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ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by President Les Swanson.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Dr. Herb Aschkenasy  
Mr. Bob Bailey  
Ms. Diane Christopher  
Mr. Rob Miller  
Ms. Ronda Trotman Reese  
Mr. George Richardson  
Ms. Janice Wilson  
Mr. Les Swanson, Jr.

Mr. Donahue has resigned from the Board. Mr. Lee and Mr. Willis were absent due to conflicts in their schedules.

Chancellor's Office -- Chancellor Joseph Cox; Andy Clark, Associate Director, Government Relations; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Francesca Clifford, Public Relations Specialist; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services and Compliance Officer; Weldon E. Ihrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Susan Johnese, Executive Secretary, Finance and Administration; Steve Katz, Controller; Grattan Kerans, Director, Government Relations; Keith Kutler, Assistant Attorney General; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Richard A. Markwood, Dean/Director, Central Oregon University Center; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies; Vicki Shives, Associate Board Secretary; Audry Symes, Assistant to Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Virginia L. Thompson, Board Secretary; Susan Weeks, Director, Institutional Research Services; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.

Eastern Oregon State College -- President David Gilbert; Jackie Grant, Director, Native American Program; James Hottois, Provost/Dean of Academic Affairs; Richard Stenard, Dean of Student; Mary Voves, Dean of Administration; Peggy Young, Assistant to the President.

Oregon Health Sciences University -- President Peter Kohler; B. Elizabeth Britton, Director, Multicultural Affairs; Lesley M. Hallick, Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.
October 28, 1994

Meeting #634

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the September 23, 1994, meeting of the Board. Mr. Miller moved approval of the minutes as submitted, and Mr. Bailey seconded the motion. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Miller, Richardson, Trotman Reese, Wilson, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.

President Swanson thanked Dr. and Mrs. Gilbert for hosting a dinner for the Board in their home the previous evening. After reviewing the agenda, Mr. Swanson indicated the Board would follow a different format than previously used. The visit would occur from 10:30 a.m. until 1:30 p.m., and the Board meeting would resume at 1:30 p.m.
Mr. Swanson informed the Board that Mr. Donahue tendered his resignation from the Board to return to Massachusetts to resume his law practice. He described the long history of service to the country and publicly thanked him for his contribution to the Board. President Swanson presented the following resolution, which Board members agreed to formally send to Mr. Donahue.

With regret, we have been informed that Dick Donahue has written to Governor Roberts tendering his resignation from the Board of Higher Education. It affords us the opportunity to thank Dick for his service to the Board. We are going to miss him.

Dick has a most distinguished professional and service background. He was a staff member of John F. Kennedy's 1960 campaign for president, and White House liaison to Congress from 1960-63. Previously he chaired the Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts at Lowell, and is and has been a trustee or member of numerous boards devoted to education and health, including the Joyce Foundation of Chicago and the Oregon Graduate Institute. Dick was named to the NIKE Board of Directors in 1977, appointed president and chief operating officer and later vice president. Now, Dick and his wife have returned to Massachusetts and the law firm, Donahue & Donahue, founded by his grandfather, where he has served for 40 years as a trial lawyer.

Dick is the parent of 11 children, so his interest in education derived from his personal life as well as from his commitment to social issues.

We're going to miss Dick's wisdom and his wit. His wisdom was manifested through his ability to succinctly state the issues and move the Board to action. But his seriousness was always tempered by wry good humor. We wish him and his wife all the best in the years ahead.
CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Enrollment

Chancellor Cox reported that although official enrollment data are not ready, preliminary review suggests that enrollment is meeting anticipated levels. Based on conversations with Community College Commissioner Bassett, enrollment figures are down at the two-year colleges.

EOSC

Dr. Cox indicated that he had spent two days at Eastern Oregon State College. "I'm tremendously impressed by the spirit here of the students, faculty, staff, and community. There's a passionate feeling about Eastern Oregon State College throughout ten counties. Also impressive here is the use of facilities and the efficiency with which this institution operates. They've grown about 25 percent in student numbers since Measure 5 passed. They're doing a lot right."

Federal Contacts

Dr. Large, Ms. Stevens, and Dr. Cox spent several days in Washington, D.C., meeting with the Oregon delegation. The Chancellor underlined the importance of federal dollars to the State System. Time was also spent with Mr. Longanecker, the assistant secretary for postsecondary education in the Department of Labor, discussing the State Postsecondary Review Entity (SPRE) and the perceived greater federal presence in education across the country.

Editorial Boards

The visits to editorial boards are almost completed. Dr. Cox noted that the meetings have been extremely positive. He's also spent a great deal of time meeting with key legislators, one-on-one.

University Center

Dr. Cox made several visits to Bend as the new University Center is starting up. The strategy of sharing facilities to increase access is also being considered in Klamath Falls, perhaps using the Oregon Institute of Technology campus to provide community college programs. Mr. Bailey asked for more detail about that. Dr. Wolf responded that there is a movement within Klamath County to form an educational service district. If that occurs, Oregon Institute of Technology will endeavor to work as a partner in meeting the needs of the region for community college services.

Legislative Campaign

Phase I of the State System's legislative campaign is almost completed (June through the election). During Phase II (November 9 through January 9), the Chancellor will seek to establish the best possible working relationships with the new administration. Dr. Cox thanked Dr. Gerald Kissler, senior vice provost at the University of Oregon, for his contribution to this process.
Finally, Chancellor Cox indicated that he has continued to meet with his colleagues in the private institutions of higher education.

Dr. Bill Danley, president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS), indicated that the faculty is dedicated to being part of the solution of some of Oregon's problems. As such the IFS voted at their last meeting to pass the following resolution in support of the Board.

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate supports the intent of the State Board of Higher Education as embodied in the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act, to improve administrative efficiency and maintain student access while preserving the rights and authority of the faculties and the autonomy of the individual campuses.

(The full text of Dr. Danley's report is on file in the Board's office.)

Dr. Cox noted that he and Ms. Christopher participated in the formulation of the strategic plan for Oregon Institute of Technology. He invited Dr. Wolf to share both the strategic plan and a plan for implementation.

Dr. Wolf introduced the new Dean of the School of Engineering and Industrial Technologies, Dr. Elijah Baker.

President Wolf referred to the report, "Building a Vision," which includes the new strategic plan for Oregon Institute of Technology. When asked by the school's foundation to describe the institution, Dr. Wolf responded that it "...fosters the study of techniques that have direct and immediate applications in the economy." He described the process for developing the plan, which began in March and gathered input from 120 faculty, staff, students, and citizens. Encompassed in the plan are undergraduate and graduate education, applied research, enrollment, diversity, and response to state need.

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

Dr. George W. Brown, director of the Forest Research Laboratory, with the concurrence of President Byrne and Chancellor Cox, recommended the following reappointments for a three-year term:

Reappointment of Ms. Patricia M. Bedient to a three-year term as a public member of the Advisory Committee. Ms. Bedient is a partner with Arthur Anderson & Co., and has been actively involved in forestry and community issues in the Portland metro area for many years. She has provided significant support during her term on the Committee.

Reappointment of Senator Bob Kintigh to a three-year term. Senator Kintigh fills the state-mandated position that represents small, non-industrial forest owners. His service on the Committee has been invaluable.

Reappointment of Dr. Norman E. Johnson, senior vice president for technology, Weyerhaeuser Corporation, to a three-year term on the Committee. Dr. Johnson provides a unique link with the largest research organization in the forest industry. He has provided outstanding counsel during his past tenure as a Committee member.

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

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

Officials of the colleges and universities have requested several amendments to the 1995-2001 capital construction budget approved by the Board in July and submitted to the Department of Administrative Services in early September. Amendments to this budget are common and have been presented to and approved by the Board in each of the last several biennia. However, such amendments can be accepted by the Department of Administrative Services only through October.

The changes that have been proposed include the phasing of the construction of the addition to and modernization of the Kerr Library at Oregon State University; a change in scope for the Business, Math, Computer Science Building at Western Oregon State College; a larger expansion for the University of Oregon Museum of Art; a reauthorization for the Native American Longhouse project at the University of Oregon; a reduction in the Systemwide Seismic Improvements project resulting from the reconfiguration of the Kerr Library project at Oregon State University; and the addition of three gift- and grant-funded projects at Oregon State University's Hatfield Marine Science Center.

In addition, an Other Funds limitation of $3 million must be established for projects to be funded with the proceeds of loans made under authority of the State Energy Loan Program. This limitation would be added to that requested by the Board for its Utility Renovation project (raising the total from $5.5 million of Other Funds to $8.5 million of Other Funds). The proceeds would be used to make improvements to conserve energy in those cases where the energy savings would pay the debt service on the loans.

Last month, the Emergency Board approved the phasing of the Kerr Library project, authorizing the expenditure of $20 million for the construction of the addition and the outfitting of one floor for use as the University's "Information Central." Oregon State University met the challenge laid down by the 1993 Legislative Assembly to raise $10 million of gifts for the project in order to match a like amount of bonds issued under Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution. The Board approved the
issuance of the bonds last summer, and they were sold earlier this month. This permits Oregon State University to reduce its request for 1995-1997 by $20 million. Originally, this would have meant that the Board would be seeking $16 million of General Fund to finish the Kerr Library project and another $4 million of General Fund for seismic upgrading of the current facility. However, Oregon State University officials have committed to raise an additional $10 million of gifts for the second phase of the project. This permits the total General Fund being sought for the project (including the seismic upgrade) to be reduced from $20 million to $10 million.

Western Oregon State College officials have been approached by officials of the Oregon State Police with a request to construct a forensics laboratory on the campus to serve the region around Salem. In addition, Western Oregon State College has concluded that it would like to rehabilitate and expand the existing Instructional Technology Center to meet the college's most critical facilities needs, which are to house its business, mathematics, and computer science programs. The 1995-1997 capital construction request approved by the Board in July included $9.9 million of General Fund for the construction of a Business, Math, and Computer Science Building in the Public Service Park at Western Oregon State College. The renovation of the Instructional Technology Center was proposed to occur in 1997-1999. Officials at the college now propose to renovate and expand the Instructional Technology Center in 1995-1997 to house most of the needed functions (including the Forensics Laboratory). The cost of this effort would be $6,950,000, including $400,000 of other funds associated with the Forensics Laboratory. This reduces the General Fund request for 1995-1997 from $9.9 million to $6,550,000. A smaller new building is proposed for 1997-1999.

The University of Oregon has studied further the expansion and renovation of the Museum of Art. Originally, the Board had approved a General Fund or Lottery request of $5,250,000 for this project. However, a further refinement of the University's needs and the recent experience of the University of Washington for a similar facility has led to a doubling of the size of the addition to 20,000 square feet and an increase in the cost to $12,250,000.

The University of Oregon's fundraising efforts for the Native American Longhouse are under way but probably will not be concluded by the end of the biennium. Therefore, the University has requested that the 1991 authorization for this project be renewed and that the limitation be...

