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ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by President Les Swanson.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Dr. Herb Aschkenasy  Mr. Rob Miller
Mr. Bob Bailey        Ms. Esther Puentes
Ms. Diane Christopher Ms. Ronda Trotman Reese
Mr. Bobby Lee         Ms. Janice Wilson

Mr. Les Swanson, Jr.

Mr. Richardson and Mr. Willis were absent due to conflicts in schedule.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the February 17, 1995, meeting of the Board. Dr. Aschkenasy moved and Ms. Wilson seconded the motion to approve the minutes, with the amendment that two tables accidentally omitted would be included in the final version of the minutes. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Puentes, Trotman Reese, Wilson, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Mr. Swanson recognized the significant contribution Chancellor Cox and his staff have made in working with the legislature. The latest budget proposal from the Education Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee included the addition of $100 million in the K-12 budget. "While we support providing the best education possible through community college level, we don’t want to hurt higher education, and it looks like that will happen with this latest budget proposal." President Swanson thanked Board members for their continued conversations with legislators.

Mr. Swanson highlighted items on the agenda, and the Work Session in particular. The Work Session was designed to begin with a presentation by Dr. Gerald Kissler, senior vice provost for planning and resources at the University of Oregon, on the Oregon economy and the impacts on higher education. President Swanson indicated that the Board would tie
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that information in with the current legislative session activity and the
directions recommended by the 2010 Advisory Panel.

CHANCELLOR’S
REPORT

Chancellor Cox was not present at the beginning of the Board meeting. He
had to appear before the legislature. Vice Chancellor Ihrig presented his
report.

Mr. Ihrig thanked President Kohler for hosting the Board meeting at
Oregon Health Sciences University. Mr. Ihrig also noted that February
was the first time Mr. Bailey had missed a Board meeting in his seven
years on the Board.

A salute to Senator Hatfield in Portland on April 20 was attended by the
Chancellor and most of the OSSHE presidents. The tribute was to express
public appreciation for the Senator’s unfailing support of a range of
initiatives, including higher education, in Oregon.

OPEU Strike

On Wednesday, April 19, the Oregon Public Employees Union (OPEU)
voted 93 percent in favor of a strike. Mr. Ihrig noted that “the earliest
time the strike can occur is Saturday, May 6. Mr. Ron Anderson, assistant
vice chancellor for personnel administration, is working with institution
representatives and state officials to develop a plan to address any eventual
strike. While we all hope this does not come to pass, we respect the views
of those employees and understand the issues affecting them. But, above
that, we need to keep our institutions fully operational in whatever manner
we can, so we’ll be balancing those issues as we go through this period."

Legislative
Update

Mr. Ihrig indicated that higher education has been on the agenda of the
Education Subcommittee for over a month now. The proposed additional
$100 million for K-12 would limit resources available for other state
agencies. The presidents, their staff, and the Chancellor and his staff are
examining ways OSSHE can respond. Vice Chancellor Ihrig commented
that we remain “cautiously optimistic.”

Recognition of PASS

Dr. David Conley, director of the Proficiency-based Admission Standards
System (PASS), has been invited to participate in the International
Conference on University Admissions for the 21st Century. Other
participants in this conference are from Canada, Germany, Sweden, the
United Kingdom, Turkey, Israel, Korea, Thailand, and Australia. This
type of recognition for Oregon, especially in light of ongoing funding
problems, speaks well of the state and OSSHE overall.
The Western Oregon State College women's basketball team won the NAIA Division II national championship. Mr. Ihrig congratulated the team and the College on this accomplishment.

Portland State University President Judith Ramaley informed the Board that the University has now been designated an Urban Grant Institution under Title XI of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

A team from the Northwest Association, headed by Dr. Richard Bowen, president of Idaho State University, conducted a review of Portland State University as part of the regular ten-year institutional accreditation process. According to Dr. Bowen, the team had expected to find much more damage, disruption, and direct evidence of the impact of the severe cuts in Oregon higher education. Instead they found that, through educational reform, curricular redesign, and the remarkable efforts in administrative restructuring, the institutions have offset a certain amount of the damage. Dr. Ramaley read a direct quote from Dr. Bowen. "But the accreditation team cautions that the potential for continued adaptation is limited. The university community, in the face of continued economic adversity, will need to prioritize, reduce, or eliminate some services in order to preserve others if the quality of what continues is to be preserved. The team observes, in spite of demonstrated capable adaptation, that the University community manifests stress requiring relief, obtainable either through acquisition of greater support or a drastic reduction of services in the allocation of resources." Dr. Ramaley suggested that this statement applies to any of the State System institutions.

Mr. Bailey added that he and Mr. Richardson had the opportunity to meet with members of the accreditation team. He indicated that the team spoke positively about how Portland State University was dealing with the tough issues at hand.

Mr. Swanson mentioned that Portland State University had applied to the Big Sky Conference. He praised Dr. Ramaley for her many contributions to Portland State University.

