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ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 8:15 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. Bobby Lee                Ms. Janice Wilson

Mr. Richard Donahue and Mr. Jim Willis were absent due to conflicts in their schedules. Ms. Karen Madden Evans, newly appointed Board member, attended the meeting.

Chancellor's Office -- Chancellor Thomas A. Bartlett; Virginia Boushey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Robin Brown, Associate Director, School Relations; Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Andy Clark, Associate Director, Government Relations; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Francesca Clifford, Public Relations Specialist; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; David Conley, School Reform Liaison; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services and Compliance Officer; Weldon E. Ihrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Steve Katz, Controller; Grattan Kerans, Director, Government Relations; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Joe McNaught, Attorney-in-Charge, Education Section; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; Stacy Pearson, Director, Internal Audit Division; George Pernsteiner, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Virginia L. Thompson, Board Secretary.

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

Oregon Health Sciences University -- President Peter Kohler; Lesley M. Hallick, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.
The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the November 19, 1993, meeting of the Board. Dr. Aschkenasy moved approval of the minutes as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

President Wilson welcomed new student Board member Karen Madden Evans, whose Senate confirmation is scheduled for February 9. Ms. Wilson noted that Ms. Madden Evans is a senior at Western Oregon State College and is serving as student body president. She is completing the unexpired term of Laurie Yokota. Ms. Madden Evans expressed appreciation for her appointment to the Board and is accepting it with great anticipation.
Ms. Wilson reviewed the dates and purposes of upcoming meetings of the Higher Education 2010 Advisory Panel and Executive Committee of the Board.

Ms. Wilson also reported on a visit to New York where she met with key people in both the State University of New York (SUNY) and City University of New York (CUNY) systems. The purpose of her visit was to discuss various approaches to the difficult problems facing higher education. "I found that we are asking the same questions and dealing with the same issues they are. In some areas, we're a little further ahead, especially in the area of differential tuition. In other areas, they are further ahead, such as strategic planning. I met some very creative, talented, interesting people. I returned convinced we are dealing with and moving along on every major question."

CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

Chancellor Bartlett noted three new employees to the Chancellor’s Office. Ms. Stacy Pearson has accepted the position of director of Internal Audit Division. She is a CPA with a strong background in internal auditing. Ms. Pearson has earned both bachelor’s and master’s degrees.

Dr. Bartlett called on Grattan Kerans to introduce the new associate director of Government Relations, Andy Clark. Mr. Clark served as a legislative assistant to State Representative Jim Edmundson in the 1991 session and for two-and-one-half years worked in the Washington office of Congressman Peter DeFazio.

Finally, the Chancellor welcomed Dr. Bill Danley of Southern Oregon State College. Dr. Danley is the new president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate.

The Chancellor recognized and greeted Roger Olsen, director of OCATE, who was attending the meeting following an extended illness.

OREGON ADMINISTRATIVE RULE 580-10-040, RESIDENCE CLASSIFICATION OF ALIENS

In response to an inquiry about the residency status of students who are aliens with Family Unity or Voluntary Departure in Lieu of Family Unity Status, staff concluded that such students should be eligible for residency if they would otherwise be considered residents. As a result of research on the matter, staff learned that individuals holding "H" and "L" visas are no longer precluded from acquiring U.S. domiciles. Staff proposes language to reflect this change.
Staff Report

During 1993, staff received an inquiry regarding potential residency status for aliens with Family Unity or Voluntary Departure in Lieu of Family Unity Status. Aliens with this status have been in the United States continuously since 1988 and have met the requirements for legalized permanent residence but must wait, as annual quotas are filled, to receive permanent residency status. This process may take a few years. Individuals who qualify for Family Unity or Voluntary Departure in Lieu of Family Unity Status may have met all other requirements to achieve Oregon residency except the receipt of permanent residence status.

During the course of research on Family Unity or Voluntary Departure in Lieu of Family Unity Status, staff learned that aliens with two other visa categories -- "H" (aliens entering for durational employment or training, and their families) and "L" (employees transferred to U.S. operations temporarily, and their families) -- are no longer precluded from acquiring U.S. domiciles. The current rule prohibits students holding "H" and "L" visas from residency because they were unable previously to acquire a U.S. domicile. Because this is no longer the case, students with "H" and "L" visas could now, if they met all other requirements, establish an Oregon domicile.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following amendments to Oregon Administrative Rule 580-10-040 to reflect changes in immigration law and to allow students who have these immigration classifications and who meet all other Board requirements to establish residency.

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

Residence Classification of Aliens

580-10-040 (1) An alien holding an immigrant visa or an A, E, G, H, I, [or] K, or L visa, or granted refugee or political asylum, Family Unity or Voluntary Departure in Lieu of Family Unity status, or otherwise admitted for permanent residence in the United States, is eligible to be considered an Oregon resident if OAR 580-10-030 is otherwise satisfied. The date of receipt of the immigrant visa, the date of approval of political asylum or refugee status, or the date of approval of lawful permanent residence, whichever is earlier, shall be the date upon which the 12 months
and other residency requirements under OAR 580-10-030 shall begin to accrue.

(2) Notwithstanding any other rule, an alien possessing a nonimmigrant or temporary, i.e., B, C, D, F, [H,] J, [L,] or M visa cannot be classified as a resident.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Ihrig explained that the intent of the amendments was to bring the State System’s residency rules in alignment with federal guidelines for residency. Dr. Aschkenasy asked about the financial impact; Mr. Ihrig noted there was none. Additionally, Dr. Aschkenasy requested staff include information regarding financial impact when presenting items for Board consideration. Ms. Wilson concurred.

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

Staff Report to the Board

The Oregon State University Foundation received from John F. Morgan a gift of land adjacent to the Oregon State University McDonald Forest. The Foundation, after consultation with Oregon State University officials, has forwarded to the Office of Finance and Administration a request to donate the land to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education for the use and benefit of the Oregon State University College of Forestry. The parcel of land contains approximately 17.5 acres and features hilly terrain forested with a variety of hardwoods and fir trees and is bordered by McDonald Forest on the north and west. An appraisal by a certified land appraiser sets the value of the property at $679,000.

The property has never been developed, and the donor has attested that, to the best of his knowledge, there are no hazardous materials on the property. Oregon State University personnel physically reviewed the property and completed a Property Environmental Information Disclosure Site Inspection Report required by the Board; it was determined that there were no signs or evidence of any conditions that would indicate a potential problem with hazardous materials or wastes.
The property is currently zoned for forest use. The College of Forestry will use the parcel in the same manner as McDonald Forest, which is managed for research, teaching, demonstration, and other educational uses.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended the Office of Finance and Administration be authorized to accept on behalf of Oregon State University the parcel of land from the Oregon State University Foundation.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Ms. Christopher moved approval of the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

**Staff Report to the Board**

Institutional officials at Southern Oregon State College have forwarded to the Office of Finance and Administration an option to purchase a parcel of land within the approved campus boundaries. The property is in the southeast portion of the campus and is bordered on three sides by Southern Oregon State College property. It is in an area identified on the campus master plan as student family housing and/or faculty/staff housing and as an area needed should the south perimeter road be constructed. The parcel of land contains approximately 0.35 acres and has a single-family residence on the property. The property is being offered by the owner for $115,000, which is slightly above the average of the two appraisals made on the property. Southern Oregon State College has indicated its willingness to pay the premium for the property due to its critical location and importance in relation to the south perimeter road.

The property has been used as a private residence for the past 73 years and the seller, to the best of his knowledge, attested that there are no known hazardous materials on the property. Southern Oregon State College personnel physically reviewed the property and completed a Property Environmental Information Disclosure Site Inspection Report required by the Board; it was determined that there were no signs or evidence of any conditions that would indicate a potential problem with hazardous materials or wastes.
The property is currently zoned for residential use. Southern Oregon State College will use the parcel for family student housing and for the south perimeter road project should it proceed.

The purchase will be funded from $95,000 of Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds and from balances available to the institution. The purchase is to be made under authority of Chapter 734, Section 6(1), OL 1989.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended the Office of Finance and Administration be authorized to purchase, on behalf of Southern Oregon State College, the parcel of land from John P. Weston for the purchase price of $115,000.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Lee asked for clarification about the use of the property for student housing and associated costs. Mr. Ihrig provided more detail, noting that the existing house will be rented and used for family housing until Southern Oregon State College is ready to install the road. At that time, the house will be demolished. The rental income will offset the maintenance costs.

Mr. Ihrig responded to other questions regarding the financial aspects of this purchase. The phrase "balances available to the institution" is a generic term referring to funds within the institution that will cover the $20,000 difference. He noted that all the campuses have a facilities master plan identifying campus boundaries and future improvements. The road location was evaluated within that context, thereby facilitating the decision to proceed with the purchase. Currently, there is no funding to install the road. However, it is appropriate to the long-term goals of the master plan to take advantage of purchasing opportunities as they arise to get the best possible price.

Mr. Bailey moved and Mr. Richardson seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, and Wilson. Those voting no: Director Lee.
Staff Report to the Board

Fee rates and policies are set forth in the preliminary Summer Session Fee Book. Rates are recommended for Board approval as submitted by the institutions. A public hearing was held on January 3, 1994, and a report on that hearing is included in this narrative.

Summer Session Instruction Fees

The direct cost support policy for summer instruction, which began in 1982, is continued in the recommendation for 1994. However, the impact of Measure 5 on the institutions has also created the need for a greater contribution from the summer session toward the indirect costs associated with these programs. The direct cost support feature has resulted in institutional fee recommendations that reflect the differences in programs as well as the differences in approaches to balancing program costs with resources. Similarities of the institutional fee structures include incremental charges for each additional credit hour and undergraduate/graduate rate differentials. Residency status is not normally assigned during summer session and is not applicable to summer fee determination. However, the University of Oregon is proposing a two-year experiment in assessing a resident/nonresident instruction fee differential. Nonresident summer session students will be assessed an additional $25 per credit hour. This will require a residency determination to be made for University of Oregon summer session students.

There are no other proposed changes to fee policies.

