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ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 10:40 a.m. by President Janice J. Wilson.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Dr. Herb Aschkenasy       Mr. Rob Miller
Mr. Robert Bailey          Mr. George Richardson, Jr.
Ms. Diane Christopher      Mr. Les Swanson, Jr.
Mr. Bobby Lee              Mr. Jim Willis
Ms. Janice Wilson

Mr. Richard Donahue arrived at 12 noon due to conflict in morning schedule. Ms. Laurie Yokota has resigned effective immediately due to the rigors of her personal and academic life.

Chancellor’s Office -- Chancellor Thomas A. Bartlett; Virginia Boushey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Francesca Clifford, Public Relations Specialist; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Dale Hess, Senior Policy Associate; Weldon E. Thrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Steve Katz, Controller; Grattan Kerans, Director, Government Relations; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Michael McCall, Interim Audit Manager; Joe McNaught, Attorney-in-Charge, Education Section; George Pernsteiner, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies; Diane Sawyer, Executive Secretary, Public Affairs; Virginia L. Thompson, Board Secretary; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.

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

Oregon Health Sciences University -- President Peter Kohler; Lesley M. Hallick, Provost.
Oregon Institute of Technology -- President Lawrence Wolf; Martha Anne Dow, Provost; Doug Yates, Dean of Administration.

Oregon State University -- President John Byrne; Roy Arnold, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Portland State University -- President Judith Ramaley; Lindsay Desrochers, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Michael Reardon, Provost; Brian White, Staff Writer, Office of Public Relations.

Southern Oregon State College -- President Joseph Cox; Ronald Bolstad, Dean, Finance and Administration; Stephen J. Reno, Provost/Dean of Faculty.

University of Oregon -- President Myles Brand; Linda Ettinger, Arts and Administration; Gerald Kissler, Senior Vice Provost for Planning and Resources, Academic Affairs; Norman K. Wessels, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration.

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

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate -- Marjorie Burns, PSU; Herb Jolliff, OIT.

Others -- Shadi Al-Atrash, Vice President, ASPSU; Bill Graves, The Oregonian; Becky Hancock, ASPSU; Chantelle Hylton, Vanguard; Debbie Lee, Assistant to Senator Springer; John Lim, State Senator; Annette Mullins, Committee Assistant, Legislative Committee Services; Robert Nosse, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Adrienne Sexton, Administrator, House Interim Task Force on Higher Education Review; Bill Taylor, Administrator, Senate Judiciary; David Yaden, Consultant.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the September 24, 1993, meeting of the Board. Mr. Aschkenasy moved and Mr. Miller seconded the motion that the minutes be approved as submitted.

The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.
President Janice Wilson thanked President Ramaley and those who participated in the presentations on access and what that means at Portland State University. "Access is a major Board priority, and the presentations covered collaboration, student access, diversity, creativity in addressing present needs, and curricular and program changes. The format was an excellent way to present complex information in a very short period of time."

Janice Wilson informed the Board that Board member Laurie Yokota, a student representative from Western Oregon State College, had submitted her resignation from the Board to Governor Roberts. Ms. Yokota reached the decision that "both her personal and academic priorities required her to make a very difficult choice. Her resignation is effective immediately. I'm very proud of her for making this personal decision. She has made a valuable contribution to the Board."

President Wilson acknowledged the presence of Senator John Lim from Gresham who is a member of the Senate Interim Committee on Education.

Chancellor Bartlett indicated that he, too, had been very impressed with the presentation by Portland State University. "The new general education proposal seems to me to get at some of the very significant educational issues. It is both very innovative and, at the same time, draws on elements that have been used many times in the past."

The remainder of the Chancellor's comments focused on two specific topics: changes occurring in financial aid and the Board's role in nurturing executive leadership.

Over the past three decades, there has been a steady shift of the burden of financing higher education away from the older generation and society as a whole. "That has been a silent revolution that has taken place in the funding of higher education. This has not been a clear decision of public policy. It has been a step-by-step shift of the burden, and it shows up in many different ways.

"Two things have transpired this year. One is the development of the National Service Plan. The present plan is larger than any such plan the United
States has had, but much smaller than the original conception. The plan would provide $4,725 toward higher education expenses for each year of service by a student. A student would be eligible to serve up to two years of national service. In addition to actual cash, the program would also provide for child care and health insurance for those individuals involved. Funding for the program will go to states who have approved programs; they will need to compete to win those resources for their National Service Programs.

"During the present fiscal year, there is a shift toward what has been termed, 'direct student loans.' For a period of time, there has been considerable debate about whether there should be a 'middle person' for distribution of the loans or if the money should go directly to the student.

"The purpose of direct loans is to save money, thus increasing the pool that can be distributed to students. A compromise agreement of the Congress is that the program will be phased-in over four years to the point where 60 percent of the load program would be direct student loans from campuses and not through any other financial institution.

"Also under consideration is a range of student options for repayment of loans. At present there are three options for repayment: standard, extended, and income contingent. Allowing for optional ways to repay a loan will have an impact on the costs of the total program and, therefore, have the effect of constricting the amount of resources available for the loans."

The second topic the Chancellor discussed with the Board was the fundamental responsibility of this and any board regarding the selection, nurturance, and, when necessary, disposition of executive leadership. It was pointed out that the present procedures require a triennial evaluation of the presidents and Chancellor.

"When that process is completed," Dr. Bartlett continued, "it ends with a final report to the Board. It seems to me there should be follow-up activities that would be nurturing and supportive of presidential leadership and that would enable presidents to build on strengths, build up areas that are not as
strong, and provide for ongoing professional growth. We do this for every other part of the organization except for executive leadership. This is a topic that will be discussed at a later time, but I wanted to begin the conversation now."

The following change is a minor substantive change to Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 580-01-020(2) relative to Availability of Public Records. It adds clarifying language concerning how costs will be assessed for obtaining records.

(NOTE: Underline denotes addition; Brackets denote deletion.)

Minor Substantive Change

580-01-020(2) Documents and [O]ther materials such as computer tapes, microfilm and microfiche copies, audio tape cassettes, computer services, etc., shall be provided at a fee reasonably calculated to reimburse the Board for actual costs incurred in making records available to the public.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board amend Oregon Administrative Rule 580-01-020, to be effective upon filing with the Secretary of State.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Richardson moved and Mr. Aschkenasy seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. On roll call vote the following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

Summary

Oregon State University requested Board approval for staff to request authorization from the Emergency Board for the construction of a $750,000 gift-funded laboratory theatre.

Staff Report to the Board

Oregon State University is proposing to construct a 5,000-square-foot laboratory theatre addition to
Withycombe Hall. In 1990 the Board and the Emergency Board authorized the renovation of space in Withycombe to house Oregon State University's playhouse when the Corvallis Fire Marshall determined that Mitchell Playhouse could no longer be used for that purpose. (Mitchell was later renovated for use as the Gladys Valley Gymnastics Center.) A laboratory theatre was not included in the original plan for Withycombe due to lack of funds. (The existing lab theatre is located at the opposite end of the campus, in Education Hall.)

Pledges have been secured for $750,000 in gift funds to construct an addition to house such a facility, which would be used as a teaching facility as well as for productions. The new facility would seat up to 200 people. A costume shop, classroom, and storage would be provided in the basement beneath the lab theatre.

The construction of this addition would permit the theatre program to consolidate the programs in a single facility, thereby reducing inefficiencies and the need to duplicate equipment. Oregon State University will pay any associated additional operating expenses in 1993-1995 from the existing budget. No plans have yet been made for re-using the space to be vacated in Education Hall. Construction would begin early in 1994.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff concurred with the request of Oregon State University and recommended the Board authorize staff to seek the approval of the Emergency Board for the establishment of an Other Funds Limitation of $750,000 and authorization to expend that amount for the construction of an addition to Withycombe Hall for use as a Laboratory Theatre.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Christopher moved and Mr. Miller seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.
SUBSTITUTION OF SELP LOAN PROJECTS, OSU

Summary

In 1989, the Emergency Board approved the release of $1,542,000 for projects at Oregon State University to be funded with loans from the Oregon Department of Energy's State Energy Loan Program (SELP). The main project was to be an electricity cogeneration facility. In 1990, the Board authorized the sale of a portion of Oregon State University's electrical distribution system to Pacific Power and Light and abandoned the cogeneration project. Oregon State University now is proposing to utilize the SELP authorization for energy improvements in Kidder Hall and Kerr Library costing $1,363,403. The Oregon Department of Energy has approved loans for these projects. Oregon State University has requested the Board to authorize staff to report this substitution to the Emergency Board.

Staff Report to the Board

In 1987, the Legislative Assembly approved a $5 million Other Funds limitation for projects at Oregon State University to be funded with proceeds of loans from the Oregon Department of Energy's State Energy Loan Program. Subsequently, all but $2,097,000 of that authorization was transferred by action of the Board and the Emergency Board for now-completed projects at Eastern Oregon State College and the University of Oregon.

In two separate actions in 1989, the Emergency Board, at the Board's request, approved energy projects at Oregon State University. These projects totalled $1,542,000. A portion of that work was completed. However, $1,428,000 of the authorization was not spent because Oregon State University abandoned the main project (an electricity cogeneration facility) when it was authorized by the Board to sell the electrical distribution system to Pacific Power and Light Corporation in 1990.

Recently, Oregon State's energy engineer has worked with staff of the Oregon Department of Energy to develop replacement projects. In Kerr Library, a direct digital control system will be installed, and improvements will be made to the heating/ventilating and air conditioning system and to lighting in order to save energy. The cost of these ef-
forts is about $610,000, and the payback period is approximately 15 years.

The Kidder Hall project includes the installation of a direct digital control system, HVAC improvements, lighting changes, insulation, and window upgrades. A 15-year payback also characterizes this $753,000 project.

The Oregon Department of Energy has approved both these projects for SELP loans.

Because the scope of these efforts is so different from that of the projects approved in 1989, the Emergency Board must be apprised.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff concurred with the request of Oregon State University and recommended that the Board authorize staff to report to the Emergency Board the substitution of these energy conservation projects for those contemplated in 1989 actions.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Ms. Christopher moved and Mr. Miller seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

The Internal Audit Division submits its Quarterly Report: July, August, September 1993. This report presents (1) the first quarter results, and (2) the status of the 1993-94 Internal Audit Plan.