Dr. Sam Connell, president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS), reported on the April 7, 1995, IFS meeting. Vice Chancellor Clark and Dr. Coley attended and presented the OSSHE proposal on new faculty diversity initiatives. Dr. Connell noted that "the IFS members discussed the document in great detail, including specific comments from the faculty
senates or other advisory groups on the campuses. At the end of our session, we came up with the following statements:

"The IFS strongly supports the goal of increasing faculty diversity and the OSSHE suggested strategies of targeting both (a) incentives for hiring minority faculty, and (b) support for increasing the number of minorities in the graduate studies pipeline and facilitating their transition to faculty appointments.

"Because of the considerable differences in mission and programs across the eight OSSHE institutions, the IFS believes that the institutions themselves should develop a plan that would increase faculty diversity on their campuses. It is possible that these plans might go beyond the five sample initiatives suggested in the OSSHE plan.

"Therefore, the IFS would endorse a diversity program that provided to each campus a general level of support for increasing faculty (and, where applicable, graduate student) diversity, where the specific initiatives and diversity plans are defined by each campus and funded by the diversity allocation each campus has received. A method for monitoring progress and 'success' could be developed Systemwide, with evaluation parameters and metrics adjusted appropriately for each campus. (This is to be distinguished from the OSSHE plan which suggests pre-defined programs in which campuses are invited to participate. The IFS believes that local institutional flexibility and autonomy in defining a diversity plan and allocating resources is of paramount importance to the success of any diversity effort.)

"The IFS notes that the proposed OSSHE initiatives concentrate on recruitment and hiring, with less emphasis on the financial resources required for retention. We understand that in an era of limited dollars, some risks must be taken, but we are cautious about any proposals that do not have some degree of ensured longevity. It would be unfortunate to bring faculty or graduate students to an OSSHE institution with promises of commitments that cannot be kept.

"The IFS opposes incentives and programs for new faculty that result in systematic salary compaction or inequities for existing faculty. In these times of continued diminished resources, the negative impact of such inequities would be enormous."
Dr. Connell provided Dr. Clark with specific written comments from faculty senates or other advisory groups on the campuses.

Dr. Aschkenasy asked about the seemingly incongruity between concern about salary compaction and knowingly paying people higher salaries because they’re harder to recruit. Dr. Connell said that, although there is no easy solution, there is concern that paying high salaries to recruit people because they may be earning a salary similar to what associate and full professors make.

Ms. Puentes pointed out that it’s important to bear in mind that retention of culturally diverse faculty and students is not tied to money as much as to a sense of inclusion. Recruitment, without a strong plan for changing campus climate, will not result in retention. Dr. Connell agreed, adding that beyond the campus, there needs to be a welcoming community as well. Ms. Puentes also noted that terminology used can have adverse effects. Using the term "minority" can be a label that implies a deficit or limitation. Rather we should seriously consider using terminology denoting linguistic or cultural diversity, supporting the understanding that these are benefits, not liabilities.

Mr. Lee asked if the term "underrepresented" is used in data about faculty of color. Dr. Clark responded that there is "a general underrepresentation in all of the Affirmative Action minority categories, but there is certainly a differential underrepresentation by field and even by institution. We need to be attentive to underrepresentation in some areas. There are many areas where Asian Americans are underrepresented. We will need to look at this campus by campus and even broadly field by field and allow for recruitment that will redress the worst representational areas."

Staff Report to the Board

Indications from Washington, D.C., are that federal funding for public broadcasting is likely to be reduced, possibly significantly. The Board, through stations operated by and at its institutions, has worked with local citizens, businesses, philanthropic foundations, and the federal government for decades to provide educational and cultural programming on public broadcasting. Public broadcasting is a critical component of the Board’s educational mission to encourage lifelong pursuit of knowledge.

The unique partnership among the federal and state governments, private citizens, and businesses around the state is heralded as an example of a
federal program that works. Federal funds provide a vital infrastructure that generates substantial private support (nationally, eight dollars for every one dollar spent by the federal government).

Staff Recommendation to the Board

To allay concerns that a reduction in support of public broadcasting by the federal government will be mirrored by a similar reduction in support for, or commitment to, public broadcasting by the Board, staff recommended the Board adopt the following resolution:

The Board reaffirms its support of public broadcasting as an integral part of its education and service missions. The recent discussions aimed at reducing federal funding for public broadcasting are of great concern. The Board instructs the Chancellor, on its behalf, to:

1. Inform the Oregon Congressional delegation of the role that public broadcasting plays in meeting OSSHE’s mission and of the importance of continued federal support for public broadcasting;

2. Assure OSSHE institutions that, regardless of the outcome of the discussions at the federal level, the Board intends to continue its long-time commitment to its public broadcasting operations; and

3. Urge future Boards to take into consideration the history of long-term community support of public broadcasting programs in any decisions regarding continuation of public broadcasting.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Christopher moved and Ms. Wilson seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Puentes, Trotman Reese, Wilson, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.
Staff Report to the Board

At its December 1994 meeting, the Board instructed the Chancellor to prepare an Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) designating as pre-tax the contribution employees must make to their retirement as a result of Ballot Measure 8. After preparing a proposed rule, staff initiated rulemaking procedures. The proposed rule is now before the Board.

