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ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 10:20 a.m. by President Janice J. Wilson.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Dr. Herb Aschkenasy  Mr. Rob Miller
Mr. Bob Bailey  Mr. George Richardson
Ms. Diane Christopher  Mr. Les Swanson
Mr. Richard Donahue  Mr. Jim Willis
Mr. Bobby Lee  Ms. Janice Wilson

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; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Nancy Goldschmidt, Senior Policy Associate, Academic Affairs; Weldon E. Ihrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Grattan Kerans, Director, Government Relations; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Jim Mattis, Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies; Audry Symes, Staff Assistant, Finance and Administration; Virginia L. Thompson, Board Secretary; Susan Weeks, Director, Institutional Research Services; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.

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

Oregon Health Sciences University -- President Peter Kohler; Lesley M. Hallick, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Oregon Institute of Technology -- President Lawrence Wolf; Martha Anne Dow, Provost; Doug Yates, Dean of Administration.
Oregon State University -- Roy Arnold, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Portland State University -- Michael Reardon, Provost.

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

University of Oregon -- President Myles Brand; Dave Hubin, Executive Assistant to the President; Gerard Moseley, Vice Provost; Barry Siegel, Professor, Economics; Gaye Vandermyn, Director, University News Bureau; Norman K. Wessells, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration.

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

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate -- Marjorie Burns, Portland State University; Sally Francis, Oregon State University; Herb Jolliff, Oregon Institute of Technology; Bill Danley, Southern Oregon State College.

Others -- Walt Curtis, Poet/Author, KBOO-FM; Marilyn Drescher, Director, OSA; M. Kenne Fahmbulleh, Programs Coordinator, ASUC; Wayne Ford, Co-Chair, Eugene-Springfield Homeless Action Coalition; Nancy Forrest, Officer, Amazon Community Tenants Council; Arik Hessedahl, Oregon Daily Emerald; Kari Hulac, Corvallis Gazette-Times; Rivers Janssen, Oregon Daily Emerald; Richard Jansen, Executive Director, WICHE (Boulder, CO); Robert Nosse, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Jetta B. Siegel, Executive Secretary, Oregon Conference AAUP; Steve Snow, WICHE; Norman Solomon, Newspaper Columnist; Eileen Traylor, Family Housing; David Zupan.

WICHE REPORT

Mr. Steven E. Snow, chair of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) and chair of the Utah State Board of Regents, noted that this is the 40th anniversary of the WICHE compact.

Snow recounted that WICHE was established by 13 Western states to promote and facilitate resource sharing, collaboration, and cooperative planning among the states and the colleges and universities.
to better meet the educational needs of citizens of the region. The basic premise was that, by working collectively, states could maximize access to high quality education resources and minimize costly duplication.

WICHE Executive Director Dick Jonsen described WICHE's three student exchange programs -- the Professional Student Exchange Program; the Western Regional Graduate Program; and the Western Undergraduate Exchange. He also described WICHE activities in the area of policy research and analysis.

Mr. Jonsen noted that Oregon was a founding member of Northwest Academic Forum, a regional higher education policy and planning organization composed of chief academic officers from 18 colleges and universities and state agencies in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, and Washington. Mr. Jonsen indicated that the Northwest Academic Forum was instrumental in establishing the Northwest Net, an intermediate supercomputer network that provides OSSHE institutions access to the Internet for national and international connectivity. The Forum was also instrumental in formation of the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications, to facilitate resource and information sharing in the use of educational telecommunications and other technologies.

In addition to providing an overview of WICHE, Mr. Jonsen acknowledged the three current Oregon WICHE commissioners: OSSHE Chancellor Thomas A. Bartlett; Oregon Commissioner of Community Colleges Mr. Roger Bassett; and former Oregon State Board of Higher Education member Dick Hensley. Mr. Jonsen also acknowledged the leadership provided by former Oregon WICHE commissioners Dr. Robert MacVicker, former president of Oregon State University and first chair of NorthwestNet, and Loren Wyss, former member and vice president of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

The Board received public testimony regarding Amazon Family Housing at the University of Oregon. Ms. Eileen Traylor, University Family Housing resident; Nancy Forrest, an officer with Amazon Community Tenants Council; Wayne Ford, Homeless Action Coalition; and David Zupan, Eugene Citizens for Low-Cost Housing, presented history and back-
ground information regarding Amazon Family Housing and requested the Board intercede on their behalf with University officials to reconsider repair and maintenance rather than demolition of the units.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the October 22, 1993, meeting of the Board. Mr. Swanson moved and Mr. Richardson seconded approval of the minutes as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Donahue, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Willis, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Wilson thanked the presenters from Amazon Student Housing and interested parties for their testimony, indicating that the issue of affordable housing is important to the Board. She expressed confidence that University officials would continue to work with interested parties to resolve the conflict.

Ms. Wilson also thanked President Brand and those who participated in the presentations highlighting innovative programs at the University of Oregon.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Having just returned from a national meeting of higher education system heads, Chancellor Bartlett reflected on the national context in which higher education decisions are being made.

- Scarce resources
- Debate over use of public funds for public services (higher education being simply one piece of that debate)
- Higher education communication with the public
- Anticipation of growing demand for higher education and concern for access
- Need for diversity on campuses
- Productivity and efficiency: Are we getting the most results from the resources allocated to higher education?
- Appropriate role of research
- Need for higher education to remain strong; essential for continued development of the state
- Widespread view that more resources should be focused on undergraduate education
- Relationships among sectors

Dr. Bartlett noted that Oregon is one of the states developing new models and underscored that "there
is no clear road map through the territory. Our greatest challenge is going to be to move from concept and analysis to action." He expressed belief that "we are in a long-term, fundamental period of change."

With long-term goals in mind, the Chancellor outlined some responses being set in motion.

- Modify internal incentive system
- Sustain research as a fundamental issue of a responsible university
- Refocus on undergraduate education
- Concentrate on efficiency and productivity
- Learn about technology: its limitations and role in problem solving
- Foster the relationship between four-year institutions and community colleges
- Support continuing education
- Re-examine structures

IFS REPORT

Dr. Bartlett invited IFS President Majorie Burns to report on activities of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS).

Dr. Burns reported that IFS members are making legislative contacts. She noted that, in times of difficulty, two things happen: people divide or they unite. She believes people are uniting very well. Finally, she indicated this is her last presentation to the Board, since her term of office ends December 1993.

APPOINTMENT TO FOREST RESEARCH LABORATORY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Staff Report to the Board

ORS 526.225 provides that the Board of Higher Education shall appoint a Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee composed of 15 members, nine of whom are to be individuals who are engaged, actively and principally, in timber management of forest lands, harvesting, or processing of forest products; three of whom are to be individuals who are the heads of state and federal public forestry agencies; and three of whom are to be individuals from the public-at-large. Although the statute does not prescribe the terms of the committee members, the practice has been to make appointments for a period of three years. Those who are performing actively and effectively traditionally have been recommended for reappointment to a second three-
year term, with all members replaced at the conclusion of a second term.

Dr. George W. Brown, director of the Forest Research Laboratory, with the concurrence of President Byrne and Chancellor Bartlett, recommended the following appointments for the terms indicated:

Reappointment of Stuart J. Shelk, Jr., general manager of Ochoco Lumber Company in Prineville, Oregon. Mr. Shelk is the current chair of the Committee and has provided outstanding counsel during his past tenure.

Reappointment of Nancy Russell, Portland, who serves as public representative and has been an important member of the Committee.

Appointment of Barbara Craig, of the Portland-based law firm Stoel Rives Boley Jones & Gray. Ms. Craig will serve as a public representative for a three-year term, replacing Gail Achterman.

Appointment of Richard Baldwin, president and CEO of Springfield Forest Products in Springfield, Oregon. Mr. Baldwin will serve as an industry representative for a three-year term, replacing Carl Ehlen.

Appointment of Dan Dutton, president and CEO of Stimpson Lumber Company of Portland, Oregon. Mr. Dutton replaces Lew Krauss and will serve as an industry representative for a three-year term.

Appointment of Howard Sohn, president of Sun Studs, Inc., and Lone Rock Timber Company of Roseburg, Oregon. He is also the current chair of Oregon Forest Resources Institute and sits on the Board of the Evergreen Foundation. Mr. Sohn replaces Carl Newport and will serve as an industry representative for a three-year term.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended the Board approve the above appointments and reappointments to the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee.
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Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Donahue moved and Mr. Miller 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.

Staff Report to the Board

At the October 20, 1989, Board meeting, approval was given to Eastern Oregon State College officials to declare vacant land on the east edge of campus as surplus and available for sale. At the same time, the approved projected campus boundary was amended to exclude the parcel. The property consists of an unimproved parcel approximately 300' by 240' between 13th and 14th Streets and "H" and "I" Avenues. The property has been on the market since 1989 and has not sold.

Institutional officials have recently reviewed the campus land situation and determined that, with the current growth of the City of La Grande and the scarcity and high price of land, it would be difficult for Eastern Oregon State College to obtain land adjacent to the College for future growth and expansion. Therefore, the institution has determined that it is in the College's best interest to retain this property and is requesting that the land be removed from the surplus category, taken off the market, and once again included within the campus boundary as part of the campus.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the land be removed from the surplus category and the campus boundary revised to include this parcel.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Swanson moved and Mr. Miller 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.
Officials at the University of Oregon have forwarded to the Office of Finance and Administration a request to enter into negotiations with the Southern Pacific Transportation Company for the purchase of a portion of the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way that runs through the land being developed for the Riverfront Research Park.

