The Center will serve Oregon's community colleges primarily but indications of interest have been expressed in delivery of programs and services to two-year colleges within the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) region. As a result of this prospective development, community colleges will have access to the expertise of the universities for such needs as program development, evaluation, institutional research, and technology transfer.

Activities of the Center are also needed in support of education reform taking place in the various states. Education reform is changing the traditional roles and relationships between public schools and community colleges; e.g., technical/professional programs require careful articulation between secondary schools and community colleges. The Center, as an umbrella organization, will bring together instructional, research, and service resources of Oregon State University, University of Oregon, Portland State University, and other participating institutions across the region to foster collaborative partnerships to meet identified needs of community college personnel. Through these partnerships, public awareness of the roles of the community colleges and the universities in training and retraining the workforce, in promoting diversity, and in global economic integration should be enhanced.

3. Quality of the Program

While the Center will operate under the Oregon State University administrative structure and the land grant university service and outreach philosophy, it is envisioned that the Center will function as a multi-institution cooperative enterprise. As such, the Center will
facilitate the professional development of community college faculty, student services, and administrative personnel through instruction (including designing, delivering, and co-sponsoring workshops, seminars, and conferences; conducting professional development forums; facilitating access to university-based degree programs); coordinating field-based professional development research (including interpreting and disseminating research findings and assisting community colleges to establish research agendas); and service (including assisting staff in community college program development; conducting needs assessment; and assisting community colleges to maximize the use of new technologies, such as Ed-Net satellite transmission, and electronic bulletin boards). The focus of effort will be on the practical problems facing the two-year institution sector.

A three-year phase-in plan has been developed for the proposed Center. During the first two years, the Center will serve primarily Oregon community colleges. The community colleges have already indicated their strong support for establishing the Center. The third year will involve consideration of expanded services. Positive preliminary responses about the Center's regional objectives resulted from a discussion with leading educators from the western region at last year's annual meeting of the Northwest Accrediting Association. In addition, WICHE officials have expressed interest in exploring working with the Center on a cooperative basis.

To ensure that the Center is responsive to its mission and clientele, there will be an external review every three years of the Center's operations including its services, personnel, and mission. This review will be conducted by the Center's external advisory committee. The report shall be made to the Dean of the College of Home Economics and Education.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. A substantial portion of Oregon State University's School of Education faculty focus
their scholarship and instruction on the community college. Administratively, the Center will operate with a permanent staff of four positions: Executive Director, Administrative Assistant-Bookkeeper, Secretary, and Research Associate. Graduate students will join the staff as graduate assistantships become available. It also is anticipated that the Center will attract community college faculty and administrators on leave from home institutions to work with the Center on special projects. As special projects are funded from external sources, the Center will staff these projects according to expertise required, cost effectiveness considerations, and timeline requirements. No decisions have been made on permanent personnel for the proposed Center.

Library, Facilities, and Equipment Resources. The proposed Center will utilize existing facilities and equipment within Oregon State University's School of Education. Additional facilities or equipment will be accessible through the cooperative arrangements with the Communication Media Center, Office of Continuing Higher Education, Kerr Library, individual libraries of Oregon State University, Portland State University, and University of Oregon, and participating colleges' academic units as appropriate.

Budget Impact. Current and projected funding for the Center is based on sources from outside the General Fund budget of Oregon State University. Current funding for planning and development includes resources from Continuing Higher Education and Chemeketa Community College. Also, the Center administers a grant that currently funds a major statewide project for the Oregon State Department of Education in the amount of $384,000, for an 18-month period to provide technical and applied academics teacher training services needed to implement Oregon's Education Act for the 21st Century (HB 3565). A second ten-month project at $75,000 is being conducted for the Oregon State Department of Education to assist in developing and promoting Tech Prep/Associate Degree programs in the community colleges and
high schools. Two other professional development grants are currently under negotiation. Grant proposals under development deal with leadership development and training, and the enhancement of learning resource centers in community colleges and technical institutes.

The Center must generate its own operating funds on a continuing basis. The annual scope of work will be developed in accordance with the funds specifically secured by the Center.

Program Duplication. Historically, Oregon State University has been authorized by the Board to provide graduate programs in community college education, college student service administration, community education, vocational education, adult education, and college and university teaching. The Center will operate on a cooperative basis with the University of Oregon and Portland State University. It is expected that each university will work in areas of specialty and serve as the lead institution in those areas. An internal advisory council, composed of representatives from the three OSSHE universities, will be formed and will meet on a regular basis to deal with internal operational procedures and problems.

Program Review

The proposal for the Center was reviewed by the Academic Council on April 23, 1992, June 24, 1992, and November 19, 1992. Members of the Academic Council are satisfied that concerns about interinstitutional cooperation have been addressed.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended the Board authorize the establishment of the Western Center for Community College Professional Development at Oregon State University, effective February 1993.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Provost Arnold reminded the Committee that over the years, at Oregon State University, centers and institutes have been designed to facilitate certain program foci, bringing faculty together in specific
areas to work collaboratively with a particular external constituency. In general, centers do not have specific faculty. That is, they are appointed and budgeted through their academic departments. This allows retention of the strength of the involvement within academic disciplines and allows people to come together as needed.

Dr. Dale Parnell explained that community colleges are a growing part of the educational sector in Oregon. Over 350,000 different individuals took one or more classes in an Oregon community college in 1992. Oregon, according to Professor Parnell, has an opportunity to be the nexus for community college interests. There are 275 community/technical accredited junior colleges in WICHE states that would benefit from the services of the Western Center. This opportunity, in turn, enables leveraging of resources for collaborative programs.

In the second place, the Center would foster cooperation among the faculty members of OSSHE institutions, bringing them together across disciplinary lines. In addition, the Center would provide service to a growing sector of higher education.

Mr. Donahue inquired about the type of projects that would be undertaken and the role of the Center in them. Dr. Parnell responded that initiatives would range from bringing together educators from the State Department of Education, local school districts, and community to work on shared concerns. One of the special projects would be, for example, implementation of the Tech Prep/Associate Degree program. The Center would act in the role of broker, where people would have a "one-stop" place to call for information and expertise.

In response to Mr. Swanson's question of how faculty from other institutions, such as Portland State University and the University of Oregon, would be involved, Dr. Parnell indicated that there are unique issues and challenges at both institutions. When, for example, there are areas related to urban settings, Portland State University would be involved.

Provost Arnold indicated that there would be an advisory council with representatives from OSSHE's three universities. This group would assist in
defining needs and setting priorities. Mr. Dodson inquired what role the Center would play in strengthening the connection among community colleges and the universities in ways that would enable students to pass more readily from one system to the other.

Provost Arnold indicated that the Joint Articulation Commission would continue to be responsible for the formal relationships, connections, agreements, and understandings. There would undoubtedly be a need for important pieces of information, a defined area of research, or other program development that would be the focus of the Center.

Mr. Dodson observed that the Center would attract faculty to a kind of concerted or cooperative effort rather than forcing individuals to do things that are not in their best interest. Dr. Parnell concurred, pointing out that there have already been requests from community college faculty for some who had sabbatical leaves to come to the Center and work on some specific project of interest.

The Committee approved the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

On July 24, 1992, the Joint Boards of Education discussed development of strategies for Oregon students to attain international understanding and second language education as part of a jointly adopted policy framework of the Board of Higher Education and the State Board of Education. Second language instruction will be part of the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) as part of HB 3565. The CIM Task Force, established by the Board of Education to identify the outcomes that will drive both program and assessment in schools, developed the following statements forwarded to the Board of Education for its consideration in fall 1992:
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- Demonstrate an understanding of human diversity and ability to communicate in a second language with at least one other culture on its own terms;

- Demonstrate an understanding of this country's place in the larger context of other countries and cultures in their historical context.