(No Board action required)

**Staff Report to the Board**

The annual investment report of the Oregon State System of Higher Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1993, is included with the supplementary materials. The following is a report from the Common Fund on the market values and performance results of the System's Pooled Endowment Fund investment accounts.
Report on Market Values and Performance Results

South Africa-Free Equity Fund - ($34.3 million market value): The fund had excellent returns for the quarter and fiscal year, 1.1 percent and 17.5 percent respectively. These were better than returns for both the S&P 500 and the S&P South Africa-Free indices, which had returns for the quarter of 0.5 percent and 0.3 percent respectively. For the fiscal year, the total return of the S&P 500 was 13.6 percent, and for the S&P South Africa-Free the return was 15.4 percent. For the second consecutive quarter, returns were helped by the Common Fund's international investments, although these investments held back returns for the year as a whole. Once again limited exposure in Japan held down returns as the fund did not participate fully in the market advance triggered by government actions. Domestically, the small capitalization bias inherent in a South Africa-Free policy helped returns versus the S&P 500. During the quarter, the Common Fund dropped Ariel Capital Management as a manager because their growth had begun to impact performance.

Bond Fund ($21.4 million market value): The fund completed another strong year with a quarterly return of 4.0 percent compared to 3.0 percent for the Lehman Government/Corporate index. Comparisons for the fiscal year were also favorable, with the fund producing 15.9 percent against 13.2 percent for the index. With long rates declining to their lowest levels in decades, the generally longer duration of the fund added return. In addition, the managers were correct in their sector allocations with over-weightings in corporates and underweightings in mortgage backed securities. Looking forward, it seems unlikely that the fund can continue to produce double digit total returns at these rate levels. Common Fund managers would not be surprised to see returns more in line with historic averages.

Real Estate ($5 million committed): During the quarter, the fund purchased an attractive 229-unit apartment complex in Raleigh, North Carolina for $13 million. In line with market returns, this complex is generating a current yield of 9 percent. Fund managers are currently evaluating three additional transactions, which, if closed, will essen-
tially complete the acquisition phase of this program.

Endowment Venture Partners I ($1 million committed): The fund is fully committed to 14 venture capital partnerships. While it is still too early to have definitive results, fund managers are pleased with the indicated progress to date. In particular, the fund has avoided the decline in market value that most venture capital partnerships experience in their early stages.

Endowment Partners I: Fund managers continue to see a number of attractive proposals and invested in three additional companies during the quarter. Some of the earlier investments have gone public with satisfying results. A particularly good investment was Snapple, purchased for $1.67 a share two years ago and recently was selling at $80 per share before a two-for-one split.

Endowment Energy Partners I ($1 million committed): An upturn in natural gas prices is increasing returns. It now appears that the problems experienced earlier are moving well toward resolution. The Common Fund has obtained warrants to purchase common stock in several of the operators. While it is now almost impossible to value these warrants, they represent a source of potential profit as the operators grow to a point where they can go public.

(No Board action required)

The Investment Report of the Oregon State System of Higher Education for the quarter ending September 30, 1993 was distributed at the Board meeting. A copy is on file in the Board's office.

Summary

Several projects advanced to the completion stage during the last six months, while others opened or were under construction. The Legislative Assembly authorized an additional 28 projects for 1993-1995. However, this authorization was made in early August. Therefore, no financial activity was recorded against these projects during the reporting period, which ended in August.
Challenges plagued several projects approved in previous biennia. First, disagreements continued between the Oregon Health Sciences University and the contractor for the Basic Sciences Addition/C.R.O.E.T. project. These are being handled by the Department of Justice. Mediation is being sought. Difficulties between the University of Oregon and the architect on the Student Housing project also continued. These also have led to the involvement of the Department of Justice. The contractual relationship between the University and the architect was being reconsidered at the time this report was prepared. Two other projects (Hoke Hall Addition at Eastern Oregon State College and the Residence Hall Storage project at Southern Oregon State College) experienced bids in excess of their construction budgets and are in the process of being redesigned.

Staff Report to the Board

The highlight of the past six months of capital construction activity was the establishment of the 1993-1995 projects. These 28 projects total about $170 million, including funds for deferred maintenance and the potential funds for the expansion and modernization of Oregon State University's Kerr Library. The status for all active projects is portrayed on the following table.

In addition, seven projects were completed during the past six months, meaning that all activities (including accounting transactions) have been finished. These include the Casey Eye Institute and the Hematology and Oncology renovation at Oregon Health Sciences University, the Oregon Institute of Technology's Metro Center and the Outdoor Activity Area, Parker Stadium improvements at Oregon State University, and the Hamilton Hall kitchen improvements and the Autzen Stadium improvements/Casanova Center at the University of Oregon. These will no longer be shown in semi-annual reports to the Board.

Several other facilities are now in use as the construction or acquisition stage of the project has been concluded. These include parking improvements at Oregon Institute of Technology, science facility improvements and the new Environmental Computing Center at Oregon State University, and the acqui-
sition of a communications services facility and the improvement of utilities at the University of Oregon.

The bidding climate in smaller markets heated up during the last six months, resulting in higher than budget bids for projects at Eastern Oregon State College and Southern Oregon State College. Their projects (Hoke Hall Addition and Residence Hall Storage Facility, respectively) are being redesigned.

Other projects moved into construction, however. The renovation of Campbell Hall at Western Oregon State College got underway with structural and basement work. Construction also began at the Southern Oregon Experiment Station, University of Oregon chemistry laboratories, the Dotter Institute Expansion at the Oregon Health Sciences University, and Southern Oregon State College's safety improvements and student health center remodel.

Bonds will have been sold during October to finance many of the projects on the list. Low interest rates are anticipated.

(No Board action required)
### CURRENT CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

**Balances as of August 31, 1993**

($ in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coll/Univ</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Limit/Appn</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Inst Adv Biomed Rsrch</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$ 21,011</td>
<td>$ 242</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1983-1985 Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Science Facilities</td>
<td>Federal, Lott</td>
<td>$ 33,579</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Casey Eye Institute</td>
<td>Fed, Gift</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>BICC</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Hosp/Clinic Rehab</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>17,195</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Handicapped Access</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>$ 3,810</td>
<td>$ 20</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Utility Improvements</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>Await DBQ*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Outdoor Activity Area</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Parker Stadium Impvs</td>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Ag Sciences II</td>
<td>GF, Fed, Gift</td>
<td>26,360</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>New Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Ag Exp Stn Improv</td>
<td>Lott, Fed, Gift</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>SELP Energy Imps</td>
<td>SELP</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>Part Compl;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rest Avail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PPL Agmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Superseded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Southbank Impmts</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>On Hold-Riverfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Parking Improvements</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Basic Sci/CROET</td>
<td>GF, Fed, WC</td>
<td>28,100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Univ Hosp/Clincis</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>12,096</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Hillar Library Add</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>$ 355</td>
<td>$ 191</td>
<td>Bal. Avail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Repair &amp; Modernization</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Repair &amp; Modernization</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Parking Impmts</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Now Open*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Metro Center</td>
<td>Lottery, System</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Exec Conf/Training Ctr</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>Await Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Building Planning</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Des. on Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Kerr Library</td>
<td>GF, Gift</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>In Planning*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Dixon Aquatic Center</td>
<td>BF, SELP</td>
<td>5,548</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Family Studies Center</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Science Fac Rehab</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Now Open*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Cold Storage Addition</td>
<td>Lottery, Gift</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>KSOR Satellite Stn</td>
<td>Federal, Gift</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Some eqptmt inst; Some on order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Computer Equipment</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Cascade Cafeteria</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Knight Library Addtn</td>
<td>GF, Gift</td>
<td>26,620</td>
<td>8,857</td>
<td>Ph I Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph II under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>EMU Outdoor Storage</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1991-1993 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYS</th>
<th>Land Acquis</th>
<th>Various</th>
<th>$355</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>None Sched.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>Hoke Hall Addition</td>
<td>BF, Housing</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Health Services Addtn</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Envir Computing Ctr</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Now Open*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Burt Hall Lab Ren</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>FRL Lab Renovation</td>
<td>Inst. Funds</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Mitchell Gym. Rehab</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>S. Oregon Exp Stn</td>
<td>Gift, Inst.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Under Const.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Women’s Bldg Lab</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>In Design*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Residence Hall Strg</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Campus Ped Safety</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Under Const.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Parking Expansion</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Health Center Renov.</td>
<td>XI-F(1) Bonds, OF</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Under Const.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Museum Nat Hist</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Longhouse</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>N. Campus Relocation</td>
<td>Riverfront</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>On Hold -- Riverfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Comm Services Bldg</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>Bldg. Acq.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Utilities System Rehab</td>
<td>BF, Housing</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Now Open*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Chem Lab Renov.</td>
<td>Gift/Grant</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Under Const.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>NeuroSensory Ctr Ph I</td>
<td>Federal, Gift</td>
<td>25,400</td>
<td>23,537</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>NeuroSensory Ctr Ph II</td>
<td>Federal, Gift</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Parking Struc #5</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Hospital Renovations</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>8,256</td>
<td>6,782</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>C-Wing Addition</td>
<td>Hospital, Gift</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>17,041</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Dotter Expansion</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>Under Const.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>19,450</td>
<td>19,352</td>
<td>In Planning*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Parkg Struct I Rehab</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1993-1995 Projects

| SYS | Utility Renovation | Various | $2,160 | NA | No Activity |
| SYS | Safety Improvements | Various | 200 | NA | No Activity |
| SYS | Academic Modern. | Various | 600 | NA | No Activity |
| SYS | Handicap Improv. | Various | 1,335 | NA | No Activity |
| SYS | Land Acquisition | Various | 750 | NA | No Activity |
| SYS | Deferred Maint. | GF,XI-G Bonds | 23,340 | 23,340 | Await Bonds |
| SOSC | KSOR Improvements | Grant, Gift | 450 | NA | No Activity |
| SOSC | Stevenson Union Add. | BF, Auxiliary | 600 | 600 | In Design |
| SOSC | Visual Arts Complex | Gift | 2,700 | NA | Await Gifts |
| OIT | Child Care Facil. | BF | 200 | NA | No Activity |
| OSU | Memorial Union Renov. | BF | 2,200 | NA | No Activity |
| OSU | Seafoods Lab | Grant, Gift | 4,400 | 4,400 | In Design |
| OSU | Seafood Ed Center | Grant | 1,995 | 1,995 | In Design |
| OSU | Pharmacy Lab Renov. | Gifts | 850 | NA | Await Gifts |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU Kerr Lib. Expan/Remod.</td>
<td>Gift, XI-G Bonds</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law Library Add.</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Fac./Staff Child Care</td>
<td>Gifts, Fees</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO OIMB Add/Alts</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Gilbert Hall Add/Alts</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Amazon Housing, Ph II</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU NeuroSens. Ctr, Ph III</td>
<td>Gifts, Hosp.</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU Utility Renov.</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU C-Wing Add Ph II</td>
<td>Hosp.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU Pediatric Reloc.</td>
<td>Gifts, Hosp.</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU Prim. Care Clinics</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU Hospital Omnibus</td>
<td>Hosp., Gifts</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU Outpatient Clinic</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU Housing Rehab.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4,475</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates change in status since previous report.