532
increased to meet the expected inflationary increases to the budget. The revised budget for the project is $650,000.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration approved a grant of nearly $500,000 for Oregon State University to design a renovated Visitor/Education Center at the Hatfield Marine Science Center in Newport. Oregon State University is seeking the $5 million needed for construction from that agency and hopes for approval before the end of the biennium. This would permit renovation of the facility to take place in 1995-1997.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration budgets for 1994 and 1995 include a total of $4.2 million for the enlargement of the dock and the construction of associated space at the Oregon State University Hatfield Marine Science Center. This will provide much-needed space to outfit vessels and permit larger research vessels to utilize the facility. This work would take place in the 1995-1997 biennium.

Fundraising is underway to finance construction of family housing facilities at the Hatfield Marine Science Center. This $1.1 million gift-funded project would construct new housing and renovate some of the existing dormitory space.

The priorities assigned to the projects already approved by the Board would not change under these requests. The priority for the Native American Longhouse, a 1991 project that is being requested for reauthorization, would be fourth under the category of non-General Fund Education and General projects. (Only three projects were included in that category in July.) The visitor center and dock facilities at the Hatfield Marine Science Center would be fifth and sixth in that category. The housing effort at the Hatfield Marine Science Center would be ranked 12th in the Auxiliary Services category.

The overall effects of these changes on the 1995-1997 capital construction budget are to reduce the amount of General Fund requested by $15,900,000 and to increase the amount of Other Funds limitation being sought by $14,850,000. The 1997-1999 request (which will be reviewed and renewed by the Board in 1996) would increase by $4 million.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board concur with the requests of officials from Oregon State University, Western Oregon State College, and the University of Oregon and authorize staff to amend the 1995-2001 Proposed Capital Construction Budget request to make the adjustments requested for the Oregon State University Kerr Library; three projects at Oregon State University’s Hatfield Marine Science Center; Systemwide Seismic Improvements; Systemwide Utility Renovations; the Business, Math, Computer Science and Forensics Building at Western Oregon State College; and the Museum of Art and the Native American Longhouse at the University of Oregon.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Ihrig summarized the proposed amendments. Dr. Aschkenasy asked for more detail on the process for making recommendations, in particular as it relates to the University of Oregon Museum of Art. Mr. Ihrig responded that campuses make the initial request. Then Associate Vice Chancellor Pemsteiner and his staff review the requests, including fundraising and use of General Funds as well as design, to evaluate the appropriateness of the request. The museum project was benchmarked against a museum at the University of Washington that recently underwent a similar type of expansion. A large portion of the work relates to humidity and temperature control systems that are currently lacking. There is an extensive amount of work needed in that area to preserve collections, and that’s the major reason that the price per square foot is so high.

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

Staff Report to the Board

William and Margaret Oberteuffer donated a parcel of land containing 112.614 acres located in the northeast part of the state in Union County to the Oregon State University Foundation for use by the Oregon State University College of Forestry. An appraisal by Montane Resource Associates values the land at $22,400 and the timber on the land at $371,900, for a total value of $394,300. The Foundation desires to deed
the property to Oregon State University for use by the College of Forestry. The College of Forestry intends to use the property in the same manner as McDonald Forest, which is managed for research, teaching, demonstration, and other educational values. The property is mostly timberland with about 12 percent grassland. There is a diverse mixture of tree species on the property, which has been managed by selective cutting over the past 20 years. The property is fenced and has all the roads in place that are needed to harvest and manage the timber. There are no year-round streams on the property. The property has been physically checked for environmental concerns; none were found. Oregon State University staff have completed an environmental survey and have supplied the Office of Finance and Administration with their report.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

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

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

At the September meeting, the Board approved Oregon Administrative Rule 580-50-100, which implements the current requirements of ORS 182.415, 182.425, and 182.435, making each state agency responsible for managing, maintaining records, and reporting on all state-provided housing.

Pursuant to statute and the Board’s Administrative Rule, Internal Management Directive (IMD) 7.170, establishes procedures for handling Board-provided housing and for setting rent, including rent reduction criteria.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following Internal Management Directive 7.170 regarding Board-provided housing.

IMD 7.170 Board-Provided Housing

(1) Pursuant to ORS 182.415 to 182.435, the Department of Higher Education should collect rent for housing provided to officers and employees. Each institution shall:

(a) Examine periodically, but not less frequently than once every five years, each rental unit's fair rental value. Fair rental value shall be determined by a qualified appraiser certified under ORS 308.010 or licensed or certified under ORS 674.310. The rental rate shall be adjusted annually to reflect changes in community real estate values, if any.

(b) Collect rent for such housing based on the fair rental value, subject to any rental rate reductions authorized in (2).

(c) Deposit such rental income in an appropriate institution account.

(d) Provide no furnishings except as authorized by ORS 182.415(1).

(e) Determine whether to provide or to what extent the institution will provide utilities and services for each housing unit.

(2) Each institution providing housing for officers or employees may reduce the rent charged, by up to 100 percent from the fair market value, based on the following factors:

(a) Rental reduction for agency need.

(A) If residence in the housing unit is a job requirement, as evidenced by contract or position description, and not offered as an incentive or a fringe benefit to the resident state employee -- 50 percent reduction; or
(B) If residence in the housing unit is not a job-related requirement but it is a distinct advantage to the institution to have the officer or employee live near the job in case of an emergency or for general protection of OSSHE's property in the area -- 20 percent reduction; or

(C) If residence in the housing unit is not a job requirement and the only advantage to the institution is to reduce the chance of vandalism and deterioration to an OSSHE-owned or controlled residence -- 10 percent reduction; or

(D) If residence in the housing unit is not a job requirement, nor is it for the benefit of the institution, but is solely for the benefit of the occupant -- NO reduction.

(b) Rental reduction for invasion of privacy.

(A) If the housing unit or a significant part of it is used for a public office or public business, or is so located that invasion of privacy by the public or by guests invited for institutionally related activities is expected or usual -- 30 percent reduction; or

(B) If the public is not invited and invasion of privacy is not the usual occurrence, but the residence location or architecture plainly indicates state ownership and there is little or no restriction of public or institution client traffic -- 20 percent reduction; or

(C) Invasion of privacy is an occasional or seasonal occurrence and there is some restriction to public traffic -- 10 percent reduction; or

(D) Invasion of privacy is no more than would be expected for an average privately owned residence -- NO reduction.
(c) Rental reduction for isolation.

(A) If the housing unit is located in an isolated area, defined as being more than 50 miles distance or 90 minutes travel by automobile from the nearest full-service community, or the travel conditions are usually severe or hazardous. A full-service community is one with supermarket, department store, medical doctor, dentist, church, school, etc. -- 20 percent reduction; or

(B) If the housing unit is located 30 to 50 miles distance or 60 to 90 minutes travel by automobile from the nearest full-service community, or the travel conditions are seasonally severe or hazardous -- 15 percent reduction; or

(C) If the housing unit is located 10 to 30 miles distance or 30 to 60 minutes travel time by automobile from the nearest full-service community, the travel conditions are only occasionally severe or hazardous -- 10 percent reduction; or

(D) The housing unit is located within 10 miles and not over 30 minutes travel time by automobile from the nearest full-service community, and the travel conditions are rarely severe or hazardous -- NO reduction.

(d) Rental reduction for unique conditions.

Certain unique conditions may arise or exist in addition to those in (a)-(c) above. Rent may be reduced as follows:

(A) To correct inequities between the fair rental value as determined in (1) and the salary of the officer or employee occupying the residence -- reduction to the extent necessary and reasonable;

(B) Because of unique conditions in the Board’s title to the property (e.g., the Board’s ownership is condi-
tioned upon residence by a specified employee) -- up to 100 percent of the fair rental value; and

(C) Other factors necessary for effective program management (cannot include factors reflecting only the convenience or comfort of an employee) -- a reduction of up to 20 percent.

(3) All information concerning housing units provided to officers or employees shall be submitted to the Office of Finance and Administration, Facilities Services, on the Rent Reduction Report form, which is obtainable from that office.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Christopher moved and Ms. Wilson seconded approval of the staff recommendation. On roll call, the following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Miller, Richardson, Trotman Reese, Wilson, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.

Introduction

Oregon State University requested that the Computer Science Building be renamed Hovland Hall. Oregon State University's request is in recognition of Dr. C. Warren Hovland's commitment to excellence in undergraduate teaching and his contributions to Oregon State University.

Present Board policy requires Board approval for naming buildings after living individuals if unusually meritorious reasons exist or if a donor contributes a substantial share of the cost of construction of a specific school, college, department, division, center, or institute.

Background

The Computer Science Building was constructed in 1919. An addition in 1923 doubled the existing space to the current total of 15,364 square feet. The building currently serves as the home of the Department of Philosophy in the College of Liberal Arts, and to some faculty from the Department of Computer Science in the College of Engineering. The building contains two classrooms, one large computer laboratory (including a unique multimedia laboratory and general access computer science laboratory), and faculty, staff, and graduate student offices. The
facility also contains a mainframe computer room wired to Dearborn Hall to support the Department of Computer Science.

C. Warren Hovland, the longtime chairman of the Department of Religious Studies at Oregon State University, is referred to by many as the "conscience of Oregon State University." Dr. Hovland joined the Oregon State University faculty in 1949, after service as a chaplain in the U.S. Navy during World War II. He was chair of Religious Studies at Oregon State University from 1967 to 1982, and was awarded the status of Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies in 1986, following 37 years of service to Oregon State University.

An exemplary teacher and superb counselor, Dr. Hovland has received the Oregon State University faculty's four highest teaching awards (Outstanding Teacher Award, 1963; Harbison Award for Distinguished Teaching, 1964; Mosser Outstanding Teaching Award, 1966; Alumni Distinguished Professor Award, 1971). He also is the 1986 recipient of the D. Curtis Mumford Faculty Service Award honoring his extraordinary service to the University in many roles.

Under Dr. Hovland's leadership, the Department of Religious Studies was the first authorized by OSSHE to offer a baccalaureate degree in religious education.

Now 77 years old and retired from teaching, Dr. Hovland exemplifies the values central to Oregon State University's mission: a strong commitment to excellence in undergraduate instruction, and integrity and compassion in the service of the university, the state, and the nation.

Renaming Oregon State University's Computer Science Building as Hovland Hall is a proposal endorsed by faculty and administrators at Oregon State University as a way to recognize Dr. C. Warren Hovland for all he has done for education and for Oregon State University.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff concurred with the recommendation of Oregon State University that the Computer Science Building be renamed as Hovland Hall to honor this outstanding teacher and mentor and to send a strong signal to students and faculty of the value Oregon State University places on the learning process.
Board Discussion and Action

In response to the question about why the computer science building was named for Dr. Hovland rather than religious studies building, Dr. Large responded that the computer science building currently houses the philosophy department and religious studies program.