In December 1992, the Board of Education voted to accept the Task Force's recommendations of a second language component in the CIM, with the following revisions in the Task Force language (this language was voted on at the Board of Education's January 7-8, 1993 meeting):

- Understand human diversity and communicate in a second language, applying appropriate cultural norms.

On November 20, 1992, the Joint Boards of Education considered the Preliminary Framework for Second Language Learning and College Admissions Requirements.

It was generally agreed by the Joint Boards of Education that the College Second Language Admissions Requirement is part of something larger -- the state's international competence. There should be development of a whole strategy to address the need for Oregon students to participate in a more global environment.

**PROPOSED SECOND LANGUAGE COLLEGE ADMISSIONS POLICY**

1. OSSHE institutions will require second language proficiency for students seeking admission to its colleges and universities for the academic year 1997-98. All students who are entering directly from high school will be required to meet the proficiency requirement. This policy will pertain to all campuses except Oregon Health Sciences University.

2. Students who graduated from high school prior to 1997-98 and students who have been out of high school for a period of eight or more years at the time of admission may apply for an exemption of the
second language requirement. In such cases, students will be required to meet an OSSHE graduation requirement, which will be a requirement of satisfactory attainment of the proficiency standard (corresponding to completion of one year of college foreign language).

3. All students entering from community colleges or other colleges and universities will be required to meet the proficiency requirement of a second language.

4. Students seeking admission from non-English speaking countries will be required to meet an English proficiency requirement using TOEFL scores and other appropriate measures.

5. Proficiency standards will be set for each language taught in an Oregon high school using the ACTFL (American Council of Teachers of Foreign Language) Guidelines; proficiency standards will be set to account for variation in difficulty of these foreign languages.

6. Student proficiency may be established by ACTFL testing that is completed by an ACTFL-certified K-12, community college faculty member, or the higher education foreign language department. An ODE/OSSHE-developed test may be acceptable in future years.

7. In general, two Carnegie Units (two years of the same high school foreign language) may be used to meet the proficiency level for an interim period, until the second language requirements are fully established and implemented within the CIM and CAM under development by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) in response to HB 3565.

8. OSSHE institutions will accept certification of proficiency at the required level established by the CIM at any stage in a student's development, even if such proficiency is established in the elementary or
middle school grades. However, since a student's understanding of the foreign culture is likely to be different and greater in later years of high school, it is recommended that proficiency at the level of the CAM be established.

9. Students may be admitted to OSSHE institutions under a special exception basis if their high school is unable to offer a two-year sequence of any foreign language. In such cases, students entering an OSSHE institution will be required to meet a graduation requirement of satisfactory attainment of the proficiency standard (corresponding to completion of one year of college foreign language).

10. Introductory college foreign language, beginning in academic year 1997-98, will be considered remedial instruction for high school and transfer students who meet the OSSHE admissions requirement using Carnegie Units but who cannot place in an OSSHE second year foreign language course. Students will be required to enroll in first-year foreign language via continuing education enrollment (self-support course), paying additional fees for this course. First-year language courses in a language other than the one studied in high school (or used to meet the admissions requirement) will not be considered remedial.

Note: Full report was enclosed as a separate handout.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

1. Staff recommended the Board of Higher Education adopt the Second Language College Admissions Policy for students seeking admission to colleges and universities for the academic year 1997-98. Staff were directed to begin implementation of the plan/timeline that was presented with the proposed Second Language College Admission Policy (ten components of which were included in the approval). Final adoption will
occur on the consent agenda at the Board's February meeting.

2. Staff should continue to work closely with the Oregon Department of Education to coordinate OSSHE's policy within a statewide framework.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Vice Chancellor Clark introduced a panel of people to discuss the proposal: Ms. Roberta Hutton, Assistant Superintendent, Department of Education who works closely with second language development; Dr. Rod Diman, Vice Provost and professor of Spanish at Portland State University; Dr. Stephen Durrant, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Oregon and a specialist in Chinese and Asian languages and literature; Mr. David Myton, Director, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC); and Dr. Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.

Dr. Zanville asked Ms. Hutton to summarize actions that had occurred during the past months with the Department of Education and the Board of Education. Ms. Hutton indicated the Board of Education, at the January meeting, agreed to the concept of a second language as a part of the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM).

An accompanying issue is whether there are a sufficient number of teachers to meet the demand for second language instruction. Mr. Myton indicated it appears there is, at the present, no shortage of foreign language teachers. However, this could change. Taking data from a number of sources, Mr. Myton explained that at present, indications are there would be a number of ways to provide teachers with foreign language expertise.

Another question frequently asked is how many students entering OSSHE institutions have one, two, or more years of second language preparation. Dr. Diman indicated that, at present, there is no data base from which to gather the information, but in a ten percent sample of 667 students entering Portland State University, 60 percent had two years of a second language. This does not include transfer students where there would probably be a larger
percentage. Dr. Durrant indicated that from a similar sample, the findings were similar.

A concern raised by a number of people is whether or not high schools will be ready to provide the kind of foreign language classes needed to prepare for the proposed admission requirements and the percentage of schools already providing at least two years of the same second language. Ms. Hutton indicated the Department of Education is optimistic that the schools have the capacity. One indicator is that the present high school graduation requirements include a caveat that schools must make available an opportunity for at least one unit to be earned in applied arts, fine arts, or second language. District forecasting indicated that availability. One hundred ninety-eight of the high schools in Oregon are active members of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, which requires that they make available two units of a second language. Schools with over 1,200 enrollment must make available up to eight units.

Ms. Hutton continued that a different situation might exist when schools are required to demonstrate competence in a language, not just completion of the course work.

Mr. Richardson posed the scenario of a student who might graduate from a school that does not offer a two-year sequence in language or the student doesn't decide to attend an OSSHE institution until the junior year and has not taken a second language. Dr. Zanville indicated that, in cases such as those described by Mr. Richardson, a second language might be an exit from higher education requirement rather than an entrance requirement.

Drs. Diman and Durrant provided the Committee comparative information from other states. The general picture from an initial review is that Oregon is behind the curve in relation to other states. However, Dr. Durrant observed, the present proposal would "leap-frog" Oregon ahead of many other institutions and states because it proposes proficiency standards, not units of language courses.

The proposed plan calls for oral proficiency testing prior to leaving a high school, not at the time.
of entrance to the college-level. However, Vice Chancellor Clark indicated there is much work to be done in the five years prior to this taking effect. The Committee discussed the various aspects of the requirement that would have to be strengthened in order to assure students had access to second languages and that the requirements were clearly defined.

Mr. Richardson asked for clarification of the rationale of number eight of the policy list that would allow OSSHE to accept a certificate of proficiency regardless of when it is established -- at the elementary, middle, or high schools. Dr. Zanville responded that a lot of discussion had occurred around timing: When is the best time to begin learning a second language? This raises the issue of recency. When did a student begin learning a second language? When did they pass the proficiency test? If they began early, are they still proficient? The intent is to encourage students to begin second language acquisition at as early an age as possible.

Dr. Durrant observed that Mr. Richardson pointed to some of the key questions needing to be answered. There is a genuine attempt to balance a number of different goals. First, the intent is to encourage students to begin language at as early a point as possible. Second, it is recognized that there is no such thing as "standing still" in a language. You are either moving forward, or you are losing proficiency. It would be very difficult for an extremely young child to perform the kinds of linguistic functions required to meet the standards. Finally, students who begin second language acquisition often have an internal motivation for continuing.

There is, according to Dr. Zanville, increasing interest in the future of requiring all teachers who are certified to have language skills in addition to subject preparation. Mr. Myton indicated study has begun on what teacher preparation and licensure would look like under this requirement. Second, there is an increased emphasis on internationalization of the curriculum. The implications are that, in addition to acquisition of a second language, there is a need for teachers to have an understanding of the culture of students whose first language is not English.
Mr. Swanson questioned whether it would be more valuable to have a certificate of mastery in cultural awareness of another country or technical proficiency in a language. Ms. Hutton indicated that the CIM requires both. There is a statement in the CIM that speaks to understanding and valuing cultural awareness, including the ability to communicate in a second language.