**Abbreviations:**  
BICC=Biomedical Information Communications Center;  
BF=Building Fee; CROET=Center for Research on Occupational and Environmental Toxicology; GF=General Fund; OF=Operating Funds;  
SELP=State Energy Loan Program; WC = Workers' Compensation
Summary

Oregon State University officials requested authorization to use funds saved from prior budgets to renovate portions of existing locker rooms in the Women's Building for use as a laboratory to study movement of the human body. The $150,000 project would utilize 1991-1993 Other Funds limitation and would be under construction this year.

Staff Report to the Board

Officials at Oregon State University have proposed to use $150,000 of Other Funds savings from prior budgets to fund the renovation of existing locker rooms in the basement of the Women's Building for use as a laboratory to study the movement and extension of the human body. This research would be conducted by faculty of the College of Health and Human Performance. Construction would begin this fall.

This project will utilize $150,000 of Other Funds limitation from that established in Chapter 647, Oregon Laws 1991 under the title "All campuses, various land acquisitions, rehabilitation, remodeling and renovation." The total amount approved for 1991-1993 was $600,000, of which $115,000 was allocated to the remodel of the student health center at Southern Oregon State College last June. The remainder is available for other projects.

Staff has concurred with the request of Oregon State University to utilize $150,000 of the limitation for the construction of this laboratory. This leaves $335,000 of authorization from 1991-1993 unprogrammed.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Board

A summary of facilities contracting activities within the Office of Finance and Administration was presented:
Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

Award of Construction Contracts

School of Nursing Elevator Installation & Modification Project, OHSU
On September 15, 1993, Pacific Coast Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $183,601. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Physical Plant Reroofing Project, WOSC
On August 26, 1993, Snyder Roofing & Sheet Metal, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $174,347. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

(No Board action required)

Introduction

The University of Oregon requested approval to offer a Master's degree in Arts Management. The proposed degree will be the primary component of the newly organized Arts and Administration Program (AAD) in the School of Architecture and Allied Arts.

The AAD program developed as an outgrowth of the closure of the Department of Art Education. In response to Measure 5, the University closed the division of Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education. That, in turn, led to closure of most ancillary teacher education programs in the University, including the Department of Art Education in the School of Architecture and Allied Arts. Formation of the AAD program, using remaining resources from the former Art Education Department, now allows the School of Architecture and Allied Arts to offer a new degree program that is in high demand nationally. This strategy utilizes most effectively the specialized expertise of the small number of remaining tenured faculty from the discontinued department.

Graduate study in Arts Management is designed for students engaged in or preparing to enter the arts administration profession. The academic area of arts and administration combines knowledge in the visual, environmental, and performing arts with
social, cultural, managerial, and educational concerns as these are relevant to administering organizations, institutions, and programs.

Arts Management is a multidisciplinary field of specialization that incorporates the social, cultural, and ethical contexts of the "arts" in general, as well as specific aspects of business, management, and arts law. In addition to a required core of courses, students will select a concentration from a menu of specifically designed areas such as Museum Management, Performing Arts Management, Community Arts Management, and Business/Marketing Management. Areas of concentration will consist primarily of courses already existing within the University curriculum and taught by faculty outside the School of Architecture and Allied Arts. These will include courses taught by faculty in the Schools of Law and Business Administration, the Department of Planning, Public Policy, and Management, and by faculty in the University of Oregon's Museums of Art and Natural History. The University is contemplating the feasibility of future additions of concentrations in Journalism (focusing on advertising and publications), Theater, and Environmental Design Management.

Southern Oregon State College has expressed an interest in working cooperatively with this program to provide internship and practicum opportunities in the College and in the Ashland community.

The University plans to begin admitting students to the program in fall term 1994. A copy of the proposal and the report of the external reviewers are included in the supplementary section of the minutes. These and additional materials are on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

The University of Oregon is a comprehensive research university. Its mission includes instruction, research, and public service to advance scientific and humanistic knowledge and service. Its programs of instruction are designed to provide high-quality education in professional preparation, as well as in the
liberal arts and sciences. The proposed program is consistent with, and supportive of, this mission.

2. **Evidence of Need**

Across the nation, the number of applicants far exceeds admissions in the limited number of Master's programs in Arts Management. Programs at the University of Wisconsin/Madison, Teachers College/Columbia University, and The Graduate School of Management/University of California at Los Angeles, each receive over 100 applicants a year. These programs admit only 10 to 15 students each annually. Directors at each program indicate there are not enough academic opportunities in the United States at present to accommodate the demand.

3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

According to the external review team, the proposed program has the potential to become one of the premier programs of its kind in the country. The team's report includes the following comments:

The proposed program offers the prospect of placing the University of Oregon in the top tier of American universities offering professional education in the fields of arts and cultural management. Our conclusion derives from the academic strength of the faculty resources committed to the program, the content and design of the curriculum, and the strong support for the success of this initiative by faculty in related disciplines, and by the university administration.

4. **Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program**

Faculty. The proposed program will initially have 4.5 FTE faculty. These are tenured faculty of the School of Architecture and Allied Arts previously associated with the Department
of Art Education. The quality of the faculty is impressive in terms of training, experience, research, scholarly contributions, and ability to generate external support. They are well published and enjoy a national reputation in their fields. No additional faculty will be required for this program. Core instructional courses for the Master's degree are designed to be taught with 2.5 FTE. All Arts Management faculty will initially share in core instruction, as well as teaching courses that serve the School of Architecture and Allied Arts, and the University. In the long term, through attrition, core course assignments are designed to be shifted to 2.5 FTE remaining faculty. Service courses will be dropped as necessary. The availability of courses taught by faculty in schools and departments outside the School of Architecture and Allied Arts adds substantially to the proposed program.

Library. Budget resources from the closed Department of Art Education were reallocated to AAD. Acquisition funds from Art Education will be assigned to the proposed program. In addition, a non-recurring allocation of $2,000 for retrospective purchases and a recurring allocation of $1,700 for new materials will be needed. These additional funds are necessary because of a higher average cost per title, and a larger number of current publications in Arts Administration as compared to Art Education. The University has reallocated funds from library resources to meet this need.

Facilities and Equipment. No new special buildings or laboratories are required for the proposed program. An equipment appropriation for a computer with video interface is needed to assist course development and research in Information Management and Program Evaluation. Currently existing facilities and equipment used by the closed Art Education Department have been reallocated for this purpose.

Although the Arts Management Master's degree is initially designed to serve only campus-based students, in the near future the University hopes to explore delivery of some courses via ED-NET. ED-NET delivery would
facilitate participation at numerous sites around the state by students and by guest lecturers from the professional arts management community -- especially in the Portland and Ashland areas.

**Budget Impact.** Faculty and the remaining staff and budget resources from the Department of Art Education have been redeployed to form the Arts and Administration Program. Costs for the proposed program will be covered through internal reallocation of these resources.

5. **Duplication**

There are currently no degree programs in arts administration in the state of Oregon or in the Pacific Northwest.

**Program Review**

The proposed program has been the subject of an external review including a site visit by the following nationally recognized experts: Edward Arian, Professor Emeritus/Co-Director, Arts Administration Program, Department of Performing and Cinema Arts, Drexel University; Nancy W. Berry, Assistant Professor of Art, University of North Texas; and Archie Kleingartner, Professor of Management and Director, Arts and Entertainment Management Programs, University of California at Los Angeles.

The reviewers' report gives an unequivocal endorsement of the proposed program and notes that the University of Oregon's expertise in the cultural context of the arts is rare nationally.

The proposed Master's program was positively reviewed by the Academic Council.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended the Board authorize the University of Oregon to establish a Master's program in Arts Management, effective fall 1994, with a follow-up review to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs during the 2000-01 academic year. The proposal will be placed on the con-
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sent agenda for final action at the November Board meeting.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Swanson moved and Mr. Miller seconded the staff recommendation to approve the staff recommendation and place the item on the consent agenda for final action at the November Board meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

**Introduction**

Portland State University requested authorization to offer an undergraduate major in Child and Family Studies leading to the B.A. or B.S. degree. This program proposal was developed by the Consortium for Children and Families, a collaborative association of faculty and professionals from Portland State University and Oregon Health Sciences University, with participation and input from community agencies and institutions.

Child and Family Studies is a multidisciplinary preparation program for professionals who will provide services to children and families. The focus of the program will be young children from birth to eight years of age. Students majoring in Child and Family Studies will acquire a broad understanding of child development, family systems, and the diverse socio-cultural contexts in which children and families develop. Core requirements for this proposed major include courses currently offered by a wide range of departments at Portland State University. In addition to the core requirements, Child and Family Studies majors will take coursework in one of six area concentrations, participate in an internship or practicum, and complete one of two capstone courses. Significant support, in the form of practicum sites, supervisory resources, research support, and faculty involvement will be provided by the Helen Gordon Child Development Center; the Portland State University Head Start Regional Training Office; Mentor Graphics Child Development Center; Student Parent Services Office; the Regional Research Institute (Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health); and the Child Develop-
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ment Rehabilitation Center at Oregon Health Sciences University.

In 1992 the State System developed budget reduction plans to guide and coordinate institution preparations for budget shortages resulting from passage of Ballot Measure 5. These plans were presented to the Board in July 1992. The Portland State University plan is focused primarily on reshaping the undergraduate curriculum. Five principles were established under the plan to guide Portland State University's restructuring process. Those principles include development of interdisciplinary majors that reflect the strengths and mission of the institution and the design of alternative staffing plans to create shared resources between or among units. The proposed program exemplifies these planning principles.