Instruction fee increases have been recommended by six institutions. Increases are, in general, a consequence of inflation factors affecting costs.
Instruction fee rates recommended for 1994 compare with 1993 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>1994 First Hour</th>
<th>1994 Each Add'l Hour</th>
<th>1993 First Hour</th>
<th>1993 Each Add'l Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO Residents</td>
<td>$95.50</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$91.50</td>
<td>$66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Nonresidents</td>
<td>120.50</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>91.50</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>96.50</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>108.50</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>115.50</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>81.50</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>58.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>1994 First Hour</th>
<th>1994 Each Add'l Hour</th>
<th>1993 First Hour</th>
<th>1993 Each Add'l Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO Residents</td>
<td>$143.50</td>
<td>$113.00</td>
<td>$136.50</td>
<td>$106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Nonresidents</td>
<td>168.50</td>
<td>138.00</td>
<td>136.50</td>
<td>106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law. Sem./Res.</td>
<td>187.00</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>178.00</td>
<td>176.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law, Sem./Nonres.</td>
<td>212.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>178.00</td>
<td>176.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>139.50</td>
<td>109.00</td>
<td>132.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>153.50</td>
<td>111.00</td>
<td>158.50</td>
<td>106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>122.50</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>122.50</td>
<td>92.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>137.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>131.00</td>
<td>96.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>114.50</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>106.50</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* OIT has no graduate courses.
* OHSU Summer Session rates are the same as the per-term rates for the 1993-94 Academic Year.

**Building Fee**

The building fee is maintained at $14.50 per student. This is consistent with the fee levels authorized by the 1993 Legislature and assessed in the 1993-94 academic year.
Incidental Fee

Incidental fee recommendations reflect the various activity and service levels proposed by the institutions. Charges compare for 1993 and 1994 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1994 First Hour</th>
<th>1994 Maximum Charge</th>
<th>1993 First Hour</th>
<th>1993 Maximum Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>26.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health Service Fee

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC (6 hrs. or more)</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC (8 hrs. or more)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fees Compared to Academic Year

Rate structures for summer session have developed as institutions adapted to direct cost support following the 1982 elimination of General Fund support. The effect of direct cost support on fees and assessments can be measured to some extent by comparison with academic year charges. The summer session rates
proposed for 1994 and 1993-94 academic year resident rates are compared on the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12 SCH Undergraduate</th>
<th>9 SCH Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Res.</td>
<td>$ 972</td>
<td>$ 950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Nonres.</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>951.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>909.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>797.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>758.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>835.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>762.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Fees Compared to Summer Session 1993

The following schedule demonstrates the rates of increase from summer session 1993 to summer session 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12 SCH Undergraduate</th>
<th>9 SCH Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Res.</td>
<td>$ 950</td>
<td>$895.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Nonres.</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>895.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>893.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>868.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>783.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>716.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>757.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Room and Board Rates

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

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

Proposed rate increases vary from zero to 6.3 percent for the basic summer session. Anticipated cost increases for personnel, utilities, services, and food since the preceding summer term justify rate adjustments at this time.

Public Hearing

A hearing was conducted on January 3, 1994, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 121 of Susan Campbell Hall on the University of Oregon campus concerning the 1994 Summer Session Fee Book. No one presented testimony, nor was any written testimony received.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Since no comments or testimony were received at the public hearing, staff recommended the Board amend Oregon Administrative Rule 580-40-035 as follows:

(Note: Underline denotes addition; brackets denote deletion.)

Summer Session Fee Book

580-40-035 The document entitled "Summer Session Fee Book" dated [January 22, 1993] January 21, 1994, is hereby adopted by reference as a permanent rule. All prior adoptions of summer session fee documents are hereby repealed except as to rights and obligations previously acquired or incurred thereunder.
RESOLUTION REGARDING SOUTH AFRICAN INVESTMENT POLICY

January 28, 1994

Through the amendment, the residence hall and food service charges and the tuition and fee rates and policies applicable during the 1994 summer session will be adopted.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Ihrig reviewed the major features of this item. Ms. Christopher moved and Mr. Miller seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. On roll call, the following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

RESOLUTION

Through the amendment, the residence hall and food service charges and the tuition and fee rates and policies applicable during the 1994 summer session will be adopted.

Staff Report to the Board

The following resolution was presented to the Board as a result of the December 22, 1993, action taken by the South African Parliament approving a new interim constitution. The constitution lays the framework for the new structure of government that will take effect immediately following the April 1994 elections in South Africa. The December action culminates several years of progress made in repealing all statutes supporting apartheid, the result desired by the Board when the South African investment policies were approved.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following resolution.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, on April 24, 1987, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education adopted a resolution reiterating its strong opposition to the policies of apartheid of the South African government and its continued support of the concept of divestiture from the Board's endowment of the corporate securities of companies doing substantial business in South Africa; and

WHEREAS, the United States government terminated economic sanctions against South Africa in July 1991; and,

WHEREAS, in September 1991, the Oregon State Legislature rescinded its policy of divestiture of state investments in companies doing business in South Africa; and,
WHEREAS, in December 1993, the government of South Africa approved a new interim constitution and a list of fundamental rights that impart equal liberties to all South Africans regardless of race, creed, or gender;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION that:

1. The Board repeal its policy of divestiture of the Board's endowment in the corporate securities of companies doing business in South Africa.

2. The Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration has the authority to move the Board's endowment equity investments into The Common Fund equity account at the appropriate time.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Ihrig underscored the fact that South Africa's new constitution will be in effect regardless of the outcome of the April 1994 election. Responding to Board member concerns about the political appropriateness of discontinuing the policy, Mr. Ihrig made the following points. One, the original intent of the policy was to respond to apartheid laws and policies, not overall human rights issues. That goal has been realized. Two, this action would be consistent with similar actions taken by colleges and universities across the country. Finally, due to the number of institutions that have dropped out of the account already, OSSHE has become too big a player in the account and it would be fiscally more appropriate to move the funds into a larger pool.

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

Staff Report to the Board

The following resolution was presented to the Board because of the need to achieve savings, starting in the 1993-1995 biennium, that can be applied to the 1995-1997 budget reduction. Concerns about the ability to pay rapidly escalating health insurance premiums have caused many eligible employees who are under age 65 to delay retirement. A subsidy of retiree health insurance premiums will enable more unclassified staff to retire,
thus creating opportunities for savings through unfilled positions and through redeployment of FTE consistent with institutional restructuring plans.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following resolution.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Board of Higher Education recognizes the need to implement separation incentives in 1993-1995 to achieve budget savings that can be applied to the impending 1995-1997 budget reductions;

WHEREAS, the Board recognizes that the escalating cost of retiree health insurance premiums is an impediment to many employees' retirement plans;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION that:

1. The Board authorizes a one-time policy to subsidize health insurance premiums for unclassified staff who retire during 1994.

2. The Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration has the authority to implement the 1994 retiree health insurance subsidy plan.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Wilson noted that this was an item not originally on the docket. It was developed by Vice Chancellor Ihrig and his staff in response to the need to develop a $12 million savings package for 1995-1997. The retiree health insurance subsidy is one element of the package, with an estimated savings of $2 million.

The package, according to Mr. Ihrig, would provide eligible employees up to $400 per month in health insurance subsidization for seven years. The result would be the freeing up of salaries and related benefits for those participating retirees. "That's a significant savings per individual, especially if their position is not replaced. If the position is replaced, hopefully it could be replaced with a lower-salaried individual. Usually the
more senior people are at higher levels of compensation." Mr. Ihrig noted that this package has widespread campus support.

This retirement feature would be activated during the current calendar year. With Board approval, employees would be able to sign up until April 15 and elect to retire before the end of December 1994. Those savings would then be available at the campus level (less the subsidy commitment).

Mr. Ihrig was asked to comment on the potential number of people who would take advantage of this benefit. Systemwide, there are approximately 520 people who would qualify. The opportunity would extend to those unclassified staff eligible for retirement. He noted that only the state can make provisions for classified staff. Therefore, if 75 people chose to participate, there would be an estimated $2 million savings.

Mr. Swanson asked if it would be prudent to offer this program on a general basis. Vice Chancellor Ihrig responded, "We need to be certain these kinds of programs really result in money savings for the institutions and that there are no long-term negative impacts. The other reason is that the 1995-1997 biennium is the time when we need all the savings we can get. We think it's important to have a window of time to encourage people to do it now rather than in 1997."

Mr. Ihrig was asked to clarify the difference between classified and unclassified personnel. He indicated that classified staff are part of the classified service of the State of Oregon who are working on the campuses in support and operations management capacities. They are governed by the State of Oregon's compensation and classification policies and bargain with the state. The State System implements those rules. The faculty and a certain number of administrators are in the unclassified staff. They are not civil service, so compensation, hiring, and firing policies are determined by the Board and implemented by the State System.

Ms. Christopher asked for the definition of tenure relinquishment. Mr. Ihrig explained that each campus has its own program that allows the institution to "purchase" a faculty member's tenure. This provides a specified date when a faculty member will leave, which allows advance planning for staffing and budgeting.

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

Introduction

Oregon State University proposes establishment of a Center for Salmon Disease Research. The proposed Center does not represent new or additional activities. Faculty at Oregon State University have been in the forefront of salmon disease research for 30 years. External funding for this research at Oregon State University currently exceeds $1.5 million per year.

Centers and institutes are mechanisms by which Oregon State University organizes to respond flexibly to the interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary needs of the state and the nation for better understanding and problem solving. Centers and institutes allow the University to focus the full power of its research faculty on needs to improve understanding, apply knowledge, and train future generations of scientists. Establishment of the proposed center will provide administrative focus for interdisciplinary research currently conducted by faculty in four colleges.

The Center for Salmon Disease Research will require $38,530 per year in noninstructional institutional funding. The funds will be used to support a director at .25 FTE, a staff position at .50 FTE, and for supplies. These funds will be from overhead return generated by grant-funded research activities. All other activities of the center will be funded directly through grants and contracts.

The director of the proposed center will be assisted by an Administrative Advisory Committee, composed of academic deans from the colleges with involved faculty. Scientific advice will be provided by a Technical Advisory Committee to include the directors of the Hatfield Marine Science Center, the Marine/Freshwater Biomedical Sciences Center, the Environmental Health Sciences Center, and the Center for the Analysis of Environmental Change. Inclusion of these directors is aimed at assuring strong collaborative interaction between the Centers.