Southern Pacific Railroad has expressed an interest in selling its excess right-of-way beyond 25 feet from the centerline of the existing tracks. The University is interested in acquiring the property for the development of the Riverfront Research Park. The property to be acquired consists of a total of 592,538 square feet, or 13.6 acres. The property has been appraised at $81,000 by an independent appraisal, and the University of Oregon sent this appraisal to the railroad company. The Southern Pacific Transportation Company responded with an offer to sell for a higher amount. University of Oregon officials would like permission to negotiate a sale for an amount not to exceed $100,000.

The property is zoned commercial, industrial, and public land and is comprised of various small, undeveloped strips of property. The University will use the strips of property to assist in the development of internal streets, a railroad underpass, parking, and building parcels for the Riverfront Research Park. An environmental inspection was conducted by Squire Associates for hazardous materials and it was determined that there are no known hazardous materials existing on the property.

Funds required for the purchase of the property and related costs are to be provided from an advance from the University parking debt service reserve with partial payment from Research Park lease revenue. The advance, less that portion directly applicable to parking, will be repaid from lease revenues. The property would be purchased under authority of Chapter 734, Oregon Laws 1989, Section 6(1).
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Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board authorize the Office of Finance and Administration to enter into negotiations for the purchase of the Southern Pacific Railroad property for an amount not to exceed $100,000.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Swanson moved and Mr. Miller 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.

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES CONTRACTING ACTIVITIES

Staff Report to the Board

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

Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

Award of Construction Contracts

CDRC Orthopedic Outpatient Clinic Remodel Project, OHSU
On October 8, 1993, Rollins & Green Builders, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $66,300. Financing will be provided from hospital bonds.

CDRC Radiology Suite Remodel Project, OHSU
On October 8, 1993, Scott Mattson Construction Company was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $83,003. Financing will be provided from hospital bonds.

Mackenzie Hall Second Floor, Mood and Sleep Disorder Laboratory Project, OHSU
On October 8, 1993, Rollins & Green Builders, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $88,000. Financing will be provided from operating funds and gifts.

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 federal funds.

Central Plant Boiler #1 Replacement Installation Project, UO
On September 21, 1993, Total Mechanical, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $1,179,514. Financing will be provided from a SELP loan.

Acceptance of Projects
McAlexander Fieldhouse Painting & Roof Recoating Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on September 17, 1993. The final direct construction costs were $115,300. Financing was provided from state funds.

(No Board action required)

Vice Chancellor Ihrig indicated that the annual approval of the Summer Session Fee Book would be presented to the Board in January. Summer housing rate increases will range between zero and six percent. Summer session tuition increases will be in the range of four to seven percent. One significant change is that the University of Oregon has expressed interest in having a differential tuition for resident versus nonresident students during summer session.

(No Board action required)

In January the Board will be asked to amend Oregon Administrative Rule 580-10-040, Resident Classification of Aliens, to bring it into conformity with changes in federal immigration laws.

(No Board action required)

Introduction

The University of Oregon requested approval of 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 di-
vision 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 consent agenda for final action at the November Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (October 22, 1993)

Mr. Swanson moved and Mr. Miller seconded the staff recommendation to approve the program 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.

Board Discussion and Action (November 19, 1993)

Mr. Miller moved approval of the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Donahue, 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 Development 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 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 (October 22, 1993)

Mr. Richardson asked that staff, when presenting new program requests, be more specific about what is meant by redeploying resources, so that Board members may get a proper sense of the magnitude of the costs, even though there may be no budget impact.

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.

Board Discussion and Action (November 19, 1993)

Mr. Miller moved 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.

Abstract

This report provided a review of Board policy on student recruitment and retention; presented Underrepresented Minority Achievement Scholarship Programs (UMASP) student demographic data and students' perceptions of institutional climate; and concluded with a discussion of future directions for maintaining cultural/ethnic diversity in supportive climates on OSSHE campuses. Board directives to campuses have provided a policy context for campuses to develop and implement programs, improve student access, and support student and faculty retention. The Minority Student Enrollment Initiative in particular has improved minority group student representation. A survey of students participating in the UMASP indicates that the programs have been beneficial and that students generally are satisfied with their experience on campuses. Improvements in minority group staffing were suggested by students. Perspectives and suggestions for future policy direction are introduced for discussion.
Oregon Minority Student Enrollment Initiative

Since the Board approved the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative in May 1987, significant gains have been made in improving minority group access to Oregon's public higher education institutions. For example, in a five-year period from fall 1987 to fall 1992, new freshman enrollment of African American students increased by 58 percent and enrollments of American Indian/Alaskan Natives and Hispanics increased 133 percent and 104 percent, respectively. Resident underrepresented minority freshman enrollment increased by 97 percent, while overall resident freshman enrollment decreased by 9 percent. As of fall 1990, the freshman college participation rate was 13 percent for African Americans and 16 percent for American Indians and Hispanics. The new freshman college participation rate of resident White students (and for all students) was 15 percent. In sharp contrast, Asian Americans had the highest participation rate at 26 percent (see appendix). In addition to increasing access, the Enrollment Initiative directed campuses to provide student services and academic programs to enhance retention among underrepresented minority group students.

Five years after approval of the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative, this report reviewed Board policy on recruitment and retention, including students, faculty, and staff; presented recent data on students participating in the UMASP and their perception of the campus climate; and concluded with issues and perspectives on achieving or maintaining diversity in supportive climates on State System campuses.

Summary of Board Reports and Approved Policies Related to Diversity

In 1985 the Board approved a policy statement on equal educational opportunity. The pertinent paragraphs from the policy statement are as follows:

It is the Board's intent that women and minority students be appropriately represented in academic programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. It is also the Board's intent that women and minorities be appropriately represented in the
administrative staff and in the teaching and research faculty.

Institution presidents have primary responsibility for developing and implementing programs to enhance enrollment and graduation of women and minority students and for achieving a diversified workforce by maintaining affirmative action plans; the appropriate social-educational climate; and other relevant conditions, policies, and practices. The Chancellor is responsible for developing and implementing similar plans, conditions, policies, and practices in the Board's Office. As a matter of law, as well as policy, the Chancellor shall evaluate the performance in these areas of presidents and other officers reporting to him. (See Board's policy on Executive Management and Evaluation of Chief Administrators.)

The Board's policy on equal educational opportunity was further articulated with the adoption of OAR 580-10-003 in July of 1986. The Administrative Rule set forth the Board's intentions for institutions in three areas: (1) that minority and female students be appropriately represented in academic programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels; (2) that the institutions take appropriate steps or make efforts in that direction; and (3) that recognition be given to those institutions that achieved the stated goals or made superior efforts and, conversely, that attention be called to those institutions that demonstrated unsatisfactory progress or effort.

In November of 1989, the Board directed the presidents of each institution to develop and present to the Chancellor a comprehensive plan for recruiting, retaining, and graduating minority students. Staff reported in June 1991 that it was not possible to address the third component of institutional recognition or attention intended by OAR 580-10-1003 until Systemwide outcome definitions and goals were established and agreed upon. Related to this point was the need to clarify those activities that would require additional resources to meet stated goals and objectives.
Institutional Plans

In 1989 each campus was directed to plan for increasing the number of minority group students, faculty, and staff. To further explicate the Board's policy, the Chancellor distributed guidelines to the presidents specifying the elements to be contained in the comprehensive recruitment and retention plan of each campus. These guidelines were also used to assist in the preparation of Schools of Education recruitment and retention plans as mandated by Senate Bill 122 -- The Minority Teacher Education Act of 1991. The elements identified for each campus plan were the following:

- The current campus situation relative to minority student, faculty, and staff recruitment and retention efforts;
- An institutional assessment of the educational and social environments;
- Institutional goals for 1993, 1995, and 2000 relative to its efforts to achieve a supportive educational environment;
- The strategies the institution will use to achieve its long- and short-term goals and objectives relative to minority student, faculty, and staff recruitment and retention;
- Mechanisms the institution will use to measure progress toward the stated goals and objectives; and
- The resources that will be used and needed to achieve the institutional goals and objectives.

The Board has received two status reports on campus recruitment and plans (December 1990 and June 1991). In addition, two detailed written reports were submitted on the status of diversity within OSSHE (May 1992 and June 1993).

The campuses are now in the process of revising their original plans, organizing to implement strategies, or implementing strategies. The Board's directives to prepare the plans had the two-fold effect of: (1) strengthening the Board's commit-
ment to pursue the tenets established in its equal educational opportunity policy and OAR 580-10-003; and (2) providing a stimulating context for each campus to review policies, practices, and relations toward minority students and faculty.

Impact of the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative and Student Feedback on Underrepresented Minority Achievement Scholarship Program (UMASP)

When the Underrepresented Minority Achievement Scholarship Program (UMASP) for first-time freshmen was approved in 1987 (and subsequently for juniors in 1989), educators in Oregon and the nation identified a number of reasons why efforts to recruit minority students to higher education have not met with sustained success:

- With a lack of financial resources available to minority students, coupled with rising costs of attending colleges, many minority students were unable to access higher education programs.

- Institutions too often have lacked coordinated plans. Those institutions that have successfully increased minority participation and graduation have not taken a piecemeal approach. Rather, their efforts are central to a comprehensive institutional mission, and are supplemented by strong administrative leadership.

- Once on campus, there have been few minority role models, which has led to lack of identification and feelings of alienation and isolation. For some it has raised concerns about exploitation. This has been especially true for those students who find that the only other students like themselves are athletes.

- Some majority students and faculty are perceived as having reservations about qualifications of minority students and staff.