The Attorney General advised us that the Board, by Administrative Rule, could designate the employee contribution as an "employer contribution" for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 USC §414(h)(2). By this action, the contribution will be deducted pre-tax, and employees will pay taxes only on the salary minus the six percent employee contribution. Without this action, employees will pay tax on the full amount of salary and then have the six percent deducted.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following Administrative Rule:

Contribution to Pension Plan

580-20-040 The Board of Higher Education designates the contribution required of employees to a retirement plan to be an "employer contribution" as defined by 26 USC §414(h)(2). Employees may not receive this amount to make the contribution directly. Employees' gross salary will be reduced by the contributed amount prior to reporting for tax purposes.

Board Discussion and Action

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

In May 1993, the Board approved the implementation of a financial information system at five sites and ratified the selection of the SCT BANNER Financial Information System (FIS) software for use in that system. Implementation was to begin in July 1993, with two universities installing the new system in July 1994, five colleges and universities to come up on the new system in July 1995, and the last (Oregon Health Sciences University) to go on-line in July 1996. The project is on schedule and within its $17 million budget.

The FIS project was implemented, in part, as a response to the recommendations of the Board Administrative Review Committee that new financial and human resources information systems were essential if efficiencies and savings were to be achieved.

The second critical system was the Human Resources Information System (HRIS). In 1993, the Board and the legislature were told that planning for such a system would be undertaken during 1993-1995 and that implementation would be slated for the 1995-1997 and 1997-1999 biennia. The HRIS would replace the current budget/payroll/personnel system and permit the State System to complete migration from a now obsolete computer base. In addition, the new HRIS was envisioned as automating critical human resource functions, such as applicant tracking, which are not a part of the present budget/payroll/personnel system.

The 1993-1995 legislatively approved budget included authority to issue Certificates of Participation (COPs) yielding $2.7 million in cash to begin the Human Resources Information System (HRIS) project. The COPs were sold in the fall of 1994. In July 1994, the Board approved an allocation of Certificates of Participation providing an additional $16.5 million of cash for this project in the 1995-1997 budget. This amount was included in the budget proposed by the Governor to the legislature in January 1995. The total approved for the project stands at $19.2 million.

An HRIS Steering Committee, comprised of representatives of all eight colleges and universities and the Chancellor’s Office, and drawing from functional experts in personnel, payroll, affirmative action, and budgeting, was constituted in the summer of 1993. It was modeled after the steering committee structure that has guided the Financial Information System analysis, selection, and implementation process.
The HRIS Steering Committee has investigated and analyzed the requirements that the State System and its colleges and universities would need in a Human Resources Information System and has investigated various software approaches. This work led the committee to recommend to the State System’s Administrative Council that a new system be undertaken and that the committee be authorized to prepare a request for proposals to find the most appropriate software for such a system. The Administrative Council approved this request in February 1995.

Implementation of the project, as currently envisioned, would cost in the range of $13.5 to $15 million. No recommendation has yet been reached about the software best suited to the system or the configuration in which to install the new system (i.e., one site vs. multiple sites). Savings, efficiencies, and other improvements sufficient to meet the cost/benefit justification tests for a system costing in that range have been identified by committee members.

The HRIS Steering Committee intends to make its recommendations about these matters to the Administrative Council before the end of the 1995 calendar year. A refinement of costs and benefits will be done at that time, as well. This schedule should permit implementation of the system within the originally proposed timeframe (i.e., in 1998).

The Administrative Council joins the Steering Committee in proposing that staff request legislative approval for authority to pursue a Human Resources Information System and to issue, through appropriate state mechanisms, Certificates of Participation yielding $12.3 million in cash for use in implementing this project.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff concurred with the request of the Human Resources Information System Steering Committee and the Administrative Council and requested the Board authorize staff to seek necessary approvals from the legislature to pursue implementation of a Human Resources Information System project and to issue Certificates of Participation yielding $12.3 million to finance that implementation.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Swanson asked about the difference between a Certificate of Participation and a bond. Vice Chancellor Ihrig responded that the
Certificate of Participation is basically a different type of bonding vehicle. President Swanson asked how bond holders would be paid, and Mr. Ihrig indicated that the intention is to pay them off with savings that are generated.

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

**Staff Report to the Board**

The Board of Higher Education permits institutions, with concurrence of their faculty, to award honorary degrees. Each institution wishing to award honorary degrees must adopt criteria and procedures for selection that assures the award honors distinguished achievement and outstanding contribution to the institution, state, or society. Criteria and procedures for selection must be forwarded to the Chancellor for approval and, when approved, filed with the Secretary of the Board. Institutions are required to forward their recommendations for honorary degrees for the Board’s approval 90 days before the date for awarding the degrees.