A copy of the full proposal is on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.
Staff Analysis

1. **Relationship to Mission**

   Oregon State University's mission is to serve the people of Oregon, the nation, and the world through research, education, and service. As a Land and Sea Grant university, Oregon State University has a special responsibility for research and education enabling people of Oregon and the world to develop and utilize human, land, atmospheric, and oceanic resources. Salmon are an especially important resource to Oregonians and to the world, not only as an agricultural product and important natural resource, but also as a valued environmental and cultural trust. Disease is one of many problems facing salmon.

   The proposed Center will have three main objectives relevant to the mission of Oregon State University and to the people of the State of Oregon:

   a. Continuation of a well-established research program in salmonid diseases;

   b. Integration of research efforts with other established research disciplines at Oregon State University and other institutions in the Pacific Northwest;

   c. Establishment of a diagnostic and advisory service for the fisheries industry in the Pacific Northwest.

2. **Evidence of Need**

   Salmon disease threatens a natural resource of importance to the Northwest, the nation, and the world. Research in this field contributes to the protection and preservation of this valuable natural resource.

3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

   The quality of the proposed program is exceptional and is grounded in the high quality of the participating research faculty. These investigators -- now numbering 12 -- have been in the forefront of salmon disease research for three decades.
Salmon disease investigators at Oregon State University have trained many of the nation's professional fish pathologists and fish health researchers, developed vaccines and diagnostic tests that are used routinely for cultured and wild stocks of fish, and contributed substantially to the knowledge of salmonid diseases of the U.S. and the world.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. Faculty associated with the proposed center are already on staff and conducting research in the area of salmon disease. No additional faculty resources will be needed.

Library. No additional library resources will be required.

Facilities and Equipment. Any additional facilities or equipment that may be required will be provided through grant funds.

Budget Impact. The proposed center will require $38,530 per year in noninstructional funding. The funds will be used to support a director at .25 FTE, a staff position at .50 FTE, and for supplies. These funds will be provided from overhead funds generated by research activities.

5. Duplication

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) is the only other institution within the State of Oregon engaged directly in salmon disease research. ODFW's research is primarily a cooperative effort with Oregon State University's Department of Microbiology. The salmon disease research program at Oregon State University is unique within the State System of Higher Education and within the state.

Salmon disease research programs exist within the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at the National Fisheries Center in Seattle and at other universities with fish disease programs. These include the University of California at Davis, where research is performed on diseases of cold-water fish, including salmon, trout, and sturgeon; and programs at Louisiana State University, Mississippi State University, Auburn University, and the University of Florida that primarily emphasize warm-water fish.
Program Review

The proposal to establish a Center for Salmon Disease Research has been reviewed and approved by the Oregon State University Faculty Senate Research Council, the full Faculty Senate, and the University. The proposal has also been reviewed favorably by the Academic Council.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon State University to establish a Center for Salmon Disease Research.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Clark introduced Dr. George Keller, vice president for research, graduate studies, and international programs at Oregon State University. Dr. Keller has responsibility for directing all the research activities at Oregon State University.

Mr. Swanson asked if there was a reason not to establish a center anytime there’s a sufficient nucleus of research activity on a campus. Dr. Keller pointed out two limiting factors. One, clearly, is funding of the administrative support required for a center. The second is appropriateness. Centers require the same kind of scrutiny as other issues that come before the Board. What is the purpose? What is the subject area? Can the work be accomplished some other way? Dr. Clark added that the Academic Council has engaged in numerous discussions about policies addressing both the establishment and dissolution of centers. Further, as part of both rounds of Measure 5 planning, campuses have seriously evaluated their lists of centers and have, in fact, dissolved some centers that were no longer viable.

There was discussion about the expectation for a research center to be funded through the research dollars it generates. Dr. Clark indicated that expectation exists because one reason for a center’s existence is its demonstration of the likelihood of attracting external funding. However, Dr. Keller added, it’s not quite that clear-cut. Some years may be good, others not. Yet, since campuses support the centers and institutes from a percentage of indirect costs recovered, the institution is probably its own best critic. Additionally, the centers receive external review about every three years.
Mr. Richardson asked to what extent the researchers are involved with salmon being considered for endangered species status. Dr. Keller remarked that most salmon these days are "coming up short on that list."

President Wilson recognized two of the distinguished faculty who were present at the Board meeting, Drs. Fryer and Rohovec.

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

**Background**

At the July 1993 meeting of the Joint Boards of Education, the State System of Higher Education was directed to develop proficiencies that could serve as the basis for admission to Oregon's public colleges and universities. This was done in anticipation of the requirements of HB 3565 that mandates full-scale implementation of Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs by the 1998-99 school year. The Board of Higher Education set the January 28, 1994, meeting as the time to review these proficiencies. Once reviewed by the Board of Higher Education, they will be transmitted to the Board of Education to assist in the development of the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery.

Subsequent to the July Joint Boards meeting, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs assembled a staff team to work on the Proficiency-based Admission Standards Study (PASS). During the past five months, the project staff has been establishing preliminary performance-based standards by working with 125 teachers and higher education faculty from multiple disciplines and by analyzing national and international standards proposed by a variety of discipline associations. Over 60 examples of performance standards from around the country have been analyzed. The project director has met with the Board of Education at its meetings in December and January and on a regular basis with staff from the Department of Education and numerous school districts to review the design of proficiency-based standards. The work of the PASS project is described in full in the Proficiency-based Admission Standards Study sent to Board members in advance of the docket distribution. (The core component of the project staff report, Sections IX and XIV, was in the supplementary section of the January docket.)
The new standards move away from seat time and credit hours toward demonstrated proficiency. The new system will place less emphasis on a hierarchy of courses and create more opportunities for curricular integration, application, and interdisciplinary study. To meet admission requirements (indicators of when a student is "college ready"), students will need to demonstrate proficiency in the content areas of math, science, social science, foreign language, humanities/literature, and fine and performing arts; as well as in the process areas of reading, writing, oral expression, critical/analytic thinking, problem solving, technology as a learning tool, systems/integrative thinking, teamwork, and quality work.

Assessments will be designed in a fashion that allows them to be used by students to meet the CAM (and in some cases the CIM) requirements. A high congruence will exist between the OSSHE proficiencies and the CIM/CAM standards, although there may be requirements for college admission that are not applicable to the CAM, and vice versa. Students will be ready for admission when they reach clearly defined performance levels on specified assessments. These assessments are likely to be complex and varied. They will not be limited to traditional paper-and-pencil tests, but will incorporate evidence in portfolios of a range of learning, for example, from the world of work, team projects, courses, self-paced learning with computers, and other on-line interactive technologies.

OSSHE and a small number of community college representatives working in discipline-based teams have met to develop extended definitions and identify key proficiency indicators for each content area. Assessments will be developed beginning summer 1994 with pilot testing and further refinement to begin at selected high schools thereafter.

System-level implementation will follow the CAM timelines. The CAM will be implemented in 1997-98, with the first group of students who spent two years in a CAM program receiving their certificates at the end of the 1998-99 school year. Therefore, full-scale implementation of OSSHE proficiency-based admissions should occur in 1999-2000 for those students who enter in the fall of 1999.

Staff Recommendation

1. Staff recommended the Board endorse the policy directions of this report, specifically the use of the proficiencies contained in the Standards for a Proficiency-based Admission System for OSSHE and
Implementation Plan and Timeline (Sections IX and XIV of the Proficiency-based Admission Standards Study) as the basis for further discussion and refinement with OSSHE campuses, community colleges, K-12 educators, and the Oregon Department of Education.

2. By the May 27, 1994, Board meeting (and meeting of the Joint Boards of Education), staff was requested to return to the Board with a refined set of proficiencies that reflects progress made in articulating the establishing of performance levels and assessments with the Oregon Department of Education.

3. Staff was encouraged to initiate pilot sites for preliminary implementation of the proficiency-based admission standards at high schools that are interested in working with OSSHE in advance of the 1999 full-scale implementation date for Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM) programs.

Board Discussion and Action

President Wilson asked that, due to the complexity of the subject, Vice Chancellor Clark provide an overview. Dr. Clark noted that about one-and-a-half years ago, University of Oregon faculty member Dr. David Conley began work, on a part-time basis, as State System liaison for school reform. He and the team he directs have done extensive research, both nationally and internationally, on school reform and particularly its impact on higher education. The recommendations emerging in Dr. Conley's work are congruent with the federal agenda for national goals.

Input has been received from faculty members, high school teachers, community college faculty, and some independent college faculty. Throughout the project, Dr. Conley has worked closely with the Department of Education, meeting on a weekly, and sometimes daily basis. He has also made several presentations to the Board of Education.

The proposed standards will move away from traditional admission requirements, which have been expressed in subject matter requirements. In the State System, there has been both a requirement of 14 Carnegie Units spread across a number of specific subjects and a grade point average requirement. The present proposal relies on students demonstrating proficiency in content and process areas, with the possibility of meeting and demonstrating proficiencies in a variety of ways. This is in
keeping with the spirit of the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery (CIM, CAM) outcomes evaluation. OSSHE will be working in partnership with the Department of Education and with the K-12 schools to develop assessments and to train teachers to make assessments in ways that are consistent and comparable.

Next steps will include refinement of the proficiency standards, with involvement of many others in that process, and development of assessments and training over the next two years as more CAM programs are developed. The proposed implementation schedule will follow the state's legislation regarding timetables for the CIM and CAM. It is imperative that the Department of Education and OSSHE activities are synchronous; one can't move very far ahead without information about the other.

Dr. Clark concluded her remarks by noting the staff recommendation, which includes direction to return to the Board in May with a refined set of proficiency standards. Dr. Conley was invited to describe his work.

Dr. Conley indicated that the work to date is a template or framework designed primarily to raise and crystallize issues and to provide possible solutions. "It's a starting point, not an ending point. That's why it's so comprehensive, why we've taken the materials and presented them in three different formats."

This work has generated much interest. Dr. Conley has been invited to four states to speak. "This attracts a lot of attention, primarily because it's not a tinkering type of activity; it is re-thinking. It's a system-level reconceptualization, not only of the relationship of K-12, but also the process of determining who comes into the higher education system." The team has found very few higher education systems doing as comprehensive a system-level examination as OSSHE is undertaking.