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

Introduction

The University of Oregon requested authorization to establish a program leading to a teacher licensure endorsement in Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education (EI/ECSE). The proposed program would be offered by the Early Intervention Area, a division of Special Education and Rehabilitation in the College of Education.

The EI/ECSE endorsement was established by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) in the spring of 1994. The purpose of this new endorsement is to provide a state-approved credential for teachers working with disabled infants, toddlers, and preschool-age children and their families.

Early Intervention is a field that encompasses a knowledge and practice base directed to populations of children who range in age from birth to six years and who are disabled or at-risk for development of a disabling condition. Scholarly areas of focus include: atypical development; learning disorders in infants and young children; social interactions across families, peers, and community agents; ecological contexts of development (e.g., economic and health conditions); effects of intervention efforts; and content and structure of early intervention programs. Clinical or applied areas include: clinical skills for effective intervention with children and family members, team skills for participating on interdisciplinary assessment and intervention teams, programming and evaluations skills, and professional/interpersonal skills.

The proposed endorsement program involves a fine-tuning of existing courses offered by the University of Oregon and formalizes a current and ongoing program. The cost of this program is already covered through
state funds and federal grants that support the existing program and faculty. No additional funds will be required to establish the proposed program. A copy of the full proposal is on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The University of Oregon's mission includes instruction, research, and public service to advance scientific and humanistic knowledge and service. Programs of instruction are designed to provide high-quality education in professional preparation as well as in the liberal arts and sciences. The EI/ECSE endorsement will prepare credentialed professionals to provide needed services to disabled and at-risk children and their families.

2. Evidence of Need

The Early Intervention Program has existed at the University of Oregon since 1978. During that time it has successfully recruited well-qualified students. Graduates of this program have been sought by public and private agencies concerned with young children and their families, including public schools, regional programs, private, non-profit agencies, and federal programs such as Head Start. Every graduate who has desired a position in the field has procured one without difficulty and typically has several options from which to choose.

Recent changes in federal and state legislation and priorities suggest the need for qualified early intervention personnel will increase dramatically. For example, since July of 1991, states are required to provide a free appropriate education to all disabled three-, four-, and five-year-old children. In addition, the federal government is offering incentives for states to develop programs for the birth-to-two population. These changes will increase the number of children and families who are eligible for early intervention services. In a recent Oregon survey, 32 counties indicated that a lack of qualified personnel constitutes a serious barrier to the development of programs. Given the recent establishment of the new endorsement by TSPC, students and professionals will be seeking university programs leading to this specialization.
3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The field of early intervention is relatively young, having developed over the past 15 to 20 years, with particularly rapid growth during the past five years. The Early Intervention Program at the University of Oregon was one of the first such programs in the nation. It has gained a national reputation in the field and is widely considered to be one of the top programs in the country.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. The Early Intervention Program has three full-time faculty. All three are leaders in early intervention research, training, and model program development. The program director, Dr. Diane Bricker, is recognized nationally and internationally as one of the foremost authorities in this field. No additional faculty will be needed to establish the proposed program.

Library. Currently, the library has the majority of basic textbooks, reference materials, and journals necessary for students participating in this program. In addition, the Early Intervention Area has systematically purchased, through grant support, many other resources, which are available to students. No additional library resources are required.

Facilities and Equipment. The Center on Human Development has four large classroom areas especially designed as intervention spaces for young children. These classrooms are each equipped with bathroom and storage space. In addition, there are kitchen facilities, as well as indoor and outdoor play areas, available in the building. These classrooms have housed early intervention programs since the mid-1970s. Currently there are three separate programs that can serve as practica sites for students. No facilities beyond those now on hand will be required in support of the proposed program.

Budget Impact. The cost of the proposed program is already covered through state dollars supporting the Director of the Early Intervention Area and through federal grants that support the remainder of the faculty. The facility is supported by the Center on Human Development, as well as by grant monies. No additional state funding will be required. Since 1978, more than $3 million
in external grant support has been generated by University of Oregon faculty for support of Early Intervention programs. It is anticipated that the faculty -- who are considered leaders in the field -- will remain competitive in grant programs for many years.

5. **Duplication**

The EI/ECSE endorsement is newly approved by TSPC and, therefore, programs leading to it are not currently available at any institution of higher education in Oregon.

6. **Program Review**

The proposed endorsement has been extensively reviewed and institutionally approved by the University of Oregon College of Education. It has been submitted to TSPC for review and was positively reviewed by the Academic Council.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended the Board authorize the University of Oregon to offer a teacher licensure endorsement in Early Intervention/Early Childhood Special Education, effective upon approval, with a follow-up review to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs during the 2000-01 academic year. The proposal should be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the November Board meeting.

**Board Discussion and Action (October 28, 1994)**

In response to the question of whether or not this proposal was restoring a program that was cut during the Measure 5 downsizing, Vice Chancellor Clark clarified that special education programs were carefully guarded during the Measure 5 cuts. Rather, the elementary education programs at the University of Oregon were the ones that were eliminated. Provost Moseley underlined that this program has been in place for a number of years, largely funded by federal dollars, and that the item before the Board was one of awarding students licensure as now approved by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC).

Ms. Wilson inquired about the potential for sharing this program with other OSSHE institutions. Dr. Clark noted that while the issues of cooperation and collaboration are always examined, sometimes it is not
feasible. "At this point, there are three faculty members delivering a program. They certainly could seed efforts in other parts of the state, but we're not really presenting it as a program that is bigger than a single-institution program. I don't believe we have the resources to make such a recommendation." Dr. Moseley added, "Certainly the faculty members would be happy to cooperate with other institutions, but they are operating at capacity right now."

When asked about the overall plan for OSSHE's educational choices, Dr. Clark indicated that three years ago a statewide teacher education plan was developed and presented to the Board. She offered to update that plan for Board review. "The whole area of teacher education -- because it has been so important in the State System's programs -- has also been an area where there is considerable duplication. Much of that, I think, is unnecessary, but these days we work very hard to be sure that if we shouldn't have more than one or two programs, that we don't spread it. In special education, though, we do have pressure from all corners of the state for teachers to add special education endorsements as second and third endorsements because they're very pressed by their school districts to have the endorsements and the versatility that brings and to meet these needs that are very evident in all school districts these days."

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

Introduction

Oregon State University requested authorization to establish an undergraduate instructional program leading to a Certificate in Applied Ethics. The proposed certificate would be offered by the Department of Philosophy in the College of Liberal Arts and coordinated by the Program for Ethics, Science, and the Environment. The proposed program is multi-disciplinary and will involve faculty in eight colleges.

The field of applied ethics focuses on understanding moral problems within social or cultural contexts and proposes norms, principles, and methods to resolve these problems. The proposed certificate program will offer opportunities for multi-disciplinary scholarship and research on ethical and social policy issues raised by new developments in the biological sciences, the natural resource sciences, and the environmental
sciences. Students in this program will be provided with a systematic and thorough understanding of moral issues in relation to civic, professional, and personal activities. The objectives of the proposed program will complement the objectives of the Department of Philosophy and the Program for Ethics, Science, and the Environment.

At Oregon State University, undergraduate certificate programs must be taken in conjunction with a baccalaureate degree program. Students wishing to earn a certificate in applied ethics will complete a minimum of 28 hours of approved coursework in addition to baccalaureate requirements for their major.

No additional state funding will be required to support the proposed certificate program. All courses drawn on by the program are currently in place and no new administrative unit will be necessary. A copy of the full proposal is on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

Oregon State University is committed to excellence in the liberal arts and sciences and excellence in advancing knowledge and the application of knowledge to practical problems. New advances in scientific research raise vexing questions for the University, the community, and the nation regarding the wise and judicious application of emerging knowledge. The proposed new certificate program will be integral to the University's mission in addressing and examining these questions.

2. Evidence of Need

Need for the proposed program is evidenced by student demand, faculty interest, community interest, and philanthropic support from alumni.

During 1992-93, over 3,500 students enrolled in courses in philosophy. Courses in ethics, both lower and upper division, are routinely over-enrolled and the Department has had to add new sections to meet the demand. Lower division ethics courses and bioethics frequently are taught on a self-support basis during summer term. The majority of students enrolling in philosophy
courses are not philosophy majors, but enroll in one or more courses as part of their general education and baccalaureate core requirements.

Philosophy faculty are frequently called upon to offer lectures and discussions on relevant ethical issues in such programs as animal science, business, family science, food science, forestry, gerontology, history, pharmacy, public health, toxicology, and veterinary medicine.

Citizen and community support for educational forums sponsored by the Program for Ethics, Science, and the Environment has been substantial. Every educational forum has been unable to accommodate all who wished to attend, and media attention to these forums has been substantial.

Oregon State University alumni have expressed concern that ethics be a vital part of the contemporary curriculum. This interest and concern has led to substantial philanthropic gifts. These gifts provided start-up funds for the Program for Ethics, Science, and the Environment and funded an endowed chair in the Department of Philosophy, which designates a specific portion of its funding to courses and research in applied ethics.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The applied ethics certificate program will provide ground-breaking education and scholarship in the integration of ethics and the sciences, producing a distinctive program found at few other institutions in the country. The established high quality of the participating departments and colleges will assure a high level of quality in the proposed program.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. All courses necessary for the implementation of this degree program are currently offered at Oregon State University. No additional faculty will be required.

Library. While current library holdings are adequate to support the proposed program, subscriptions to additional multi-disciplinary journals are desirable to enhance the integration of scholarship.
between ethics and the sciences. Support for these additional subscriptions will be provided from gift funds.

Facilities and Equipment. No additional facilities or equipment will be required to implement the proposed program.

Budget Impact. No additional state resources are needed to implement the proposed program. Gift funds in the amount of $432 per year have been pledged for the purchase of new multidisciplinary journal subscriptions.

5. Duplication

There is only one program in Oregon that has made applied ethics central to its purpose: The Center for Ethics in Health Care at Oregon Health Sciences University. The goals of the Center are to promote careful attention to the rights and dignity of individual patients and to increase the participation of health care practitioners in the community's search for just and prudent health care policies. The proposed certificate program would be complementary to the objectives of the Center but unique in Oregon in that it includes areas of inquiry beyond medicine and health care and provides coursework for students.

Program Review

The proposed program has been reviewed by the Oregon State University Curriculum Council and approved by the Faculty Senate. The program proposal has also been reviewed positively by the Academic Council.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon State University to establish an undergraduate certificate program in Applied Ethics effective fall 1994, with a follow-up review of the program to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs during the 2000-01 academic year. The proposal should be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the October Board meeting.
Board Discussion and Action (September 23, 1994)

Vice Chancellor Clark reported that certificate programs are not often brought to the Board. The State System has approximately 28 certificate programs compared to about 330 baccalaureate programs. A certificate program is smaller than a major, somewhat larger than a minor, and is very focused in an area. It is useful to the student in terms of providing recognition that they have an additional specialization. Dr. Clark noted that, since Measure 5 program losses began, OSSHE is still at a net loss of about 80 programs, even with this proposed addition.