Two additional authorizations beyond those requested by Oregon State University and Portland State University in February 1995 were requested. Oregon Health Sciences University and the University of Oregon each requested Board authorization to award degrees at their June commencements. Institution and Chancellor’s Office staff acknowledge that the lateness of these requests violates Board policy for 90-day approval of honorary degrees. In approving these recommendations, the Board will, in effect, be approving a waiver of this requirement.

**Oregon Health Sciences University**

Oregon Health Sciences University proposes to award an honorary doctorate to Miriam J. Hirschfeld.

**Miriam J. Hirschfeld**

Dr. Hirschfeld, Chief Scientist for Nursing at the World Health Organization since 1989, is an internationally respected scholar who has had a major impact on the field of gerontology and the lives of older people throughout the world. She was educated in Austria, Israel, and the United States, earning her doctorate in
nursing science at the University of California, San Francisco. She was one of the first researchers to recognize the critical importance of the family as the central provider of long-term and geriatric care and to elucidate processes used by families in the provision of this care. Her research on family care of cognitively impaired older people, published in the early 1980s, continues to be cited as classic work by gerontological researchers everywhere.

Dr. Hirschfeld is one of few researchers in the field of senile brain disease who has struggled to operationalize new models of care for vulnerable aged persons. Her creative work as National Coordinator of Chronic Care and Aging Services with Kupat Holim (the Workers' Sick Fund of Israel) from 1978-1989 won the respect of the international gerontological community and was followed by requests for her participation in scores of international advisory groups, workshops, and consultancies through the World Health Organization (WHO) and the European gerontological community.

At WHO, Dr. Hirschfeld's focus has shifted toward service to the international community by creating an increasing emphasis on developing cost-effective systems of care for chronically ill and older people throughout the world. She has also been a leader in the campaign to improve the health of women. Through her scholarship and her sensitivity to culture and its impact on health care and health behavior, and through her mastery of many languages, she is able to blend "local" expertise with scientific expertise to produce interventions and systems of care that are tailored to the specific needs and characteristics of various countries and regions.

Dr. Hirschfeld has contributed directly to Oregon Health Sciences University by providing opportunities for faculty to work in advisory positions within WHO -- an enriching experience for the faculty and the teaching programs of the University. Further, Dr. Hirschfeld has given keynote addresses at two Oregon Health Sciences University symposia: "International Perspectives on Health Care of the Aged" in 1981 and the "International Family Conference" in 1991.

Dr. Hirschfeld was one of the first international scholars to recognize the importance of the Oregon Health Plan. As a health
care researcher and activist, the issue of distributive justice has been an overt component of her thinking and writing.

Dr. Hirschfeld is one of the foremost nurses in the world and an extraordinary international scholar and servant in health care and gerontology. She has received numerous awards, among them an honorary doctorate from the University of Nottingham, England, in 1994.

University of Oregon

The University of Oregon proposes to award an honorary doctorate to Corazon C. Aquino.

Corazon C. Aquino

Corazon C. Aquino served as president of the Republic of the Philippines from 1986 to 1992. Propelled into politics by the death of her husband, Benigno Aquino, in 1983, Mrs. Aquino became a symbol of opposition to the regime of Ferdinand Marcos. In February 1986 she outpolled Marcos in presidential elections.

President Aquino’s major accomplishments in office included restoration of democratic institutions to the Philippines. In July 1987 she convened a new bicameral congress that marked a return to a form of government that had existed before the imposition of martial law in 1972.

Recognized worldwide as a leading spokesperson for human rights and democratic principles, President Aquino left office in 1992 in the first orderly and democratic transfer of power in the Philippines in almost 30 years.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended: the Board waive the 90-day requirement for approving honorary degrees; approve Oregon Health Sciences University’s request to award an honorary doctorate to Miriam J. Hirschfeld at the June 1995 commencement; and approve the University of Oregon’s request to award an honorary doctorate to Corazon C. Aquino at the June 1995 commencement.
Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Clark pointed out that the proposals did not meet the Board’s proscribed timeline because negotiations were in progress to ensure that each of these individuals would be permitted to attend the graduation ceremonies.

Mr. Bailey indicated that he is very pleased about the award to President Aquino. "My grandmother and grandfather both are graduates of the University of Oregon. My father and his brothers and sisters were all born in the Philippines. They’ve spent about 10 or 15 years there helping set up the health and education systems on the south island of Mindanao. We still have a lot of ties to the Philippines, and I think it’s a very meaningful experience for us personally."

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

Introduction

In February 1993, the Board authorized Oregon Health Sciences University and Portland State University to establish the Oregon Health Policy Institute (OHPI), effective March 1993. The Institute focuses on the development and analysis of health policy in Oregon and is the state’s resource center for collecting and analyzing health data and disseminating reliable and authoritative health policy analyses. Oregon Health Sciences University serves as the lead agency and provides space and facilities on its campus to house the Institute. Both universities provide staff and other support for the Institute.