- The social environments into which many minority students have been thrust have no ties to the student's home environment, creating difficult adjustment problems.
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While the concerns about low minority student enrollment and graduation in OSSHE were widespread, solutions to the problems were elusive in the 1980s. The Minority Student Enrollment Initiative was developed to make it possible for the State System to lay the necessary foundation for renewed and sustainable undergraduate minority enrollment and graduation efforts. In addition, the expected success of these efforts would result in increases in the enrollment and graduation of minority students at the graduate and professional school levels. The benefits of the Initiative were expected to go beyond the State System, stimulating the enrollment of underrepresented minority students in other sectors of higher education in Oregon.

The Enrollment Initiative provided a basis for campus implementation of focused and intensive recruitment efforts to enroll qualified first-time freshmen and transfer junior underrepresented minority students: African Americans, American Indians, and Hispanics (and Latinos). In January 1990, the fee remission program structure was reorganized in order to improve the overall academic quality and diversity of the System's enrollment and to attract Oregon residents based on academic merit and achievement. After five years with the UMASP freshman and three years with the junior component of the Initiative, the Interinstitutional Minority Affairs Committee (IMAC) developed a survey to demographically describe UMASP students and to elicit their perceptions of campus climate. (Campus climate was defined as student satisfaction with academic and social experiences.)

Each campus in the System is represented on IMAC. Campus representatives, in general, are responsible for student-related multicultural affairs issues. Each campus representative was responsible for the distribution and collection of surveys. Of approximately 639 students receiving UMASP awards in fall 1992, 304 usable responses were received and analyzed. The number of usable responses represent 47.5 percent of UMASP students in fall 1992. Responses to climate questions indicated no significant difference (at the 0.05 level) among students by race/ethnicity. Importantly, among those responding, students indicated they have had satisfactory experiences as UMASP students, including the support they received from UMASP staff and the
accessibility of various campus services and programs.

Demographic characteristics:

Among the responding students, 29 percent attended Oregon State University, 14 percent University of Oregon, 13 percent Western Oregon State College, 12 percent Portland State University, 10 percent Oregon Institute of Technology, 9 percent Southern Oregon State College, 8 percent Eastern Oregon State College, and 5 percent Oregon Health Sciences University.

- The high schools where students attended were classified according to proportion of minority enrollment. Students from high schools with 10 percent or more minority enrollment were 29 percent of the total sample, and students from high schools with less than 10 percent minority enrollment were 62 percent of the total. The remaining 9 percent of the high schools were private or out-of-state schools from which the information was not available for classification.

- Seventeen percent of responding students had attended one or more Oregon community colleges, and another 4 percent had attended out-of-state community colleges. As for current class standing, 25 percent were freshmen, 18 percent sophomores, 22 percent juniors, 33 percent seniors, and 3 percent graduate students.

- Age of students indicated that 61 percent are between seventeen and twenty-one years old, 11 percent are twenty-two, 7 percent are twenty-three, and 20 percent are twenty-four or older. In terms of the years of college attended, 31 percent had attended for one year (or less), 19 percent two years, 20 percent three years, 16 percent four years, 11 percent five years, and 3 percent more than five years.

- The racial makeup of responding students showed that 18 percent were African American, 56 percent Hispanic, and 26 percent were Native American or Eskimo.
Those applying for financial aid were 83 percent of the total; those qualifying were 70 percent; and those receiving need-based aid were 63 percent of the total.

The most popular major was business, with 16 percent choosing that as a major; 13 percent chose liberal arts, 12 percent social sciences, 10 percent health professions, 9 percent natural sciences, 6 percent teacher education, 6 percent pre-professional, 6 percent engineering, and 5 percent undecided. Remaining students in smaller proportions chose agriculture, architecture, journalism, health education, computer science, home economics, foreign languages, criminal justice, and fine arts.

Students were asked if they had transferred from another OSSHE institution; 14 percent said yes, and 86 percent said no. The most common reason listed for transferring (54 percent of transfer students) was to pursue a certain major. Other reasons mentioned were a desire to be closer to home, 23 percent; a dislike for the area at their previous school, 10 percent; and financial reasons, 5 percent.

In terms of the hours worked per week, 33 percent indicated they did not work, 18 percent worked 1-10 hours, 31 percent 11-20 hours, 13 percent 21-30 hours, 4 percent 31-40 hours, and less than 1 percent over 40 hours per week.

Responses to institutional climate questions:

On the 22 climate questions, students were asked to rate the items from "outstanding" to "not applicable" ("not applicable" was not used in reporting results). Because of small cell sizes, "outstanding" and "generally acceptable" were collapsed, "adequate" stood alone, and "less than satisfactory" and "generally unsatisfactory" were collapsed.

A summary of student responses to the questions is listed in Table 1. Some of the major observations from the climate-related responses are:

- UMAASP students value the academic support services they receive. Seventy percent thought
the support was satisfactory; only five percent thought the services received were unsatisfactory.

- A majority of the respondents noted these items as satisfactory: a link between campus and ethnic communities (57 percent), support for UMASP students in campus activities (56 percent), enforcement of discrimination and harassment policies (53 percent), and gaining better understanding of college requirements (53 percent).

- The UMASP staff and support efforts have been most satisfactory in helping students to resolve academic crises (56 percent) and to relate to their cultural identity (55 percent).

- Factors that students viewed as having satisfactory impact on their college experience include: support from faculty or staff mentors rated (71 percent), communication with UMASP staff (65 percent), availability of multicultural events (63 percent), and involvement in extracurricular activities (62 percent).

Student responses to the open-ended questions related to plans for their future varied. Many students, especially freshmen, said their plans were indefinite. Most expressed a desire to go to graduate school, either immediately or sometime in the future. Others saw themselves moving immediately into the workplace and staying there. A few expressed a desire to travel upon graduation.

Suggestions for improvement of UMASP indicate that most respondents were very satisfied with the program. The feelings were overwhelmingly positive, and many of the students described at length how they wouldn't have made it through school without the UMASP. Only a couple of the 304 surveys were decidedly negative.

A few suggestions arose frequently regarding how the program could be improved.

- More staff and more one-on-one attention
- Frequent contacts by staff
More information about what is available through the program

New freshmen orientation describing the program in more detail

More social activities (or at least more posting of planned activities)

Social activities that foster friendships with other minority students

Differential financial aid based on the perceived greater needs of juniors as compared to freshmen

Recruitment of more minority students and faculty

Special opportunities for employment, housing, books

The Next Stage

A challenge for the State System in the next five years will be to move to what the National Task Force for Minority Achievement in Higher Education (1990) has termed the third stage to achieving outcomes. The third stage follows removing barriers and establishing a climate of support in order to achieve fair outcomes for all students. Achieving fair outcomes involves making fundamental changes in institutional procedures and group relations, pedagogical approaches, and curricular development. Recently, members of the Interinstitutional Minority Affairs Committee discussed possible directions that could be taken in the System to increase the impact of institutional efforts to achieve diversity and the steps that might be undertaken to better build on existing policies and practices. Among the perspectives and suggestions that emerged were the following:

An enlarged emphasis is called for in presenting information on the status of achieving diversity on our campuses. The shift goes beyond a descriptive account of demographic, academic, and ethnic/racial characteristics to a more in-depth account of what is happening to students, faculty, and staff. The campuses are providing a number of activities and
programs to attract and support diverse campus representation. Now, a critical question is how or to what extent these activities and programs are making a difference to minority group retention and campus climate.

- What are student and faculty perceptions of these activities? Are they appropriately designed to attract, retain, graduate, and promote individuals of color on campus?

- What are the stated campus goals for student and faculty support services? Are they being achieved? Who has access? What can be done to achieve greater minority group representation? How do minority group support programs relate to the overall campus relations among students, faculty, and staff?

In responding to these questions, IMAC members offered several ideas for consideration within the System:

- Develop faculty exchange programs within the System (e.g., regional campuses might better recruit minority group faculty if they knew they could teach a term or two at one of the research institutions. Faculty already at institutions could also participate in campus exchanges where research and instructional interests can be enhanced while providing students a diverse faculty).

- Programs to support students of color are perceived to have been underfunded prior to Measure 5, or were funded on federal grant support (soft) dollars (e.g., Trio programs, Title III). These programs have been adversely affected by the impact of Measure 5. A proposal might be developed for legislative consideration to provide additional funds to diversify students and also to compete for minority group faculty. This is an approach recently taken by Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Colorado. Regional campuses are particularly understaffed; a System-level initiative is needed.

- Plan and implement by 2010 a Systemwide assessment of efforts to achieve or maintain
diversity among faculty and students. The need to identify what works is important, although determination of cause and effect is complex.

These preliminary ideas were presented for consideration to the Board and campus leaders. They were intended to help move the System to better understand what is happening on each campus by assessing the outcomes of policies and programs, and to make timely and appropriate adjustments. Staff will bring to the Board recommendations related to campus climate and student retention strategies once the campus communities have had an opportunity to discuss the results of the UMASP study.

As noted earlier in adopted statements, the Board's commitment to diversify is integral to achievement of educational opportunity and excellence in the State System. Further attention to diversify should include vigorous, affirmative steps to ensure not only recruitment of minority students, but academic success and degree completion. Of equal importance is attention to recruitment and retention of minority faculty and staff, for this is closely linked to student success, and is further evidence of Board and institutional commitment to diversity and equity.

**Board Discussion**

Dr. Clark noted that the report was in response to the Board's request for discussion of campus climate issues regarding minority students. Dr. Thomas Coley highlighted various aspects of the report, including the two important areas that affect student retention and perception of campus climate: peer influence and faculty interaction.