Dr. Clark described the program as "a unique program in Oregon. Its closest relative would be the Oregon Health Sciences University's Center for Ethics in Health Care. Applied ethics concerns moral problems that arise from new developments in the biological and natural resource sciences, the environmental sciences, and other areas. It's also about the methods that help with resolution of these problems."

Vice Chancellor Clark noted that student interest in applied ethics at Oregon State University is very high. Provost Roy Arnold added that this program represents faculty and departmental response to both external and internal need and interest.

Dr. Moore, chair of the Philosophy Department, indicated that the truly vexing, practical problems students are going to face when they become leaders aren't technological problems, but rather relate to making decisions within a very complex moral, social, and political context. Therefore, the series of courses in an interdisciplinary package will be a useful addition, acquainting the students with the moral landscape of their discipline.

Mr. Richardson asked if this program would deal with a topic such as sexual orientation. Dr. Moore responded that there are three foci: moral issues that arise in scientific inquiry, moral issues that arise in resource management, and health care issues. To the extent that those three areas might touch on sexual orientation, then it would be addressed. Mr. Richardson clarified his concern. "In the staff report it says that one of the purposes of the program is to propose norms, principles, and methods to resolve these problems. How are those decisions made within that context, to say this is the norm?" Dr. Moore explained that, using the principle that moral decisions can be defended by reference to reason, students will be trained to make decisions that can be defended rationally. "We're not
in the business of imposing norms on people; we are in the business of helping them understand the next step when conflicting norms deadlock any kind of discussion." Professor Courtney Campbell added that part of the responsibility in this training is to help students learn about conflict resolution. In cases where conflict may be unresolvable, then the task is to help the student understand how they can tolerate ambiguity and difference of opinion. One course of study is entitled Ethics of Diversity and would touch on some of these issues.

Mr. Swanson expressed the opinion that "in university inquiry, there really shouldn't be anything important that's left untouched. If you have an opportunity in a college or university to think through issues in a structured way -- to consider alternatives and do some complete exploration -- it gives grounding for dealing with those kinds of issues and other new issues. I applaud your program and wish you the best of success."

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

Board Discussion and Action (October 28, 1994)

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

This report summarizes campus responses to a survey by OSSHE Academic Affairs staff to update the Board on the implementation of minority group recruitment and retention plans. Each campus was directed through Board policy to develop and begin implementation of a recruitment and retention plan by fall 1990. Two progress reports were presented to the Board, in December 1990 and in June 1991, on campus plans. Each campus identified specific steps leading to the adoption and implementation of a plan by January 1992. For this report, campuses were asked to respond to four aspects of the implementation of their plans:

1. Indicate steps taken to implement and monitor campus diversity plans, including evaluation and opportunities for campus input.
2. Note goals from the plan that have been reached over the past three years (1991-92 to 1993-94).

3. List campus priorities for the next three years (1994-95 to 1996-97) as part of the campus plans for minority group diversity for students and for faculty.

4. Note those activities or programs that have been effective in achieving minority group recruitment and retention for students and for faculty.

Individual campus responses are included as Appendix A to this summary report. Listed below are summarized responses for each area.

1. Steps taken to implement and monitor campus diversity plans, including evaluation and opportunities for campus input.

- Most campuses have established campus-level committees to monitor the implementation of diversity and/or affirmative actions plans (e.g., University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Southern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology).

- In some cases, affirmative action plans are interrelated with diversity plans. Affirmative action plans focus primarily on the recruitment and hiring of faculty/staff and would be considered a part of the minority group diversity plan that focuses on both students and faculty. The University of Oregon and Oregon Health Sciences University, for example, have established systematic processes for monitoring their affirmative action plans. Western Oregon State College has intervened directly in the search process to increase diversity among faculty. As a result, Western Oregon State College has cancelled or re-opened three searches where there was not adequate representation in the applicant pool. This approach yielded an increase in numbers of minority candidates, according to the campus.

- Students at Oregon Institute of Technology have approved a student government referendum to support half of the full-time Ethnic and International Student Services position through incidental fees.
• The University of Oregon, Portland State University, and Eastern Oregon State College have indicated that implementation of their plans has been assigned to a single individual or is a shared administrative relationship with primary responsibility for coordinating campus activities and supporting the work of campus affirmative action or diversity-focused committees.

2. Goals from plans that have been reached over the past three years (1991-92 to 1993-94).

• Most campuses reported progress in increasing the total number of minority group students and faculty. In terms of students, however, several campuses face more challenges in the recruitment of American Indian and African American students.

• Although the actual numbers are low, most campuses note progress in hiring minority group faculty. The University of Oregon and Oregon State University, for example, point to targeted funds to assist in the recruitment and hiring of minority group faculty as key to their success.

3. Campus priorities for the next three years (1994-95 to 1996-97) as part of campus plans for minority group diversity for students and for faculty.

• Campuses will continue to emphasize outreach to targeted minority group communities (such as Eastern Oregon State College working with the Umatilla and Warm Springs tribes) and to offer programs that will bring high school minority group students to campus.

• Several campuses plan to increase faculty recruitment through a "grow our own" approach (Western Oregon State College) or through targeted funds for minority faculty hiring (Portland State University, Oregon Health Sciences University, University of Oregon, Oregon State University).

• All campuses have increased minority group student and faculty recruitment and retention as a priority.
4. Activities or programs that have been effective in achieving minority group student and faculty recruitment and retention.

- Utilizing the Underrepresented Minority Achievement Scholarship Program (UMASP) to minority group students to campus.
- Outreach activities to middle and high school students.
- Support for minority group students to organize clubs/unions and cultural/community events.
- Obtaining external grant funding for academic and support programs to work with minority group communities and with students after arrival on the campus.
- Targeted funds for recruitment and retention of minority group faculty.
- Greater involvement of faculty in monitoring and developing the affirmative process for creating greater diversity.

Campuses also provided information on their faculty hiring activities from October 1, 1993 to June 1, 1994. In this report, each campus was asked to indicate the number of offers made to candidates by minority group classification and the outcome from the offer (i.e., acceptance or rejection of the offer). (See Table 1.) Although the data are for one year, the objective is to give the Board a better sense of campus efforts that attracted a diverse faculty. Several observations:

1. About 15 percent of offers were extended to faculty minority group candidates in 1993-94. More information is needed on the number of minority group candidates in the pool. The current search/hiring process under affirmative action on each campus should be examined to determine how it could work to increase the number of offers to minority group candidates.

2. Minority group candidates were more likely than European American candidates to reject an offer during 1993-94. Further investigation is needed to determine why rejection of offers occurs.
Staff will work with campuses to develop more effective faculty search/hiring processes within the System.

**Board Discussion**

Dr. Coley reviewed the report, noting that although progress has been made in the area of minority group recruitment and retention, two major impediments to achieving diversity goals remain. They are community and campus culture and lack of resources. He noted that in the coming years, priorities on the campuses would vary and might include reaching out to specific minority group communities. For example, Eastern Oregon State College might have a targeted outreach effort with the Umatilla and Warm Springs Tribes to attract Native Americans to the campus. "I have had conversations with the leadership at Eastern Oregon State College, for example," Dr. Coley related. "I have asked what it would take to attract a person of color, say an African-American faculty member to come to the community of La Grande where there isn't a large minority population. What does it take to get that person? Is it a realistic expectation as opposed to focusing on, for example, Native American Indian faculty?"

Relative to changing the campus culture, Dr. Coley remarked that more attention would need to be directed toward penetrating the cultural events of the campuses, particularly at the search committee levels.

Several campuses have expressed an interest in a "grow-your-own" approach where they would attract students with an eye to moving them through the educational experience with a goal of retaining them at the conclusion as faculty or staff members. Continuing, Dr. Coley indicated that it was agreed by the Academic Council that the institutions should develop realistic benchmarks. Ms. Wilson requested that the benchmarks be presented to the Board at the February 1995 meeting, and that they include retention as well as hiring numbers. In addition, she requested that they focus on targeted groups, not just people of color. Mr. Miller added that he would like to know the top five or ten obstacles that hinder progress. Dr. Clark agreed to present the report in February. She added, "It's going to be very important to couple with that a commitment of resources to follow-up the goals that are set."

Mr. Richardson expressed frustration that, although there had been progress during the eight years he has served on the Board, it is not enough or fast enough. He stressed that in his opinion, changes would have to be made in the number of candidates of color who were offered
positions. Dr. Coley agreed and indicated that the search process was an area where changes would be required. Chancellor Cox added that there was another dimension to finding solutions and "that is in empowering presidents and provosts, with your support, to set aside the straightjacket of process. We have all written the processes for the campuses and Systemwide to accomplish these goals. Sometimes those processes become part of the paradox and prevent us from accomplishing the goals."

Mr. Richardson acknowledged that responsibility for achieving the goals resided with the presidents. However, he added, "I would like to see that each institution identify one person, whoever it is on that campus, to be held accountable for assuring that the goals are met."

Dr. Clark agreed to present a report in February, but added that "it's going to be very important to couple with the benchmarks a commitment of resources to assure that the goals that are set can be met."

(No Board action required)
TABLE 1

SURVEY OF 1993-94 OSSHE CAMPUS HIRING ACTIVITY *
October 1, 1993 - June 1, 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommended Tenure/Tenure-Track Appointments</th>
<th>Recommended Non-Tenure/Tenure-Track Appointments</th>
<th>Hiring Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof Assoc Asst (e.g., Instructor, Research Associate)</td>
<td>Gender Male Female</td>
<td>Offers Extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0 3 6</td>
<td>3 3 9</td>
<td>12 3 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td>4 3 2</td>
<td>5 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1 2 21</td>
<td>40 36 28</td>
<td>64 2 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic American</td>
<td>1 0 8</td>
<td>14 8 15</td>
<td>23 3 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2 5 36</td>
<td>61 50 54</td>
<td>104 8 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European American</td>
<td>15 17 108</td>
<td>443 297 280</td>
<td>577 2 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>17 22 144</td>
<td>504 347 334</td>
<td>681 10 671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These data are for one year and should be viewed as only a snapshot as opposed to a pattern of hiring activities.

** The primary objective of this report was to focus on full-time hires in tenure and tenure-track positions. However, faculty in research, extension, and clinical positions at Oregon Health Sciences University, Oregon State University, and, to some extent, University of Oregon, were included because they contribute to instructional programs on campus. As a result, some part-time instructional faculty were included.
THE STATUS OF WOMEN FACULTY IN OSSHE

October 28, 1994

Meeting #634

Introduction

In January 1992, staff presented to the Board of Higher Education a report on the status of women students, faculty, and staff. In addition, a report on the results of a pilot study on the promotion of women faculty was presented to the Board in November 1993. The current report on the status of women faculty in the State System provides an update of the data on faculty presented in the earlier reports.