Following Board action, Oregon State University joined this effort. President Byrne became a member of the OHPI Board of Directors and Ann Rossignol, chair of the Department of Public Health at Oregon State University, was named an Associate Director.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board formally recognize Oregon State University as an official member of the Oregon Health Policy Institute.
Board Discussion and Action

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

In accordance with Board regulations, the following members represented the Board in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas for the graduating classes at the institutions during the 1993-94 academic year and summer session:

- Eastern Oregon State College
  Richard Donahue

- Oregon Health Sciences University
  George Richardson

- Oregon Institute of Technology
  Diane Christopher

- Oregon State University
  Rob Miller

- Portland State University
  Jim Willis

- Southern Oregon State College
  Les Swanson

- University of Oregon
  Bob Bailey

- University of Oregon -- Law School
  Bobby Lee

- Western Oregon State College
  Karen Madden Evans
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Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board confirm the actions of the Board members in approving degrees and diplomas.

Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

In December of 1986, Robert B. Brown made a gift to the Oregon State University Foundation of an 80-acre parcel of land in Harney County. This gift was an addition to a Unitrust established in 1985 and increased the value of the Unitrust. When the property was deeded by Mr. Brown, the grantee on the deed was listed as Oregon State University rather than Oregon State University Foundation, although the grantee’s name and address listed on the bottom of the deed is the Oregon State University Foundation. The Foundation has, since 1986, been paying the holding costs of this parcel, such as taxes and insurance.

The Foundation was in the process of selling the property, and a preliminary title report showed the property’s title vested in Oregon State University. To clear title to the property so that the Foundation can proceed with the sale, a Bargain and Sale Deed needs to be executed in favor of the Oregon State University Foundation.

The State System Office of Finance and Administration has documentation clearly showing that the transfer of the property should have been to the Oregon State University Foundation and not Oregon State University. The value of the property is approximately $5,000.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended approval of the execution of the Bargain and Sale Deed in favor of the Oregon State University Foundation.
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Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

The Industrial Security Manual issued by the U.S. Department of Defense requires that owners, officers, and executive personnel of corporations and regents or trustees of colleges and universities whose employees have access to classified material in the course of working on Department of Defense contracts delegate to others the authority for fulfilling the requirements of the Industrial Security Manual and exclude themselves from access to classified information.

The resolution recommended for adoption is that which is required by the Manual and is, except for changes in the date, names of Board members, and the number of vice presidents, identical to that which has been previously adopted by the Board.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following resolution regarding access to classified information related to the Department of Defense material.

Resolution

That those persons occupying the following positions for Oregon State University shall be known as the Managerial Group as described in the Industrial Security Manual for Safeguarding Classified Information:

President
Vice Provost for Research and International Programs
Chief Business Officer
Security Supervisor
Assistant Security Supervisor
That the chief executive and the members of the Managerial Group have been processed or will be processed for a personnel clearance for access to classified information, to the level of the facility clearance granted to this institution as provided for in the aforementioned Industrial Security Manual.

That the said Managerial Group is hereby delegated all of the Board's duties and responsibilities pertaining to the protection of classified information under classified contracts of the Department of Defense or User Agencies of its Industrial Security Program awarded to Oregon State University.

That the following named officers and members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education shall not require, shall not have, and can be effectively excluded from access to all classified information in the possession of Oregon State University and do not occupy positions that would enable them to affect adversely the policies and practices of Oregon State University in the performance of classified contracts for the Department of Defense or User Agencies for its Industrial Security Program awarded to Oregon State University.

**Officers and Board Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Les Swanson, Jr.</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Aschkenasy</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bailey</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Christopher</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobby Lee</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter R. Miller</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Puentes</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George E. Richardson, Jr.</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronda L. Trotman Reese</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Willis</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice J. Wilson</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Cox</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia L. Thompson</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board Discussion and Action

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

Staff Report to the Board

On April 28, 1994, the State Board of Higher Education, acting on behalf of Southern Oregon State College, entered into a land sales contract with the City of Jacksonville, Oregon, for the purchase by the city of the remaining unsold portion of the Britt estate property. Southern Oregon State College received various parcels of property in the estate of Amalia Britt in 1957 and over the years has been disposing of the parcels. This sale to the City of Jacksonville completes the disposition of the land acquired from the Britt estate.

Due to a long-term encroachment by a private party on the parcel sold to the City of Jacksonville in April, the City is anxious to acquire formal title to the land so that the small (0.8 acre) encroachment problem can be resolved. Since title to the full 73-acre site will not pass to the City until final payment under the land sales contract is made, it is being requested that the area of the encroachment be deeded to the City now. The City has paid Southern Oregon State College $2,000 for this small parcel, and the College is recommending that it be deeded to the City.