The question was raised about OSSHE involvement with the (WICHE) Institute on Ethnic Diversity. Vice Chancellor Clark responded that the Institute's activities are at a very basic level, one that the System has already passed. The Institute is working with institutions to develop plans; the Board and OSSHE campuses already have policies and plans in place. Dr. Clark reported that WICHE plans to educate minority graduate students within the region, particularly at the doctoral level, where the lack of representation (specifically among African Americans) is very evident.
Mr. Richardson thanked staff for the report, adding that he'd like future reports to address the issues of "so what?" In other words, what are the results of these programs and investments? How are they making a difference?

Mr. Bailey asked if financial barriers for under-represented minorities still exist. Dr. Coley responded that financial need is always a concern, adding that it inhibits both access and retention.

Mr. Lee asked for justification of exclusion of Asian Americans in the UMASP program. Dr. Coley offered to address that concern in the spring 1994 report to the Board.

(No Board action required)
### Table 1
Climate Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a UMASP recipient, rate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 1</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 2</strong></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on alternative financial/employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3</strong></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link between campus and ethnic communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 4</strong></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support UMASP students in campus activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 5</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of discrimination and harassment policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 6</strong></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with faculty/staff of color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 7</strong></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek student of color input on multicultural development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate extent to which UMASP has helped you to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understand college requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 9</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore career objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 10</strong></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify personal values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 11</strong></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve academic crisis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 12</strong></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate to cultural identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 13</strong></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolve personal problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate impact on your college experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 14</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from faculty or staff mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 15</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate with UMA SP staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 16</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 17</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from community mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 18</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study with diverse groups of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 19</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research project with instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 20</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities with students of color</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 21</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in extra curriculars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 22</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of multicultural events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix

Financial Support for Minority Students
Enrolled in the State System

State financial support can be divided into three major categories for students enrolled in the State System: (1) fee remission awards, (2) financial aid, and (3) graduate assistantships. The financial cost of college along with curriculum availability, institutional reputation, and size, type, and location affects student choice of institution. For underrepresented minority students, cost is an especially important factor. The long-term objective of the minority fee remission programs is to promote and sustain resident underrepresented minority enrollment and graduation. Also, successes with recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority students at the undergraduate level are expected to translate into increases in the enrollment and graduation of minority students at the graduate and professional school levels.

Fee remission programs, along with financial aid, have given campuses the advantage of addressing both academic merit and financial need at the undergraduate level. Although research fellowships and personal support in the form of loans are available at the graduate level, graduate assistantships represent the primary area of support for students.

Fee remission programs under the Minority Student Enrollment Initiative include:

- The Underrepresented Minority Achievement Scholarship Program (UMASP) for freshmen, initiated in fall 1987, has the objectives of: (1) increasing the college participation rate and enrollment of Oregon's resident, underrepresented minorities, and (2) improving academic support to achieve those objectives.

- The Underrepresented Minority Achievement Scholarship Program (UMASP) for juniors, which began in 1989-90, recognizes meritorious achievement of underrepresented minority students in reaching junior-level status and emphasizes campus support to increase underrepresented minority group enrollment and retention through graduation from a baccalaureate program. Although this program applies to resident minority students from any college or university, it especially targets those transferring from Oregon community colleges.

- The Oregon Health Sciences University Minority Program, established in 1989-90, is an effort to increase the number of underrepresented minority students enrolling in and graduating from the health professions.
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Since the University of Oregon's Master of Library Science (MLS) degree program was suspended in the early 1970s, considerable demand for graduate-level library science education has developed. Many placebound people working in the field of library science have been unable to continue their education due to absence of an educational program in the state. For many, family and job responsibilities have made leaving their communities in Oregon for an extended time period to pursue a Master's degree program an impossibility. While this educational need was generally recognized throughout the library community, it was sharpened when distance learning programs began to be available in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Calls expressing interest in a degree program that could be delivered in Oregon by an institution from outside the state were received at the Oregon State Library and the Chancellor's Office.

Potential interest, as evidenced by a growing mailing list of names (now totaling over 140 persons), was brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs in 1991. After reviewing the need, Vice Chancellor Clark appointed a committee composed of people from the library community from within and outside higher education, and convened by Dr. Jon Root, coordinator for electronic distance learning programs for OSSHE, to study programs that might be suitable to meet Oregon needs.

After almost two years of study and correspondence with five different MLS programs, and intensive investigation of two programs, the committee has concluded that the best program for Oregon is offered by Emporia State University from Emporia, Kansas. This innovative program is currently being offered in Colorado, New Mexico, Nebraska, and Iowa. It is directly equivalent to the on-campus program at Emporia and is fully accredited by the American Library Association and the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Emporia State University has recently received approval from the Kansas Higher Education Board of Regents to begin a doctoral program in library and information sciences. In addition to correspondence and audio conferences with Dean Martha Hale of the program, two members of the committee conducted an on-site visit of the programs in New Mexico. The visitation, including conversations with the students, faculty,
and the on-site coordinator, confirmed the conclusion of the Oregon committee that this is a high-quality program.

Much of the off-campus program is taught by the same quality faculty that teach on campus in Kansas. Those who are not regular faculty come with strong credentials and are selected from other accredited graduate library programs elsewhere in the country. The courses are taught at a selected site in the state where instructional facilities and needed library resources are available. Courses are taught on long weekends, usually beginning Friday evenings, going throughout the day Saturday, and continuing through mid-afternoon on Sunday. Faculty come to the site in advance of the formal courses to meet with students who have special needs. Typically, a course will meet for two of these long weekends, one each during two consecutive months, and then have an extended library research or writing project that relates to the subject of the course. Program sites are selected based upon the location of the majority of the students, and the available facilities. Students proceed through the courses in a cohort group. Transfer courses may be taken from other institutions offering acceptable library science related courses. After acceptance into the graduate program and the start of coursework, the typical time required for students to complete the program is two years and eight months. There is no requirement for the students to take classes in residence on the Emporia State University campus.

With the encouragement of the Committee on Master of Library Science Distance Education Programs and the facilitation of the Office of Academic Affairs, Emporia State University has submitted a proposal to the Oregon Office of Educational Policy and Planning to begin the Master of Library Science program in Oregon in September 1994. One exciting aspect of the proposal is that Emporia State University has agreed to accept up to 18 credit hours from existing library/media certificate courses presently offered by Portland State University and Western Oregon State College that are equivalent to courses offered by Emporia State University. Dr. Joyce Pietre from Portland State University and Dr. Richard Forcier from Western Oregon State College, the program leaders for these offerings, have de-
veloped a listing of course offerings to be made available to Emporia State University students and are currently working out the details of the offerings with Dean Hale of The School of Library and Information Management at Emporia State University. These offerings will greatly add to the flexibility and efficiency of how the Oregon students may proceed through the MLS program. Some or all of the Oregon-based courses may be taught over Oregon ED-NET to selected sites around the state.

This innovative use of local higher education resources, combined with educational resources from another state, is one of the first of its kind and may develop into a model for other programs where curricular offerings and resources for an entire program are not totally available within Oregon.

Board Discussion

Dr. Clark highlighted aspects of the program, noting that the State of Oregon Library Federal Funds awarded a $60,000 grant, which will offset the first year's expenses. "Except for a great deal of staff time and campus participation time, we will not be making a resource investment in having a new program available." In response to Board concern about adding a new program, Vice Chancellor Clark clarified that this is a not a new OSSHE program. "We're acting as facilitators to bring in an opportunity for which there has been a demonstrated need."

(No Board action required)

Over the past several years, the Oregon State System has conducted studies of gender comparisons with respect to faculty salaries and the distribution of men and women faculty among academic disciplines as part of its ongoing monitoring of the status of women in the System. Missing from these analyses, however, was information on the promotion of men and women in the faculty ranks. To attempt to fill this gap, a new methodology was developed and pilot tested on a small scale, the results of which are reported here.
Focus of the Pilot Study

The focus of the pilot study was to provide a framework to answer several questions about promotion and other employment changes among tenure-track faculty, the most prominent of which were:

- Do female assistant professors receive tenure in the same proportion and at the same rate as male assistant professors?
- How do men and women compare in the length of time to promotion from associate professor to full professor?
- Are there differences in the frequency and types of leave taken -- sabbaticals and leaves without pay?
- Are there differences in voluntary terminations of employment?
- How do men and women compare in the number taking on administrative assignments?
- Are there differences in the average term of appointment or full-time equivalency (FTE)?

Because the answers to these questions are not readily available from existing databases, a sample of four OSSHE institutions -- two universities and two colleges -- was asked to develop data from personnel records on two cohort groups. The data were compiled and analyzed by staff in the System's Office of Institutional Research.

Methodology

The pilot study followed promotion and employment changes of tenure-track faculty over a ten-year period, from 1981-82 through 1991-92. Two cohort groups were monitored: (1) all assistant professors hired in 1981-82; and (2) all associate professors hired or newly promoted in 1981-82. The 1981-82 academic year was the earliest for which the employment data were readily accessible in all of the sample institutions. Manual record-keeping prior to 1981-82 in some of the institutions made it impractical or unfeasible to study earlier cohorts.
Results

The results of the pilot study are summarized in Table 1. The small number of faculty in the cohort groups -- even when all four institutions' data are combined -- make it difficult and inappropriate to draw general conclusions based on statistical data. However, in general, the pilot study results suggest that in most areas of faculty promotion and employment, the findings for women are comparable to those for men. Possible exceptions to those patterns may lie in the proportionately larger number of women taking sabbatical leave, and the larger number of women in the associate professor cohort who held administrative assignments. Still, with such small numbers in the population, the findings are more suggestive than conclusive.