Dr. Conley pointed out some of the features of the proficiencies. Evaluating results rather than input is a different way of looking at education. The team has been careful not to get into the "minutia of content" -- making up a checklist of things people must do -- but rather describing broad areas. It is a set of cumulative expectations written in a way that allows them to demonstrate interdisciplinary competence. "We emphasize the need to learn across disciplines and to integrate. We also emphasize the importance of being able to apply knowledge. A learned person is not simply someone who can repeat an abstract concept. We're sensitive to the notion of 'contextualized learning.' The standards try to
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take into account those types of issues to reach a balance between discipline and integration."

Dr. Conley underscored two specific points about the proficiency areas. They are basically using the same content areas currently being used in high school, except for English and the fine and performing arts. "We found some attendant problems with organizing an English requirement. There's a tendency to segregate large elements of literacy into English. There's also a tendency to move that out of the context of other content areas. So someone reads in English, writes in English, but they somehow don't apply those skills broadly. Also, English has tended to become kind of a grab bag, in a sense, for a wide range of learning experiences.

"What we believe is most important for higher education is humanities and literature as a subset of English. Therefore, we moved reading, writing, or expression over into the process area. We've said these are important processes that we would like to see occurring throughout the curriculum, not simply in a language arts or English environment. So humanities/literature is a new way of thinking about that requirement."

Second, Dr. Conley noted that the fine and performing arts content area was added because it provides important skills for students as part of a well-rounded liberal arts education. Also, such activities and skills are congruent with the type of creativity, investigation, and problem solving students will need to succeed in the 21st century.

The presentation moved to the assessment system. Currently, entrance decisions are based on such things as SAT scores, GPAs, and class standings. "What we are suggesting is that complex assessments, such as portfolios and demonstrations, can be analyzed in ways that provide useful information for admission officers and, at the same time, do not overwhelm them. We're talking about basically developing performance levels that allow for translation of these tests into basic numeric scores. Schools would have a lot of flexibility in terms of learning experiences that they utilize to get students to high levels of performance. But there would be a continuity of performance and standard across the state." Dr. Conley concluded his remarks by re-emphasizing that the work of OSSHE will be in concert with the work of the Department of Education.

The Board asked about the articulation of the admission standards with the CIM and CAM. Dr. Conley described the goals of CIM and CAM, which may be toward college entrance but are not limited to that outcome. The
bridging between the two systems will need to be worked out. "That's why we're proposing the proficiency as a bridging mechanism that allows the certificate to have its own integrity if it needs to. However, it gives us an opportunity to come together with the K-12 system to the maximum degree possible to define the overlap between our needs and their certificate." Mr. Bailey added that the majority of those who attain the CAM may not seek admission to a four-year institution.

It was underscored that although the Board is concerned about congruence of the proficiency-based standards and the CIM and CAM, that is not the only basis for the work. Dr. Conley reiterated that the objective is to have a seamless transition from K-12 to higher education, and that the two systems are working collaboratively. "What differentiates us from almost every other higher education system in the nation is that, right now, we are actively pursuing a new relationship with K-12. We are not involved in any obstructionist behavior."

Dr. Conley was asked how the assessment system responds to cultural and ethnic diversity issues. He pointed out that current assessment systems impact groups differentially, and little attention is being given to that in the present system. One of the guiding principles for the new assessment system would be to design it in such a way that differential effects result in re-examination of assessment strategies. The method of utilizing a variety of assessment methods means that a student could demonstrate mastery in more than one way. The potential for this system to adapt to cultural diversity and gender differences is much greater than the current system.

Dr. Clark was asked to comment about the cost, human and dollar, of assessment. She responded that it is difficult to make that estimation. However, it is increasingly clear that many people are interested in moving in these directions. Dr. Conley also noted that in Oregon, with roughly 250 high schools, one could realistically train a representative from each high school in a single auditorium. In that respect, it is not unmanageable in the way it might be in a larger state. "We must assume that there will be much more assessment going on as a regular part of the high school program. As a regular part of teachers' professional development, they will be learning many of these skills. The costs are there. It's a matter, in many cases, of reallocating time, emphases, and resources."

Dr. Conley indicated there is a Board policy that allows high schools to try different admission procedures. Movement in this direction is encouraged.
Ms. Christopher asked about interstate articulation. Regarding students moving to other states, Dr. Conley responded that, even with the current system, Oregon cannot tell another state to accept our students. Each state system tends to set its own standards. However, OSSHE is carefully keying its activities to national reports and national developments, particularly around curriculum standards and national goals. It is his understanding that the Department of Education will work with other state systems to develop a standardized, translatable transcript for export.

It would be reasonable to ask incoming students to demonstrate proficiencies. Also, it’s important to remember that schools around the country are doing more things like portfolios. Further, out-of-state students who transfer to Oregon schools are not equally distributed through the nation. "If we take the top 20 districts that contribute to the state and work more closely with them, we might be able to get a higher level of congruence between the two systems. But there’s going to be a period of transition where you’re running parallel systems. It’s going to be complex, but it does not appear to be impossible."

President Wilson congratulated Drs. Clark and Conley and their staff for the excellent work. Ms. Christopher moved and Mr. Bailey seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, and Wilson. Those voting no: none.

President Wilson called on Mr. Swanson to provide an update on the work of the 2010 Advisory Panel. He indicated that the meeting on January 25 used a new format, dividing the Panel into three small groups for in-depth discussion of the draft materials. The Panel’s work is on schedule. Using input from Panel members gathered at the last meeting, staff is working on decision points that will form the bases of discussion by the Board Executive Committee at a mid-February meeting. Following that meeting, the Board and Panel will continue working in February and March to move the plan closer toward actual implementation strategies.

Mr. Swanson concluded his remarks by noting that this has been a positive and unifying experience, and he is optimistic about the outcome. Ms. Wilson thanked staff for the time, energy, and creativity in this endeavor.
Mr. Miller distributed a brief overview of the work of the Committee, indicating that the full report is due for completion within the next month. Mr. Miller noted that BARC has worked collaboratively with the Executive Department, the Governor's office, the Secretary of State's office, and with a number of legislators. He outlined a few major differences between the way the Committee is working with the University of Oregon versus its approach with Oregon State University. At Oregon State University, structure was examined task by task. They tried to theoretically reorganize the university -- conceptually, on paper, as if it had not existed. At the University of Oregon, examination is occurring more on a person-by-person basis. In other words, the current organizational structure is being examined as a means for commenting on reorganization and restructuring already in place. The campus committee has proposed three or four alternate ways of doing business in every category, and BARC is then commenting on that.

Another major change is that Peat Marwick has been asked to build an accountability or implementation matrix into the report. This will include describing how changes will be implemented, indicating who will be accountable for implementing the changes, a timeline, and the savings, if it can be calculated.

Mr. Miller mentioned that a "bench review" of the Portland State University Introspect study was done and it appears to have been done very well. Mr. Miller concluded his remarks by thanking staff at the institutions for their contributions.

Mr. Miller also mentioned that Executive Department analyst David Small recently suffered a serious illness. Both Mr. Miller and Ms. Wilson commented on the importance of being sensitive to the pressures on staff as they proceed through Measure 5 changes.

Dr. Larry Large conveyed Mr. Donahue's regrets that he was unable to attend the Board meeting. Dr. Large distributed the final report of the Committee, which lists the areas it considered and the research the Committee undertook to determine the level of understanding among Oregonians about the State System.

Two items that will define the success of the Committee's work are upcoming. One is the identification of operating themes that can be used broadly to communicate with the public. Dr. Large indicated, "Those will be developed in such a way that they will be at a very high level of
generalization and, hopefully, will open up opportunities for the individual campuses to coordinate and implement their own detailed ideas for marketing that are specific to the constituencies of their institutions."

The second item not in the report is a detailed implementation plan that will guide the principles that are distilled in the report. Work is being done with faculty to develop a strategy that will be available to the institutions.

**Issue**

Should the Joint Boards adopt a policy statement to clarify the work of the two separate boards relating to the high school-college transition?

**Background**

The question of how best to manage the transition from high school to college has engaged the attention of both boards recently. The boards have been able to use their common meeting as the Joint Boards to clarify and support their work as separate boards. This policy provides a statement of both the common and the complementary interests of the boards as they relate to the transition to college.

The Joint Boards Working Group has discussed the need for such a statement since the July meeting and has agreed to bring this one to the Joint Boards for adoption.

**Joint Boards Policy Statement on the Transition to College**

It is the responsibility of the Joint Boards to promote a smooth transition from high school to four-year postsecondary study. That is a task neither board can perform alone. In doing so, the Joint Boards provide a single context for the two aspects of that transition.

The Board of Education has the principal responsibility for developing the education reform agenda in high schools and community colleges so that students who choose to continue their academic education will be well prepared to do so. The Board of Higher Education has the principal responsibility for setting standards for admission to baccalaureate study that enable students to succeed in college work and that are
consistent with the goals of education reform, namely, the improved learning performance of students.

Recommendation to the Board

The Joint Boards Working Group recommended adoption of the policy statement.

Board Discussion and Action

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

1993-94 ENROLLMENT REPORT

Despite admitting all qualified Oregonians who applied and despite increases in the number of nonresident undergraduate students, the actual headcount enrollment for fall 1993 was 59,545, 1.1 percent below the targeted fall enrollment. Targeted headcount enrollment for each year of the 1993-1995 biennium is 60,209 (46,813 three-term FTE) compared to the fall 1992 actual headcount enrollment of 60,525. Western Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, and Oregon Health Sciences University exceeded their estimated headcount enrollments for fall 1993, while the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University, Eastern Oregon State College, and Oregon Institute of Technology did not meet their projected fall headcount enrollments. Tables A and B provide the 1993-94 enrollment statistics.
### Table A. HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT 1993-94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1992-93 Fall</th>
<th>1993-94 Planned</th>
<th>1993-94 Fall</th>
<th>Dif Plan vs Fall 93</th>
<th>Dif Fall 92 vs Fall 93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Resident</td>
<td>41,151</td>
<td>39,630</td>
<td>39,385</td>
<td>(245)</td>
<td>(1,766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Nonres</td>
<td>6,935</td>
<td>7,781</td>
<td>7,949</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Resident</td>
<td>9,745</td>
<td>10,060</td>
<td>9,618</td>
<td>(442)</td>
<td>(127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Nonresident</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>(74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Resident</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Nonresident</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Medicine</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Med/Den Res</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Med/Den Nonres</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,525</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,545</strong></td>
<td><strong>(664)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(980)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B. SUMMARY OF ENROLLMENT CHANGES
1993-94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO*</td>
<td>17,078</td>
<td>16,593</td>
<td>14,176</td>
<td>13,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>14,485</td>
<td>14,101</td>
<td>12,574</td>
<td>12,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>14,530</td>
<td>14,486</td>
<td>8,378</td>
<td>8,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>3,650</td>
<td>3,997</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>3,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC*</td>
<td>4,435</td>
<td>4,514</td>
<td>3,457**</td>
<td>3,612**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>1,650**</td>
<td>1,556**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>2,087**</td>
<td>1,970**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>1,277**</td>
<td>1,572**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60,209</td>
<td>59,545</td>
<td>46,813</td>
<td>46,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: These figures include undergraduate nonresidents. The targeted headcount for 1993-94 excluding undergraduate nonresidents is 12,783 for the University of Oregon and 3,977 for Southern Oregon State College. The actual headcount for fall 1993-94 excluding undergraduate nonresidents is 12,231 for the University of Oregon and 3,978 for Southern Oregon State College. The targeted three-term FTE figure excluding undergraduate nonresidents is 10,336 for the University of Oregon and 3,072 for Southern Oregon State College. The estimated actual three-term FTE figure excluding undergraduate nonresidents is 9,876 for the University of Oregon and 3,173 for Southern Oregon State College.