The proposed program is the first of four new undergraduate majors Portland State University anticipates implementing as part of a major revision of its general education curriculum. The proposed program and each of the anticipated new majors will support program needs in more than one field of study, be developed through consultation and agreement across school and college lines, and will strengthen the University's teaching, research, and public service mission. These programs will be supported through a planned process of redeployment of existing resources. A copy of the full proposal is on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

The proposed program is consistent with and supports Portland State University's designation as a comprehensive urban institution. The proposed program furthers Portland State University's mission to provide an appropriate array of arts and sciences programs and professional programs relevant to the needs of the Portland area and is responsive to urgent human needs of an urban population.
2. **Evidence of Need**

The Consortium for Children and Families convened in 1989 and informally surveyed interest and needs of the university community. It was determined that an undergraduate major in child and family studies was a critical need. In 1991 a community gathering of over 60 professionals serving the metropolitan area was convened to further explore the need for such a program. Their input reinforced the need for the Child and Family Studies major and encouraged an interdisciplinary approach.

The proposed program addresses many goals of House Bill 3565 (School Reform) in the preparation of individuals to meet the needs of increased Head Start program availability, Early Childhood Improvement Programs targeting "at risk" children and their families, alternative learning environments, services and intervention for students needing assistance, and comprehensive preparation for professional/technical endorsements. The proposed major also responds to a number of significant local and state initiatives related to education and services for children and youth.

The proposed program will assist in responding to the critical need for early intervention specialists, teaching assistants, day care personnel, Head Start teachers, and other professionals providing services for children and families.

3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

The proposed program will draw on faculty strength and expertise from a number of established fields of study within the institution. Involvement of the Consortium for Children and Families in the planning process and ongoing program advisory capacity will assist in maintaining the quality of the proposed program.

To determine the effectiveness of the proposed program, several monitoring procedures are planned, including orientation sessions; pre-/post-surveys of knowledge, expectations,
and role perceptions; recording of proceedings in capstone courses; and exit interviews. The advisory board will be charged with developing additional assessment procedures.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. With the exception of two senior year courses, all courses needed for this major are currently being offered at Portland State University. Two new "capstone" courses will be added. These courses will be covered through a re-deployment of faculty effort from the School of Education and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Library. With the exception of three professional periodicals related to this field of study, current library holdings are adequate to support the proposed program. Library resources will be shifted to purchase the additional subscriptions at a cost of approximately $300 annually.

Facilities and Equipment. No additional facilities or equipment are needed to support this program.

Budget Impact. Portland State University will not need additional resources to support the proposed program. However, a re-deployment of current University resources will be necessary. In addition to the re-deployment of faculty effort and library resources described above, a part-time position will be needed to coordinate the program. This position will be re-deployed from within the University. As curricular restructuring continues, it is anticipated that this position will become full-time and undertake coordination of all multidisciplinary programs at Portland State University.

5. Duplication

Oregon State University has undergraduate and graduate programs in Human Development and Family Sciences. These programs are widely recognized and exemplary. However, the demand for professionals in the fields served by the
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proposed major, and the needs of the Portland Metropolitan area together with the opportunity for direct involvement of Portland area agencies and institutions, support establishment of this program at Portland State University.

Program Review

The proposed program was developed by the Consortium for Children and Families with participation and advice from community service agencies and institutions. The program has also been positively reviewed by the Academic Council.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board authorize Portland State University to establish an undergraduate major in Child and Family Studies leading to the B.A./B.S. degree, effective fall of 1993, with a follow-up review of the program to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs during the 1999-2000 academic year. The proposal will be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the November Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

Regarding new program requests, Mr. Richardson asked that staff be more specific about what is meant by re-deploying resources. "In terms of the cost of these programs, what are we really saying when there is 'no budget impact, but that resources will be re-deployed internally?' It is very difficult for a Board member to get a sense of the magnitude of the costs."

Vice Chancellor Clark responded that this information would be made more explicit in the future.

Ms. Christopher moved and Mr. Miller seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation and place the item on the consent agenda for final action at the November Board meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.
Introduction

Oregon Health Sciences University, Oregon State University, and Portland State University joined in requesting authorization to offer a joint campus graduate program in public health leading to the Master's of Public Health (MPH) degree.

This cooperative proposal was developed in response to a Board request in 1989 for development of a coordinated plan for the delivery of health administration and public health programs.

In 1989, the Academic Council and the Office of Academic Affairs had increasing concern related to the rapidly growing demand for graduate programs in the areas of health administration and public health. The health care industry was experiencing a marked shift from hospital-based delivery to a variety of alternative delivery modes. New organizational structures were evolving as residential care facilities, assisted living centers, and ambulatory surgical and outpatient care centers developed and flourished. Demand for graduate education to meet the needs of health care professionals in this rapidly changing environment was strong and growing. Institutions were eager to respond to that demand. Without a plan, the System perceived a significant potential for program proliferation, duplication, and overlap in the area of health administration and public health programs.

The Office of Academic Affairs recommended a coordinated approach to development of programs in this area. The Board concurred and requested development of a coordinated plan to be submitted to the Chancellor by 1991.

The plan, which included documentation of cooperative agreements, and supply and demand data, was submitted in a report to the State System Office of Academic Affairs in July of 1991. The coordinated health plan report was prepared by Interim Portland State University Provost Robert Frank, Oregon Health Sciences University Vice President Lesley Hallick, and Oregon State University Provost and Vice President Graham Spanier.
The July 1991 report called for development of the cooperative Master's of Public Health (MPH) program described in this proposal. In addition, the plan recommended use of the collaborative planning process as a mechanism for examining, coordinating, and supporting all pending and future graduate public health program proposals.

The educational environment in Oregon has changed significantly since the Board made its initial request for a coordinated plan for delivery of health administration and public health programs in 1989. However, the cooperating universities have evaluated the proposal in light of those changes and remain convinced that, because of the importance of public health, the proposal can and will be implemented even under present resource constraints.

The proposed cooperative MPH program will provide leadership for Oregon and Oregonians in all aspects of public health. The proposed program is structurally and conceptually unique in that it represents the joint efforts of three major universities in this state. It has been designed and developed collaboratively, and the planned implementation is similarly conceived. The proposed program will advance public health education in Oregon through existing academic and institutional strengths in a new and coordinated manner.

Public health, as a field, is devoted to the promotion of health and the prevention of disease through identification of the factors affecting the health of population groups. As these factors are identified, the mission of public health is to plan, develop, implement, and evaluate preventive health strategies designed to bring about the changes necessary to assure the maximum quantity and quality of life for all people. The proposed program has, as its unifying theme, health promotion, health protection, and injury and disease prevention.

The proposed program will prepare students for careers as public health professionals in a wide range of specialties. Graduates of the program will be trained to identify and examine factors that affect the health of individuals in a community, and will have the capability to plan, implement,
and coordinate programs to meet the needs of the community.

The proposed MPH program will be interactive with the recently approved Health Policy Institute, which is jointly sponsored by the Oregon Health Sciences University and Portland State University. Objectives of the Health Policy Institute include provision of a laboratory environment to enhance related programs at the participating institutions, and assistance with training of graduate level students in fields related to health policy analysis. Linkage with the Institute will provide an important arena for student and faculty research activities.

The research goals of the proposed MPH program are to gain an understanding of factors that affect the occurrence of illness and injury, and to improve methodologies for the analysis of physical, environmental, mental, and social factors affecting health. In addition, research goals relating to the development of new knowledge regarding the promotion of health, strategies for initiating social change related to public health, and the organization and operation of the health care system, will be advanced.

Implementation of the MPH program will be accomplished in phases. Phase one will provide instruction in a coherent set of concentrations with opportunities for addition of other concentrations in a second phase if resources become available. However, the initial phase achieves a complete MPH program, and the soundness of the proposal does not rest upon completion of a second phase. Future program concentrations will be coordinated by the Master's of Public Health Coordinating Council, and will be integrated into existing institutional review and approval procedures. A copy of the full proposal is on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

The proposed cooperative program is supportive of and furthers the missions of all three participating institutions.
The mission of Oregon Health Sciences University includes serving the citizens of Oregon as the primary center for education in the health professions for students in the state and the region. The mission of Oregon State University includes service through research to extend the frontiers of knowledge in all aspects of natural, human, and economic resources and to provide the educational programs necessary to develop and utilize human resources. The mission and the strategic plan of Portland State University are committed to the enhancement of the intellectual, social, cultural, and economic qualities of urban life by providing quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to the metropolitan area.

2. Evidence of Need

Interest in a coordinated offering of health administration and public health programs in the State System of Higher Education exists at all levels in Oregon. The Board and the Chancellor made recommendations in this direction in November 1989. A number of national studies conducted in recent years and reported to Congress indicate shortages of public health personnel, and in a number of the public health occupational categories, the shortages are critical.

Minimum standards for local health department employment recommend, if not require, master's level preparation for mid-level and supervisory positions. A 1988 study conducted by the Institute of Medicine, in cooperation with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, concluded that a major cause of the inadequacies in the provision of public health services in the United States is a lack of well qualified professionals. Large numbers of personnel working in a wide range of public health areas have not received basic preparation concerning theories, principles, and methods of public health. In addition, many public health professionals who initially were adequately educated have not had access
to continuing professional education during their careers.

Faculty and administrators at Oregon State University and Portland State University report that many currently enrolled students have indicated plans to transfer to the MPH program when it is approved. At Oregon Health Sciences University, a sufficiently large applicant pool exists to guarantee that their limited number of student slots can be filled by qualified applicants.

3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

Major strengths of the proposed program are the faculty, the history of collaboration among institutions, and the commitment from institutional leadership to continue collaboration and cooperation. The report issued by the external review committee commented on the enviable quality of the faculty and their enthusiastic commitment to this program; faculty resources and expertise were among the most impressive elements of the proposal to the site visitors. The participation of three major universities and the linkage with the Health Policy Institute provide a rich resource base on which to build an excellent program. Ongoing review and quality assurance will be provided by the statewide MPH Program Coordinating Council, which will have two members from each of the three cooperating institutions.

4. **Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program**

**Faculty.** The faculty needed to offer the proposed program are currently on staff at the three participating universities. No new faculty will be needed to initiate phase one of the proposed program. A program director and funding to support internship requirements will be needed at Oregon State University, however, before future phases of the proposed program can be initiated.