Limitations

As indicated, the greatest limitation of the pilot study was the small population size, in spite of the fact that all of the newly hired or promoted assistant and associate professors were included in the study cohorts. Part of the reason for the small cohort size lies in the budget restrictions in place during the recessionary 1981-82 year. Later cohorts would likely be somewhat larger. Nevertheless, there is always the possibility that any given year might be anomalous because of external factors, and with small numbers in the cohorts, statistical analysis will always be difficult. The solution to this problem may be to replicate the study periodically and to examine faculty promotion issues in the context of several successive cohorts.

Implications and Proposal

The focus of this pilot study was on the usefulness of the study method as a means of tracking faculty promotion and employment history. With the understanding that general statistical analysis probably is not possible given the inherent problems of cohort size, the data nevertheless are useful in monitoring trends and in identifying potential problems that institutions can subsequently pursue on a case-by-case basis.
Staff propose to conduct the study on a regular basis for all Oregon State System of Higher Education institutions, at least through the end of this decade, after which the usefulness of this approach can be reassessed. Given both institution and Chancellor's Office staff time involved in the study, and the variation in the data expected from year to year, it does not appear necessary to conduct the study more frequently than every two years. Staff plan to include results of the study in the biennial reports to the Board on the status of women in the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

**Board Discussion**

Vice Chancellor Clark commented that the pilot study demonstrates a new methodology developed to answer questions concerning actions OSSHE is taking regarding gender equity relating to the career progress of women and men faculty. Having discussed this with the IFS leadership, there is general agreement that this is a positive feature to add to the regular reporting process.

(No Board action required)
### Table 1

**Ten-Year Faculty Promotion History: 1981-82 Cohorts**

**Total Pilot Study Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professor Cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total in cohort</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average FTE over 10-year period</td>
<td>0.96 FTE</td>
<td>0.94 FTE</td>
<td>0.95 FTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received tenure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average years to tenure</td>
<td>5.6 years</td>
<td>6.4 years</td>
<td>5.9 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied tenure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted to full professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary termination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took a sabbatical leave</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took leave without pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had administrative FTE at some time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |     |     |       |    |       |    |
| **Associate Professor Cohort** |     |     |       |    |       |    |
| Total in cohort       | 33  | 75.0| 11    | 25.0| 44    | 100.0|
| Average FTE over 10-year period | 0.95 FTE | 0.87 FTE | 0.93 FTE |
| Promoted to full professor | 15 | 45.5 | 4 | 36.4 | 19 | 43.2 |
| Average years associate to full professor | 6.2 years | 5.3 years | 6.0 years |
| Voluntary termination | 8   | 24.2| 6     | 54.5| 14    | 31.8|
| Took a sabbatical leave | 20 | 60.6 | 8 | 72.7 | 28 | 63.6 |
| Took leave without pay |     |     |       |    |       |    |
| Once                  | 3   | 9.1 | 3     | 27.3| 6     | 13.6|
| Twice                 | 4   | 12.1| 1     | 9.1 | 5     | 11.4|
| Three times           | 0   | 0.0 | 0     | 0.0 | 0     | 0.0 |
| Had administrative FTE at some time | 2 | 6.1 | 3 | 27.3 | 5 | 11.4 |
The policy on evaluation of chief administrators was revised last in 1985. After review of that policy, staff recommended minor changes to bring the policy into line with current practice.

(NOTE: Underlined material indicates addition; bracketed material indicates deletion.)

EVALUATION OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS


1. The presidents and Chancellor shall be evaluated by the Board. The Chancellor shall assist the Board in assembling the evaluation material for the presidents.

2. The chief administrators shall be evaluated immediately following the initial three-year period of appointment, and additional evaluations shall be undertaken each [three] four years thereafter in accordance with Section 4 of the Board's Executive Management Policy.

3. At the Chancellor's discretion, each year when the Notice of Appointment is issued s/he may hold an informal conference with each president around achievements of the prior year and plans for future accomplishments.

4. Evaluative criteria for the presidents shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

   a. Academic leadership and management
   b. Administrative leadership and management
   c. Internal relationships
      (1) Faculty and staff
      (2) Students
      (3) Alumni and institutionally associated groups
   d. External relationships
      (1) State Board of Higher Education
      (2) Board's staff
      (3) State government
(4) General public, both local and statewide
(5) Regional and national affiliations
  e. Effectiveness in achieving affirmative action objectives and sensitivity to other equity issues
  f. Physical condition

[4]5. Evaluative criteria for the Chancellor shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. Administrative leadership and management
b. Internal relationships
   (1) State Board of Higher Education
   (2) Oregon State System of Higher Education
   (3) Presidents and Board's Office staff
c. External relationships
   (1) State government
   (2) General public
   (3) Regional and national affiliations
d. Effectiveness in achieving affirmative action objectives and sensitivity to other equity issues
e. Physical condition

The following procedural steps for evaluation of the presidents shall be followed:

1. The Chancellor shall consult with the president to be evaluated concerning [a] procedures to be followed in obtaining evaluative material.

2. The president shall be asked to submit a statement concerning the president's stewardship. The statement shall include references to the evaluative criteria in Item [3] 4 above.

3. Following receipt of this statement, the Chancellor shall seek evaluative information from teaching faculty, administrative faculty, students, and related external groups and individuals. Other groups and individuals, both within and outside the institution, shall be given the opportunity to submit evaluative information.

4. The president shall submit the results of a physical examination to the Chancellor.

5. The Chancellor shall prepare and submit to the Board an evaluative report.
6. The Board shall review the evaluative material, after which it may meet with the administrator to discuss the evaluation.

Information needed for evaluation of the Chancellor shall be determined by the Board. (See also "Policy: Evaluation of the Chancellor" adopted Meeting #531, November 22, 1985, pp. 379-381.)

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board approve the revisions to the policy on Evaluation of Chief Administrators.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Swanson moved and Mr. Bailey 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.

Vice Chancellor Large noted that since Congress is still in session the report on the fiscal year 1994 budget would be brought to the Board in January. He pointed out that higher education is subject to some of the federal budget decisions and deficit questions. OSSHE institutions are formulating input on the federal Penny Kasich Amendment for Budget Deficit Reduction, which would negatively impact indirect cost recovery.

Dr. Large mentioned the state postsecondary review entity, which will be created by federal funds. OSSHE and the community and independent colleges will be developing rules and regulations for implementation. The Oregon Educational Policy and Planning Office (OEPP) and the Governor's Office will serve as the host agency. This initiative was developed from the 1992 amendments to the federal Higher Education Act. The plan contains some controversial aspects that may be brought to the Board at some future date.

Grattan Kerans indicated that OSSHE staff have met with the chairs of the state legislative interim committees, with positive results. Representative John Schoon has adjusted his calendar to capitalize
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on the progress of the Board's Work Plan. The same is true for the Senate Committee on Education. The Chancellor met with Senator Catherine Webber and, as a result, she has asked for briefing on the work of the Higher Education 2010 Advisory Panel. She also has delayed until May 25 consideration of what she describes as the Higher Education Act of the 21st Century to consider legislation/policy coordination needs.

Dr. Large thanked the institution presidents and senior staff for sharing campus perspectives about the last legislative session and future direction. Chancellor Bartlett added his appreciation for Mr. Kerans' knowledge, experience, and style of working with legislators.

President Wilson called on Mr. Miller to present the report of the Board Administrative Review Committee (BARC). Mr. Miller provided a brief overview of the work, noting that a more detailed report would be given in January. Committee members agree with the consultant's recommendations that the primary foci of the Chancellor's Office should be policy, leadership, planning, and advocacy.

Another part of the report proposed that processing and direct service activities should be handled at the campus level whenever possible. These activities have been, or are in the process of being, delegated to the campuses.

Installation of the Financial Information System (FIS) is well underway. The initial installations (at the University of Oregon and Portland State University) will be completed in July 1994. Planning for the Human Resource Information System (HRIS) is continuing.

Mr. Miller noted that prior to Measure 5, the Chancellor's Office had a staff of 189 people. There has been a 25 percent reduction; 144 are now employed by the Chancellor's Office.

Mr. Donahue indicated the full report of the Public Information Committee is in preparation and will be distributed within a couple of weeks. The report will consist of a description of the assessment of available research on public attitudes toward higher education and various potential messages that
would help inform the public about higher education. The Committee determined that the first priority was to gain a benchmark understanding of Oregonians' attitudes toward public higher education, how much they know about it, and what they think is important. The Committee's premise is that the more that Oregonians know about OSSHE, the more they will support higher education.

The next step will be to develop a specific message or messages and a marketing plan. Staff will review both the message(s) and plan with the Executive Committee or at a full Board work session in the future.

Mr. Bailey reported that the Joint Working Group has met and is planning for the January 28, 1994, meeting. The main topic of that meeting will be the status of current teacher education programs -- needs and models that fit with the educational reform agenda.

Mr. Swanson indicated that at the October 26, 1993, meeting, the Panel identified and prioritized eight key issues: Education in the Future; Access; Public Support/State Funding; Relating to Others (community colleges, K-12, private colleges); Geographic Focus; Productivity; Central Controls; and Role of Research.

For the November 30 Panel meeting, staff have formulated an initial set of directives that take different approaches to addressing the first two issues.

Mr. Swanson requested a significant block of time at the January Board meeting to present a more detailed report of Panel activity.