Dr. Zanville introduced Mr. Robert Wilner, Executive Director of the Oregon International Council who extended the support of the Council in this effort. He agreed that linguistic capability does not equate with cultural sensitivity. "However, you could reach a certain level of cultural sensitivity, but it is clear that it will be superficial until you get beyond the gestures and body language to deal with higher language."

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation and place the proposal on the consent agenda for the Board's February meeting.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Ms. Davis indicated she would like to have proficiency in American Sign Language (ASL) considered as a second language. Vice Chancellor Clark responded that there has been initial discussion about the inclusion of ASL, but there is not, at present, agreement. Many institutions around the country have accepted ASL as a second language. However, in Oregon, one intent of the language requirement is furthering goals of intercultural understanding, which is part of the school reform legislation. Ms. Davis observed that there is a deaf community with a culture of its own that needs to be understood.

Mr. Bailey asked for clarification about the parameters of the new proposal and the ability to make adjustments in the policy as progress is made toward implementation. Dr. Clark noted there is a very elaborate chronology of work to be accomplished over the next five years, which provides for flexibility and adjustments along the way. This would also allow for adding ASL, as requested by Ms. Davis, if appropriate.
The Board approved the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee and the item will be on the February Board consent agenda for final ratification. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Davis, Dodson, Donahue, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, Yokota, and Bailey. Those voting no: none.

Staff Report to the Committee

The Academic Year Fee Book contains the fees and associated policies relating to all mandatory charges required of students in the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Certain policies affect processes that occur well in advance of the academic year to which they relate. To have those policies in place to permit those processes to occur, certain amendments require action now. None of the proposed amendments presented herein affect tuition rates, but either are in response to federal legislative changes or relate to application and fee payment processes that occur prior to the beginning of the academic term and for which the normal July adoption of the Fee Book is too late to implement.

Other Policy Changes

Other fees and policies set forth in Sections I, II, and III of the Fee Book provide guidance to the institutions and determine other fees that are established by Board rules. The major proposed revisions are:

**Application Fee Increase:** The application fee is currently at $40 for all institutions. The institutions will have the option of setting their application fee no less than $40 and no more than $50. This fee will be effective for those students seeking admission during the 1993-94 academic year.

**Advanced Tuition Deposit:** The advanced tuition deposit is currently at a maximum of $200. The deposit maximum will be raised to $300. This will be effective for advanced tuition deposits for fall 1993.
Late Registration Fee: The late registration fee is being changed to the late registration and/or payment fee. Currently the policy specifies that the initial date of assessment of the late fee, while at the institution's prerogative, must be no later than the eighth day after classes begin. There are also maximum daily fee rates of $99. The new accounts receivable monthly billing cycle system of most institutions creates the need to remove the dates specifying assessment and the daily rate amounts. The maximum late fee would be $100. This will be effective for fall 1993.

Student Loan Administrative Services Fee: The federal Higher Education Amendments of 1992 passed by Congress in July clearly prohibit the assessment of this fee. Based on the change in federal law, this fee will be eliminated. This is effective immediately. Institutions stopped assessing this fee as soon as they learned of the change in federal regulations.

Housing Policy Changes: Institutional residence halls operate as auxiliary services. As such, their fees and charges are to cover the cost of their operations. The same schedule relative to application processes of academic programs affects the residence hall operations. Two changes are needed in the housing policies to permit timely implementation.

Deposit, Cancellation, and Refund Policies: The current policy authorizes a $50 partially refundable deposit to be submitted with the residence hall application. If the student is accepted, it is held for breakage.

Due to varying housing markets among the institutions' residence hall operations, some institutions need more predictability of applicants. This policy is changed to permit an application fee/deposit or combination thereof not to exceed $50. Rate, cancellation, and refund policies are established and approved by the institution.

Room and Board Installment Payments: As with tuition payments, the new accounts receivable monthly billing cycle system of most institu-
tions creates the need to change the timing and manner of fee payment.

Current policy specifies the date on which the first payment of a term is due. This would be changed so that the due date for the first payment of a term is due in accordance with each institution's residence hall contract or approved policies.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff recommended that, following public hearings on June 2 and July 16, 1992, for tuition and fees and residence hall and food service charges, the Board amend OAR 580-40-040 as follows:

Academic Year Fee Book
580-40-040 The document entitled "Academic Year Fee Book," dated July 24, 1992, is hereby [adopted] amended by reference as a permanent rule. All prior adoptions of academic year fee documents are hereby [repealed] amended except as to rights and obligations previously acquired or incurred thereunder.

Through the action, the Board amended the document entitled "Academic Year Fee Book," memos of attachment amending the draft document, and other amendments and attached schedules noted in this agenda item.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

OSSHE Budget Director, Davis Quenzer, explained that it was necessary to make changes in fees now for student enrollment for fall term 1993. Changes in the policy included an increase in the application fee from $40 to $50 and raising advance tuition deposits from $200 to a maximum of $300. Mr. Quenzer explained that consideration had been given to making the application fee a percentage of the amount of tuition, but there had not been sufficient time to discuss this proposal with the Board. Whenever the Board establishes a range for fees (such as advance tuition and deposits), institutions must hold public hearings to establish the specific amount.
The proposed policy included a change in late registration fees to $100 to reflect changes in registration processes. Institutions establish policies to apply the fee.

It was pointed out that flexibility for determining if a housing fee is an application or deposit fee and procedures for applying the policy are left to institutional decision-making.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

Fee rates and policies are set forth in the preliminary Summer Session Fee Book. Rates are recommended for Board approval as submitted by the institutions. A public hearing was conducted on January 19, 1993. A report on that hearing is being submitted following the hearing.

Summer Session Instruction Fees
The direct cost support policy for summer instruction, which began in 1982, is continued in the recommendation for 1993. However, the impact of Measure 5 on the institutions has also created the need for a greater contribution from the summer session toward the indirect costs associated with these programs. The direct cost support feature has resulted in institutional fee recommendations that reflect the differences in programs as well as the differences in approaches to balancing program costs with resources. Similarities of the institutional fee structures include incremental charges for each additional credit hour and undergraduate/graduate rate differentials. Residency status is not assigned during summer session and is not applicable to summer fee determination.

There are no proposed changes to fee policies.
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Instruction fee increases have been recommended by seven institutions. Increases are, in general, a consequence of faculty salary rate increases granted in fiscal year 1992-93 and other inflation factors affecting costs.

Instruction fee rates recommended for 1993 compare with 1992 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hour</td>
<td>Each Add'l Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$87.50</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>109.50</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>75.50</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hour</td>
<td>Each Add'l Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$130.50</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Sem.Equiv.</td>
<td>167.00</td>
<td>165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>96.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>149.50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>105.50</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>91.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* OIT has no graduate courses.
* OHSU summer session rates are the same as the per-term rates for the 1992-93 academic year.

Building Fee
The building fee is maintained at $14.50 per student. This is consistent with the fee increase granted by the 1989 legislature and assessed in the 1992-93 academic year.

Incidental Fee
Incidental fee recommendations reflect the various activity and service levels proposed by the institutions. Charges compare for 1993 and 1992 as follows:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Hour</th>
<th>Maximum Charge</th>
<th>October 1993</th>
<th>First Hour</th>
<th>Maximum Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>52.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>26.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health Service Fee
Health service fees, like the building fee, are assessed at a single sum per student, based upon the service level available at each institution. For institutions providing summer health service, rates compare as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Health Service Fee</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC (8 hrs. or more)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees Compared to Academic Year
Rate structures for summer session have been developing as institutions adapt to direct cost support following the 1982 elimination of General Fund support. The effect of direct cost support on fees and assessments can be measured to some extent by comparison with academic year charges. The summer session rates proposed for 1993 and 1992-93 academic year resident rates are compared on the following schedule:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>12 SCH Undergraduate</th>
<th></th>
<th>9 SCH Graduate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$907</td>
<td>$895.00</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>$1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>893.50</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>871.00</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>783.00</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>716.00</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>775.00</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>758.00</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tuition rates are not fully comparable. The academic year rates apply to a range of credit hours designated for full-time students classified as residents (12-18 credit hours for undergraduates and 9-16 credit hours for graduates). Summer session rates displayed are for 12 credits undergraduate and 9 credits graduate. Additional summer credit hours require incremental charges. Also, incidental and health service levels differ from academic year to summer.