** Note: The targeted three-term FTE and estimated actual three-term FTE numbers for Southern Oregon State College, Eastern Oregon State College, and Oregon Institution of Technology do not include the students enrolled in the nursing programs at these institutions. The nursing students at these institutions are included in the Oregon Health Sciences University numbers.

Although total enrollment has not changed significantly from fall 1992, the mix of enrollment is changing somewhat more dramatically than in past years. Resident undergraduate enrollment for fall 1993 is down nearly 4.3 percent from fall 1992. As in 1992, the decline in the number of resident undergraduates can be attributed primarily to two factors: continuing concerns pertaining to Measure 5 budget cuts, which resulted in program eliminations during the 1991-1993 biennium, and increasing tuition rates. Although there will be no program eliminations during the 1993-1995 biennium, an uncertainty about the impact of potential future budget cuts continues to linger in the minds of Oregonians. OSSHE institutions have
accommodated all qualified Oregonians requesting admission in the State System.

While resident undergraduate enrollment rates continue to decline, nonresident undergraduate enrollment is up significantly from 6,935 in the fall of 1992 to 7,949 for fall 1993. The growth comes despite significant tuition increases (nonresident undergraduates pay the full cost of their education) and tighter residency rules. The University of Oregon and Southern Oregon State College, in particular, have seen dramatic growth in their numbers of nonresident undergraduates with an increase of 22 percent and 14 percent, respectively, over fall 1992. OSSHE welcomes nonresident undergraduates while maintaining its policy of accepting all qualified residents. Because nonresident undergraduates pay for the cost of their instruction, they are not a burden to the Oregon taxpayer. However, nonresident enrollment makes it possible for institutions to maintain academic programs, therefore benefiting Oregonians and maintaining the academic infrastructure of the institutions.

Graduate enrollment, both resident and nonresident, is also declining. Unlike nonresident undergraduates, the rising tuition rates for nonresident graduate students appear to have an impact on enrollment. This is particularly true for nonresident law students.

Institution budget allocations for 1993-94 withheld a portion of each institution's budget pending actual enrollments for fall 1993. The amounts withheld are being released, except for the University of Oregon whose estimated actual three-term FTE for 1993-94, based on fall 1993 FTE enrollment, is 460 FTE (552 headcount) below its targeted enrollment. For the University of Oregon, the targeted enrollment numbers exclude nonresident undergraduates. Because the University of Oregon’s enrollment fell more than 350 three-term FTE students below its target, the University’s budget will be reduced to reflect that lower enrollment. Portland State University, Western Oregon State College, and Southern Oregon State College, however, have estimated actual three-term FTE enrollments above their targets for fall 1993, and thus will be provided the equivalent of tuition for those additional students.

Summer 1993 enrollment figures are shown in Table C. They reflect a 0.5 percent increase from summer 1992.
Table C. SUMMER 1993 HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT (excluding OHSU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total 1993</th>
<th>Total 1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td>2,658</td>
<td>6,803</td>
<td>7,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>2,946</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>4,476</td>
<td>4,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>6,688</td>
<td>9,405</td>
<td>16,093</td>
<td>15,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>2,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>16,831</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,171</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,016</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Discussion**

Vice Chancellor Ihrig cited two reasons for decreased Oregon resident undergraduate enrollment: lingering public perception of System instability due to program cuts during the first biennium of Measure 5 and rising tuitions. Mr. Swanson asked about recruitment efforts. The Chancellor indicated that recruitment was a major topic at the last Council of Presidents meeting and is a very high priority, both at the System and institutional levels. Vice Chancellor Clark noted that recruitment was also a topic at the last Academic Council meeting. Dr. Robin Brown, OSSHE's high school visitation program director, reported to the Council that coordinating Systemwide recruitment efforts allows for easier entry by recruiters into many high schools. However, restructured school days with large class blocks has resulted in a reluctance of some school personnel to release students for nonclass purposes. Dr. Clark added, "We have extensively evaluated comments we've received from counselors, and they are very concerned with perceptions of program instability, the adverse effects of Measure 5, tuition, and perhaps cuts to student and academic support services. There is much discussion of whether or not counselors are advising most academically-able students to look at out-of-state opportunities." She noted that a study of the high school class of 1993 is
underway to learn where those students are and, if they’re not in OSSHE institutions, why not.

President Wilson invited the presidents to comment about the market and public perception. They indicated that public perception of System instability is a key issue. Program cuts have affected this perception, although some of the eliminations were due to valid academic reasons, not budget reductions. Increasing tuition is a factor, although the comment was made that for the top students, this has not been the strongest deterrent. Finally, housing shortages have contributed to lowering enrollment figures. One president noted that enrollment numbers may be driven in part by the size of graduating classes. Also, it is important to look at the total enrollment: continuing education, graduate school, the new nontraditional students. President Ramaley added that the perception of scarcity has created an environment at Portland State University that is, in essence, a self-fulfilling prophecy. Students, fearing such scarcity, are over-enrolling, thus creating the very scarcity they fear.

There was discussion about the effects of raising tuition and then using those additional resources to create or strengthen programs. President Brand indicated that that would better position campus recruiting and marketing. Mr. Richardson reinforced his concerns about underrepresented minority enrollment. Dr. Brcmd responded that, at the University of Oregon, the increased enrollment of nonresident students has actually increased diversity on campus.

(No Board action required)

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

(No Board action required)

The Board approved the staff request in July 1992 for authority to issue Certificates of Participation to fund the assessment and possible initial implementation of a human resources information system to replace the current budget, payroll, and personnel system. Last year, the Legislative Assembly approved $2.7 million of such certificates.
Following the model established with the Financial Information System, a Human Resources Information System (HRIS) Steering Committee was formed in the summer of 1993 with the charge to determine OSSHE's needs for such a system and to evaluate whether the BANNER HRIS software could meet those needs. Using a requirements document developed by Oregon State University as a starting point, the HRIS Steering Committee last fall determined the requirements of a human resources information system.

The SCT Corporation, which developed and markets the BANNER HRIS software, demonstrated its capabilities at a several-day session at Portland State University in November. In addition, the Committee decided to visit three sites that were running the software to determine how it worked in operation. They visited Linn-Benton Community College in Albany in November, Rice University in Houston, Texas, and the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology in Calgary, Alberta, in December.

The results of the demonstration and the site visits confirmed that the BANNER product performed adequately on several counts but fell far short of expectations on other critical factors. Therefore, the Steering Committee determined that it should look at other software options in addition to BANNER. This decision was made knowing that it would probably be more difficult to communicate among the student, financial, and human resources systems if a product other than BANNER were installed since the other main systems (financial and student) use the BANNER software products.

Three major alternatives will be explored by the Steering Committee: a) implementing BANNER; b) implementing another software package for HRIS; or c) as an interim step until an adequate package can be found and implemented successfully, converting the current budget/payroll/personnel system to OSSHE's new hardware environment.

Some campus representatives not on the Committee wish to move forward quickly to implement the BANNER product in order to minimize the amount of time required for BANNER FIS to be interfaced with the budget/payroll/personnel system. However, several Committee members are concerned that the BANNER product is not mature and robust enough to be of use to OSSHE and want to try to find alternatives. The Commit-
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Committee hopes to have a recommendation prior to the submission of the 1995-1997 budget.

(No Board action required)

Summary

Last May, the Board authorized the implementation of a new financial information system. Financing for that system was approved by the Legislative Assembly. The project is underway, with rules and tables being developed, plans for conversions and interfaces completed, training begun, processes and procedures reviewed and changed, software installed, hardware acquired, and overall implementation planning finished. The project is on schedule and within budget to this point. Several critical steps must be completed successfully before the implementation of the first two sites (Portland State University and the University of Oregon) can occur. That implementation is scheduled for July 1994. Further reports will be made as the project progresses.

Staff Report to the Board

In May 1993, the Board authorized staff to proceed to implement, as a single system, a new Financial Information System at five locations. The Board stressed that the system provide "...common, consistent, timely, and accurate..." information regarding the State System and its colleges and universities. This report summarizes progress to date in implementing that system.

1. **Locations**: The five locations chosen include the four universities and the Corvallis office of the Chancellor. This last site will process transactions for the Chancellor's Office, the three regional colleges, and Oregon Institute of Technology and will aggregate information from all eight colleges and universities for Systemwide reporting and management of information. Each of the colleges, Oregon Institute of Technology, and the Chancellor's Office will operate within separate databases on a single computer.

2. **Software**: Last May, the Board agreed to the use of the Systems and Computer Technology Corporation's (SCT) BANNER Financial Information System software. This is a relational database software that uses the Oracle database product. It has been designed for use by colleges and universities and is installed at
numerous sites around North America. It has not been used before for aggregating data for an entire State System operating in separate data bases. The software has been installed at both the University of Oregon and at Portland State University. These two universities are slated to implement FIS on July 1, 1994. Other implementations are scheduled for July of 1995 and 1996.