The State System Office of Finance and Administration has reviewed the documents relating to the sale, and staff concurs with deeding the small parcel to the City of Jacksonville. The price received for the parcel is in line with the values determined by an appraisal of the property.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the small parcel of land containing approximately 0.8 acre be deeded to the City of Jacksonville.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Wilson moved and Mr. Miller seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschken-
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Introduction

The University of Oregon requested authorization to offer an undergraduate major in environmental studies leading to the B.A./B.S. degrees. Environmental studies is an interdisciplinary major that investigates the relations of humans with their environment. The proposed program is designed to combine theory and practice about environmental systems from the natural sciences, the social sciences, the humanities, and the fields of architecture, planning, law, journalism, and public policy. The program includes a required multidisciplinary core of study at both lower and upper division, as well as opportunities for students to design their own emphases within the larger field of environmental studies.

The proposed environmental studies major differs from majors in environmental sciences, environmental policy, or environmental practice; students majoring in environmental studies balance between requirements that give them basic but broad exposure to diverse areas of environmental science, policy, and practice, while allowing substantial opportunities for specialization in the natural sciences, social sciences, or humanities. The major will emphasize a liberal arts approach that focuses on the contributions of many disciplines to an understanding of the environment.

The proposed program will be drawn primarily from existing curricula. However, three new lower division courses will be added to provide an overview of each of the three program areas and at the upper division level there will be new offerings related to research and practica. The program will include a required multidisciplinary core of study at both the lower- and upper-division levels, as well as opportunities for students to design their own emphases within the larger field of environmental studies.

Funds in the amount of $74,011 -- increasing to $157,704 in year four -- will be required to implement the proposed major. These funds will be provided through reallocation of existing resources within the College of Arts and Sciences resulting from recent faculty retirements and from gift funds dedicated to the study of environmental issues. A copy of the proposal is included in the supplementary section of the docket. A copy of the full proposal with appendices is on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.
Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

The environmental studies major fulfills a part of the University of Oregon’s mission to offer high-quality general education in the liberal arts and sciences. As the largest liberal arts and sciences university in a state noted for its environmental concern and management, the University of Oregon has a strong interest in providing an innovative undergraduate major in environmental studies. The strategic plan for the University, A Vision for the Future -- 1992-97, singles out undergraduate education and internationalism for major emphases. Environmental studies furthers these goals through bringing together diverse strands of undergraduate coursework in a focused manner as well as through studies of global environmental problems.

2. Evidence of Need

The need for an undergraduate environmental studies program exists on societal, institutional, and individual levels. In American society, and in other societies worldwide, significant attention is paid to environmental issues. Environmental issues were the focus of the 1993 United Nations conference in Rio de Janeiro and were among the central issues at the 1994 United Nations Population Conference in Cairo. Nationally, environmental issues are raised in many political debates. In the Pacific Northwest, daily concerns over forests, wildlife, and pollution and their concomitant political, economic, legal, societal, and scientific implications suggest a compelling need for a better and more integrated understanding of the environment.

Institutionally, demand for the proposed program has been demonstrated by the steadily increasing number of students at the University of Oregon who have declared Environmental Studies as a minor -- currently over 100. A partial poll suggests that nearly half of these minors would prefer a major. Of the 35,000 potential students who inquired about entering the University beginning fall 1994, 847 indicated an interest in environmental studies. New students quickly fill the Environmental Studies Freshman Interest Group. During 1993-94, a group of undergraduates independently initiated a "poll" of student interest in an environmental studies major. The result
indicated an overwhelmingly positive response, with several students indicating they plan to transfer to institutions that offer that major. Estimated enrollments in the proposed program are expected to reach 150 by year five.

3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

The quality of the proposed program is assured by the high quality of the participating faculty. When contrasted with other large universities offering strong environmental programs such as Oregon State University, Yale, Duke, and Cornell, the University of Oregon, which currently offers an undergraduate minor and a Master's degree in Environmental Studies, compares favorably despite the modest resources of the current program.

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

**Faculty.** No additional faculty will be needed to implement the proposed program. Seventy-four faculty in 24 academic departments have demonstrated interests in Environmental Studies. Existing faculty will participate in the program through course-release arrangements with their home departments.

**Library.** Library holdings are adequate to initiate the proposed program. As the literature in environmental fields continues to increase, funding will need to be increased. The Environmental Studies Program office maintains a supplemental resource of published materials, periodicals, and newsletters.

**Facilities and Equipment.** No special facilities beyond those now available will be required. Additional office space for the Program Director and the Graduate Teaching Fellows (who will assist with the Introductory and Environmental Issues courses), and a seminar room will be needed. This space will be provided through reallocation and renovation of existing space within the College of Arts and Sciences.

**Budget Impact.** Financial resources needed to implement the program will total approximately $74,000 in the first year, increasing to $157,700 by year four. The majority of these funds will be used to purchase faculty release time, to pay graduate teaching assistants, and for support personnel. $12,500 of the required annual funding will be from gift funds dedicated to this program. The remaining
funds will be provided from reserves accumulated in the College of Arts and Sciences from faculty retirements.