Distribution of Women Among Ranked Faculty

Table 1 shows the percentage of women in each academic rank for the years 1980-81, 1983-84, 1990-91, and 1993-94. Significant changes occurred over that period: at the professor level, the percentage of women increased from 6 percent in 1980-81 to 13 percent in 1993-94; at the associate professor level, from 16 percent to 32 percent; and at the assistant professor level, from 29 percent to 42 percent. The proportion at the instructor rank showed a smaller increase (from 45 percent to 53 percent) and fluctuated during that period. In total, the percentage of women among full-time faculty increased from 18 percent to 29 percent.

Table 2 shows the distribution of women among the major discipline groups, with a comparison of the 1993-94 data to the 1990-91 data displayed in the 1992 Board report. Although most of the patterns are the same as in the earlier data, there have been slight increases in the proportion of women in the natural sciences and larger increases in the "all other" discipline category (see Appendix A for a list of departments included in the discipline categories). For men, there have been declines in all categories except the "all other" group, which showed an increase from 16 percent of male faculty to 29 percent.

As Table 2 shows, the largest proportion of women is in the humanities and fine arts (26 percent in 1993-94). The largest proportion of men is in the natural sciences (22 percent in 1993-94); only 9 percent of the women are in the natural sciences. And, although there are declines for both men and women in the proportions in the "high market" disciplines (engineering, computer science, business, and law), the decline for men was greater.
Average Salaries Paid to Women Faculty

The analysis of faculty salaries is a replication of the methodology used in the 1992 report. The analysis includes regular faculty with academic rank, both 9-month and 12-month appointments, employed full-time at the institution (.90 FTE or greater) with at least .50 FTE in an instructional department, as reflected on the October 31, 1993, payroll file. Salary data on 12-month faculty were converted to a 9-month basis by applying a standard calculation used in federal reports.

Tables 3 through 10 display average salary data for full-time faculty by gender, discipline group, rank, and years in the rank. In the aggregate, average salaries for women are lower than those for men. However, the aggregated data can be misleading. Market factors influence average salaries paid in particular academic discipline groups. The smaller percentage of women in higher paying disciplines contributes to an overall institutional average salary that is lower for women than for men.

Most of the differences in salaries by gender can be further explained by adding years-in-rank to the analysis. Within the academic discipline groups, on the average, the greater the number of years employed at a particular rank, the higher the salary, regardless of gender.

As was done in the 1992 study, further analysis was conducted after first excluding rank and discipline comparisons in which five or fewer faculty were reported (according to the convention used by the American Association of University Professors in reporting faculty salary data), and excluding comparisons in which the average salary differences by gender were within five percent of the average for that group. The resulting analysis for this study, like the earlier study, indicates that in every rank and discipline comparison across the State System, with only two exceptions, differences in average salaries by gender can be explained by the number of years employed at the academic rank and the academic discipline.

Gender Comparisons in Faculty Promotion

The pilot study of gender comparisons in faculty promotion that was presented to the Board in November 1993 described a framework for monitoring faculty promotion and included a provision to conduct the study on a regular basis through the end of this decade. This is the first biennial report of the full study.
The purpose of the study is to provide the means by which institutions in the State System can answer several questions about promotion and other employment changes among tenure-track faculty on such issues as the rate at which tenure is awarded, the length of time in promotion, differences in frequency and types of leave taken, differences in voluntary terminations, administrative assignments, and average term of appointment or full-time equivalency.

Because the answers to these questions are not readily available from existing data bases, each of the eight OSSHE institutions was asked to collect data from personnel records on two faculty groups. (The study excludes Eastern Oregon State College, which had no faculty in either cohort in 1983-84. Oregon Health Sciences University also is not included in this study because the nature of their faculty appointments is quite different from that of other institutions, and because their academic personnel data base is not structured in a way that facilitates compilation of the data into the format used in this study. Changes in the data base will permit their inclusion in the future.) The data were compiled and analyzed by staff in the State System's Office of Institutional Research.

The study followed promotion and employment changes of tenure-track faculty over a ten-year period, from 1983-84 through 1993-94. Two cohort groups were monitored: (1) all assistant professors hired in 1983-84, and (2) all associate professors hired or newly promoted in 1983-84. The results of the study are summarized for the State System as a whole in Table 11. Because of the very small numbers of faculty in several of the institutions' cohorts, individual institution data are not included in this report. They have been provided to institution provosts for their information and monitoring purposes.

The small number of faculty in the cohort groups -- even when all institutions are combined -- makes it difficult and inappropriate to draw general conclusions based on statistical data. However, in general, the study results suggest that in most areas of faculty promotion and employment, the findings for women are comparable to those for men. One possible exception is the higher proportion of women in the associate professor group taking sabbatical leaves.

With such small numbers in the population, any findings are more suggestive than conclusive. As in the pilot study that used 1981-82 cohorts, the 1983-84 cohort size is small because of budget restrictions in place during the early 1980s. Several institutions reduced staff under
financial exigency. Eastern Oregon State College had no new faculty in either the 1981-82 pilot cohort or the 1983-84 cohort. Western Oregon State College had no newly hired assistant professors in 1983-84.

Later cohorts are likely to be somewhat larger. Nevertheless, there is always the possibility that any given year might be anomalous because of external factors, and with small numbers in the cohorts, statistical analysis will always be difficult. The solution to this problem may be to replicate the study periodically and to examine faculty promotion issues in the context of several successive cohorts. Even with the analytical problems posed by the small cohort sizes, the data are useful in identifying potential problems that institutions can subsequently pursue on a case-by-case basis.

Conclusion

The data shown in these updates provide evidence of a continuation of the trends identified in previous reports. Women continue to show increases at all faculty ranks. While these changes may seem gradual, they become far more meaningful when viewed in the context of the many years normally spent at each faculty rank. As the larger numbers of women at the assistant professor rank advance in their careers, the proportion of women in the senior faculty positions will grow dramatically. Further, the promotion data suggest that women will advance in a manner and on a schedule consistent with those of the male faculty. Finally, the State System will continue to monitor the salary data and to address significant deviations from what would be expected, given the number of years in rank and market factors associated with specific academic disciplines. Current data do not indicate salary patterns at variance with what would be expected, given those factors.

Board Discussion

Dr. Clark reviewed the report and noted that "we do not need to be guarded in our encouraging language relative to the progress on all levels." Mr. Miller asked about improvements in the number of women entering science disciplines. Ms. Weeks responded that there has been an increase in the proportion of women in the natural sciences as compared to 1990. Dr. Clark added that smaller proportions of women are entering application fields such as engineering; however, there is greater representation of women in the life sciences. "In the salary area, we have differences when we look at the aggregated data that we think are attributable to field differences in salaries. But when we take the fields
apart, and particularly when you look then at a gross indicator like length of time in rank, the differences between men and women faculty in salary disappear. That is very encouraging to us."

Ms. Wilson asked that future reports show annual comparisons as well as comparisons by decade. Also she asked that goals and obstacles be identified and addressed. Dr. Clark agreed to prepare that information and offered to develop a presentation about specific efforts being made to encourage women to choose careers and advance in the sciences.

(No Board action required)

The Board adjourned at 10:30 a.m. for the visit to Eastern Oregon State College and reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

Dr. Aschkenasy re-introduced the subject of names within the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act. After lengthy discussion of the merits and shortcomings of many suggested names, the Board decided to set criteria for the name and then seek an outside opinion of recommended names. Criteria mentioned were that the name should: clarify that community colleges are not part of the system, that the institutions are public, and that the marketing position of colleges would be strengthened without a loss to any other segment.

Dr. Cox reflected that this should be a "new name for a new era." President Swanson summarized the important parameters. "The creation of an acronym isn't important as long as we have a relatively short, clear name that conveys the message. In fact, I would prefer not to have an acronym because I think they can be confusing and it would take a long time for people to identify the acronym with what it is. I want a name that conveys high-quality education, and not bureaucracy." The Chancellor agreed that he and Dr. Large would work with the consultants to achieve concurrence on a name to bring back to the Board in November.

Dr. Large informed the Board that, on the strong recommendation of Mr. Donahue, Ms. Shannon Olsen has been hired half-time for three months to develop a specific strategic plan for implementing the decisions of the Committee. The draft plan will be presented to the Board at the January meeting. Vice Chancellor Large indicated the Committee had decided to delay firm implementation until after the election.
Mr. Bailey reported that the Joint Boards Working Group hadn’t met since the last Board meeting. They will meet the second week of November to discuss agenda items for the January 1995 Joint Boards meeting.

Mr. Kerans listed legislative committee meetings that would occur before the November Board meeting. He indicated that Representative Schoon, chair of the House Higher Education Review Task Force, has asked for a draft bill on a prepaid tuition program. Basically, it would provide a method for families to prepay or pre-purchase tuition for children and grandchildren.

Vice Chancellor Large noted that in November he would provide post-election analyses and there would be sufficient time for Board discussion. The Thursday evening before the meeting, a panel will join the Board for dinner to discuss the election results.

Mr. Bailey reported that the Joint Boards Working Group hadn’t met since the last Board meeting. They will meet the second week of November to discuss agenda items for the January 1995 Joint Boards meeting.

Mr. Kerans listed legislative committee meetings that would occur before the November Board meeting. He indicated that Representative Schoon, chair of the House Higher Education Review Task Force, has asked for a draft bill on a prepaid tuition program. Basically, it would provide a method for families to prepay or pre-purchase tuition for children and grandchildren.

Vice Chancellor Large noted that in November he would provide post-election analyses and there would be sufficient time for Board discussion. The Thursday evening before the meeting, a panel will join the Board for dinner to discuss the election results.

Mr. Kerans listed legislative committee meetings that would occur before the November Board meeting. He indicated that Representative Schoon, chair of the House Higher Education Review Task Force, has asked for a draft bill on a prepaid tuition program. Basically, it would provide a method for families to prepay or pre-purchase tuition for children and grandchildren.

Vice Chancellor Large noted that in November he would provide post-election analyses and there would be sufficient time for Board discussion. The Thursday evening before the meeting, a panel will join the Board for dinner to discuss the election results.

Ed Vignoul, Director, Student Financial Aid at the University of Oregon, provided some preliminary data that point to the success of the new federal Direct Student Loan Program (DSL). As shown below, the University has dispersed $2,901,932 more in loans to 1,491 more students under the DSL than last year, based on a comparison of first-day-of-semester data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1993-94</th>
<th>1994-95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recipients</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford Loans</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>$2,848,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsubsidized</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>708,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford Loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the substantial administrative changes required to implement the new program, relatively few problems have been reported. Student complaints are being handled on an individual basis.