Fees Compared to Summer Session 1992
The following schedule demonstrates the rates of increase from summer session 1992 to summer session 1993.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>12 SCH Undergraduate</th>
<th></th>
<th>9 SCH Graduate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$845</td>
<td>$895.00</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>$1,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>893.50</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>871.00</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>783.00</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>716.00</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>775.00</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>757.00</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Room and Board Rates
Summer session room and board accommodations on each campus vary according to the need and demand. They may include rates by day, week, multi-week, or term. A combined room and board rate is usually offered, as well as rates for room only, board only, and conference activities. Rates are generally comparable to those for individual terms of academic year.

The rates shown in the tables in the fee book are for all campuses except Portland State University, where Portland Student Services, Inc., operates the residence halls and establishes the rates as specified in a service contract. The rates require
preliminary review and approval by Portland State University officials before becoming effective.

Proposed rate increases vary from zero to nine percent for the basic summer session. Anticipated cost increases for personnel, utilities, services, and food since the preceding summer term justify rate adjustments at this time.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

After consideration of any comments or testimony received at the public hearing, it was recommended that the Board amend OAR 580-40-035 as follows:

**Summer Session Fee Book**

580-40-035 The document entitled "Summer Session Fee Book," dated January 24, 1992 January 22, 1993, is hereby adopted by reference as a permanent rule. All prior adoptions of summer session fee documents are hereby repealed except as to rights and obligations previously acquired or incurred thereunder.

Through the amendment, the residence hall and food service charges and the tuition and fee rates and policies applicable during the 1993 summer session were adopted.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Summer sessions are, according to Board policy, to be self-supporting for the direct instruction portion of cost. Direct instruction, according to Mr. Quenzer, "is defined as teaching faculty salaries, staff costs associated with the summer session, and items such as cost of preparing the summer session catalog and operation of summer session administrative offices. The cost of summer session does not include a pro rata cost on items such as physical plant, business office, or maintenance of facilities."

All OSSHE institutions now have a policy of a per-credit-hour charge. In addition, there is a first hour charge that is considerably greater than any succeeding hour. Mr. Quenzer pointed out that particularly at the universities, summer session fees are about equal to the academic year fees.
Tuition is comprised of fees for instruction, building, incidental, and health.

President Brand pointed out that during summer session there is no distinction between resident and nonresident students. Mr. Quenzer added that this results from the situation that very few of the institutions have a mechanism by which to determine residency for students since no application is required. Vice Chancellor Ihrig indicated that this may be the appropriate time to examine the way summer fees are charged. The University of Oregon has indicated an interest in exploring the appropriateness of resident and nonresident tuition for summer session.

The Committee discussed the concept of incidental fees and Mr. Quenzer indicated "the institutions are required by statute to present incidental fee guidelines to the Board for approval. The institutions must go through a very elaborate process on the campus to establish these.

"There are optional and mandatory fees. A mandatory fee is one that is established by the Board and every student must pay the fee. Tuition is such a fee. The Board permits the institutions to establish a host of optional fees. That is, a student has the option of buying the service. A mandatory fee is tuition."

Ms. Jackson suggested this may be a good time to re-examine all of the fees. Vice Chancellor Ihrig suggested that a presentation be made to the Committee at the April meeting of the Board that would include some historical background on the issue and a framework for policy considerations.

Mr. Ihrig pointed out that summer session enrollment figures have, with the exception of Western Oregon State College, been very flat. This trend has led some institutions to want to raise summer session fees to test the extent of what the market will bear in terms of cost.

Mr. Quenzer reported that a public hearing had been held on January 19, at the Erb Memorial Union on the University of Oregon campus. No one testified and no correspondence was received.
The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.

**Board Discussion and Action**

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

**Staff Report to the Committee**

Actual headcount enrollment for fall 1992 (excluding Oregon Health Sciences University) is projected at 59,487, slightly higher than the fall 1991 headcount enrollment of 59,329. (See Table A.) Western Oregon State College is the only institution that met the budgeted three-term FTE enrollment for the 1991-1993 biennium. In addition, Portland State University, Eastern Oregon State College, and Oregon Institute of Technology had headcount enrollments in 1992-93 over the biennial target.

To get a better understanding of what is happening to the enrollment of Oregonians, one must look at the change in enrollment based on residency. Table A shows that resident undergraduate enrollment is nearly eight percent below the planned levels for 1991-1993. This drop in resident enrollment can be attributed to at least two factors. The first is the elimination of programs and uncertainties regarding possible program eliminations in the future. Students are concerned that their program will be eliminated after they have made a decision to enroll. Even though additional programs were not eliminated in 1992-93, the potential for further program reductions due to required budget cuts is still a factor for many students in selecting an institution. This concern toward System institutions brought on by the necessity to eliminate programs due to Measure 5 reductions was reported by faculty and administrators as they visited Oregon high schools this past fall. The second factor impacting enrollment of resident undergraduate students is the effect of the 33 percent increase in tuition in 1991-92. Both of these factors, especially program uncertainty, are hurting resident enrollments even as System institutions
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have expanded efforts to inform students about State System institutions.

Table A. HEADCOUTN ENROLLMENT (excluding OHSU) 1991-1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Undergrad.</td>
<td>38,252</td>
<td>36,569</td>
<td>35,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonres. Undergrad.</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>6,213</td>
<td>7,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Graduate</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>3,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonres. Graduate</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>1,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Part-time</td>
<td>8,453</td>
<td>8,657</td>
<td>9,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td>2,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,480</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,329</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,487</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonresident undergraduate enrollment continues to grow at selected institutions despite the large increases in tuition. The growth in nonresident enrollment at the University of Oregon over the planned 1991-1993 levels is 1,228 students, over a 50 percent growth in nonresident undergraduates. At Southern Oregon State College, the growth in nonresident undergraduates is 168 students, nearly a 58 percent growth. This growth in nonresident undergraduates has been encouraged by the Board, as long as all qualified resident applicants are accepted, to provide the means to protect the academic infrastructure of the institutions. Nonresident undergraduates pay for the cost of their instruction and thus are not a burden on the Oregon taxpayer. However, nonresident enrollment makes it possible for institutions to maintain academic programs, therefore benefiting Oregonians.

The number of Special Part-time students (those taking seven credit hours or less) has grown. More students taking lighter loads is further demonstrated by the change in the fall 1992 headcount and three-term FTE relationship. While the fall 1992 headcount is 158 more than fall 1991, the three-term FTE is projected to be 469 below the 1991-92 three-term FTE. Such a change in relationship between headcount and three-term FTE occurs
when a greater number of students take loads of less than 15 credit hours. In short, the number of part-time students is growing. (See Table B.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>17,510</td>
<td>14,723</td>
<td>16,770</td>
<td>13,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>15,075</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>14,385</td>
<td>12,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>15,045</td>
<td>9,128</td>
<td>15,232</td>
<td>8,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>3,934</td>
<td>3,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>4,685</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>4,435</td>
<td>3,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSC</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>1,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,136</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60,480</td>
<td>47,879</td>
<td>59,487</td>
<td>45,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The institution budget allocations for 1992-93 provided for some enrollment uncertainty by not allocating all of the tuition income estimated to be generated by the targeted enrollment levels. Because this conservative approach was used in the initial budget planning for 1992-93, there will be no negative budget adjustments due to realized enrollments.