**Library.** The proposed program will have access to resources from a number of libraries, including the Oregon State University
Library, the Oregon Health Sciences University Library, the Portland State University Library, and the Kaiser Permanente Center for Health Research Library. The resources provided through these libraries will be adequate to support the needs of the program.

Facilities and Equipment. No additional facilities or equipment will be required at the institutions to support the proposed program. Access to long term care facilities and other resources such as state regulatory bodies for occupational health, environmental health, and public health and safety will be important. Such access will be developed based on the considerable experience faculty already have in these areas at each of the participating institutions.

Budget Impact. For phase one of the proposed program, no additional funding will be required. For each of the concentrations offered, there will be some shift in the use of existing resources; however, the effect of these shifts will be minimal. The program will require some new courses at each institution and some existing faculty resources will be shifted to support these courses. A shift of students from other related programs to the MPH is also anticipated.

If the second phase of the proposed program is implemented in the future, there will be additional costs at Oregon State University for faculty and some additional services and supplies. However, implementation of the second phase is not requested at this time.

5. Duplication

No institution in Oregon currently offers the MPH degree.

Program Review

The proposed MPH program has been reviewed and approved by the appropriate bodies at all three institutions and has been the subject of an external review including a site visit by nationally recognized experts in the field of public health.
The proposed program was also positively reviewed by the Academic Council.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon Health Sciences University, Oregon State University, and Portland State University to establish a joint campus graduate program in public health leading to the Master's of Public Health (MPH) degree, effective fall term 1993, with a follow-up review to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs during the 1999-2000 academic year. The proposal should be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the October Board meeting.

**Board Discussion and Action (September 24, 1993)**

Vice Chancellor Clark emphasized the timeliness of the program in the present environment that is so focused on universal health care. "This program is an unusual one and a model for future efforts."

Mr. Miller, reflecting on informal Board policy of several years ago that there would be no new programs, asked if that policy still applied. Chancellor Bartlett provided clarification; the agreement was that there would be no new programs approved unless there was a specific funding source. Translated, this means reallocating.

"We are starting and stopping things all the time," the Chancellor continued. "If we don't do this, we in effect freeze in place."

Dr. Lesley Hallick, provost for Oregon Health Sciences University, highlighted that this program creates a "virtual school of public health from existing programs. Each institution had bits and pieces of very talented faculty and programs, but they were not coordinated. There won't be any new courses; students will be taking them at the three institutions that constitute a core in public health and preventive medicine."

Mr. Miller moved and Mr. Swanson seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation and voted to place the item on the consent agenda for final action at the October Board meeting. The following voted in favor: Directors Lee, Miller, Richardson,
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Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

Board Discussion and Action (October 22, 1993)

Mr. Aschkenasy moved and Mr. Richardson seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

Background

The 1991 Legislature adopted HB 3565, the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. The Act calls for a restructured educational system necessary to achieve the state's goals of the best educated citizens in the nation by the year 2000 and a workforce equal to any in the world by the year 2010.

The Act calls for the Department of Education to serve as the coordinating agency for implementation, working closely with a number of the public agencies, including the Board of Higher Education. The Act mandates higher education's involvement in a number of areas, particularly related to the development of programs of research, teacher and administrator preparation, and continuing professional development that are responsive to the needs of the educational system and related to the goals of the Act.

1991-1993 Initiatives

After the close of the 1991 legislative session, OSSHE became actively involved in addressing a range of issues related to HB 3565. In order to enable OSSHE to respond to the far-reaching implications of HB 3565, the Board of Higher Education approved set-aside dollars when it adopted the 1991-92 annual operating budget allocations in September 1991. The Board subsequently approved an "OSSHE Plan for Responding to the Joint Boards Interests in Teacher Education, HB 3565, and Measure 5" in January 1992.

The centerpiece of the plan was the establishment of a Board's Grant Program for 21st Century Education Innovations, to spawn a variety of needed initiatives among OSSHE campuses, school districts,
and community colleges to address school reform, particularly related to curricular revision, sequencing, and integration. Work begun under the Innovations program continues through December 1993, and has been reported to the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs during 1992-93 on an individual project basis.

The plan also provided support for the intersector reviews of applied academics courses; the initiation of new professional and technical teacher certification programs; several supply and demand studies to provide data requested by the Joint Boards of Education (school staffing trends to respond to HB 3565, teachers, counselors, the reserve pool, foreign language teachers at K-12 and post-secondary levels); and work on proficiency-based college admissions and early college programs.

Funding Available in OSSHE for Initiatives in 1993-1995

OSSHE and the Office of Community College Services combined decision packages in the amount of $6.2 million ($1.2 million was OSSHE's request) at the request of legislative committees to support post-secondary institutions' involvements in support of HB 3565, specifically related to staff development. The 1993 Legislature provided funding in the budget of the Office of Community College Services in the amount of $2,060,000 out of lottery funding (SB 81) for both OSSHE and the community colleges. OSSHE's allotment is 19 percent of the lottery funding or $400,000, the same proportion requested by OSSHE when the joint request for $6.2 million was made.

The Western Center for Community College Professional Development, housed at Oregon State University and approved by the Board of Higher Education in January 1993, also received funding from lottery dollars through the Office of Community College Services in the amount of $300,000 for the biennium. These dollars will enable the Center to facilitate staff development activities for community college faculties on issues of concern in school restructuring.
Proposed Priorities for Funding Initiatives in 1993-1995

OSSHE staff have been participating for the past year on an interagency staff planning committee (OSSHE, Department of Education, Office of Community College Services, Western Center for Community College Professional Development) to develop a coordinated plan for the implementation of staff development and other programs related to HB 3565. The group has adopted a "team approach" to the setting of priorities to guide the agencies' implementation initiatives. Each agency is currently developing its highest priorities for consideration of the interagency group, which will then develop a final listing of projects to be funded. This list will be reviewed with the Workforce Quality Council's Executive Committee.

The following list represents OSSHE's areas of top priority for consideration by the Board of Higher Education and the interagency planning committee. Higher education projects will be designed to involve higher education faculty in partnerships with school districts, community colleges, and others, addressing significant aspects of HB 3565. The emphasis will be upon faculty development to provide ongoing support in school reform, and capacity building among the OSSHE campuses, particularly in the areas of training programs and articulation policies/practices, to enable the educational systems to integrate their programs more smoothly as educational restructuring moves forward.

- Continued support to selected OSSHE campuses for professional/technical education training programs, both preservice and staff development.

- Development of a new teacher licensure endorsement program/series of courses, to be available in OSSHE institutions and to be developed on an interinstitutional basis, for a "Workforce Interface and/or Applications Specialist." (For teachers and counselors as well as preservice students.)

- Development of a new "Middle School Endorsement Preservice Program for CIM Teachers" to
be offered in OSSHE institutions and to be developed on an interinstitutional basis.

- Proficiency-based Admissions Standards Demonstration Site (High School). Building on the Proficiency-Based Admissions Standards Project underway in the State System Office of Academic Affairs (to be reported on at the January 1994 Joint Boards of Education meeting), this effort would address the movement of students out of CAM programs into OSSHE institutions, and focus on high school-to-college articulation.

- Creation of "Content Update" Forums (possibly using ED-NET) To Deliver State-of-the-Art Knowledge to K-12 Teachers. This would involve curriculum development specialists and teachers from K-12 with OSSHE faculty.

- Development and first-time offering (pilot) of an academic year or a summer course/workshop in at least one location (possibly more if ED-NET can be used) for teachers selected by Oregon Department of Education and others, led by OSSHE faculty on the topics related to school reform. Courses would be team taught by faculty and lead teachers from school districts, and the emphasis would be on the "training of trainers" model. Probable topics include:
  
  ▶ "Applied Academics" (technology interfaces)
  
  ▶ "Leadership Development Training for Working on Site Council Teams and Developing School Reform Plans and Implementation Programs"
  
  ▶ "Methods for Integrating Disciplines"
  
  ▶ "Effective Strategies for Diversity and Multiculturalism in the Classroom"
  
  ▶ "Responding to the Proficiency Movement: Portfolio Assessment, Proficiency Assessments"
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- "Proficiency Teaching in Foreign Languages" (Standards, Methodologies, Articulating Elementary, Middle, High School, and College Foreign Language Programs)

- "Methods for Teaching in Multi-age Grouped Classrooms" (Elementary Teachers)

- "Developing Alternative Programs to CIM" (At-Risk Youth)

(No Board action required)

COLLABORATIVE/INTEGRATED PROGRAMS (NURSING)

Provost Lesley Hallick, Oregon Health Sciences University, provided the Board with an update of the Statewide Nursing Program.

Education Programs

As a result of the lottery funding obtained for this biennium, undergraduate class size and faculty have been maintained at 1992-93 levels for the programs at Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology, and Southern Oregon State College. Class size at Portland has been reduced by approximately 25 percent, and 12 faculty FTE were eliminated or terminated.

Faculty at all sites have significantly increased academic productivity by offering the baccalaureate degree at 11 off-campus sites and by extending the Family Nurse Practitioner program to Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology, and Southern Oregon State College. In 1994 they expect to add additional sites such as Astoria and Bend. (See Attachment 1 of Board meeting handouts.)

Research

The Portland campus has included extramurally-funded research as a significant part of the measure of faculty productivity for many years. Their success in obtaining grants even during times of restricted availability of funds is illustrated in Attachment 2 (also available as a Board meeting handout). Faculty at all sites are developing this form of scholarship, which will be enhanced by interinstitutional collaborations in the future.
Clinical Practice
As appropriate, faculty at Oregon Institute of Technology and Southern Oregon State College will be asked to develop practice plan arrangements with a percentage of that income used to defray costs of the educational program. Faculty in Portland and La Grande will continue to develop their existing practice activities as workload permits.

Administrative Arrangements
Considering the potential obstacles, the statewide approach has been implemented with relative ease and a great deal of hard work. Support from the Chancellor's Office at key junctures has been very helpful. An interinstitutional agreement describing the details of the arrangements between campuses has been drafted and should be finalized in the near future.

Future Plans
Nursing educators anticipate major curricular changes associated with health care reform. The prediction is for fewer jobs in the acute care hospital and continuing increases in jobs in community-based health clinics. The Oregon Health Sciences University School of Nursing is monitoring supply and demand issues in Oregon and will adjust the curriculum and program size as appropriate.