Mr. Swanson noted that the final report of the Committee had been submitted at the October Board meeting. OSSHE faculty are, in fact, very productive and in line with national norms. Questions now being asked include how much time should be devoted to research? to undergraduate teaching? Can learning be made more productive? How does new technology assist in attaining that goal? In other words, it is less an issue of academic productivity, and much more a new way of looking at the educational process as a whole.
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Mr. Swanson explained that Requests for Proposals were extended to faculty members, departments, and schools to formulate alternative ways of educating. This is not to demean the customary lecture format, but rather to expand the educational avenues available to meet future needs.

In response to a question about the money set aside as incentive for departments to develop innovative ways of increasing productivity, Chancellor Bartlett clarified that the funds were part of the regular budget for this biennium. Board members discussed the appropriateness of requesting additional money from the legislature. Mr. Swanson shared his conclusion that the legislature is confident that higher education has taken seriously the task of reorganization and efficiency. In his opinion, there is no need to feel hesitant about approaching the legislature "asking for our share of the state dollars that are on the table. There's no reason why other state agencies should have any more claim to those dollars than higher education."

Dr. Large added that the legislature allocated $20 million to help fund the anticipated additional higher education students. Two key issues have emerged from the discussion. One, it is imperative to keep legislative leaders informed of higher education's activity. Two, if the legislature, in the process of internalizing that knowledge, wants to provide extra funding, we want to be in a position to use those dollars as efficiently as possible.

President Wilson noted that since there is no regularly scheduled Board meeting until January, the Board should delegate to the Executive Committee the authority to take action on behalf of the full Board as necessary. Mr. Miller moved the recommendation and 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 12:30 p.m. and reconvened in Work Session at 1:30 p.m.

Chancellor Bartlett provided the framework for a report given by Dr. Peter Kohler, president of the Oregon Health Sciences University. "We are in the midst of one of the great debates on health care.
Academic health centers are deeply affected by any major change in the health delivery system in the United States. Our academic health center, Oregon Health Sciences University, is a very big player in higher education and in the state. We should be alert to the broader issues that may affect one of our largest activities."

Dr. Kohler described the issues of access, quality, and cost as they relate to health care. Approximately 450,000 Oregonians do not have covered health care, except very late in the course of an illness and at very high cost. "The quality of health care is surprisingly spotty. While people can receive very high-quality care in this state and country, the U.S. falls behind every other civilized nation in the world in a number of areas, one of which is infant mortality. There are also areas in which a large segment of our population is not nearly as well covered. Disease prevention is not utilized enough in the system that we have." 

"The cost, however, is clearly the thing that's driving the health care agenda. This year or next, health care costs will reach about a trillion dollars nationally. That's about 15 percent of our gross national product right now, and every expectation is that it will continue to increase. Three of the top four employers in the City of Portland are health related; this shows the size of the enterprise."

Dr. Kohler described the Oregon Health Plan, designed by former Senator John Kitzhaber. One part of the Plan was Medicaid, which provides coverage for individuals below the federal poverty line. The University Hospital is a provider of last resort to a number of individuals who currently have no health coverage. "We have an absolutely open-door policy for children and something very close to that for adults."

A second part of the Oregon Health Plan was insurance coverage for high-risk patients. A third part was the employer mandate, thereby increasing access.

Dr. Kohler named various organizations examining the Oregon Health Plan. The Health Services Commission was formed in 1989 to help set priorities.
There is a Health Resources Commission to address the issue of technology transfer and the high cost of various entities having the same technology. The Oregon Health Council, charged by the Governor, advises her on how the Oregon Health Plan is working.

The Clinton Health Plan evolved from a "pay or play" concept (if an employer doesn't cover its employees, it would have to pay for somebody else to cover them) to "managed competition." President Kohler explained that "it means you would have a group of plans competing against each other in such a way that it would drive the cost of health care down. Clinton added to the idea of managed competition some kind of cap on health care spending, which would be another way to drive down health care costs." Health care providers would form groups (called "plans"), and alliances (regional or corporate) would purchase health care from a managed plan. A national board would set policy. "I think the managed care idea is just beginning to sink in. The risk to the person covered will go from having too much done for them to having too little. An appropriate balance will need to be struck."

Having provided summary background, Dr. Kohler highlighted how the Oregon Health Sciences University may be affected by these changes. The Medicaid part of the Oregon Health Plan begins February 1, 1994. He noted that the University is developing a private HMO with the ODS Insurance Company. University Hospital has handled a large proportion of indigent patient care. If that same population were now covered by some form of insurance, other health care providers might remember their altruistic origins. The University will need to train more primary care physicians and nurses and downsize tertiary care training programs.

The question was raised about the financial remuneration attached to the Medicaid part of the Oregon Health Plan. Dr. Kohler noted, "Medicaid is actually a very small part. Of the 450,000 currently in the gap population, perhaps 120,000 of those are covered by Medicaid. The biggest part by far are working people who are not covered. And they still won't be covered -- in other words, they're not part of Medicaid groups, so the money
isn't going to start rolling in until something is done about the mandate -- either from the employer or the individual."

The University is also receiving requests to provide more clinical services in rural parts of the state. "I think in the future it will be very important to have clinics that are different, that include nurse practitioners and probably family practitioners together in such a way that the entire population is covered."

On June 26, 1992, the Board adopted the recommendations of the Board's Tuition Policy Committee. The Committee's basic recommendation was to charge Oregon resident undergraduate students an instruction fee no more than one-third the average cost of instruction. However, the Committee also suggested that after fundamental education needs were met, the users of educational services should bear a larger portion of the cost of instruction. That objective led to Board acceptance of the Committee's recommendation that resident students who accumulate more than 32 credit hours beyond those required for a baccalaureate degree should pay non-resident tuition rates. The recommendation included the possibility of "appropriate exception and waivers..." A subsequent staff implementation plan, presented to the Board Finance and Administration Committee in April 1993, recommended that the same objective could be met by raising the credit hour threshold to 48 credit hours beyond the total degree requirement, with no exceptions or waivers. The Committee requested details on how many students exceeded their degree requirements.

At the May meeting of the Finance and Administration Committee, the staff submitted a report on the numbers of students that would be subject to this policy. The report indicated that, of the 2,031 seniors in 1991-92 at or above the credit hours necessary for their specific degrees, 572 students exceeded a 32-credit-hour limit and 342 exceeded a 48-credit-hour limit. After considerable discussion by the Committee, concerns remained whether the 48-hour-credit limit provided enough incentive to reduce excessive credit hours toward a degree versus the administrative cost of implementing a more restrictive threshold with greater exceptions. There are a wide range of degree credit hour require-
ments, plus special situations, that add credit hours to degree programs including double majors, honors programs, and arts performance requirements, as well as transfer students.

The credit hour threshold proposal is still pending, as reported in the educational reform discussion at the Board's October work session. The current plan is to consider the credit hour threshold option along with other options as part of the educational reform approach to increase student learning productivity in planning for 1995-1997.

Board Discussion

There was discussion about the percentage of students who would be impacted by such a threshold and administrative costs of implementation. Vice Chancellor Ihrig pointed out that those are considerations already being evaluated by staff. Rob Nosse of the Oregon Student Lobby indicated that course requirements might be streamlined. Chancellor Bartlett made the personal observation that academic requirements may need to be re-evaluated in light of productivity issues and resource allocation strategies. Dr. Clark commented that the issue of degree requirements has come before the Academic Council. Final comments centered around the notion that at the rate tuition is rising, the need for a credit hour threshold might be negated since students will want to finish as quickly as possible.

(No Board action required)

Summary

Over the last five years, there has been increased interest and activity in postsecondary assessment at the institutional, state, and national levels. Assessment of the undergraduate student experience in higher education is linked to higher education reform and calls for academic improvement and external accountability. The goal of assessment is to demonstrate the effects of higher education on the intellectual, personal, and occupational development of students.

The Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE) has been involved in assessment activities that respond to demands for academic improvement and
accountability. A brief chronology of this activity follows:

First, a Task Force on Assessment was appointed in April 1991 to develop an inventory of current assessment activities on OSSHE campuses as well as efforts of other institutions, states, and national groups and to make recommendations for Systemwide approaches to assessment and accountability. The final report and recommendations were presented to the Board of Higher Education in March 1992 and later shared with the Joint Boards of Education.

Second, the Academic Council has been working with a national expert in assessment to develop guiding principles for a Systemwide assessment policy.

Third, the Academic Council is considering an OSSHE Assessment Model that will focus on strategies for assessing students at three points during the undergraduate years: admissions, an interim checkpoint such as matriculation to junior status, and graduation. OSSHE campuses have begun the development of assessment plans in response to this emerging framework. Integral to the framework is work underway to develop proficiency-based admission standards in response to Oregon's school reform plans.

Fourth, the Chancellor's Office has designated a position, Senior Policy Associate for Assessment and Planning, to focus on the definition, development, and implementation of assessments of the student experience at the System level.

This report reviews (1) the national and Oregon context for assessment and (2) details the recent efforts of OSSHE to develop an assessment system that will include appropriate programs, activities, indicators, and reporting mechanisms. OSSHE intends to meet a variety of internal and external needs for information about how well OSSHE is performing compared to national and other standards. Accountability about OSSHE's performance is essential not only for developing public awareness and support but for continuously improving the quality and effectiveness of OSSHE's programs.
THE ASSESSMENT ENVIRONMENT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The National Context

Assessment of the undergraduate student experience in higher education is linked to calls for academic improvement and external accountability. First, assessment emerged as an essential component of internal and external reform agendas in reports on undergraduate education in the 1980s [e.g., Access to Quality Undergraduate Education (Southern Regional Education Board, 1985); Involvement in Learning (National Institute of Education, 1984)] which called for re-examining the structure and content of the undergraduate curriculum. National reform reports such as Time for Results (National Governors' Association, 1986) emphasized the use of assessment as a tool for reform. Second, accountability in higher education has become an issue of critical importance as a result of public concern about the effects of higher education investment given its escalating costs, higher prices for students, shrinking financial resources due to increased competition from other state programs, and demands to serve more and different groups of students.