Each institution has been given the option to place its nonresident undergraduate enrollment and the income it generates outside the Systemwide pool of instruction fee income. After the institution meets the System income obligation for resident students, it is entitled to the over-realized nonresident income. The University of Oregon and Southern Oregon State College have chosen this option, and their budget allocations for 1992-93 will reflect that choice.
Summer 1992 enrollments are shown in Table C. They reflect very little change since 1989.

**Table C. SUMMER 1992 HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT**
* (excluding OHSU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total 1992</th>
<th>Total 1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>3,941</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>6,547</td>
<td>5,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>3,941</td>
<td>4,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>5,123</td>
<td>2,585</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>7,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>1,038</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14,030</td>
<td>8,154</td>
<td>22,184</td>
<td>22,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Committee Discussion**

Vice Chancellor Ihrig introduced the 1992-93 Enrollment Report by indicating that the only institution that met the budgeted three-term FTE enrollment for the biennium was Western Oregon State College. There were more fluctuations than usual, attributable to the uncertainties caused by revenues in the state, increasing tuition, and reductions and/or eliminations in programs.

Mr. Ihrig highlighted that nonresident undergraduate enrollment continues to grow at selected institutions, specifically at the University of Oregon (with a 50 percent increase) and at Southern Oregon State College (58 percent increase). As tuition continues to increase, there are a growing number of part-time students at OSSHE institutions.

Mr. Miller asked if students were going into community colleges in greater numbers. Mr. Ihrig observed that community college enrollments are increasing, especially in the college preparatory areas. However, as the community colleges are starting to feel the impact of resource reductions,
they are beginning to protect technical education programs and are beginning to limit access in other areas.

Finally, Mr. Ihrig highlighted that at the present time only 17 percent of Oregon high school graduates go on to OSSHE institutions. To reach the Benchmarks goals by the year 2000, that figure needs to be approximately 23 percent.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Committee

Officials at Oregon Health Sciences University have requested the Board authorize the use of $110,000 from the Milada Goedek quasi-endowment as part of the funding for the expansion of the Dotter Institute for Interventional Radiology.

The first $110,000 from the Goedek estate was received in August 1992 and is the amount that Oregon Health Sciences University requests to devote to the Dotter Institute expansion. Oregon Health Sciences University is not presently proposing to utilize any additional Goedek quasi-endowment funds for that purpose.

The $800,000 expansion of the Dotter Institute was authorized by the Board in September 1992 and approved by the Emergency Board in December 1992. Construction is scheduled to begin in the spring of 1993. Occupancy of the new facility is slated for late summer. The entire project is funded with gifts.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff concurred with the request of Oregon Health Sciences University and recommended the Board authorize the expenditure of $110,000 from the Milada Goedek Quasi-Endowment for the expansion of the Dotter Institute at Oregon Health Sciences University.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation.
Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

The Pharmacy Building at Oregon State University was constructed in 1924. Although some of the space has been renovated and some systems improved over the years, the facilities do not adequately meet the needs of the 1990s Pharmacy program.

The College of Pharmacy is proposing to renovate the practice and compounding laboratory (which has not been upgraded since the early 1970s), construct a clean room for use in compounding volatile chemicals in an environment of total sterility, and renovate the student study area/reference library space.

Oregon State University's Department of Facilities Services has estimated the cost of these improvements to be approximately $850,000.

The College of Pharmacy intends to raise the entire cost of the renovation from gifts. Fund raising activities are already underway.

Oregon State University officials have requested that the renovation of the pharmacy laboratories be included in the 1993-1995 capital construction budget, which will be considered by the Legislative Assembly during the current session. The Executive Department's Budget and Management Division has indicated its willingness to forward this project as an amendment to the Governor's 1993-1995 Recommended capital construction budget if the Board authorizes staff to seek approval for this effort.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Staff concurred with the request of Oregon State University and recommended the Board authorize staff to seek approval from the Legislative Assembly to include in the 1993-1995 capital construction budget for Higher Education an Other Funds
Limitation of $850,000 and the authorization to expend that amount for the renovation of pharmacy laboratories and related space for the College of Pharmacy at Oregon State University.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Associate Vice Chancellor Pernsteiner explained that Oregon State University requested expenditure limitation to expand and renovate pharmacy laboratories. The institution will raise the money, but needs approval to move forward on the project.

The Committee agreed the Board should approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

On a personal note, Mr. Adams observed that the building at Oregon State University was constructed the year of his birth and he understood the need for renovations.

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

DONATION OF TIDELANDS TO OSU

Staff Report to the Committee

Officials at Oregon State University have notified the State System Office of Finance and Administration that approximately 20 acres of tidal and subtidal lands at the upland portion of Yaquina Bay have been donated to Oregon State University. The tidelands were originally donated to the Oregon State University Foundation by Ellen Hooven, Helen Berg, and Jean Overholser with the stipulation that the property be known as the Hoovolserberg Tidelands and that the property be held or used by Oregon State University for the benefit of the Hatfield Marine Science Center. The tidelands will be used as an educational training site for primary and secondary school teachers in the techniques of specimen collection. A portion of the land will also be used for research in herring spawning since a small area of the parcel is a herring spawning ground.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board authorize the Office of Finance and Administration to accept the donation of the tidelands on behalf of the Oregon State University Hatfield Marine Science Center.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Pernsteiner indicated that no formal environmental assessment had been done since the area is tidelands and there is no record of any structure ever having been constructed on it.

Mr. Miller observed that logic would say that no assessment would be required. However, he questioned the wisdom of accepting the land without an impact statement.

Mr. Pernsteiner indicated that rules are being promulgated to provide institutions and foundations guidelines for accepting property. However, for property already in the transition phase, this is difficult. The property under consideration was donated with restrictions, accepted by the foundation with those restrictions for use by Oregon State University for the Marine Science Center.

Continuing, Mr. Miller asked what would be required under the new rules. Mr. Pernsteiner responded that a formal letter would be required from a consultant saying the property records had been examined and there was no history of any problems in terms of environmental concerns. "If it is that simple," Mr. Miller responded, "why not ask for a letter from the foundation saying that if there is a problem, they would accept the responsibility for it?"

The Committee agreed to withdraw the item and return to the Board at the time a letter has been received.

Board Discussion and Action

Item withdrawn from consideration.

Staff Report to the Committee

Officials at Oregon State University have notified the State System Office of Finance and Administra-
tion that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has donated, via a quitclaim deed, a parcel of land and the building thereon at the Hatfield Marine Science Center to the State Board of Higher Education on behalf of Oregon State University. The property has a total area of approximately 29,400 square feet of land or about .675 acres. The building is known as the Library and was constructed in 1989.

The property was deeded to the EPA in 1988 for the construction by EPA of the library building. Two other parcels were deeded to the EPA at the same time -- one parcel for use as a marine water reservoir and the other as the site for the laboratory building.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board authorize the Office of Finance and Administration to accept the donation of land and building on behalf of the Oregon State University Hatfield Marine Science Center.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended approval of the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Committee

In November 1990, after a consultant had surveyed facilities at Oregon State University and college and university personnel had inspected all other campus facilities, staff reported to the Board that the deferred maintenance backlog for the State System's educational and general facilities stood at more than $135 million and that more than $400 million should be spent on other repair and modernization projects. In January 1992, staff reported that the Legislative Assembly had appropriated $10.8 million for 1991-1993 to address deferred
maintenance and other repair needs. The Board had requested more than $91 million.

During the current biennium, some deferred maintenance and modernization needs will have been addressed using other funds. The Mitchell Gymnasium Renovation at Oregon State University and the Chemistry Laboratories Renovation at the University of Oregon are prominent examples. The total value of the other funds projects approved or proposed for educational and general facilities during the first 19 months of the biennium stands at $3.8 million.