Over the next two to three months, the dean, associate deans, community advisory groups, and selected faculty, students, and staff will create a strategic plan for the school. The first regional planning meeting will occur in mid-November in Ashland.
OHSU SCHOOL OF NURSING
APPROXIMATE ENROLLMENT (Fall 1993)

UNDERGRADUATE:

General BS Program

Portland 205
La Grande (BOSC) 53
Ashland (SOSC) 73
Klamath Falls (OIT) 48

Sustotal Baccalaureate 379

RN/BS Outreach

Based in Portland 78
Based in Ashland 64

Subtotal RN/BS Outreach 142

GRADUATE:

Portland 209
Primary Care Nurse Practitioner Outreach 34

Subtotal Graduate 243

Approximate Total Headcount 764

(NOTE: This is one document from Attachment I)

---

1 Includes students enrolled in the Rural Frontier Delivery (RFD) program.

2 Includes Salem, Albany, Eugene, and Newport.

3 Includes Coos Bay, Roseburg, and The Dalles.

4 Includes both Master's and Ph.D. students.

5 Includes La Grande, Ashland, and Klamath Falls.
Board Discussion

Mr. Richardson inquired about the logic behind having a Primary Care Nurse Practitioner program at Oregon Health Sciences University.

Dr. Hallick responded that the program is designed to address the need to deliver health care in underserved areas.

Chancellor Bartlett highlighted the importance of the programs that allow two-year (Associate Degree) nurses to enter into four-year (Baccalaureate) programs. "This is a part of the program that has been missing," Dr. Bartlett continued. "It has been elusive for a number of psychological, political, and institutional reasons. This is a major breakthrough."

Ms. Wilson recalled that in the original stages, there had been controversy over the coordination of the programs and asked how that was proceeding.

Dr. Hallick responded that some issues remain, primarily administrative. A great deal of time has been spent in seeking resolution to these problems and progress is being made.

IFS REPORT

Dr. Marjorie Burns, president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) indicated there were two major issues under consideration by the IFS -- access and product. The IFS has been having discussions with Roger Bassett, Commissioner of Community Colleges, regarding cooperative degrees. The faculty of the State System institutions and the community colleges will be meeting in December.

A second set of issues relates to the exiting of students and of assuring that students not only learn information, but that they learn how to think. For IFS, the product, not productivity, is the primary focus.

Finally, IFS is working on the importance of publicity, that is, describing the successes of the academic programs.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Vice Chancellor Larry Large discussed the emerging development of a federal agenda. "We have attempted to put in place System priorities that are both
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responsive to the Congressional delegation's need to know where the State System stands on important federal issues and to sharpen our ability to integrate and acknowledge what is an increasingly larger and larger portion of funding for overall System activity.

"The State System has been successful in obtaining earmarked funds, and we are increasingly capitalizing on the successes. In addition, a large amount of research funding comes directly from the federal government, virtually all of which is a consequence of the success of faculty making applications in response to a particular federal agenda for research. Faculty win these awards or the opportunity to conduct research through a peer review procedure. Oregon has been highly successful in winning these awards.

"There are other areas of opportunity, and efforts are underway to work with the campuses to attempt to aggregate points of view and, therefore, have the optimal amount of impact on some of the policy debates on critical issues such as financial aid."

Mr. Lee indicated that, given the severe budget reductions in Oregon, it is crucial for the State System to be aggressive on these federal issues.

Grattan Kerans, director of Government Relations, reminded the Board that there are three interim legislative committees: the House Education Committee, the Senate Education Committee, and the House Higher Education Review Committee. None of the committees has met and probably will not be scheduled to meet until after the first of the year. Mr. Kerans indicated that his office would be acting in a service mode to these committees, assisting them and responding to their requests.

On a proactive side, Mr. Kerans reported that he is setting up a schedule for the Chancellor to meet with every returning member of the legislature over the next few months.
President Wilson called on Mr. Swanson to present the report of the Board Academic Productivity Committee (BCAP). Mr. Swanson thanked the members of the Committee for the time and commitment it took to complete the Committee work.

Highlights of the report included, "the first thing we determined is that our faculty is working very hard. The average faculty work week in Oregon is in excess of 50 hours. The first area of recommendations is that considerable time and energy be placed on the issues of mastery learning. This should include measuring a student's work effort and learning productivity by testing what they know rather than simply measuring how much time they have spent in the classroom.

"Time-shortened degrees is another area of emphasis. This includes concepts like simplification of curriculum to enable smoother transition into community college programs and within programs in the institutions within the System. The Committee focused on the introduction and utilization of new technologies in teaching and learning and the need for incentives for innovation and productivity increases.

"These efforts should be recognized, and one that has already begun is the Request for Proposals from the campuses for ways in which to increase learning productivity. The first phase of that project will be funded with $250,000 of grants to institutions based on plans they present. A second $250,000 will also be available to fund the best projects.

"We do not think $500,000 is sufficient. Grattan Kerans is asking legislative leadership to meet to discuss the results of the Committee's work and to request additional funding for demonstration projects. Monies might be used for purchase of equipment and new technology to demonstrate how new ways of teaching and learning can occur.

"Finally, there is a recommendation to the Board that it (the Board) direct the Chancellor to report to the Board within six months of the date of the report and recommend improvements in the total tenure process, from pre-tenure to post-tenure review. We are urging the Board to make the greatest effort possible to get the public's views on higher educa-
tion, to understand what those are, and then to respond to them with better information to the public about what is being done."

Board members concurred in their praise of the work that the BCAP had done and requested that acceptance of the final report be delayed until the November meeting to allow further study of the recommendations.

Higher Education 2010 Advisory Panel

Mr. Swanson reported that the Higher Education 2010 Advisory Panel had held the first meeting on October 2, 1993. The purpose of the meeting was primarily informational. The second meeting, scheduled for October 26, will focus on identification of the issues that are of primary importance for higher education.

Joint Boards Working Group

Mr. Bailey reported that the Joint Boards Working Group would meet on November 3, 1993. The primary purpose of the meeting will be to move the agenda along for the January meeting. Topics for that meeting will include the college admission standards, postsecondary access, and teacher preparation. Vice Chancellor Large indicated that a more formalized proposal (on access) would be completed for the meeting.

Public Information Committee

Mr. Donahue reported that the survey data are completed and a report and recommendations would be forthcoming at the November meeting.

PRESIDENTIAL SEARCHES

Introduction

The Board's Work Plan for 1993-94 included a request for changes in Board policy regarding the procedures for the search and selection of institution presidents. The proposed changes are intended to achieve the following goals:

1. Assure securing the most effective presidents to fill vacancies as they occur;

2. Assure campus acceptance of appointee;

3. Sustain stable and effective campus governance during the search process;

4. To the extent possible, conserve Board member and other volunteer time commitments by
deploying efficient search procedures while meeting the foregoing goals; and

5. To the extent possible, conserve State System and campus personnel time commitments by deploying efficient search procedures, yet meet the foregoing goals.

At its October 11, 1993, meeting, the Executive Committee discussed proposed changes to current policy. The Committee focused on the role of the Board in presidential searches and a schedule that would reduce the length of the search and selection procedure.

Based on Executive Committee comments, staff revised the earlier proposal.

(Note: Material to be deleted is highlighted; material to be added is underlined.)

PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS

(Adopted by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, Meeting #535, March 21, 1986, pp. 122-130; amended Meeting #560, February 17, 1988, pp. 64-70, and Meeting #570, October 21, 1988, pp. 564-570; Meeting #581, October 20, 1989, pp. 457-463. The process approved by the Board is presented below in narrative form. See also discussion, Meeting #558, December 18, 1987, pp. 602-609.)

Introduction

The following policy outlines the process to be followed in the search for and selection of presidents for Oregon's eight public four-year colleges and universities. The purpose of the policy is to assure that the selection of institutional presidents is carried out in a clearly understood, timely, and effective manner. In designing the presidential search process, the State Board of Higher Education was guided by its Internal Management Directive 1.020(1), which provides that: "The Chancellor shall make recommendations to the Board, in which rests the sole power of decision, concerning the selection, appointment ... of Presidents...." The Board has considered many factors including the traditions for selecting presi-
dents in Oregon, institutional needs, resources, and leadership requirements. Particular attention was given to balancing the need to guarantee candidates' confidentiality to keep them in the search process and the desirability of having candidates meet a broad cross-section of the campus community. This policy on the presidential search process was first adopted by the State Board on March 21, 1986, and was modified on February 17, 1988, and on October 22, 1993.

The Board

When it becomes necessary to hire a president, the board will review the current position description and modify it, as appropriate. The Board will also develop a statement of preferred qualifications. At the Board's direction, the Chancellor will, using the position description and preferred qualifications, initiate the procedures provided in this policy to identify candidates for consideration by the Board.

The Search Committee

A single search committee shall be responsible for assisting the State Board by identifying and recruiting possible candidates for the position of president. The State Board retains the responsibility for the selection of institutional presidents. The direct costs of the presidential search shall be borne by the institution.

Members of the search committee shall be appointed by the Chancellor. The search committee shall be composed of three Board members, four faculty members, one student, one administrator, a community member, and an alumni representative. The president of the Board shall recommend members of the Board to serve on the search committee. The appropriate faculty body or bodies of the institution shall be asked to nominate eight persons to the Chancellor, who will choose four to serve. The other four will be designated as alternates, to be called on only if those designated members are unable to serve on the search committee. Similarly, the president of the student body shall be invited to nominate two students, with one being chosen to serve and the other designated as an alternate. Administrators will be asked to nominate two campus administra-
tors, typically deans, directors, or vice presidents, one to be named to the committee and one to serve as an alternate. The community representative and alumni representative will be selected after the Chancellor consults with institutional officials and the alumni organization. In selecting members of the search committee, the Chancellor shall be mindful of the desirability of having women and minority representation on the search committee.

The president of the Board shall serve ex-officio without vote. Unless a public meeting is announced, however, no more than five Board members may be present at any committee meeting. The president should retain the degree of detachment that will enable the exercise of impartial leadership through the final selection process.

The Chancellor and an affirmative action officer appointed by the Chancellor shall serve as consultants to the committee and may attend its meetings.

The Chancellor, in consultation with the president of the Board, shall appoint one of the Board members to serve as the committee chair. In order to keep the names of the candidates confidential, only the chair of the search committee or a designee shall speak on behalf of the committee to the press or others concerning the progress of the search.