In response to these reports, there has been increased interest and activity in postsecondary assessment at the institutional, state, and national levels in the last five years. The goal of outcomes assessment is to demonstrate that higher education makes a difference in the intellectual, personal, and occupational development of students and prepares them appropriately to assume responsible leadership roles in the 21st century. (A brief report to the Oregon Progress Board, Board of Higher Education, October 1992.)

The quality of higher education institutions continues to be described primarily in terms of their inputs (e.g., number of students enrolled, number of courses offered, number of volumes in the library, number of full professors) and to a lesser extent workload (e.g., average number of student contact hours per faculty, faculty/student ratio). However, postsecondary assessment stipulates that the quality and effectiveness of higher education should be judged by its outputs and value added to the participants (e.g., what students learn, number
who graduate, number who are employed in their field).

This shifting of emphasis from describing input to assessing outcome has prompted many institutions, accrediting agencies, and professional associations to investigate the congruency between an institution's course/credit requirements and its academic mission and goals. Why are specific courses and certain numbers and combinations of courses required? The assumption is that by selecting certain courses, certain types of learning will occur.

The National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment at Pennsylvania State University has been looking at the factors that improve student learning and has established a consortium addressing assessment initiatives. Members of the consortium include Pennsylvania State University, University of Illinois at Chicago, Syracuse, Northwestern, and Arizona State University. A total of 18 projects are included in the Consortium's assessment efforts. Research indicates that institutions can identify clusters of courses that are more likely to lead to the desired outcome (such as improvement in critical thinking, communication skills) for certain groups of students (Ratcliff, 1992).

A concomitant interest in the outcomes of higher education is looking to factors that influence the retention and degree completion of undergraduate students. A number of states (as well as the Task Force for Assessing the National Goals Relating to Postsecondary Education) are examining persistence and graduation rates of undergraduate students. This type of information is useful for revising programs and student advising. A growing body of research about the student learning experience indicates that differences in student learning are greater within institutions than between them (Baird, 1988).

In sum, assessment looks at the long-term effects/outcomes of education and learning and serves two functions -- program improvement and public accountability. As a program improvement tool, assessment reveals the gaps between what higher education wants to accomplish with students and what students have actually learned. As an accountabili-
ty tool, assessment can be used to describe student learning to identifiable audiences for clearly articulated reasons.

The Oregon Context

A number of questions are being raised by states (including Oregon) about higher education in the context of their key public priorities:

- What are the priorities in which education plays a part?
- What is the specific role of higher education in accomplishing these priorities?
- What are authentic indicators of the contributions of higher education to the attainment of priorities?
- How can these indicators best be collected, measured, described, and analyzed?
- What role does assessment play in establishing benchmarks and monitoring progress from those benchmarks? (Ratcliff, June 1993)

In Oregon, benchmarks developed by the Oregon Progress Board are a basis for setting program and budget priorities and seeking interagency cooperation on broad issues.

One group of benchmarks addresses the need for "well educated, capable people" to support the economic development and diversification of the state. Specifically, benchmarks for adult formal education attainment have been established as the percentage of adult Oregonians who have completed baccalaureate and advanced degrees by the year 2000 and 2010. In 1990, the goal was for 23 percent of adults (426,700) to hold baccalaureates, but the actual number achieved was only 21 percent of Oregon's adult population (382,171). In the year 2000, the goal is for 27 percent to hold baccalaureates (556,200). Will these goals help Oregon attain its key public priorities? Are they realistic?

- The actual educational attainment of Oregon's adults is slightly below that of other western states including Washington, Colorado,

- A survey of the best cities for business by Fortune 500 notes significantly higher levels of educational attainment of adults in cities that are magnets for high technology industries. For example, in Raleigh/Durham, North Carolina almost 32 percent of the adults hold baccalaureates (12 percent have graduate degrees). The educational levels in all but one of the cities in the top ten exceed the educational attainment levels of adults in Portland (where 23 percent hold baccalaureates and 8 percent hold graduate degrees) and are higher today than Oregon's benchmark goals for the year 2000.

Although the gap between OSSHE's declining enrollment trends and benchmark targets has been noted elsewhere, there is concern that Oregon's benchmark goals for educational attainment levels may not be sufficient either to compete with the best or meet Oregon's public priorities.

In addition to producing a certain number of degree holders, a major issue in "measuring" the attainment of this benchmark includes identifying the goals and standards by which postsecondary education can be assessed. Identification of common competencies and appropriate levels of proficiency for the undergraduate core and common for all fields of study and types of institutions is one of the primary challenges facing OSSHE in the development of an effective assessment program.

**OSSHE ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES**

This environment prompted OSSHE to establish a Task Force on Assessment in April 1991 and marks the beginning of OSSHE's commitment at the System level to assessing higher education outcomes. The Task Force reviewed the national literature related to outcomes assessment, examined assessment activities and experiences of numerous states, and compiled an inventory of current assessment activities conducted within OSSHE. (Examples of assessment practices, initiatives, and policy approaches being taken nationally are included in Appendix A.)
The final report and recommendations were presented to the Board of Higher Education and the Joint Boards of Education in March 1992.

In response to the principal recommendations of the Task Force, the Office of Academic Affairs has been working with the institutions to review their programs of assessment, identify omissions or gaps, and determine what steps should be taken to provide a comprehensive Systemwide approach. Assessment of postsecondary student learning typically includes skills in communications, writing, critical thinking, and problem-solving. These are common to all disciplinary areas for postsecondary student learning. Other variables for student learning include content, cognitive learning, values and attitudes, and retention and persistence.

- The OSSHE Academic Council has been reviewing assessment strategies being used elsewhere in the United States and planning for the development of an assessment framework for the OSSHE campuses during the past several years.

- OSSHE produced an Inventory of OSSHE Assessment Activities (December 1991) that described the variety of assessment activities conducted by individual institutions and/or the Chancellor's Office (e.g., assessments related to enrollment and retention, undergraduate student outcomes, alumni surveys, graduate student outcomes).

- The Council conducted three planning discussions (June, September, and November 1993) with a national expert in assessment, Professor James Ratcliff, director of the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment at Pennsylvania State University (described in previous section).

As a result of the Task Force effort and the current planning discussions of the Academic Council, a number of principles were formulated to guide the development of an OSSHE assessment framework.

- The institutions will use existing assessment efforts within OSSHE as a starting point for developing standards for postsecondary assessment.
Individual institution efforts are critically important and should relate to their respective missions and should reflect the diversity within the State System.

There will be institutional flexibility in determining appropriate timing of the mid-point assessment in light of program organization.

Assessment efforts should stimulate reform.

Demonstration projects will be used so OSSHE institutions can pursue their respective interests but share experience and wisdom with other campuses.

Assessment efforts should improve individual institutional performance as well as the State System's performance.

OSSHE will coordinate separate efforts to assure that separate activities are integrated into a Systemwide assessment effort to provide evidence about what OSSHE is doing.

**Proposed Assessment Model**

A broad-based assessment of general student learning at the undergraduate level should measure:

1. The level of cognitive skills and abilities to be learned.

2. The values, attitudes, and motivations toward learning to be acquired.

3. The scope of curricular content in fields of study to be learned.

4. Progress, persistence, and level of performance expected (for example, completing degrees, high marks, etc.).

The areas in which learning can be assessed include the curriculum, instructional practices, out-of-class learning/living/interacting, and organizational policies and practices.
The OSSHE Assessment Model will focus upon assessment strategies at three key "checkpoints" during the college years:

1. **Admissions.** The first assessment checkpoint would be both diagnostic and prescriptive and would occur during the admissions process. There could be several Systemwide measures for the admissions checkpoint such as writing, math, critical thinking, and likelihood of retention.

The institutional concern should focus on whether a student's abilities and interests can be fully developed on a campus. There are likely to be some commonalties in standards across the System and some that are unique to institutions. At the admissions checkpoint, a decision of whether to admit a student will be made.

2. **Interim Checkpoint.** The second major assessment checkpoint would be around the students' matriculation to junior status. This would be designed as a "temperature check" of general education skills and abilities.

3. **Graduation.** The third assessment checkpoint will happen near baccalaureate degree completion. This focus should be on identifying differences in outcomes for students who graduate from our institutions. Specific attention would be given to differences related to certain student groups (e.g., students from rural areas, diverse ethnic groups, commuting students, part-time students, mid-career students).

Assessment data collected at this point will be used to improve OSSHE programs and organization structures that may foster or impede student progress in order to better serve students who represent diverse backgrounds.

**Next Steps**

OSSHE campuses will be asked to develop assessment plans, based on the three-part framework, proposed above. The Chancellor's Office would also develop a Systemwide plan, incorporating data elements that
would be collected from the campuses through the Office of Academic Affairs, the Institutional Research Services Office, and other Systemwide resources. The Office of Academic Affairs has designated a position, Senior Policy Associate for Assessment and Planning, to focus on the definition, development, and implementation of assessments of the student experience at the System level. Nancy Goldschmidt assumed this assignment on November 1, 1993.

A number of issues will need to be resolved, including how postsecondary assessment connects with K-12 reform, employer concerns about adequate preparation for the workplace, and community college transfer policies; identifying what are appropriate proficiency levels, what areas (e.g., critical thinking skills) should be assessed and when; whether all students will realize their general education goal.