The State System has contracted with SCT to design and install several software modifications to meet the needs of the Chancellor's Office for Systemwide reporting, and of the institutions. The State System’s policy, adopted by the Administrative Council, is that the OSSHE baseline software will be the same at all locations. Therefore, all software modifications made by SCT will be installed at all five sites, not just at the two universities implementing the system in 1994. Most of the modifications are scheduled to be completed in time for the most intensive user training in the spring of 1994. The later modifications will not affect the July 1 cutover date, and the cutover will occur even if these later modifications are not completed on time. The critical modifications scheduled to be completed before training deal with cash processing, budget entry to pooled accounts, redefaulting, balancing methods, and trial balancing. Other modifications scheduled for the initial implementations, if possible, include improvements related to grant accounting and interinstitutional transactions. The first modifications are slated to be delivered to OSSHE at the end of January 1994. Thus far, SCT has proceeded on schedule.

The new Financial Information System must interface with a variety of existing institutional and Systemwide automated information systems. The most prominent of these is the Budget/Payroll/Personnel system operated by the Chancellor's Office in Corvallis. All OSSHE employees (except for University Hospital nurses) are paid from that system, and required reporting to the state and federal governments is generated from it. The critical interfaces have been designed and are scheduled to be coded and tested over the next several weeks. Work is proceeding on a similar time frame with regard to the conversion of existing financial data from the central Financial Management System, which FIS is intended to replace. Testing and modifications will continue throughout the spring on these conversions and interfaces. SCT will assist in designing and installing the interfaces.
3. **Hardware:** The BANNER software is not tied to any one computer hardware vendor's product line. The University of Oregon has upgraded its existing Digital Equipment Corporation (DEC) system, while Portland State University added another Sequent Corporation processor to the one it had. BANNER operates on both these systems. The Chancellor's Office and the colleges solicited proposals from hardware vendors for a configuration to run the fifth site's work. OSSHE has recommended that a contract be awarded to one of the three vendors submitting proposals. However, the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) in Salem has not yet completed its review and contract award process for this procurement. Last fall, Oregon State University acquired a DEC system for its BANNER Student Information System that can be expanded to support FIS as well. Oregon Health Sciences University has proposed to upgrade its NCR computer system (which runs the BANNER Human Resources Information System payroll for the University Hospital nurses). This also could be used for FIS, with appropriate upgrades or additional processors. The telecommunications network linking the eight colleges and universities is proposed for upgrade during 1994 to handle additional data traffic associated with FIS.

4. **Rules:** The BANNER FIS software is a rule-driven product. The rules and tables determine what will be done, how it will be done, and who can do it. There are both technical rules/tables and financial/accounting rules/tables. The basic technical rule is that the OSSHE baseline software can be changed only by or under the authority of the Chancellor's Office and not by individual computer center staff at the five locations. The OSSHE baseline includes the SCT baseline as delivered, plus modifications made by SCT. It also can include modifications approved for general release by the FIS Steering Committee. Site managers can make those adjustments needed to adapt the delivered code so that it will run on a given hardware platform, as well as making certain tuning adjustments needed to make the software run on that platform efficiently. Users can develop reporting extract programs as needed. The integrity of the baseline and of the data must be maintained at all times.

The accounting/financial rules and tables have been the subject of considerable effort during the past several months. Key to the development of these critical aspects of the system has been the
creation of the OSSHE chart of accounts. Under the BANNER structure, the chart of accounts has four critical and two optional types of codes. The critical codes include fund, organization, account, and program (FOAP). The optional codes are activity and location. The initial OSSHE-level chart was completed last fall, with comments from the colleges and universities received in mid-December. The final version of the OSSHE-level chart is due in early February. The OSSHE-level chart includes those elements required by the System's controller and budget director to be consistent among the eight colleges and universities. Some levels of the fund, account, and program structures are required to be consistent. The organization codes and the optional activity and location fields will vary by institution.

In addition, Portland State University, the University of Oregon, and the Chancellor's Corvallis Office operations are investigating their processes and procedures in light of FIS and redesigning them. This will lead to new operating policies and procedures that reflect the opportunities afforded by the new system. These will emphasize distribution of responsibility and workload to end users, with approvals/controls deemed appropriate by each institution within the rules established by the Chancellor's Office for data and software consistency.

5. Training: Training of core users (key personnel from business offices, computer centers, and principal user departments) began at the University of Oregon in July and at Portland State University in August. Some Chancellor's Office accounting and budgeting staff also have been trained. Training has been offered on site by experts from SCT. Plans for training end users are underway now and will be completed by the end of March. End user training at both universities will begin in April and continue until after cutover. OSSHE staff have been prepared by SCT to provide that end user training. Chancellor's Office technical and accounting staff also will be trained during that time frame. Selected staff from Oregon State University will begin participating in training this month.

6. Budget/Financing: The Board agreed to a $17.2 million project budget in May 1993. The Legislative Assembly approved the issuance of $17 million of Certificates of Participation to finance the project. With the Board's approval, the State Treasurer and the
Director of Administrative Services issued $9,080,000 of these certificates last fall. The average interest rate was 4.2 percent. The remainder face issuance dates in the fall of 1994 and the winter of 1995. The project remains within budget.

7. **Schedule:** Implementation for the University of Oregon and Portland State University is scheduled for July 1994. The project is on schedule. However, if SCT modifications are not completed on time or if the conversion and interface programs do not work properly, the schedule may not be met. The Chancellor's Office might implement FIS for internal operations in July 1994 if the new computer is installed and stabilized in time. The OSSHE aggregation system would be implemented at the same time. The three colleges, Oregon Institute of Technology, and Oregon State University are scheduled to implement FIS in July 1995. The colleges already have begun their planning. Oregon Health Sciences University is not slated to implement FIS until July 1996.

8. **Critical Points:** In order to meet the implementation deadline set for FIS at Portland State University and the University of Oregon, certain activities need to be completed. First, the system must be validated, with its rules and tables established (February), its interfaces and conversion programs designed (January 31) and implemented (various times between March and July), and its software modifications completed (various times between January and June).

Second, each university must implement changes to its business processes and procedures based upon how it wishes to operate and the opportunities/constraints offered by the software (decisions by January 31 and implementation of forms, approval processes, and documentation by March 31).

Third, users must be trained adequately, with the plan completed by January 31, training materials completed by March 31, and training offered throughout the spring and even past implementation.

Fourth, necessary computer improvements must be in place and stabilized by April.
Fifth, *standard practices and procedures* for the system must be established by March, including data definitions, help procedures, data distribution architecture, policies, and Systemwide reporting requirements/formats.

Finally, a *stabilization plan* and an *audit plan* must be developed by June and August, respectively.

(No Board action required)

The Oregon Regional Primate Research Center was established in 1960 in a joint statement of responsibilities signed by the Chancellor, the University of Oregon president, the dean of the Medical School, two prominent Oregon Health Science University researchers, and the chair of the Medical Research Foundation of Oregon (MRF). Although MRF owns the Primate Center, the president of Oregon Health Sciences University is the principal investigator on the National Institutes of Health (NIH) grant and exercises final appointment authority for the director of the Primate Center. MRF has fiscal responsibility to manage the $8 million in NIH grants received by the Primate Center.

Oregon Health Sciences University is currently working toward the creation of the Oregon Regional Primate Research Center as a research institute of the University, along with revisions to the bylaws and articles of incorporation of the Oregon Health Sciences University Foundation and the Medical Research Foundation of Oregon in order to effect their merger. Final approval for the designation of the Primate Center as an Oregon Health Sciences University Institute will be contingent upon NIH approval of the proposed structure. A more effective link with the University has been strongly encouraged by NIH for many years, and the proposed merger has been approved in principle by Dr. Judith Vaitukaitis, director of the National Center for Research Resources (NCRR, the branch of the NIH that funds primate centers). Formal NIH approval of the newly proposed transfer and merger structure and indirect cost reimbursement rates must be obtained. Both this process and the necessary approvals and legal arrangements between the two Boards are underway. However, the NIH $6 million core grant renewal application for the Primate Center is due on February 1. In order to best assure approval of the renewal grant application and to be in the strongest position to negotiate an appropriate indirect cost structure, Oregon Health Sciences University and the Primate Center would prefer to be able to represent to the NIH that the University’s governing body is prepared to receive a
proposal giving the University authorization to assume responsibility for the Primate Center. A preliminary proposal was approved by the OSSHE Academic Council in November 1993, and a final version of the proposal will be forwarded to the Board of Higher Education at the earliest possible time for review and approval.

(No Board action required)

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES CONTRACTING ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

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

Fish Disease Laboratory Office Upgrade Project, Smith Farm, OSU
On November 8, 1993, Wayne Anderson Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $31,482. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Central Power Station Fuel Oil Storage Facility Project, UO
On September 17, 1993, O'Sullivan Petroleum Equipment Company was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $525,210. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds and institutional funds.

Chilled Water Improvements -- Electrical Project, UO
On December 17, 1993, L. H. Morris Electric, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $79,152. Financing will be provided from physical plant operating funds.

Acceptance of Projects

Mackenzie Hall Neurosurgery Offices Remodel Project, OHSU
This project is complete and was accepted on November 5, 1993. The final direct construction costs were $144,186. Financing was provided from state funds and gifts.
Outpatient Clinic Restroom Remodel Project, OHSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 15, 1993. The final direct construction costs were $59,200. Financing was provided from state funds.

Dryden Hall Piping Replacement Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on December 28, 1993. The final direct construction costs were $104,656. Financing was provided from state funds.

Carson Hall Kitchen/Dining HVAC Upgrade Project, UO
This project is complete and was accepted on July 1, 1993. The final direct construction costs were $252,236. Financing was provided from Housing Department maintenance reserves.

Knight Library Carpet Project, UO
This project is complete and was accepted on November 9, 1993. The final direct construction costs were $257,500. Financing was provided from state funds.

Modular Classroom Replacement Project, UO
This project is complete and was accepted on August 15, 1993. The final direct construction costs were $56,810. Financing was provided from state funds.

(No Board action required)

The Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering (OJGSE) serves to coordinate and enhance graduate education and research in engineering and computer science in Oregon. Funded by the 1991 legislature and supported by the Governor and the American Electronics Association-Oregon, the OJGSE is headed by an Engineering Council of five senior executives from engineering companies and four university presidents.