The Chancellor shall appoint a vice chancellor for academic affairs who shall serve as liaison between the Board, the Chancellor's Office, the search committee, and the institution.

The Search Coordinator

The vice chancellor for academic affairs, in consultation with the search committee chair, the president of the institution, and the Chancellor, may appoint a search coordinator whose duties include: (1) handling all of the logistics involved with the meetings of the search committee, including making appropriate arrangements for the visits of candidates; (2) preparing correspondence for the committee and the chair; (3) maintaining the records and files and keeping minutes of search committee meetings. Although not
members of the search committee, the coordinator and the vice chancellor for academic affairs are expected to attend most of the search committee meetings.

The Charge

The Chancellor shall give the search committee a written charge spelling out the committee's responsibilities and authority. The charge should include an approximate date for the committee to submit its nominations to the Chancellor, the number of candidates to be recommended, and the information the committee should provide on each candidate.

The Responsibilities of the Search Committee

1. Review a Statement of Qualifications

The search committee shall review the Board's position description and statement of qualifications and recommend any modifications. The committee chair shall consult with the Board regarding any search committee recommendations for changes of the position being sought for the presidency. In preparing the statement of qualifications, the search committee shall invite comments from concerned groups and individuals (faculty, students, administrators, alumni, and members of the community, etc.). The statement of qualifications may indicate that credentials for academic tenure are highly desirable but the statement may not preclude candidates without such credentials if they have other attributes which would make them outstanding institutional presidents. The statement of qualifications shall be presented to the State Board for approval.

The statement of qualifications, along with the institution's mission statement, excerpts from the State Board's Administrative Rules and Internal Management Directives concerning the authority and responsibilities of the president, and other descriptive materials about the institution should be sent to all
nominees nominations and applicants for the position.

2. Solicit Soliciting Nominations and Applications

A vacancy announcement shall be prepared by the coordinator, based on material received by the search committee from the Board. It shall appear in at least two weekly issues and widely distributed. It must be printed in a minimum of four weekly issues of the Chronicle of Higher Education. Nominations shall be sought aggressively from institutional faculty and students, other State System presidents and personnel, regional and national educational leaders, regional and national educational organizations, and other leaders in the community, state, and nation.

Advertisements for the position shall include a deadline for the submission of applications and nominations. The search committee shall decide the deadlines for the receipt of materials needed by the committee to assure complete its screening of candidates who meet the deadline.

3. Screen Screening

The task of the search committee is to recommend to the Chancellor three to five people persons, any one of whom would be satisfactory to the search committee.

The screening process is divided typically into four distinct stages. The first screening consists of reviewing applications and nominations and identifying those that meet the minimum qualifications for the position. If there are relatively few applicants, the entire committee may participate in this stage of the screening process. If there are a large number of applicants, the committee may choose to use one or more subcommittees to undertake the initial screening.

The second stage of the screening process involves a more thorough review of the candidates meeting the minimum requirements for the position. References are checked and the committee
may choose to talk with some of the candidates by telephone. The goal at this stage is to nar-
row the list of candidates down to 10-15 semi-finalist candidates who will be given careful consid-
eration by the committee.

The third stage, the semi-finalist stage, is critical for the success of the search process. The search committee needs to collect a great deal of information about the remaining 10-15 semi-finalist candidates and, at the same time, as-
sure that the names of the candidates remain confidential in order to keep them in the pool of remaining candidates. At this stage, the committee may talk to the candidates, talk to references, send one or more mem-
ers to visit candidates, or, if necessary, invite candidates to meet the campus search com-
mittee. The goal at this stage is to identify a group of semi-finalist who will be invited to campus for interviews.

When the semi-finalists are invited to the campus for interviews, the search committee shall be responsible for the campus visit. At this stage, it is important to protect the confidential-
ty of the candidates by keeping meetings as private as possible. Typically, each candidate will be interviewed by the search committee, a campus screening committee, and a limited number of other people who can assist the search com-
mittee with its evaluation of the candidate.

The campus screening committee shall be selected by the search committee and consist of six fac-
ulty members, three department heads, three deans or directors, and two students (one of whom should be a graduate student, if appropri-
ate). The search committee shall seek nominations for the campus screening committee from appropriate campus organizations. The search committee shall establish the time, place, for-
mat, and confidentiality of meetings of candidates and the campus screening committee. The campus screening committee is advisory to the search committee. The campus screening committee should not rank candidates. It should provide the search committee with an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of all the semi-final-
ists it interviews.
The fourth stage consists of selecting three to five finalists and preparing the search committee's report to the Chancellor.

4. **Recommendation**

Following the campus interviews, the search committee shall recommend three to five finalists to the Chancellor. The search committee's recommendations should be accompanied by a detailed report on the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate, especially in terms of the desired qualifications for the position. The report may include summaries of the evaluations of the campus screening committee and other individuals and groups who provided information about the candidates to the search committee. The recommendations from the search committee shall be unranked.

**Board Selection**

When the Chancellor receives the search committee's recommendations and report, times will be set for the finalists to be interviewed by the Chancellor and by the Board. The Chancellor's Office shall prepare a news release on the finalists to be interviewed by the Board and make that available to the press three days before the Board meets with the finalists. During the three days before the Board interviews, the finalists shall be invited to campus to meet faculty, administrators, and other campus and community members. Campus representatives will be responsible for conveying information from these meetings to the Board through the Chancellor's Office.

The Chancellor shall interview the committee's finalists prior to the public announcement of the names of candidates to be interviewed by the Board. The Chancellor shall have the authority to narrow the field of candidates, but could do so only after consulting with the search committee. In no case could he or she add names to the list of finalists. The Chancellor shall also have the authority to rank the candidates to be interviewed by the Board.

Following the Board's interviews with the finalists, the Board shall meet in executive session to rank the nominees in priority order and to direct
the Chancellor to negotiate with the Board's first choice. If the first choice does not accept the Board's offer, the Chancellor shall seek further advice from the Board before contacting the second choice.

When the Chancellor has negotiated an acceptable appointment, the Board shall hold a special or regular meeting, which is open to the public, to vote on the selection of a president.
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Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board amend the policy on presidential searches as noted above.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Miller moved and Mr. Richardson seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Donahue, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

The Board meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. and reconvened in Work Session at 12:30 p.m.

Vice Chancellor Clark outlined the framework for a higher education reform strategy.

I. Why Does OSSHE Need a Higher Education Reform Strategy?

A. Overall, the Board needs to plan for the role of OSSHE at all levels of public education and implement reforms that support student learning performance in those areas of direct responsibility.

B. Oregon higher education is highly productive; it must become even more so (increasing productivity is an imperative for American higher education, and arguably for every sector of our economy). This means producing demonstrably more education, research, and service
for the resources requested from students, parents, and the state.

C. Needed productivity increases cannot be achieved exclusively through reducing the inputs (faculty and staff) and increasing workload (number of courses/students per faculty). Some changes in academic culture and workload adjustments are possible and will be actively pursued; however, this strategy alone will fall far short of accommodating the additional 20,000 students that Oregon Benchmarks targets for the year 2000-01.

D. An emphasis on academic productivity must be coupled with greater attention to the learner (the output/outcomes side of the equation). How can learning a body of knowledge or skills -- mastery learning -- be done in less time and/or with less costly inputs? Learning in less time can reduce institutional costs, and also the opportunity costs (foregone earnings) of the student who could then enter the labor market earlier, or in the case of the older advanced student, at a higher level.

II. Undergraduate Educational Reform Aimed at Increasing Student Learning Outcomes Typically Costs More. What Approaches Seem Both Promising and Cost-Effective?

A. Follow the lead of several other states (e.g., New York, Virginia, Colorado, Minnesota, Washington) to encourage more college-level learning in the high school years -- at the high school or by permitting enrollment in courses at nearby colleges.

B. Early college programs (described in II.A.) and other innovations enable the implementation of accelerated baccalaureate programs from which students would graduate in less than four years. Time-shortened degree strategies include attention to:

1. College-level learning for credit by high school students and/or early college entry.
2. Redesign/reduce degree requirements (emphasis on general education requirements).

3. Redesign the academic calendar to better use the summer as a regular term.

4. Re-engineer some courses into modules for self-paced and individualized learning, and offer them on a continuous basis; adjust the classroom hour definition of faculty responsibility to include effort expended on development of new technologies for instruction and the products that result.

5. Redesign student financial aids to support accelerated, year-round learning.

6. Price accelerated programs advantageously to incent students to complete baccalaureate requirements in less than four years.

7. Develop advising procedures and program materials to motivate students toward commitment to a whole degree program plan versus term-by-term planning.

The State System needs demonstration programs to experiment with different (but systematic) approaches to time-shortened degrees. Nationally, interest in these approaches is growing; led by the State University of New York (SUNY) System, an informal network of experimenting public and private institutions/systems is forming, of which OSSHE is a part.

C. Redesign curricula, course sequences, time schedules, and faculty teaching assignments to assure that students have access to courses in their degree programs at the proper time and in the proper sequence. Instruction should be organized to enable students to graduate in a timely way (Portland State University's September 1993 Report and Recommendations of the General Education Working Group sets forth a promising curricular reform plan that may serve as a model for other institutions).
D. Maximize individual and self-paced instruction for mastery learning to achieve shorter course completion times. Time then is no longer the constant, but the variable. Learning performance is the constant.

E. Implement tuition policies that assist or require students to focus on making timely progress toward their degrees.

F. Expand distance education programs to meet present state workforce education needs and to serve some planned portion of the predicted increase in student enrollments by the end of the 1990s. (All OSSHE campuses have ongoing continuing education programs and also operate over 20 off-campus centers in Oregon that offer for-credit programs.) OSSHE leads all other sectors in delivering instruction over ED-NET, and uses other electronic (high speed computing and data transfer) and telecommunications strategies to deliver instruction as well.

Is the Board interested in other major elements of distance education planning/implementation for 1993-94?

III. What Systemwide Strategies Will Move Us From Study of Productivity and Educational Reform to Planning, Experimentation, and Implementation?

A. In response to a 1993 legislative budget note about campus plans for increasing productivity, in anticipation of the recommendations of the Board Committee on Academic Productivity (BCAP) and building on progress made in Systemwide activities in 1992-93, Chancellor Bartlett sent presidents a memorandum on August 17, 1993 directing the development of comprehensive campus academic productivity and educational reform plans.