In addition, in keeping with practices discussed by the Board in 1990, approximately $1.2 million of educational and general funds originally targeted for operating new facilities but not needed because of delays in construction schedules was allocated to deferred maintenance projects. Therefore, almost $16 million has been made available to help meet critical maintenance needs during 1991-1993. (This is virtually the same level of funding as was available in 1989-1991.)

National standards for colleges and universities call for annual spending of 1.5 to 2.5 percent of the replacement value of facilities in order to meet maintenance and repair needs. The estimated replacement value of OSSHE educational and general facilities as of June 30, 1992, stood at nearly $1.35 billion. This translates into a need to expend more than $20 million per year on repair and maintenance, even at the 1.5 percent level. In other words, the deferred maintenance backlog will have grown by $24 million in 1991-1993 due to less spending on maintenance and repair than called for by these national standards.

Inflation also has added to the price tag of the deferred maintenance backlog. About $13 million of cost escalation can be attributed to inflationary pressures in 1991-1993, even though the construction rate was about four percent per year. (The six percent construction inflation rate of 1989-1991 also added to the original 1990 deferred maintenance estimate.)

Finally, a recent consultant's report on the foundation of 123-year-old Campbell Hall at Western
Oregon State College (the oldest building in the State System) indicated that about $3 million should be spent to stabilize that structure.

The net effect of all these factors is that the deferred maintenance backlog can be expected to reach almost $190 million by the end of the current biennium. This estimate is based on the original surveys conducted in 1990. To these results have been added the amounts needed for capital repair during the intervening years, inflation, and the results of new investigations (such as that at Campbell Hall). Deducted from these results have been the actual capital repair/deferred maintenance expenditures that the colleges and universities have made. The backlog is expected to exceed 13 percent of the value of the facilities by June 30, 1993. In 1990 it stood at 11.5 percent.

In the 1993-1995 capital construction budget request, the Board submitted educational and general projects for deferred maintenance and modernization/repair totaling nearly $83 million of General Fund and nearly $4.3 million of other funds. Only the other funds amount was recommended by the Governor in the 1993-1995 capital construction budget presented to the Legislative Assembly. The $45 million for deferred maintenance and $15 million for instructional networking improvements (including classroom upgrades) included in the Board's Benchmarks budget request were not recommended for funding by the Governor.

In addition, the Board requested $11.7 million in the base operating budget for deferred maintenance and asked, in a decision package, for another $2.5 million. The Governor's mandated budget includes sufficient funding for the $11.7 million. Coupled with the recommended other funds limitations, this means that nearly $16 million has been identified to address deferred maintenance needs in 1993-1995. The Board has maintained its level of deferred maintenance spending at the 1989-1991 level despite two rounds of budget cuts.

The deferred maintenance backlog can be expected to grow again in 1993-1995 to more than $200 million.
Committee Discussion

Associate Vice Chancellor Pernsteiner reviewed the Deferred Maintenance Update, underscoring the increasing problems resulting from lack of resources to catch up on needs. In addition, conditions uncovered in the process of repairing Campbell Hall at Western Oregon State College, point out the seriousness of not being able to maintain aging buildings. The structure of Campbell Hall has come into question because of compaction of the soil beneath it. A study has been commissioned to determine a viable solution since this is the oldest building in the State System and is on the state historic register.

The Governor and legislature have begun to recognize the seriousness of the deferred maintenance problems. The Governor has established a $20 million pool of money from which agencies can apply during the next biennium to address some of the most critical deferred maintenance needs. Higher education will apply for as much of those funds as possible.

Mr. Adams suggested that it would be worthwhile to keep track of the amount of the difference in cost between what would normally be correction of maintenance and remodeling, and what has accrued additionally because of the time lapse to correct a situation. Stated another way, what are the additional losses because there were not resources to get the work done soon enough.

Ms. Wilson concluded the discussion by observing that there is a major problem in managing deferred maintenance, which has been used as a budget balancer. The funds, therefore, have always been taken out. This must change if the infrastructures of the campuses are to remain useable.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Committee

The Internal Audit Division's Quarterly Report: December 31, 1992, summarizing the status of audits completed as of December 31, and the status of the 1992-93 Annual Audit Plan, is submitted to the Chancellor, members of the
Board, and to the State of Oregon Executive Department as required by Executive Department Administrative Rule 15-001-03.

Committee Discussion

Peter Hughes, Director of Internal Audit, pointed out that there are five major categories or classifications of audits that relate to reliability, integrity of information, compliance, safeguarding of assets, economy and efficiencies, and accomplishment of objectives. The Audit Division is proposing each quarter to present a matrix that summarizes the audit effort in each of the five categories.

The Audit Division has contracted for an external review of the office as required by the Executive Department. The external reviewers will be conducting their review March 8 - 10, 1993. The consultants will develop a report that summarizes observations, strengths, and weaknesses.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Board

Oregon Revised Statute 183.545 requires each state agency to review agency rules every three years. To fulfill this requirement, staff reviewed the Board's Administrative Rules. Staff considered whether the rules should remain unchanged, be amended, or be repealed, keeping in mind the statutory goal is to minimize the economic effect of agency rules on business. Staff solicited public and institutional comment on the rules. Three types of changes are proposed in the attached document: 1) grammatical changes, corrections, or clarifications of language; 2) changes to keep the rules current; and 3) minor substantive changes. Other proposed changes have been referred to appropriate staff for consideration and are not included here.

The following lists identify the rules proposed to be changed by the type of change recommended.

**Minor Substantive Changes**

580-01-020 - Availability of Public Records
(1) increases charge for copying documents
from $.15-to-$0.20 per page to $.25 per page.

(2) establishes that this rule applies to any OSSHE institution not having its own rules.

580-20-005 - Academic Rank
(1) removes prohibition on graduate students holding faculty rank to acknowledge that, from time to time, faculty members may also enroll as graduate students.

580-40-007 - Retainage Processing Charges
(2) increases the charge to contractors for establishing retainage accounts and changes reconciling of bank statements to monthly from quarterly.

580-42-015 - Institutional Responsibility
(2) eliminates requirement for Facilities Division approval of requests submitted to outside funding entity proposing purchase of land or construction expenditure of $10,000 or more.

Changes to Keep Administrative Rules Current

These changes are intended to make rules consistent with current practice, to reflect a change in requirements, or to delete or amend outdated lists, titles, or practices.

580-01-005 Procedural Rule for Changes and Additions to Administrative Rules
580-11-005(4) Student Health Services
580-11-010 Hospitalization
580-11-021(1)(a) Campus Housing Advisory Committees
580-11-045(2) Charging of Administrative and Physical Plant Costs to Auxiliary Enterprises
580-15-005 Assistance to Organizations
580-15-010 Definition of Discrimination
580-15-025 Admissions

52
January 22, 1993

580-15-045 Counseling and Use of Appraisal and Counseling Materials
580-15-055 Comparable Facilities
580-15-080 Athletics
580-15-085 Textbooks and Curricular Materials

580-21-215(2) Sabbatical leave Reports
580-21-345 Hearing Committee
580-21-350 Conduct of Hearing

580-22-050 No Discrimination Based on Race, Color, Religion, National Origin, Handicap, Age, Marital Status, Sex, or Sexual Orientation

580-30-011 Governing Body, University Hospital

580-40-005 Delegation and Assignment of Responsibility
580-40-010(7) Institutional Authority to Establish Fees and Charges

580-43-026 Office of Finance and Administration Responsibilities

Grammatical Changes, Corrections, or Clarification of Language

580-01-020 Availability of Public Records
580-10-003 Affirmative Action Goals: Enrollment
580-10-035 Residence Classification of Armed Forces Personnel
580-10-045 Review of Residence Classification Decisions by IRC
580-10-085 Student Exchanges
580-10-090 Incidental Fee Guidelines and Procedures