5. **Duplication**

The proposed program is not duplicative of other undergraduate environmental programs in the state. Oregon State University has undergraduate majors in environmental sciences and natural resources. Southern Oregon State College has an undergraduate major in environmental studies in which students select an option area in biology, chemistry, geology, or geography. The University of Oregon offers a degree in general science in which students may emphasize environmental science. The proposed environmental studies major differs definitively from these existing programs in its emphasis on a broad, interdisciplinary approach with a liberal arts base. The existing programs all have strong natural science emphases.

The University of Oregon and Oregon State University have an increasing number of collaborative faculty projects that provide the underpinning for assisting students in using resources from both institutions. Oregon State University’s strong natural resource and environmental science programs and the University of Oregon’s proposed environmental studies program can provide an additional opportunity for enhancing curricular options for students at both institutions. The mission of the program is to explore, develop, and diffuse ideas and practices that emphasize the inclusion of humans and their cultural and societal creations in the natural physical and biological systems of the earth.

**Program Review**

The proposed program has been reviewed by all appropriate institutional committees and approved by the University of Oregon Assembly and Senate. The program proposal was reviewed positively by the Academic Council that included input received from the Oregon Office of Educational Policy and Planning in its deliberations. The proposal received additional supportive responses from Oregon State University and Portland State University.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board authorize the University of Oregon to offer a major in environmental studies effective fall term 1995, with a follow-up review of the program to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs during the 2001-02 academic year. The proposal should be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the next Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (February 17, 1995)

Vice Chancellor Clark summarized the key features of the program proposal. Ms. Trotman Reese inquired about employment opportunities for graduates of this program. Dr. Richard Gale, director of environmental studies at the University of Oregon, responded that graduates would generally select one of three options: proceed to graduate school, work in a government agency, or participate in a non-governmental environmental organization.

Dr. Aschkenasy noted that, although currently popular, he wondered about its relevance to actual job opportunities. Dr. Gale responded that it's not a vocational major; in other words, people are not being trained to do a specific task. Rather the focus is to put environmental studies into a global context. That being the case, Dr. Gale feels confident that the program is sensitive to the students and their needs relative to the job market.

Ms. Christopher and Ms. Wilson both expressed support of the program and its value to communities and to the state as a whole. Ms. Wilson added that environmental impact studies seem to be a big consideration no matter what one's area of business.

Mr. Swanson asked about student demand. Dr. Gale responded that student demand for this major is high.

Mr. Miller asked about the University of Oregon working with other State System institutions. Dr. Clark indicated that the programs at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University are complementary. The University of Oregon program is very broad while the Oregon State University program is much more science oriented. So there is an area of overlap but not duplication.
Mr. Richardson expressed confusion regarding a statement in the staff report that no additional faculty would be required to implement the program; that faculty would participate in the program through course-release arrangements. "Does this mean that if a particular course is being taught under one department, that basically that course would leave the department? You indicated that a faculty person would essentially leave his/her department and teach a course in the new department and the sending department would hire someone to teach the course vacated by the faculty. It seems to me that you either increase the workload of someone else or you bring in someone new. In my way of thinking, that is adding new faculty, either full-time or part-time."

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

Board Discussion and Action (April 21, 1995)

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

Introduction

Oregon State University requested authorization to offer the B.A./B.S. degree and a minor in Ethnic Studies effective fall of 1995. The academic discipline of ethnic studies is defined by a concentration on the concerns and experiences of U.S. minorities traditionally underrepresented in the curriculum (African Americans/Blacks, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, Latino/Hispanic/Chicano Americans, American Indians, and Alaskan Natives). Ethnic Studies courses are specifically designed to investigate the histories and concerns of these major U.S. ethnic minorities from the perspectives and belief systems common to those cultures. Taught by faculty who have extensive personal experience and academic training in those diverse cultures, ethnic studies courses provide knowledge and experience not commonly available elsewhere in the existing academic structure in concentrated form.

Ethnic Studies will be housed in a new department in the College of Liberal Arts consisting of four core faculty members (4.0 FTE), one of
whom will serve as department chair, and one full-time classified support staff person. It is anticipated that approximately 35 percent of Ethnic Studies course offerings will be existing courses currently offered by faculty in other disciplines. Students will be strongly encouraged to pursue Ethnic Studies as a double major or as a concurrent degree in conjunction with another program.

In 1993, in preparation for the Governor’s proposed 1993-1995 budget, Oregon State University made substantial cuts in the budgets of a number of academic programs. Because of subsequent legislative actions that softened the impact of the proposed budget, those program reductions were larger than was ultimately necessary. The result was a pool of recurring funds that the institution reserved for high priority programs. Some of the monies conserved have been devoted to student recruitment efforts and establishment of an Honors College. The remainder is dedicated to programs that will enhance ethnic diversity.