B. Related to the Chancellor's directive, additional funds have been set aside to support intercampus projects that, for maximum effect, require the involvement of two or more campuses. The first of two Systemwide requests for proposals (RFPs) was issued on
October 1 with project proposals due on November 15. Five priority areas are specified.

1. Student self-paced learning projects, particularly related to technological developments.

2. Curricular streamlining projects such as time-shortened degrees, accelerated baccalaureates.

3. Distance education collaborative degree/curricula projects.

4. Faculty capacity projects (enable faculty to develop new skills to organize instruction differently).

5. Special assessment projects that evaluate mastery and non-traditional learning formats for effectiveness and efficiency.

C. At the System level, in consultation with OSSHE campuses, a project is underway to develop proficiency-based admission standards for college entry. In alignment with Oregon's school reform mandate, the emphasis will be upon learning outcomes versus inputs (seat time, courses taken, etc.). Recommendations and a report will be made to the Board in January 1994.

D. With the advice of a national expert, the OSSHE Academic Council is developing a framework for assessment of undergraduate education inclusive of System and campus levels at three key "checkpoints" during the college years: admissions, at the conclusion of the general education component, and at graduation. A preliminary report will be made to the Board in November.

IV. Review and Redefinition of the Baccalaureate Degree for the Early Part of the 21st Century: Does the Board Wish to Proceed, and If So, How?
A. Recommendations:

1. The review and redefinition of the baccalaureate degree for the early part of the 21st Century could be incorporated into the Board's long-range planning process.

2. Since campus productivity and educational reform planning during this biennium will focus on reconceptualization of undergraduate education, the Board may wish to specifically direct campuses to address this issue as a deliberate part of their planning.

B. Alternative Recommendation:

1. The Board could establish a Commission on the Baccalaureate Degree for the 21st Century, with membership to be drawn from (for example) Board members, Chancellor or vice chancellors, presidents, faculty members, students, and non-OSSHE members.

2. The Commission's overall purposes: to consider what will be expected of baccalaureate degree holders in the early part of the 21st Century; to examine whether and how OSSHE programs prepare students to meet the changing needs, emerging opportunities and challenges of the 21st Century; and to make recommendations to assure that students are prepared for new realities.

V. Brief Summary

Discussion centered on the following themes. First, a concern was expressed that proposed changes should strengthen, not lessen, perceptions of the importance of the baccalaureate degree. In other words, shortening or narrowing the educational experience, at the undergraduate level, should not undermine the strength of the degree. Some Board members underscored the need to be very clear "what is being fixed, a clear definition of the problems being addressed."

It was pointed out that traditionally, educational reform has been related exclusively to structure and form and not focused enough on what actually
occurs within the expectations and aspirations of individual staff, faculty members, or in the lives of individual students. The challenge is to change the culture at the point where teaching and learning are actually happening.

This approach, if followed, will cause major changes in the culture of our institutions and in the role of the faculty. When students are given more responsibility for their own learning, faculty might assume more of a role of guide and tutor than purveyors of knowledge. Faculty members will increasingly be challenged to answer the question, "what is it that I can do with this student that the student cannot do for himself/herself? What is my essential contribution to the education process?"

The role of technology in educational reform was discussed as key to changes in the teaching environment. Increased use of technology implies costly investment in equipment and training of faculty to use it.

Concerns were expressed about "how far afield can we go in being innovative without damaging our relationship with other educational systems?" In response, the Board was reminded of several presentations made recently by nationally recognized experts that underscore that the Oregon agenda is, in fact, a national agenda.

It was pointed out that at each of the State System institutions, innovation is occurring. Because the Board usually hears about programs and initiatives one-at-a-time, it does not appear that major changes are underway.

A key component to implementing change is in a re-examination of the faculty reward system. A question for consideration is, "how much are we willing to change this system? Are we willing to look at differential career paths, some of which lead to research and others that lead to teaching and service?"

It was generally agreed that many of the issues and questions raised in the discussion also relate to work of the Higher Education 2010 Advisory Panel, to productivity plans of the institutions, and to
recommendations of the Board Committee on Academic Productivity.

**Background of College High Programs:** For over a decade, Oregon colleges and high schools have developed cooperative educational programs that offer college courses for credit in the high schools to currently enrolled students. The courses are taught by high school teachers and result in the student earning "dual credit," i.e., high school credit and college credit. The colleges are responsible for the curricular content and standards, administrative support, and program monitoring.

The basic purpose of the program is to provide academically able and interested students the opportunity to experience more academically challenging coursework and to begin earning college credit while still enrolled in high school.

Currently in Oregon, 106 high schools, 12 community colleges, and three State System colleges and universities offer College High programs that enroll an estimated 3,400 Oregon high school students each year in at least one course. Financial support for College High programs comes from students who pay reduced tuition rates and from the sponsoring colleges and universities that provide administrative services.

**College High Issues and the Pilot Study:** Since College High programs were first implemented, concerns have been raised about educational standards and practices and the quality of the academic outcome. College High programs are developed and managed locally; common statewide standards and practices have not been adopted. To a greater or lesser degree, participating colleges follow standards and guidelines developed in 1985 by an intersector committee and adopted by the Board of Higher Education. Since 1991 Oregon's community colleges must follow standards and requirements defined in an Oregon Administrative Rule on "Dual Credit Programs." As a result of concerns about quality assurance and performance outcomes, the OSSHE Academic Council and the Deans of Instruction of Oregon's community colleges agreed that a pilot study should be conducted to provide an updated description of College High Program activity in Oregon and an evaluation of the freshman year.
academic performance of College High students in OSSHE institutions.

To conduct the cooperative pilot study, the records of 1,140 students enrolled in College High programs offered by Portland Community College, Mt. Hood Community College, Tillamook Bay Community College Service District, Umpqua Community College, and Portland State University were matched with records of first-time freshman students enrolled at OSSHE institutions. The match yielded 306 College High students who enrolled as first-time freshmen during the 1991-92 academic year.

Results of the College High Pilot Study: It is apparent that College High programs provide important educational opportunities that enable students to pursue college-level work for credit while still enrolled in high school. The evaluation of the freshman year academic performance of College High students in this study showed a consistent pattern of above average performance in comparison to all other OSSHE freshmen that would likely be affirmed if a study were conducted of all College High students enrolled in OSSHE institutions. There is evidence, however, of a modest amount of repeated coursework in writing and mathematics, and significant repeated coursework in foreign language by College High students in their freshman year.

The draft report in its entirety was included in the docket materials. It is under review by the OSSHE Academic Council, the Joint Boards' Articulation Commission, and other interested groups.

(No Board action required)

Vice Chancellor Ihrig summarized previous discussions that have occurred regarding differential tuition and other aspects of entrepreneurial incentives. The discussion was framed around questions of whether or not the present tuition structures are adequate and/or appropriate as they are or if there is reason for radical changes.

In explaining the tuition and fee structure, it was pointed out that the key difference between the instructional fee and state General Fund is that the instructional fee goes into a pool of money
with the state General Fund to pay the cost of instruction, whereas the resource and other fees go directly to the institution that collected it.

A goal of the present allocation system is to provide incentives for allocations based on efficient and effective campus operations. The funding level to maintain a quality education based on the programs and missions of each campus is determined. Campuses then should have the freedom to spend the resources allocated to them in whatever manner they think is most appropriate to meet their mission without micro-management from the System level.

A key question that must be asked within this model is: are more differential tuition models desirable? If so, what are the goals of the models? As a part of differential cost of instruction, should there be differential costs for students? Should students be charged differentially for the missions of the campuses?

Various models of differential tuition were suggested:

1. Differential tuition based on the particular area of study. For example, should engineering majors be priced higher than art majors since the potential earning power of an engineer is greater than that of an artist?

2. Differential mission of institutions could be used as a means for differentiating tuition. If, however, the pricing of the product is not done correctly, and the wrong number of students make the decision to attend, there could be serious shortfall of income.

3. Differential tuition could be associated with demand for either a specific institution or major. For example, there are waiting lists for students to get into Western Oregon State College. Should they be charged more tuition because of high demand?

4. Unit pricing for different classes was suggested as a way of applying differential tuition.

5. Differential tuition for resident and nonresident students has already been applied at the
University of Oregon and Southern Oregon State College. Should it be expanded?

6. Tuitions could be calibrated differently for lower and upper division classes and for different majors. There are liabilities for students on financial aid in the event they decide to change.

7. It was suggested that one type of differential tuition might be made on a model similar to a basic health model in which there would be a basic package and individuals could pay more for more services beyond that basic package.

Following discussion on differential charges, it was pointed out that attention also be made to differential expenditures. Many individuals assume that if charges are made differentially, a change in expenditure patterns will follow. If changes are made in expenditure patterns to fit a change in charge patterns, then the assumption is that those students will be getting more services. Are we going to expend resources for students who pay it? Are we going to expend it for the campus from which it came but not necessarily on the same students? Are we going to divorce the source of money from the pool of expenditures? It was postulated that there must be both differential charging and differential expenditures.

Some potential problems with differential tuition were raised:

1. Will differential tuition among institutions create a perception that differential tuition equates to differential quality -- those institutions that charge less are inferior?

2. How far does the System want to go as far as differentiating for Oregon residents? Should discussions continue to differentiate between in-state and out-of-state students? How far will the market go before the returns begin to diminish?

3. There appeared to be general agreement that tuition levels had gone up about as far as they could for Oregon residents. Genuine concerns
regarding access were raised along with concerns about maintaining diversity on the campuses.

Ms. Wilson summarized the discussion and indicated that "we already have differential tuition -- that is not the issue. The issue is how far to go and in what directions. The Board is saying to institutions, 'when you are putting together your plans, you should use differential as a tool. But if you want a differential tuition, you're going to have to come to the table and talk about why you want it and what value it adds to the institution.'"

It was observed that educational reform and the tuition pricing discussion must continue together. One of the things they have in common is that neither one is sustainable within present practices. Whatever is done in one area should be tied directly to programs and outcomes expected in the future.

Vice Chancellor Large observed that "the public is going to expect us to do things at a lower unit cost, whatever the price. We've moved from an average cost of 25 percent for an undergraduate education to 38 percent. How much farther can we move it? This throws us directly into conflict with how many people need and want an education. One thing is certain: we cannot be 'business as usual.'"

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Virginia L. Thompson
Secretary of the Board

Janice J. Wilson
President of the Board
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