580-11-005(5) Student Health Services
580-11-020 Self-Supporting Concept for Student Housing
580-11-021 Campus Housing Advisory Committees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>580-11-030</td>
<td>Rates of Charge for Student Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-11-045</td>
<td>Charging of Administrative and Physical Plant Costs to Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-12-005</td>
<td>Solicitation of Students for Funds Prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-13-005</td>
<td>Institutional Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-13-030</td>
<td>Release of and Access to Student Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-13-035</td>
<td>Confidential Records - Restrictions on Release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-13-040</td>
<td>Petition by Student for Change in Personal Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-13-050</td>
<td>Permanence, Duplication, and Disposal of Student Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-005</td>
<td>Assistance to Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-015</td>
<td>Discrimination Prohibited in All Higher Education Programs, Services, and Interschool Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-020</td>
<td>Appointment of Compliance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-025</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-030</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-060</td>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-070</td>
<td>Health and Insurance Benefits and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-075</td>
<td>Marital or Parental Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-090</td>
<td>Procedure for Reporting Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-100</td>
<td>Investigation of Complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-125</td>
<td>Open Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-15-160</td>
<td>Requirement of Prompt Attention to Complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-19-001</td>
<td>Minimum Standards for Institutional Drug and Alcohol Treatment Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-20-005</td>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-20-010</td>
<td>Compensation Plan for Academic Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-20-030</td>
<td>Perquisites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-21-005</td>
<td>Appointment Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>580-21-010</td>
<td>Consultative Procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Purposes of Sabbatical Leave
Eligibility for Sabbatical Leave
Approval and Revisions of Sabbatical Leave Requirements
Sabbatical Leave Reports
Length of Leave for Academic Year Staff
Length of Leave for Fiscal Year Staff
Cost of Sabbatical Leaves
Policy Regarding Sabbatical Leave
Timely Notice
Termination Not for Cause
Initiation of Formal Proceedings
Temporary Suspension of Academic Staff Member
Academic Staff Member's Request for a Formal Hearing
Committee's Report
Action by the President
Date of Termination
Review by the Board
Board's Initiative in Bringing Investigation or Charges
Personnel Record
Discretionary Review of Academic Non-Disciplinary Personnel Decisions
Who May Appear
Evidence
Decision
Academic Freedom
Public Activities
Candidates for Public Office
Relationships with State Government
Academic Staff Holidays
Staff Fee Privileges
Proscribed Conduct
Employment of More than One Member of a Household
Institutional Rules
Locations and Custody of Faculty Records
Release of and Access to Faculty Records
Access to Files by Faculty Members
Retention of Evaluative Materials Concerning Candidates for Possible Employment
Permanence, Duplication, and Disposal of Faculty Records
Function and Responsibility
Institutional Authority to Establish Fees and Charges
Hospital Charges
Medical, Surgical, Oral Health, and Medical and Dental Clinic Professional Service Fee Schedules
Traffic Regulations, Parking Fees, and Enforcement Fines
Vehicle Safety Rule
Delegation
Board Acceptance of Scholarship Gifts
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580-43-011 Employee Responsibilities and Rights
580-43-016 Institutional Responsibilities
580-46-005 Recognition of a Foundation
      Institution Foundation Organization, Affiliates, Relationships
580-46-020 Foundation Independence from Institution
580-46-025 Foundation and Institution Operational Procedures, Gifts, Accounts, Institution Support, Contracts
580-46-045 Revocation of Recognition
580-50-031 Public Contracting Rules
580-50-032 Contracts for Repairs and Public Improvements

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the Administrative Rule changes identified in the attachment, Proposed Amendments to Administrative Rules, Periodic Rule Review, to be effective upon filing with the Secretary of State.

Board Discussion and Action

Melinda Grier reminded the Board that by Oregon Statute, the Board is required to review all of the Administrative Rules every three years. This has, Ms. Grier reported, been completed.

Comments have been solicited from the public and interested constituencies. A hearing was held and, as a result of both oral and written testimony additional changes were proposed.

All changes appear in the corrected Administrative Rules filed with the Secretary of State offices.

The Board approved the staff recommendation and, on roll call, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Davis, Dodson, Donahue, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, Yokota, and Bailey. Those voting no: none.
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A summary of facilities contracting activities within the Office of Finance and Administration is presented below:

Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

Cordley Hall Water Piping Replacement, OSU
An Agreement was negotiated with MFIA, Inc., Consulting Engineers, for engineering and consulting services not to exceed $10,500.00. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Award of Construction Contracts

Cascade Residence Transformer Relocation Project, SOSC
On November 23, 1992, Valley Electrical Contractors, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $93,360.00. Financing will be provided from housing funds.

Klamath Hall Basement Repairs Project, UO
On November 17, 1992, J. T. Stephens Construction Co., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $116,799.00. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

#2 Turbine Generator Major Overhaul Project, UO
On December 8, 1992, Turbo Mechanical, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $125,000.00. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Information Booth Relocation Project, OHSU
On November 16, 1992, James V. Cassetta Construction Services was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $48,694.49. Financing will be provided from state funds.

MacKenzie Hall/Cafeteria Fire Sprinkler Retrofit Project, OHSU
On November 16, 1992, Patriot Fire Protection, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $208,135.00. Financing will be provided from state funds.
Outpatient Clinic Rooms R-3102, R-3104, R-3315 & R3321 Project, OHSU
On January 5, 1993, John May Construction Co., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $56,973.00. Financing will be provided from hospital funds.

University Hospital North 2NE, Pediatric Cardiology Clinic Project, OHSU
On December 9, 1992, Pacific Crest Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $77,700.00. Financing will be provided from hospital funds.

Acceptance of Projects

Gleeson Hall Reroofing Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $50,217.00. Financing was provided from state funds.

Greenhouse, Columbia Basin Ag Research Center Pendleton, Oregon, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $89,872.00. Financing was provided from federal funds.

Haybarn Addition, Columbia Basin Ag Research Center Pendleton, Oregon, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $64,806.00. Financing was provided from federal funds.

Parker Stadium Improvements 1991 Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $4,402,368.00. Financing was provided from gift funds, XI-F(1) bonds, and capital repair funds.

Strand Ag. Hall Rooms 136/138 A/C Modifications Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $27,600.00. Financing was provided from state funds.
Water Research Lab Reroofing Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $37,412.00. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

Weniger Hall Area B & C Reroof Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $132,233.00. Financing was provided from state funds.

Women's Building Pool Area Reroofing Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $162,063.00. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

Campus Fitness Center, Bid Packages A, B, C, & D, SOSC
This project is complete and was accepted on September 11, 1991. The final direct construction costs were $64,246.00. Financing was provided from gifts and lottery funds.

Campus Fitness Center, Bid Package E, SOSC
This project is complete and was accepted on December 31, 1991. The final direct construction costs were $12,084.00. Financing was provided from gifts and lottery funds.

Library Roof Repairs Project 1991, SOSC
This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1991. The final direct construction costs were $66,607.00. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

Music Building Roof Repairs, SOSC
This project is complete and was accepted on July 30, 1991. The final direct construction costs were $54,465.00. Financing was provided from state funds.

Tennis Courts Resurfacing (Rebid), SOSC
This project is complete and was accepted on July 10, 1991. The final direct construction costs were $35,235.00. Financing was provided from XI-F(1) bonds.
Tennis Courts Resurfacing Wightman Street Project, SOSC
This project is complete and was accepted on March 5, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $119,682.60. Financing was provided from XI-F(1) bonds.

Track Rehabilitation Project, SOSC
This project is complete and was accepted on January 25, 1990. The final direct construction costs were $129,600.00. Financing was provided from XI-F(1) bonds.

Autzen Stadium Sound Reinforcement System Replacement Project, UO
This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $89,533.00. Financing was provided from athletics operating funds.

Bean Hall Lighting & Smoke Detector Upgrade Project, UO
This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $66,372.00. Financing was provided from housing reserve funds.