Systemwide policies and initiatives to support implementation of the assessment plans will be addressed, including fiscal support of systematic assessment approaches, identification of common data elements to be collected at each campus, revised college proficiency admissions requirements, campus incentives to develop specific assessments, and consultative assistance to campuses.

A date for campus plans to be submitted to the Chancellor's Office will be established. Implementation initiatives would begin soon after with a report on assessment to the Board to follow.

(No Board action required)
Appendix A

EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT PRACTICES, INITIATIVES, POLICIES

- Florida's "rising junior exam," is designed to assure readiness for entry to junior level in four-year institutions. Despite this exam's existence for a number of years, no other state has gone this direction. Florida developed its own instrument.

- New Jersey uses its own exam for entering students to test for basic skills; used for placement. New Jersey also developed the General Intellectual Skills Test, tested it and then stopped use of it due to state budget shortfall. The test is very expensive to administer.

- Tennessee is using the ACT COMP at entry to four-year colleges and universities and at end of senior year. With this exam, and others like it (from ETS), all the research suggests its lack of usefulness in showing the true impacts of a four-year undergraduate education. It is too gross a measure to capture the distinctive academic experiences of a diverse group of students in different academic settings. Also, student motivation to take the test seriously, to do their best, is very low. Further, this exam has not been useful at the local institutional level for diagnosing areas in need of change thereby enabling local administrators to use the information to develop an improvement plan.

- All national trends are away from using single standardized tests to show learning gains over the years of the undergraduate education experience. (Major reasons: expensive, student motivation is lacking, too gross a measure to capture the distinctiveness of a particular institution, measurement problems with pre-/post-testing trying to show gains.)

- In response to demands for accountability at state levels, the trend is toward the notion of "comprehensive performance indicators" -- a kind of report card. The notion here is to identify from 15-20 different indicators of institutional performance, including measures of inputs, processes, and outcomes. All institutions in a state would collect and provide this set of data to state boards and other state policy groups. The demand for accountability is driving this movement. The states that are most active so far are South Carolina and Texas, with Minnesota about to become involved.

- Goal number 5 of the National Education Goals for graduating seniors includes performance in critical thinking, problem-solving, and communications. NCES is currently involved in a design activity focused on developing instruments for use in the national assessment of these skills. While the interest here is
In the master plan (December 1987), the State of Washington's Higher Education coordinating Board recommended that each two-year, four-year, and one-year instructional conduct a pilot study to evaluate the appropriateness of using standard tests as a measure for estimating the communication, co-operative, and critical thinking skills of college sophomores. The purpose for such a meeting would be for instructors to strengthen their

ability data to the public.

corectively improve teaching and learning, and provide account-
To design and implement the study requested by the master plan, two task forces were established -- representing the public baccalaureate institutions and the community colleges. Both task forces included faculty and academic administrators from each participating institution and two HBC Board staff members. The two task forces worked in parallel and ultimately conducted a joint study.

Only three tests met the criteria of the HBC Board recommendation for study: the Academic Profile (AP), the College Outcome Measures Program (COMP), and the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP). Over 1,300 sophomore students from the public four-year institutions and from eight two-year colleges were tested, with each student taking two of the three tests. More than 100 faculty members from the same institutions took shortened versions of the tests and critiqued them for appropriateness of content and usefulness.

The results of the pilot study strongly suggest that the three tests do not provide an appropriate or useful assessment of the communication, computation, and critical thinking skills of Washington college sophomores. None of the tests studied measured the separate academic skills (communication, computation, and critical thinking). Rather, these tests primarily measured verbal and quantitative aptitude.

- Ninety percent of institutions have a distributional liberal education requirement. Research suggests that students are taking only five to seven percent of their courses in common. This is a commentary on how diverse the curriculum is and how reflective this is of modern society. This curricular diversity has developed since World War II. We talk about a core curriculum, however, the kind of diversity we have found in our institutions does not suggest a core at all, but rather a menu. This reflects the complexities of knowledge, structure, etc. Assessment must recognize the many different paths students take to degree completion, hence a rationale for not looking at courses taken but student learning outcomes.

- Studies that have been completed by the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment have found that the differences in student learning are greater within a single institution than between institutions. People who enroll in different coursework learn different knowledge, skills, and abilities (and from this, students maximize their strengths). Many walks of life are served by institutions of higher education. There is great curricular as well as student diversity. Assessment models must take cognizance of this complexity.
• A process is underway in a national project (National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment) to identify common standards among a variety of institutions. Only a handful of institutions have programs that assess at different points in time. Some are state-imposed and some are locally-generated. Those institutions that have tended to generate their own assessment programs in the past generally still have them today. Those institutions that have generated them when they have been required by state legislatures tend not to use the data for program improvements.

• Assessments at the community colleges are being used primarily as a diagnostic tool.

• At the matriculation level, there are many examples of assessment programs; however, most are state-imposed, such as in the case in Florida with its "rising junior" test.

• Oklahoma takes one dollar of every student registration to go to assessment of students.

• Some institutions require the GRE of all students as a "graduation" assessment -- the students are expected to pay for this testing.

• Many colleges have embedded examinations in their curriculum as a graduation/exit assessment.

• A British university requires an end-of-year broad examination. Students sit for exams and a decision is made if they are ready to move on. The emphasis here is to move away from small activities that are primarily course-related to broader knowledge that is expected for college graduates. The emphasis is on cumulative student learning, not learning gained in individual classes.

• Studies on transfer students indicate that students take the majority of their work in institutions other than those from which they graduate. From a state policy perspective, it is better to ask a question about the student than the institution.

• The British model in higher education builds matriculation examinations into the faculty expectations. It is five percent, generally, of a faculty member's duties and not an add-on.

• Northwest Missouri State instituted a program of assessment during a time of fiscal retrenchment in Missouri.

• A university in Florida compares GREs to SATs.
King College in Pennsylvania uses senior year writing/credit skills and exams embedded in curricular requirements and in senior capstone seminars during which papers are written and evaluated by faculty across the institution. They provide for different kinds of allocation of time. Some of these are requirements for graduation and even do double-duty as course papers.

Findings from the research on assessment and assessment frameworks reveal that variation in student learning is greater within a single institution than among institutions (e.g., commuting students take longer to complete their programs and do not do as well as residential students).

Students who enroll in different coursework learn different knowledge, skills, and abilities. Most institutions have from 1,000 to 3,000 courses. Most students select only 45 courses per year. Typically students have less than 15 percent of courses in common when student transcripts are reviewed. Students benefit from a mix of curricular and extra-curricular learning activities that match their interests, aptitudes, and prior achievements. Much discussion has occurred about a core-curriculum approach versus diversity in curriculum approach related to this finding.

There is a shift nationally in assessment programs in past decades from a report card, comparative approach, to a focus now on the student -- in the areas of teaching and learning and assessment of learning.

The National Center is studying the Coursework Cluster Academic Model (CCAM). This looks at how students gained learning, in part by looking at the course pattern differences and the coursework.
BUSINESS PLAN

The Board's 1993-94 Work Plan, priority area Business Plan, includes an item entitled: Reconfigure the System to deal with projected 40 percent growth in student demand for higher education in Oregon between now and the year 2002. A subheading listed six possible strategies; it was the Board's intent to return to them to decide which ones should be given priority in future planning.

1. Traditional campus configuration, missions, and programs reviewed and modified, and enrollment targets redefined;

2. Use new technologies in on- and off-campus settings statewide to teach more students at lower cost per student;

3. Academic program mix and support services reconfigured to expand undergraduate capacity;

4. Systemwide academic programs that can be provided where and when needed to address changing demand and spread overhead costs;

5. New approaches to improve integration of programs with other education sectors in Oregon; and

6. Adjustments to facilities plans to reflect new directions.

The purpose of the discussion during the Work Session was to reach consensus on which strategies should be given highest priority in the System's planning. It was understood that plans in this area would be provided to the Higher Education 2010 Advisory Panel and, in turn, emerging themes of the Panel would be used in these deliberations.

Board Discussion

Staff were asked to comment on the accuracy of the projected 40 percent growth in demand for higher education given flat enrollments in OSSHE and Portland-area high schools. Vice Chancellor Ihrig indicated that staff are watching the trends closely to determine if the change is due to K-12 enrollments, tuitions, cuts in academic programs, or other factors.
Vice Chancellor Large emphasized the necessity for careful examination of the demographics. "If you divide the population into quartiles based on income, we're only educating about eight percent of the bottom quartile. Our society may be in real trouble if we don't figure out a way to be more effective with the low income and minority students." He also questioned the reliability of the projection for numbers of high school graduates and whether we would begin to see more of the lower income group failing to graduate from high school. The Chancellor concurred. "It's too soon for us to try to figure out what's happening this term. We just don't have enough information, but we can extrapolate. Either some of the variables are going to have to change, some of the past experience needs to be modified for the future, or we will see a natural working out of our experience. As the number of children from relatively low economic levels increase, college-going rates will decrease, and that would be a terrible thing to have happen given where we think our society should go."

President Wilson concluded that the Board continues to welcome comment from staff. "It sounds as if the direction is all of the above. We're open to creativity. We're open to more differences than what we've had in the past. We're open to whatever it takes to figure out how to get the job done. That's what we want to see the institutions thinking about.

"I'm sure we're putting the best talent in the state to a very difficult problem. We are extremely fortunate to have the administration and faculty to help us through this. Tapping and utilizing that to the ultimate is one of our major challenges as a Board."

(No Board action required)
Meeting #624

ADJOURNMENT

President Wilson again thanked President Brand for the morning visit presentation. The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Virginia L. Thompson
Secretary of the Board

Janice J. Wilson
President of the Board

November 19, 1993
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