Programs supporting five primary interdisciplinary areas, based on identified key industries in the state of Oregon (electronics, computers, metals [materials], environmental engineering, and manufacturing), will receive the majority of OJGSE funding.
Continuing Programs

The Oregon Center for Advanced Technology Education

The Oregon Center for Advanced Technology Education (OCATE) began in 1985 as a cooperative educational program in support of Oregon's high-technology community. Operating under the aegis of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, its success was largely responsible for the decision to create the Joint Graduate Schools program.

OCATE sponsors graduate-level engineering and science classes, special topic workshops, and colloquia in applied physics, electrical engineering, computer science and computer engineering, materials science, environmental engineering, and manufacturing engineering. Programs are offered in a variety of academic and industrial sites throughout Washington County, including the OCATE facility, and statewide via interactive television. Degree credit for coursework is transferable among participating universities.

Faculty, engineers, and scientists from the Oregon Graduate Institute (OGI), Oregon State University, Portland State University, the University of Oregon, and many other local, national, and international researchers participate in the programs.

Through the cooperative efforts of the educational institutions and advanced technology companies, OCATE will continue to meet the advanced education needs of the high-technology community and contribute to the economic development of the state.

The Lintner Center for Advanced Education

The Lintner Center is an educational broker that works with the high-technology industry in the Portland metropolitan area to determine workforce training and development requirements. It identifies resources within member colleges and universities to meet those needs in a cooperative and cost-effective manner.

The center provides information about existing programs and workshops in business and technology for the high-tech workforce, brokers customized training designed to meet the specific needs of an individual company, and coordinates design of new educational programs to meet the changing needs of the high-tech community.
A recent major accomplishment was the establishment of the Business Educators Strategy Team (BEST), a consortium of senior training managers from the largest high-tech companies. It meets on a monthly basis to articulate clearly the industry's employee development needs, which are then shared via the Lintner Center with colleges and universities.

Another major initiative was the completion of a cooperative software engineering job analysis across four electronics and computer companies. The data, which are based on successful software engineering practices, will be used to modify corporate training programs and provide universities with a detailed road map for educating current and future engineers. The Lintner Center helped secure Oregon Office of Economic Development funds for partial support of the project.

The Lintner Center became part of OCATE's program in 1990-91, but is still partially funded by industrial contributions.

New Developments

In part the funds provided in 1991-1993 were directed to the State System universities to add faculty in the key areas summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electronics</th>
<th>Computers</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result, some key faculty positions have been filled, including the department chair in Computer Science at the University of Oregon, the Boeing professorship in Concurrent Engineering at Oregon State University, and a senior professor of digital communications at Portland State University.

Technical Advisory Boards (TABs)

Industry-dominated TABs have been established in the computer area -- co-chairs M. Schwartz (Tektronix)/I. Crandell (Hewlett-Packard), manufacturing -- chair C. Hinerman (Intel), metals -- co-chairs J. Hargarth (Teledyne Wah Chang) and J. Dillon (ESCO), and environmental engineering -- M. Kennedy (CH2M Hill).
The major achievement in manufacturing has been the completion of an effort by Oregon State University and Portland State University to develop a M.S. degree in Manufacturing Engineering. Industry is extremely supportive of this effort, and the approval process has been forwarded to the appropriate graduate schools on each campus. The program is designed to be delivered by television to a targeted industrial audience, and it is anticipated that there will be participation by engineers in a range of industries.

In metals, a joint research program among Oregon State University, OGI, the Bureau of Mines (Albany), and the Oregon Metals Industry has been continued, with additional funding from the Office of Economic Development. To qualify, all research projects considered for funding in this program have industry matching funds committed for the project.

Coordination of computer systems and software packages, e.g., Geographical Information Systems (GIS), have been standardized at Oregon State University, OGI, and Portland State University to facilitate interdisciplinary education and research programs.

Network for Engineering and Research in Oregon (NERO)

The NERO project is directed at facilitating cooperation among the Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering (OJGSE) and with industry through the provision of advanced digital networks. The vision for the NERO project is high-speed, high-bandwidth data connections (digital, video, and audio) within and between the OJGSE sites and the Biological Information Computer Center at Oregon Health Sciences University; similar links to high-technology industrial partners; and when additional capacity is added and where appropriate, outreach to other State System institutions, small businesses, and the community college educational system. Ultimately NERO will allow the delivery of new services to the desktops of faculty and engineers in industry to increase collaboration in research, to access distributed computing resources and databases, and to participate in the delivery and receipt of "non-site specific" course offerings including seminars, workshops, and colloquia, as well as specific advanced degree programs.
Collaborative engineering education and research in Oregon will be enhanced by the following:

- Higher speed access to the Internet and higher bandwidth between sites [1.5Mb/sec → 45 Mb/sec → 155 Mb/sec and eventually to Gigabit networks].
- Upgrades of campus engineering backbone local area networks (LAN’s).
- Establishment of high-speed engineering LAN’s.
- Broadcast television over digital media.
- Video services to the desktop workstation or personal computer.
- Creation of a wide-area ATM network.
- Collaboration with high-tech industrial partners.
- Outreach to small businesses and community colleges for data network services.
- Connection to the National Research and Education Network (NREN).

The primary goal for NERO is creation of a desktop-to-desktop collaborative computing environment for research and instruction among the OJGSE institutions in a manner that will be compatible with National Information Infrastructure (NII). This will require the deployment of enhanced networking capabilities. High-speed network access will make possible a number of activities such as multimedia for distance learning, collaboration and concurrent engineering, a shared work environment, including a shared file system and distributed software tools; supercomputing; scientific and medical imaging; and greater bandwidth access to the Internet.

The implementation of these collaborative tools and network facilities will require a program of education and information dissemination to provide increased productivity on the part of faculty, staff, and students, as well as general technical support services.

Secondary goals are to provide the opportunity for Oregon industrial sites and software developers to connect to NERO for collaborative purposes. Many of these sites will want to interact with OJGSE personnel in the activities described above.

We believe that investment in broadband fiber optic networks and the use of advanced digital-video technology will have enormous impact on education. In addition, digital video will be the most significant driver of economic prosperity, not only for Oregon, but also for the nation.
Board Discussion

Dr. John Owen commented on one of the unreported benefits of the program, which is the extensive cooperation between the Colleges of Engineering at Portland State University and Oregon State University.

Dr. Bartlett summarized the NERO project by observing, "It's a high-capacity communications system on four or five campuses by which we get the full range of communication technology available: data, voice, and images. The critical part of it is funded by a federal grant. It's a way to tie together all of our advanced technology in education, and it also establishes patterns and experiences we can use in other fields." He noted that it also provides the capacity for private industry to tap into this core network so that companies can conduct training and develop research relationships with individual faculties or schools. Dr. Owen agreed, describing the work as "the cutting edge of telecommunications developments. We hope to be able to deliver desktop-to-desktop video, voice, and data; the combination of those will, I believe, be responsible for a revolution in education in the next ten years."

Mr. Bailey asked about up-front costs of both software and hardware. Vice Chancellor Owen responded that there is a free trial partnership with U.S. WEST for network interconnections among the campuses. "The national infrastructure will, I think, be built by private corporations. It's not intended to be built by the public. The digital video area will be the area that not only drives communications, but will be the biggest driving force for the next generation development of electronic devices. I think it will certainly govern a lot of what goes on in the semiconductor industry.

"You probably saw the announcement Intel made this week about these new, fairly inexpensive computer systems than enable communication 'video-wise' between people. This is the future of communications. My concern is that, nationally, there will not be enough space reserved for the educational programs and that we will be competing with the pay-for-view people. I think the structure will be built; we have to move aggressively to be participants. If we aren't, I think we'll be in danger of being left behind."

When asked about timelines, Dr. Owen responded that the program is projected to start spring term, involving Portland State University, Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, the Oregon Graduate Institute, and OCATE. There is also the intention to experiment with sending echo-
cardiograms between Oregon Health Sciences University and Good Samaritan Hospital in Corvallis.

Mr. Miller asked about the effect of this technology on ED-NET. Dr. Owen indicated that ED-NET isn't designed to handle data as well as video. It is different technology. There was discussion about how this work interfaces with the planning of the 2010 Advisory Panel, and it was agreed that it would be useful to have a demonstration of the technology at a future Board meeting.

(No Board action required)

Background

Numerous recent national reports have highlighted the new imperative for higher education, i.e., that higher education must become more productive. Colleges and universities must engage in reforms that produce demonstrably more education, research, and training for the resources requested from students, parents, and taxpayers. Productivity advances will not be achieved alone through traditional approaches of reducing faculty and staff while holding student enrollment constant or increasing it. Significant, sustainable productivity advances will be achieved through greater attention to the learner and, therefore, learning -- the demonstrated mastery of a defined body of knowledge and skills.

Learning productivity is a new focus for higher education reform that addresses four critical problems affecting higher education: financial strains on campuses caused by revenue sources unable to keep up with rising costs; financial strains on parents and students with tuition/fees rising faster than family incomes and with student work and debt loads mounting to unacceptable levels; students entering college or coming of college age who are inadequately prepared for college or entrance into the workforce; and inadequate learning in the undergraduate years of college.

With these national developments in mind, the Board of Higher Education appointed a Board Committee on Academic Productivity (BCAP) in April 1993 to consider the distribution of faculty effort within a national context and make recommendations on ways to improve academic productivity while maintaining or enhancing quality in the Oregon State System of Higher Education. BCAP subsequently met with national experts on the topic of academic productivity, and reviewed developments that could lead to increases in academic productivity in a number of areas, particularly
mastery learning, greater use of technology, and time-shortened degrees. BCAP recommended that funds be allocated to the campuses for experimentation and evaluation for innovation and productivity increases in these areas. To this end, a Request for Proposal process addressing interinstitutional productivity and educational reform projects was put into motion by the State System Office of Academic Affairs in September 1993. Chancellor Bartlett advised the presidents in August 1993 that campuses would be required to develop plans for academic productivity and educational reform that will assure demonstrable results. These plans will be submitted to the Chancellor by March 1994; preliminary reports were received in December 1993.

This report addresses progress made in implementing "interinstitutional" academic productivity and educational reform projects.

**Request for Proposal Process**

A Request for Proposal (RFP) for Academic Productivity and Educational Reform was issued on October 1, 1993, with the deadline for proposal submission on November 15, 1993. The purpose of the RFP was to fund "demonstration projects to enable OSSHE institutions to increase their academic productivity via interinstitutional strategies related to higher education reform." The RFP process called for two rounds of funding -- $250,000 available in each. The second RFP will be issued in February 1994. Revisions in the February RFP are planned as a result of experiences with the October RFP.