Biomedical Information Communication Center, Phase II, OHSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 1, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $10,859,172.00. Financing was provided from federal funds.

Nursing--Health Sciences Building, OHSU
This project is complete and was accepted on November 7, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $11,832,091.00. Financing was provided from federal funds.

Outpatient Clinic Restroom Remodel Project, OHSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $195,770.00. Financing was provided from hospital operating funds.
Buried Geothermal Utilities Replacement & Connections Project, OIT
This project is complete and was accepted on November 18, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $286,799.38. Financing was provided from state funds.

Cornett Hall Reroofing Project, OIT
This project is complete and was accepted on November 20, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $330,500.00. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

Physical Plant Reroofing Project, OIT
This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1992. The final direct construction costs were $81,300.00. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

(No Board action required)

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Vice Chancellor Large called on President Bailey to report on a presentation he made before the Senate Education Committee. Mr. Bailey reported that the Committee appears to be very supportive of education and has a good understanding of the problems confronting it.

The Committee is viewing education as one system and expressed a great deal of interest in the work of the Joint Boards. They expressed a desire to have the Boards look at delivery system changes, particularly in the ways in which nontraditional students are handled.

Higher education services, especially in the Portland area and specifically at the graduate level, is another area of interest. Finally, exploration of ways to increase efficiency (stemming from the BARC reports) and faculty productivity are continuing areas of interest.

Dr. Large continued by pointing out that the issues of revenue are central to all that is occurring in Salem at the present time. There is a considerable amount of tension developing as the Ways and Means Committee begins to get a better understanding of the issues facing it.
There are already several budget and revenue plans: the Governor's strategy is largely expressed in the three budgets she has presented; the Speaker of the House has a plan; and there are a number of individual revenue initiatives beginning to surface as well.

Higher education is the target of some criticism in the halls of the legislature and, although it is not entirely clear what the sources are, it is important to be communicating with individual members of the legislature and leadership of the committees. In that regard, the State System strategy is to broaden the front; presidents and Board members will be enlisted to meet with legislators.

OSSHE remains committed to pushing for tax reform, but it is not clear which strategy will be endorsed. Based on conversations the Board had during the Renewal in November, Dr. Large reported that the System is continuing to press for the interests of higher education to be included in any of the initiatives that call for a dedicated tax for education.

Mr. Donahue reported on an incipient Board committee on Public Information. The charge to the Committee, he reported, is to improve and enhance Oregonian's understanding of the state's higher education system. The premise is that the more Oregonians know about their system, the better off they are.

The specific charge is to identify the most important messages for Oregonians and to deliver those messages. To date, the Committee in formation consists of Board member Beverly Jackson; Presidents John Byrne and Judith Ramaley; Marlys Levin-Pierson, Oregon Health Sciences University; Don Wieden, an industry representative; a private college representative; and LuJean Smith, student at Western Oregon State College. Dr. Barbara Edwards, Associate Vice President, Public Affairs and Development, University of Oregon will serve as staff to the Committee.

Mr. Swanson asked for a list of names and capitol addresses for members of the Ways and Means Committee and other important contacts in Salem.
Mr. Dodson reported that he had attended the Ways and Means Committee and that Senator Hannon and Representative Mannix indicated they were looking for leadership from the Board, in particular, in two areas. One is an innovative approach to education and the other is assistance in reconstructing the revenue bill.

Mr. Bailey remarked the Board was facing many challenges, including the budget realities. However, "I would like the Board and institutions within the System to take a more aggressive look at higher education reform.

"We have undertaken some initiatives over the last two to three years, both at our own initiative and because of external pressures, and from budget and legislative impetus. We have undertaken things like BARC, examining faculty productivity and efficiency, establishing cooperative and consolidated programs such as teacher education, nursing, and engineering. We have taken a lot of steps in the Joint Board process in areas such as articulation, teacher education, education reform, and implementation of HB 3565.

"Now I would like to challenge us to explore some more revolutionary (especially for Oregon) higher education delivery systems. I would like to lay out three or four to begin our discussion.

"One proposal would be similar to the way the System currently operates. I would call it a diversified system. We would still have eight institutions, but each would have a more defined mission and be more differentiated in areas such as tuition, programs, academic rigor, public service, and research.

"A second delivery system might be in the form of a public corporation or a non-profit corporation for either all or part of the System. Some ties would be broken with the state, but there might be some opportunities for flexibility and entrepreneurial activities.

"A third way of looking at organization is through campus realignment -- everything from eight campuses to one institution or something along the continuum. In this design, a hard look would be given
to the role of the Chancellor's Office and how it relates to the state and to the institutions. Some recommendations have already come out of the BARC report.

"Finally, we should look at alternative delivery systems. Some of these are presently in place: continuing education and Ed Net. We have discussed cooperative programs with community colleges, and these relationships should be explored further.

"I am asking the Chancellor to review these and any other alternatives and be prepared to discuss their viability at the February Board meeting.

"One of the criteria for any delivery system is that we need to be able to adjust to both revenue shortfalls and investment opportunities, especially when we face the demands of needing the capacity to serve 80,000 students within the next ten years. However, I do not believe we should back away from the criteria we established three or four years ago relative to access, quality, and diversity. I think it is in our best interest and in the interest of all the people in Oregon that we talk about opportunities rather than playing a defensive mode."

Mr. Miller supported the proposals Mr. Bailey proposed and indicated he had received a number of calls, all requesting that the State System look at radical new and different ways of doing business in education. "The call is for this review to be led by Board members, non-experts in higher education coupling that non-traditional look with the degree of expertise that we have with the Chancellor and his staff."

Continuing, Mr. Miller added, "The one kind of gutsy, radical idea that I would like to see explored, both pro's and con's, is the concept of distance learning and trying to find some way to make distance learning high quality education.

"Second, if the radical way to improve functioning is the traditional one, we can't forget it either. We have to look at the Joint Boards approach that is well on the way to working well."

Ms. Jackson added her support for thinking more creatively and developing new paradigms. "With the
IFS and the Oregon Student Lobby also working with us I think this is the time, hopefully, that we can encourage dialogue with the constituencies these groups represent."

Mr. Dodson suggested that the record should reflect that a lot of the ideas have "been kicked around in past renewal sessions and we have never really felt the time was right to push them. I think maybe we have an opportunity to do that now. The Academic Affairs meeting this morning, chaired by Les Swanson, was one of the most uplifting ones, despite the cloud out there in the legislature. The direct connection with the community colleges, the second language issue -- these have been in front of us for years. Some of these things we are now beginning to address.

"I'm not sure that's enough. I think we have to go the next step up and examine whether or not there is a more efficient way for us to continue."

"I certainly approve of the chair's suggestion that we do some innovative thinking," added Mr. Adams. "I would guess that everyone in the room is concerned about OSSHE. Sometimes we have a bit of a helpless feeling but certainly, with the brain power assembled, we can think of some things that can be done in a positive manner that will help turn the ship around."

Mr. Swanson expressed his support and added, "I think of it in terms of advance planning and exploration. Apart from any innovative ideas that we might develop over the next several months, we have to do the planning for what lies ahead, which may require us to do something that is very innovative without having any choice about it. And if we haven't worked those alternatives through, then I think we would be turning our backs on our responsibility to the people of the state. So I strongly support our efforts."

Chancellor Bartlett clarified the request for information and agreed that his staff would develop an outline for the next Board meeting. At a meeting of the Committee of the Whole, these ideas will be explored.
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Mr. Swanson indicated that it would be very helpful to have some concrete examples of where an idea has been put into practice. He requested case history materials that clearly demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses of an idea.

Mr. Bailey reminded the Board that the February meeting will be held at Oregon Health Sciences University and will include a campus visit. The visit will begin early on Friday with a breakfast. He reminded the Board that it would be an all-day meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

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

Robert L. Bailey, President
Oregon State Board of Higher Education