The Board will receive a year-end report on the program in the spring.
Income-contingent Loans

The Chancellor's Office, along with the Oregon Student Lobby, joined 200 higher education systems, institutions, and student groups around the country in urging the U.S. Department of Education to re-examine the proposal for student loan repayment. In a letter prepared and distributed by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), members of the higher education community outlined their concerns with the Administration's design of an income-contingent loan provision that is a part of the DSL program.

The income-contingent loan program would allow a borrower to establish a repayment amount based on his or her income. The principal concerns with the design of the program are the creation of more debt, longer indebtedness, and higher costs to borrowers.

The Department's plan would extend repayment for up to 25 years -- well beyond the current experience of repayment within ten years. There is concern that such an extension creates a "second mortgage" for students, with long-term economic implications for both the student and society.

The proposed repayment schedule is seen as flawed because it creates several scenarios that disregard a student's actual ability to repay a loan by offering nearly identical repayment amounts to students with widely varying income levels. For example, under the plan, a student with $2,500 in student debt and an annual salary of $7,000 would have a $25 per month loan repayment while a student with the same amount of debt and an annual salary of $30,000 would have a $26 per month loan repayment.

The plan would also place many loans into repayment schedules that would result in negative amortization. Problems also exist with the way in which debt repayment is handled in the case of married couples.

With widespread support of the DSL program from the higher education community, which has as its goal providing students access to loans at lower costs, the increase in loan costs to borrowers that would result under the proposed income-contingent repayment plan appears to undermine that goal and is contrary to higher education's efforts to maintain affordable access.
There is also a philosophical concern within the higher education community over the plan's contribution to a trend to shift the generational responsibility for paying for college.

**U.S. Department of Education Phase II Reform**

Motivated by its success to date with implementation of the Direct Student Loan Program, the U.S. Department of Education has begun to pursue "Phase II" of student aid reform. Officials of the Department are holding a series of regional meetings with members of the higher education community to discuss the Department's reform agenda.

The Department's first regional meeting was held in Seattle earlier this month. In his opening remarks, Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, David Longanecker, made it clear that he wants to capitalize on an operating environment in Washington that is likely to remain amenable to such reforms for at least the next two years.

During the meeting, members of the higher education community were asked to provide comments on the following questions: Can aid be better targeted to ensure access in postsecondary education? Can postsecondary vocational education and training better meet the needs and objectives of students and institutions? Can regulatory and administrative simplicity help institutions better fulfill their educational missions and target their resources on educational rather than administrative tasks?

Members of the audience were candid in expressing their wariness with the rhetorical nature of the questions, saying that few in the higher education community would not support such reforms. Several expressed concern that the questions were simply a way to "hook" the community's interest without making them real partners in reform discussions.

The issue of the Department's State Postsecondary Review Program (SPRP) was presented as a tangible reason for the community's reticence. The SPRP was developed to combat fraud and abuse in the federal Title IV program. Throughout the development of the final regulations, the higher education community had communicated its concern that SPRP had cast too wide a net and that such a one-size-fits-all approach to the development of regulations created unnecessary administrative expense. Several representatives from the California community college system were present to express their frustration with the SPRP regulations in light
of the fact that less than one-half of one percent of their revenues come from Title IV programs.

Support on the issue of differentiated, or targeted, regulations for different groups of institutions was high. John Anderson, Director, Financial Aid at Portland State University, encouraged Dr. Longanecker to provide relief from some regulatory requirements to institutions that have demonstrated administrative quality and efficiency. Under federal law, the Department possesses the ability to grant some institutions regulatory relief.

A difference of opinion existed between the representatives of the community colleges and vocational programs over the issue of the Department's move toward use of outcome data.

The Department's regional meetings are scheduled to take place through November.

**OSSHE Priority List for Federal Funding of Capital and Infrastructure Projects for FY95**

A report on the status of projects on the OSSHE priority list was expected to be provided at the Board meeting. However, that information has not been finalized.

(No Board action required)

The past six months saw significant activity on Board-approved capital construction projects, with 30 projects either being created or changing status. The following table portrays the status of all active capital construction projects. A few are listed as complete, meaning that the facilities are occupied and all artwork, accounting, construction claims, and other transactions have been finished.

Seven projects reached this stage during the past six months: the Biomedical Information and Communications Center at Oregon Health Sciences University; one of the Systemwide projects dealing with handicapped accessibility; one of the Systemwide efforts relating to land acquisition and various improvements; the Oregon Institute of Technology's Metro Center; the Family Studies Center at Oregon State University; the acquisition of equipment for the Computer Services Building at Southern Oregon State College; and a project related to science facilities.
at the University of Oregon. These projects will not appear on the next semi-annual report.

Three projects moved into construction during the past six months. These included the construction of the University Hospital's C-Wing, handicapped accessibility efforts at Susan Campbell Hall, and utilities work at Oregon Institute of Technology. Many repair projects also began.

Design work for the expansion and renovation of Oregon State University's Kerr Library re-commenced. Design also began on three other projects.

Balances were canceled for several projects with expired limitations. This is required by state law on some projects.

The claims associated with the construction of the Basic Sciences Addition/C.R.O.E.T. facility at Oregon Health Sciences University have been resolved, conditioned upon all parties agreeing to a settlement document. That document is under review by Department of Justice attorneys. The dispute continues between the University of Oregon and the architect that was terminated from a student housing project.

Construction cost escalation has become evident on many of the projects bid during the past few months. This has led to some scope reductions and re-bids.

Board Discussion

Mr. Bailey asked what was meant by "balance cancelled." Vice Chancellor Ihrig responded that the project was completed and not all of the funds were used for a specific project. When the balance is cancelled from that specific project, then those funds are used for other projects.

(No Board action required)
# CURRENT CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Balances as of August 31, 1994

($ in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Limit/Appn</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU BICC</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Hosp/Clinic Rehab</td>
<td>17,195</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1987</td>
<td></td>
<td>SYS Handicapped Access</td>
<td>$3,810</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OIT Utility Improvements</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>Under Const.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Ag Sciences II</td>
<td>26,360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Southbank Impmts</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Parking Improvements</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>1,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Basic Sci/CROET</td>
<td>GF, Fed, WC</td>
<td>28,180</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Univ Hosp/Clinics</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>12,090</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSU Millar Library Add</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-1989</td>
<td></td>
<td>SYS Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Repair &amp; Modernization</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OIT Parking Impmts</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OIT Metro Center</td>
<td>Lottery, System</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOSC Exec Conf/Training Ctr.</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Kerr Library</td>
<td>GF, Gift</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Family Studies Center</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Cold Storage Addition</td>
<td>Lottery, Gift</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Seed Warehouse Replic</td>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOSC KSOR Satellite Stn</td>
<td>Federal, Gift</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOSC Computer Equipment</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OIT Knight Library Addtn</td>
<td>GF, Gift</td>
<td>26,620</td>
<td>1,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UO Parking Improvements</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>9,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UO Student Housing</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UO Science Facilities</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU School of Nursing</td>
<td>GF, Federal</td>
<td>13,825</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Parking Structure #5</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Hospital Renovations</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>5,979</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OHSU Util System Impmts</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>2,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSU PCAT Remodel</td>
<td>Fed, Inst Funds</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SYS Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EOSC Hoke Hall Addition</td>
<td>BF, Housing</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WOSC Health Services Addtn</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Envrn Computing Ctr.</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU FRL Lab Renovation</td>
<td>Inst. Funds</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Mitchell Gym. Rehab</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU S. Oregon Exp Stn</td>
<td>Gift, Inst.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSU Women's Bldg Lab</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOSC Residence Hall Strg</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOSC Campus Ped Safety</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOSC Parking Expansion</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SOSC Health Center Renov. XI-F(1) Bonds, OF 115 95 Under Const.
UO Museum Nat Hist Gift 1,570 NA No Activity
UO Longhouse Gift 545 NA No Activity
UO N. Campus Relocation Riverfront 2,225 NA On Hold
UO Comm Services Bldg Auxiliary 5,200 4,710 Bldg. Acq.
UO Utilities System Rehab BF, Housing 800 176 Now Open
UO Chem Lab Renov. Gift/Grant 1,520 1,199 Under Const.
UO PSU SELP SELF 667 250 Under Const.
OHSU NeuroSensory Ctr. Ph I Federal, Gift 25,400 18,190 Under Const.
OHSU NeuroSensory Ctr. Ph II Federal, Gift 23,000 22,056 In Design
OHSU Parking Struc #5 Parking 3,345 NA No Activity
OHSU Hospital Renovations Hospital 8,256 4,281 Under Const.
OHSU C-Wing Addition Hospital, Gift 17,700 14,262 Under Const.*
OHSU Dotter Expansion Gift 800 0 Now Open
PSU Student Housing Housing 19,040 18,858 On Hold*

1993-1995 Projects

SYS Utility Renovation Various $ 2,160 $ NA Part Transf.
SYS Safety Improvements Various 200 NA No Activity
SYS Academic Modern. Various 600 NA Transferred*
SYS Handicap Improv. Various 1,335 NA Transferred*
SYS Land Acquisition Various 750 NA Part Transf.
SYS Deferred Maint. GF,XI-G Bonds 23,340 17,066 Under Const.
SOSC KSOR Improvements Grant, Gift 450 NA No Activity
SOSC Stevenson Union Add. BF, Auxiliary 600 559 In Design
SOSC Visual Arts Complex Gift 2,700 2,421 Pt Under Cst.
SOSC Handicap Access Inst. 72 69 In Design
OTT Child Care Facil. BF 200 198 In Planning*
OSU Memorial Union Renov. BF,SELP,Inst 2,884 2,064 Await Cont*
OSU Seafoods Lab Grant, Gift 4,400 4,106 In Design
OSU Seafood Ed Center Grant 1,995 1,950 In Design
OSU Pharmacy Lab Renov. Gifts 850 NA Await Gifts
OSU Langton/Women's Access Inst. 322 322 In Design
OSU Kerr/Kidder Energy SELF 1,371 1,371 In Design
OSU Kerr Lib. Expan/Remod. Gift, XI-G Bonds 20,000 20,000 In Design*
OSU Lab Theater Renov. Gift 750 685 In Design*
OSU Food Innovation Ctr. Grant,Inst,Rent 8,775 8,775 In Planning*
UO Law Library Add. Gifts 2,315 NA Await Gifts
UO Fac./Staff Child Care Gifts, Fees 1,240 NA Await Gifts
UO OIMB Add/Alts Grant 1,500 NA Await Grant
UO Gilbert Hall Add/Alts Gifts 7,500 NA Await Gifts
UO Amazon Housing, Ph II Housing 9,000 9,000 In Planning
UO International College GP/Housing/Lott. 18,000 17,923 In Planning
UO S. Campbell Access CO 295 295 Under Const.*
UO Johnson Hall Access Inst 150 150 In Design*
OSU NeuroSens. Ctr., Ph III Gifts, Hosp. 7,000 NA No Activity
OSU Utility Renov. BF 190 NA No Activity
OSU C-Wing Add Ph II Hosp. 4,000 NA No Activity
OSU Pediatric Reloc. Gifts, Hosp. 20,000 20,000 In Design*
OSU Prim. Care Clinics Hospital 8,000 NA No Activity
OSU Hospital Omnibus Hosp., Gifts 22,000 21,998 In Planning*
OSU Outpatient Clinic Hospital 3,000 2,968 In Design*
OSU Mac Hall Acc/Imp. Various 585 585 In Design*
PSU Harrison Hall Inst 1,500 1,500 In Design*
PSU Housing Rehab. Housing 4,475 NA No Activity

* Indicates change in status since previous report.
SUMMARY OF FACILITIES CONTRACTING ACTIVITIES

Staff Report to the Board

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

Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

Environmental Consulting Services, SOSC

A retainer agreement was negotiated with BWR Associates, Inc., of Medford, for environmental consulting services at Southern Oregon State College.