Thirty-two proposals were submitted by the campuses in response to the October RFP, for a total of $1,272,100. After a review of these proposals by the State System Office of Academic Affairs and the Chancellor, 12 projects were selected for funding, for a total expenditure of $255,000.

Proposals were funded in the following priority areas:

- Student self-paced learning projects, particularly related to technological developments;
- Curricular streamlining projects such as time-shortened degrees, accelerated baccalaureates;
- Distance education collaborative degree/curricula projects;
- Faculty capacity-building projects; and
- Special assessment projects.
Projects Funded in Round-One RFP

Eastern Oregon State College. "Building Student Computer Capability." $5,000

This project supports planning to determine basic computer literacy of entering students and to identify self-paced learning programs that are already available in the public domain for students to use in raising their competency level as a condition for moving through degree programs (such as Agricultural Sciences) at Eastern Oregon State College. Oregon State University will be a collaborating partner in identifying basic learning programs for students (for example, videotape, software, print materials that enable students to achieve basic computer literacy to permit enrollment in more advanced-level coursework in computer applications). Cost-effective approaches of assuring widespread student computer literacy are at issue across the System.

Oregon Health Sciences University. "Distance Education Programs for Registered Nurses." $40,000 (includes cost-sharing from OSSHE Annenberg Grant)

This project supports expansion of distance education programs in nursing to serve approximately 60 students at three additional sites -- South Coast (Gold Beach/Brookings), Astoria, and Bend. Faculty from the four campuses of the School of Nursing (Oregon Health Sciences University, Eastern Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology) will focus on the development of innovative methods for course delivery to include electronic conferencing (using COMPASS, statewide computer network of ED-NET), syllabus restructuring to increase student independence in learning, and cross-campus faculty teaching teams. The project will result in faculty and student productivity enhancements as a statewide master plan for outreach program delivery is developed and new programs that incorporate more opportunities for individualized learning formats are developed and implemented.

Oregon State University. "OSSHE Technology in Teaching/Faculty Training." $45,000

This project will establish a statewide training program available to faculty from all OSSHE campuses on how to incorporate the new instructional technologies into their courses. The project will sponsor a summer workshop for approximately 50 faculty as well as provide follow-up
liaison and resources faculty need to integrate available technology into their fall term coursework. Training will include a vision for technology in teaching and models for implementing technology, with sessions guiding faculty through a number of software packages and innovative instructional techniques that utilize visual, auditory, and interactive materials for various learning environments.

Oregon State University, "Streamlining Introductory Biology Courses." $10,000

This project supports planning to streamline Oregon State University's introductory biology sequences using new technologies and critical thinking approaches. The current Oregon State University biology program offers three introductory biology sequences each year, requiring 27 faculty to teach them. Oregon State University would reduce the number of introductory sequences from three to two, resulting in increased faculty productivity. Changes in the biology sequence will reflect national recommendations for curricular reform, which call for reduced content mass and stress on memorization and more emphasis on scientific process, use of new technologies, and development of inquiry skills. The project will work with community colleges and other OSSHE institutions to determine how biology sequences for introductory students are provided at other campuses so that new majors sequence and materials may be shared among all campuses to expedite articulation for transfer students.

Portland State University, "Curriculum Planning for New General Education Program." $32,000

This project continues work in progress by the University to develop a new General Education Program to begin in fall 1994. The project will enable Portland State University to develop the first level curriculum (Freshman Inquiry Courses) of the General Education Program and the processes necessary to implement the fourth level of the new program, a required service learning component (Capstone Service Learning). Portland State University will work cooperatively with Southern Oregon State College to involve faculty from both institutions working on these two aspects of curriculum development. A feature of the project will be a special conference for faculty from the two institutions to work with national experts in a faculty capacity building component.
Portland State University. "Graduate Social Work Education." $25,000

This project supports the development of an off-campus Master's of Social Work (MSW) program that could be delivered over ED-NET and other technologies to sites throughout the state. The project will revamp preliminary courses (the first four to six courses in the degree sequence) in the MSW for delivery to one or two sites (Eugene, Eastern Oregon State College) where considerable student interest has been demonstrated. Faculty will be trained in distance education techniques by participating in the Oregon State University Distance Education Workshop, building faculty capacity for further expansion of the MSW beyond these preliminary courses.

Southern Oregon State College. "Refocusing Undergraduate Education (Accelerated Baccalaureate Program)." $35,000

This project builds upon the results of a previous Southern Oregon State College project undertaken in cooperation with regional K-12 schools and business/industry. The project will enable Southern Oregon State College to continue development of an accelerated baccalaureate program by achieving a calibration among the standards for the CAM, admission to an OSSHE institution, and the performance indicators of Southern Oregon State College's undergraduate Core Curriculum. This articulation will enable students to enter an accelerated baccalaureate program that will have the following features: restructured general education, minor, and major subject requirements; and student mastery model of assessment. Southern Oregon State College will work collaboratively with Portland State University in focusing on general education curriculum development efforts. Southern Oregon State College will also work collaboratively with Eastern Oregon State College, whose extensive prior experience in prior learning assessment may be of assistance to early admission provisions established for the high school students transitioning into college program.

University of Oregon. "Journalism Education Through Distance Learning at OSSHE Campuses and Community Colleges." $12,000

This project supports planning to develop and provide journalism courses on community colleges and OSSHE campuses via ED-NET, supplemented by other media such as Internet and CD-ROM, to prepare adequately transfer students for the major and shorten their time to graduation. The project will focus on the identification of need for three courses at various locations throughout the state: J201, Mass Media and Society; J202,
Information Gathering; and J204, Visual Communication. These are required of journalism and communication majors at the University of Oregon. Collaborators in the project will be community colleges and OSSHE institutions interested in receiving these course(s) for their students, both those who might utilize these courses in their own programs at the receiving institutions or those planning to transfer to the University of Oregon to complete a major in journalism and communication (there are approximately 90 students per year who transfer from community colleges to journalism). Some of these courses are presently available at community colleges and OSSHE institutions; however, it may be more efficient for such courses to be provided by the School of Journalism to reduce duplication.

University of Oregon, "Self-Paced Courses for Undergraduate Physics Major," $15,000

This project would establish a data base of problems and solutions in undergraduate physics for use by all state institutions. Contributions to the data base will be made by professors at participating institutions, to be identified early in the project. Students will have access to the problem sets and solutions by logging onto the educational network. Data could be used by students and faculty in multiple ways: developing self-paced courses with credits granted on achieving appropriate proficiency; review and self-study periods; and granting credits to transfer students, those who have taken advanced placement tests in schools and credits by challenge.

University of Oregon, "Statewide Undergraduate Business Program," $10,000

This project supports planning by the University of Oregon and Oregon State University to meet the needs of working adults to complete the last two years of an undergraduate general business program (B.S. in Business) at a variety of locations in the state, particularly community colleges that offer coursework equivalent to the lower division business core and support courses in arts and sciences. The primary delivery mechanisms for the upper division baccalaureate completion degree would be ED-NET and Internet. Because undergraduate business courses are currently being provided by Eastern Oregon State College and Southern Oregon State College to nearby community colleges, the project will consult with other providers of undergraduate business programs to determine how to mesh with their efforts, and how best to enable the
resources of the University of Oregon and Oregon State University to serve the state's needs in this area.

University of Oregon, "The Use of High Technology to Improve Productivity and Quality of Teaching in Computer Science," $20,000

This is a collaborative project between the University of Oregon and Oregon State University to deliver an introductory class for majors in computer science using technology in the form of a statewide computer network and modern multimedia delivery system to improve both the productivity of instructors and the quality of instruction. The University of Oregon and Oregon State University will offer a course for approximately 50 students in 1994-95 following work by faculty on course design (enrollment the following year is expected to reach 250). The course will use a portion of the Mosaic system (a software that enables students to "tour" on Internet, to include texts, graphics, audio and video components -- or multimedia; and hypertext -- transporting to other tours) to deliver the lecture portion of the course. The project will develop a tour, or course, that can be delivered with minimal cost to 10 or 1,000 students without requiring change to the course. The project will address policy issues raised for both faculty and students when moving to new instructional modes such as those to be demonstrated.

Western Oregon State College, "Reforming the Teaching of Entry Level Mathematics in the Electronic Age," $28,000

This project will enable Western Oregon State College to develop a combined computer science and mathematics course of six credit hours, with the goal of teaching students to use mathematics and technologies in formulating and solving real-world problems. The course will be offered in a lab setting, adapting a "learning by discovery" model at the heart of current calculus reform projects. The course will consist of six one-credit modules to be completed over one or two terms. The course will use a mastery learning model, allowing students to progress through a module only after demonstrating mastery of material in that module. The course lab format will achieve the cost effectiveness of large lecture courses while still providing individualized instruction. Western Oregon State College anticipates proposed course cost reductions of nearly 50 percent. Western Oregon State College has been asked to work with other institutions to insure applicability to other campuses and potential for replication.
Board Discussion

Mr. Swanson commented that he was impressed with the quality and diversity of the projects. President Wilson added her thanks for the tremendous work of the faculty participating in these projects.

(No Board action required)

Vice Chancellor Ihrig indicated that an amendment of the Oregon Administrative Rule relating to professional consultants would be brought before the Board at a future meeting. It will suggest changes in the limits and processes regarding professional consultants in capital construction projects. The goal is to increase institutional flexibility and reduce expensive overhead without increasing risks.

Mr. Lee mentioned a series of forums that he and President Brand are organizing in order to educate students about changes in the higher education system.

Ms. Christopher indicated that the administration of Southern Oregon State College meets regularly with local superintendents, and that soon that arena will be expanded to include high school principals and community college people for a discussion about school reform. Dr. Conley has agreed to participate, and the Department of Education and Board of Education have offered to participate as well. In addition, Southern Oregon State College will be hosting the "Meet the People" session (receiving public input about the future of higher education) on February 3.

Mr. Miller publicly acknowledged the hard work of President Wilson.
President Wilson thanked Dr. Peter Kohler, Ms. Mary Ann Lockwood, and Mr. Mark Kemball for their outstanding work in hosting the meeting and responding to last-minute needs of the Board. The meeting adjourned at 12 noon.
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