Retainer Agreements were awarded to professional consulting companies to provide architectural, engineering, and other professional consulting and planning services to the OSSHE colleges and universities for projects not to exceed $100,000. These awards were made pursuant to the selection process outlined in the Board’s recent amendment of OAR 580-50-020. The following companies selected to provide services from July 1, 1994 through June 30, 1996 are:

Architectural Services. Gene J. Abell of Medford; Abeloe & Associates of Medford; Gary N. Afseth of Medford; Ankrom Moisan Associated Architects of Portland; Lisa Diane Bailey of Corvallis; Barber, Barrett & Turner, Architects of Bend; Barrentine, Bates, Lee, AIA of Lake Oswego; Benchmark Architectural Services of Corvallis; Boucher, Mouchka, Larson, Architects of Portland; Gary W. Breeden, AIA of Medford; Carkin, Arbuckle, Costic Architects of Salem; Clark/KJOS Architect of Portland; The Estime Group of Portland; Giffin, Bolte, Jurgens Architect of Portland; gLAs Architectural Group of Eugene; David W. Hilts of Portland; Hanns, Schwanke Associates of Portland; R. Jurgens & Associates of Beaverton; McBride Architects, P.C. of Beaverton; Michael & Kuhns Architects, P.C. of Portland; Nagao Pacific Architectural P.C. of Eugene; Neale & Co., AIA, of Bend; Petersen, Kolberg & Associates of Wilsonville; Poticha Architects of Eugene; Robertson, Merryman, Barnes Architects of Portland; Robertson Sherwood Architects, P.C. of Eugene; Roscoe C. Lawless, AIA, of Hillsboro; RSS Architecture, P.C. of Woodburn; Settecase, Smith, Doss Architecture of Salem; Skelton, Straus & Seibert of Medford; Douglas Snider of Medford; Soderstrom Architects of Portland; TBG Architects & Planners, P.C. of Eugene; Unthank Waterbury Architects of Eugene; Waterleaf Architecture & Interiors of Portland; Wegroup pc/Architects and Planners of Portland; Stastny Architects of Portland; Frederick L. Walters of Monmouth; GBD Architects of Portland; SRG Partnership, P.C. of Portland; BOORA
Architects of Portland; Zimmer/Gunsul/Fransca Partnership of Portland; Yost/Grube/Hall Architecture P.C., of Portland.


Landscape Architecture. Mitchell/Nelson/Welborn/Reimann Partnership of Portland; Mayer/Reed of Portland; Cameron, McCarthy, Gilbert of
Eugene; PlanWest Associates of La Grande; Nevue Ngan Associates of Portland; Robert Perron of Portland; Leisinger Designs of Salem; Walker & Macy of Portland.


Air & Water Balancing. Air Introduction and Regulation of Eugene.

Environmental Engineering. RZA AGRA, Inc., of Portland.


Award of Construction Contracts

Basic Science Addition, MacKenzie Hall Courtyard Intertie Project, OHSU
On September 7, 1994, MacKay Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $481,000. Financing will be provided from gifts.

Campus Drive Renovation/Beautification Project, OIT
On September 12, 1994, Klamath Pacific Corporation was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $229,080. Financing will be provided from capital repair and state funds.

Outpatient Clinic Elevator Upgrade -- ADA Project, OHSU
On August 10, 1994, Armor Kone Elevator, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $69,439. Financing will be provided from hospital funds.
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Medical Research Building, Laboratory Water Piping Replacement Project, OHSU
On August 30, 1994, Hydro-Temp Mechanical, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $299,700. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

Physical Plant Stores Repair, SOSC
On September 12, 1994, Treehouse Woodworks was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $283,263. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

Radial Brick Chimney Removal Project, OSU
On August 26, 1994, Dale Ramsay Construction Company was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $169,950. Financing will be provided from capital repair bonds (Article XI-G).

School of Dentistry, Clinical Support services, Rooms 130-136 Project, OHSU
On September 12, 1994, John May Construction Company was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $55,967. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Acceptance of Projects

Milam/Strand Sanitary/Storm Sewer Replacement Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on October 11, 1994. The final direct construction costs were $404,013. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

(No Board action required)

Background

Chancellor’s Office staff developed a study of first-time freshmen that would (1) provide data similar to those developed by institutions in other states, (2) establish a baseline for each institution from which future retention activities could be monitored, and (3) permit a more complete understanding of the institutional and student characteristics affecting each OSSHE institution’s retention patterns.

The current study focused on first-time freshmen who entered the State System in 1986-87 and followed a fairly traditional research design.
However, this study departed from tradition in two important areas: (1) An effort has been made to include interinstitutional graduation rates -- that is, graduation from any institution within the State System, not just from the institution in which the student entered as a freshman; and (2) further analysis has been conducted to account for demographic and academic preparation variables that have been shown in national studies to have a significant effect on an institution's graduation rate.

It is important to maintain an appropriate perspective on the use of this study design in evaluating institutional success. For institutions with a larger proportion of traditional first-time, full-time freshmen, such as Oregon State University and the University of Oregon, this type of study is a more important, although certainly not singular, measure of student outcomes. However, for institutions in which degree-seeking, first-time freshmen are a relatively small proportion of the total number of students served, such as Portland State University, it is important to use a variety of other measures to evaluate successful student outcomes.

Study Data

For each institution, the study population consists of a cohort of all first-time freshmen who entered the institution in fall, winter, or spring term of 1986-87 and were enrolled in at least 12 credit hours during their first term of enrollment. Each institutional cohort was tracked fall-to-fall for the study period from fall 1987 to fall 1993. For each fall term of the study period, a count was made of those still enrolled in that term, those who had received the bachelor's degree during the preceding academic year, and those who had neither graduated nor enrolled as of that fall term.

Graduation Rates

For the State System as a whole, 51.1 percent of the 1986-87 OSSHE freshman cohort had received the bachelor's degree as of fall 1993, with a range of from 62.9 percent to 22.8 percent. This figure includes students in the cohort who graduated from any OSSHE institution, not just the institution they entered as freshmen. The graduation rate for students graduating from the institution they entered as freshmen is 43.9 percent for the System as a whole, with a range of from 56.2 percent to 15.6 percent.
Attrition

The highest attrition rates are in the first year: 31.1 percent of the 1986-87 OSSHE freshman cohort did not enroll during the fall 1987 term. The first-year attrition rate ranges from 21 percent to 54.4 percent. OSSHE's rate of 31.1 percent is comparable to that of other institutions across the United States (29.4 percent).

Time to Complete the Degree

Compared to available national data, more OSSHE students complete their degree within five years, but relatively few take longer than five years. Of the students in the study cohort who received the bachelor's degree, 34.9 percent received the degree within four years (compared to 36.1 percent nationally), 45.7 percent received the degree within five years (compared to 31.1 percent nationally), and just 19.4 percent received the degree in more than five years (compared to 32.8 percent nationally).

Demographic Characteristics and Retention

Graduation rates across the demographic variables of residency, gender, and ethnic group are relatively consistent, with the exception of the low rates for underrepresented ethnic minority students: 16.7 percent for American Indian students, 19.4 percent for African Americans, and 29 percent for Hispanic/Latino students. In contrast, rates by residency, gender, and for Asian Americans and European Americans range from 43 percent to 49.3 percent. It should be noted that the Underrepresented Minority Achievement Scholarship Program, which provides tuition waivers to underrepresented minority students, was implemented in 1987-88. Later cohorts of underrepresented minority freshmen would be expected to show higher graduation rates partially as a result of such programs.

Academic Preparation and Retention

A very clear and consistent linear relationship exists between either high school GPA or SAT score and college graduation rate: the higher the GPA or SAT score, the higher the graduation rate.

In a 1993 essay on college graduation rates, Alexander Astin suggests that a simple retention rate "tells us a lot more about who an institution admits"
than about how effective its retention practices are." Indeed, the OSSHE data on high school GPA and SAT scores would bear that out.

The influence of these pre-college academic factors, along with the effect of ethnic group and gender on college retention, led Astin to develop a formula derived from multiple regression analyses that can be used by institutions to calculate an expected retention rate. This formula was applied to the OSSHE data.

For both the University of Oregon and Oregon State University, the expected and actual completion and continuation rates are nearly the same. However, for the other OSSHE institutions, actual rates are quite a bit lower than the expected rates.

The fact that the distribution of actual rates follows the same pattern as the distribution of expected rates for those five institutions (Portland State University, Western Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, Eastern Oregon State College, and Oregon Institute of Technology) -- only lower -- suggests the influence of an additional phenomenon that operates on all of those schools and is only indirectly related to academic preparation, gender, and ethnicity. That phenomenon may be a combination of institutional mission and the reason the student chose the institution in the first place.

Possible Explanations for the Discrepancy Between Expected and Actual Completion Rates

State System institutions serve different missions and student populations, not only with respect to academic programs, but also with respect to the proportion of freshmen compared to transfer students, full-time compared to part-time students, local or placebound students compared to more mobile students, rural compared to urban populations, and, of course, admission requirements. Different combinations of these variables are likely to have an effect on completion rates.

The variable that may explain much of the discrepancy between actual and expected completion rates may be related to the reason the student chose the institution in the first place. Many students may choose an institution with the expectation that they will transfer later, either to another OSSHE institution or to a college or university outside the State System. For Eastern Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, and Oregon Institute of Technology, the absence of a nearby community college would
make the OSSHE college a logical alternative while the student waited to transfer to another college or university. Portland State University's proximity to a large population center makes it a likely choice for both transfers in and transfers out. Additionally, studies conducted at Western Oregon State College found that a significant proportion of new freshmen planned to transfer but wanted the experience of spending their first year or two at a small, residential campus. In addition, many Western Oregon State College students indicated they planned to transfer because the college did not offer the academic program they wanted -- a factor that may affect completion rates at the other regional colleges as well.

Study Limitations

Like other similar studies across the country, this study does not track the academic progress of students once they permanently leave the State System. Many of these students may complete their education at a private or out-of-state institution.

In addition, it is not yet clear what effect Measure 5 has had on student retention patterns, as a result of either program reductions or tuition increases.

Future Study

A combination of Chancellor's Office and institutional preliminary data for University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University suggest that later cohorts will show higher four- and five-year graduation rates. Since the 1986-87 cohort was admitted, OSSHE institutions have initiated new programs aimed at improving retention. The 1986-87 cohort should be viewed as a baseline or benchmark against which to monitor the progress of institutional retention efforts as well as the effects of externally mandated changes, such as budget reductions. An annual update of this study is recommended.


Board Discussion

Mr. Swanson asked about the factors contributing to lower-than-expected graduation rates at the colleges. Ms. Weeks indicated that the answer is
very complex, with many variables. For example, students may be attracted to the small college environment for the first year or two, but plan to transfer to a larger institution to complete their degree. There are probably a number of other variables that can't be identified in these data, including socio-economic status and educational attainment of parents. High school GPA and SAT scores are primary factors as well. Dr. Cox added that those institutions in communities that don't have community colleges are, by default, fulfilling part of that role.

The Board discussed the effect of increased tuition on student retention. Dr. Aschkenasy asked what can be done to improve the preparedness of entering freshmen. Dr. Clark responded that the Board took a big step toward that improvement in the mid-'80s when it increased the Carnegie Units of preparation requirements. "Although we're moving away from that approach in the proficiency-based admission standards, we're building into those standards expectations that meet and exceed those that have been expressed in more traditional terms."

Mr. Miller asked if staff could infer strategies to encourage students to graduate in four years rather than five. Ms. Weeks responded that that type of information couldn't be gleaned from these data. "I think the preliminary data would suggest more students may be completing, but not necessarily at a faster rate." Vice Chancellor Clark added that in January when the campuses report on implementation of their campus productivity plans, some parts will address curricular streamlining, sequencing, and strategies to move students through programs expeditiously. "I think the Portland State University experience is instructive, with 15 percent receiving a degree after four years, and 44 percent within five to seven years. That seems almost directly attributable to the part-time nature. Whether we can do something to encourage students to be more full-time seems dependent upon the financial resources plus a whole web of other obligations and responsibilities of nontraditional students who are now so much a part of our student bodies."

Following up on the concept of curricular streamlining, Mr. Miller inquired about poor advising and courses that are too full as contributing to slowing down completion of degrees. Dr. Clark indicated that those issues are being addressed by systems of electronic advising and progress is being made in those areas.

Ms. Trotman Reese said that she believes for focused students, money is not an insurmountable obstacle because those students can see the goal.
"I'm a perfect example of that. I balance a lot of things. I was willing to give up a lot because I know when I get out of school, it's going to pay off. So focus and preparedness are the keys to everything."

Mr. Richardson underlined the importance of creating and maintaining a positive climate for underrepresented minorities as well as tuition waivers such as the Underrepresented Minority Achievement Scholarship Program (UMASP) if we are to meet retention goals. Dr. Clark concurred that there are many variables, in addition to cost, that affect retention.

(No Board action required)

The State System has undertaken efforts to develop a model to assess undergraduate student outcomes that serves the dual functions of demonstrating accountability to our stakeholders and improving undergraduate teaching and learning. This effort is consistent with national developments in the area of assessment of college student learning; Oregon Benchmarks, pertaining to the percentage of college graduates who meet established skill levels; and the System's interest in academic productivity as reflected in the April 1993 report of the Board Committee on Academic Productivity (BCAP). Student assessment is an important component of academic productivity as it provides needed information about the accumulating effects of what is done (e.g., changes in technology, structures, streamlining) to improve the quality of college student learning. The assessment framework, coupled with the academic productivity and educational reform planning and initiatives, produces a robust environment to further good instructional practices and evaluate student performance.

The Oregon Assessment Framework adopted by the Academic Council in fall 1993 provides for the assessment of student learning at three critical transition checkpoints in the undergraduate years and is based on research undertaken at the National Center for Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment at Pennsylvania State University (Dr. James Ratcliff, director). These assessment checkpoints include: (1) admissions for placement into college courses, (2) interim or midpoint assessment of general education core learnings, and (3) graduation outcomes. The framework enables OSSHE campuses, which have very different missions, to develop assessments appropriate to their individual contexts and processes. The midpoint check can be used to determine whether a student is making sufficient progress and, if not, to identify additional coursework and/or to target relevant student services needed to enhance student
progress. When the assessment framework is fully implemented, OSSHE will be better positioned to answer questions about the effects of higher education investment and participation on the individual and the state. A related concurrent State System activity well under way, the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS), is expected to have profound and yet to be realized implications for the admissions checkpoint in this framework.

The approach taken stresses systematic planning and incentives to encourage campuses to develop assessments consistent with the Oregon Assessment Framework. First, the status of assessment activity across the State System was determined through a survey completed by the campuses in April 1994. The survey provided baseline information about what individual campuses are already doing as well as identified similarities and differences within the State System.

Admissions. Almost all campuses are involved in assessing students in writing and mathematics at the admissions/placement checkpoint in order to match skills and knowledge levels of entering students with the available courses.

Midpoint. Little assessment activity is directed toward determining the effects of the general education curriculum on higher order intellectual skills. The lack of activity at the midpoint or interim checkpoint is explained by the relatively recent interest in this point of assessment and the difficulty of determining the appropriate timing of a midpoint check.

Graduation. With respect to graduation outcomes, employment of graduates appears to be an activity undertaken by campuses as a whole or by at least some programs. In addition, some campuses or programs have adopted major field tests or senior capstone experiences to assess end-of-program student learning.

For the most part, OSSHE campuses use assessment methods and procedures developed by their faculty. Despite their utility, the lack of nationally normed measures used at any of the checkpoints makes it difficult for the State System to describe how well students compare nationally and globally in these dimensions. OSSHE's interest lies in developing multiple assessment methods and procedures that are useful to a variety of audiences, including the individual student, the faculty, the Oregon Progress Board, and the public-at-large.
Second, institutions appointed individuals responsible for coordinating assessment activities on their campuses. An Assessment Work Group was formed to provide a forum for campuses to develop a common language, identify and discuss issues, and develop shared understandings about assessment. Establishing common ground is an important step in moving toward a systematic approach to assessing how Oregon’s postsecondary students are doing.

Third, the Chancellor’s Office targeted $200,000 for special projects in undergraduate student assessment. Each campus developed a proposal to begin assessments related to checkpoints in the framework not covered by their ongoing assessment activities. Campuses were encouraged to pursue assessment methods for (a) public accountability, such as advanced skill diagnosis, productivity evaluation, or survey research and for (b) improvement of student learning, such as major field assessments or the analysis of course-taking patterns and learning outcomes.

The campus projects combine direct and indirect indicators of educational attainment and include assessing student cognitive attainment, identifying key experiences related to success in college, securing self-reports of cognitive outcomes, and tracking employment and careers of graduates. A number of campuses will be piloting the use of commercially available instruments in addition to faculty-developed methods to assess general education skills and knowledge. The approaches being taken by OSSHE campuses are consistent with national trends to move away from the adoption of a single test to measure student performance. One test is not a sufficient indicator of an individual’s capacities. Assessment in the State System will involve a comprehensive, multi-faceted analysis of student performance in appropriate contexts.

The projects undertaken this fall represent a good effort on the part of the campuses to integrate the Assessment Framework into existing activities to track student progress, improve the quality of student education, and inform policy action. A description of the campus projects follows.

Oregon State University

- Critical thinking abilities of Oregon State University students after completing general education component of undergraduate curriculum. Using national instrument (TBA).
Recent graduates’ perceived outcomes and satisfaction with services provided by the university, including quality of instruction and career placement. Using Oregon State University survey.

Major field outcomes for students in sociology. Using portfolio and quantitative approaches.

Portland State University

Writing, communication, reasoning, and math knowledge and skills of students after completing Freshman Inquiry Classes. (Portland State University recently revised general education curriculum based on an analysis of those courses that lead to increased student learning outcomes.) Using ACT-COMP.

Activities and experiences of students related to student retention and success in school (e.g., grades, degree completion). Using Portland State University survey.

University of Oregon

Activities and experiences of students related to student retention and success in school (e.g., grades, degree completion). Using national surveys.

Perceived outcomes of alumni (overall satisfaction and employment) of higher education participation. Using University of Oregon survey.

Oregon Institute of Technology

Work-readiness skills -- teamwork, applied math, applied technology, reading for information, writing, listening, locating information -- of students in federally supported program cooperatively provided by Oregon Institute of Technology, Intel, and Portland Community College (two-year engineering program for older, displaced workers). Using ACT’s Work Keys.
• Alumni’s perceived outcomes related to institution’s programs and services. Using ACT’s Alumni Outcomes Survey.

**Eastern Oregon State College**

• Relationships between writing proficiency and scores on Test of Standard Written English (TSWE), grade point average, gender, minority/ethnic status, and writing courses completed.

• Critical thinking abilities after completing writing requirement.

**Southern Oregon State College**

• Critical thinking abilities of students after completing general education interdisciplinary core courses of undergraduate curriculum. Using national instrument (TBA).

• Major field outcomes for students in sociology and anthropology. Using Educational Testing Service (ETS) instrument.

• External reviews of senior capstone experiences required of all majors.

**Western Oregon State College**

• Abilities of students in written and oral English language, critical thinking, and math/computer science skills after completing Liberal Arts and Sciences Core Curriculum (LACC). Using portfolio and tests (TBA).

**Oregon Health Sciences University**

• Survey of alumni of undergraduate programs in nursing, dental hygiene, and medical technology -- (a) to track involvement in lifelong learning; (b) to determine relationship between national licensure examination scores and course grades; and (c) to secure graduate assessment of quality of instruction received.
Most of these projects will be completed by January 1995 and will be used to develop an accountability report for the 1995 Legislative Session. Information about the outcomes of these projects will be shared with the Board at a later date.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Miller asked if there was input or evaluation from outside the academic setting. Dr. Nancy Goldschmidt responded that there are two relevant activities. One is a survey being sent to employers, legislators, and faculty to elicit opinions about the extent to which certain critical thinking skills are important in the workplace and should be covered in curriculum. Second, some of the campuses will be interviewing employers for feedback on how well their students are doing. "Through this, we're trying to establish what is expected and whether we're meeting those expectations." There is an interinstitutional assessment work group that meets monthly to assure that campuses, individually, and the System move toward implementation.

(No Boa action required)

A number of Board members thanked Dr. Gilbert and Eastern Oregon State College for the hospitality and informative visit. Dr. Aschkenasy noted how apparent it is that the regional colleges are not only educational institutions, but central to the life of the region.

Mr. Bailey commended State System faculty and staff for maintaining morale while under the constant pressure of budget constraints and expectations of the public.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting adjourned at 3 p.m.

Virginia L. Thompson
Secretary of the Board

Les M. Swanson, Jr.
President of the Board