Because of its potential to significantly enhance diversity across the institution and foster understanding of diversity issues by all members of the University community, funding for the proposed Department of Ethnic Studies will be made available from funds received in excess of the Governor’s initial 1993-1995 budget. A copy of the proposal is included in the supplementary section of the docket. A copy of the full proposal, including 13 appendices, is on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.

**Staff Analysis**

1. **Relationship to Assigned Mission**

The increasing ethnic complexity of the United States and the attendant potential for serious social and political divisiveness make expertise in ethnic diversity areas of vital importance to the University and to the state. The proposed program is consistent with and supportive of Oregon State University’s land grant responsibility to serve society through the application of knowledge to important societal needs. Additionally, the institution’s mission compels it to diversify its knowledge base and recognize the experiences and concerns of different cultural groups in order to remain a comprehensive University.
The existence of a defined and integrated curricula specifically oriented to the concerns and issues of ethnic minority groups signals an institution's commitment to issues of diversity and has been demonstrated to significantly affect the recruitment and retention rates of ethnic minority faculty and students across all disciplines. The land grant concept originated out of a desire and a need to provide postsecondary education to those not being effectively served by the higher education institutions of the time. The proposed program will not only further Oregon State University's diversity goals, it will effectively serve all members of the University community and provide a program for those students who may have felt ill-served in the absence of such a program major in Oregon.

2. Evidence of Need

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education and the System as a whole have focused on issues of diversity in higher education for many years. Despite efforts to recruit and retain faculty and students of color, institutions have not made the progress they had hoped to achieve. The past decade shows modest and uneven progress. Board members have repeatedly expressed frustration at the rate of advancements in this area.

In 1986 President Byrne established a Board of Visitors for Minority Affairs whose 25 members were leaders from ethnic minority communities around the state. The Board was asked to assist the University in developing strategies to recruit, retain, and serve underrepresented minority students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The Board of Visitors developed a comprehensive program for enhancing educational and professional opportunities for ethnic minorities at Oregon State University. A Minority Affairs Commission was appointed and charged with implementing the Board of Visitors’ recommendations. The Commission recommended the University develop specific strategies to integrate minority perspectives into mainstream "American" cultural courses and appoint a subcommittee with expertise in interdisciplinary/cross-cultural curriculum to develop an interdisciplinary ethnic studies program. This proposal is a direct outgrowth of those recommendations.

Oregon State University continues to have difficulty attracting ethnic minority students, faculty, and staff, and it is challenged by issues of racism on campus. In addition, the University continues to try to
establish stronger ties with the ethnic minority communities in the state and seeks to provide culturally diverse knowledge bases and experience in its curriculum. An ethnic studies undergraduate major and minor will provide an academic and social environment supportive of these goals.

Even in an era of downsizing, many businesses are committing substantial resources to raise employee understanding of and sensitivity to issues of cultural diversity. The Ethnic Studies Department will provide courses students must have to be adequately prepared for the diverse workplace, society, and polity they will be entering.

In the early years of the program, it is anticipated that 15 to 20 students will declare a major in Ethnic Studies. However, based on the experience of other universities in the country, the instructional impact is likely to be much greater. Approximately 500 students per year are expected to enroll in Ethnic Studies courses.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The quality of the proposed program has been assured by the high quality of the interdisciplinary group of faculty who initiated this proposal, participated in its development, and who will participate in the program. Assistance has been obtained from distinguished ethnic studies scholars and educators from other institutions and from members of ethnic communities in Oregon. Faculty searches will be designed to attract and select faculty with a demonstrated high level of scholarly achievement.

Establishment of a Department of Ethnic Studies, with its own core faculty, will provide an academic peer group and foster intellectual productivity. It will lend integrity and legitimacy to the field of study, enhance interactions with associates in other departments, and ensure coordination of an ethnic studies curriculum. The proposed program's emphasis on double majors is also an important quality element, guarding against indirectly discouraging minority students from pursuing degrees in the sciences and professional schools.
4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. Four new faculty positions will be established. Three positions will be at the assistant professor level and one, the department chair, at the associate professor level. Importantly, ethnic studies courses will not be the exclusive purview of this unit; they will also be offered by faculty in other disciplines.

Library. In 1993, a special $5,000 gift was allocated for purchase of books in multicultural areas, which resulted in the addition of 120 books to the library's collection. With the addition of one new journal and continued book purchases by bibliographers, the current library holdings will be adequate to support the Ethnic Studies programs.

Facilities and Equipment. Office space, equipment, and appropriate remodeling for four faculty and one office coordinator will need to be provided. Office space is available for this purpose. Office furniture and equipment will need to be acquired.

Budget Impact. Funding in the amount of $323,481 annually -- increasing to $360,231 in year five -- will be needed to establish the proposed department. The major portion of the program budget will be devoted to support of faculty, graduate assistants, and an office coordinator, with the remainder being used for space renovation, equipment, services and supplies. Program funds will be provided from recurring funds conserved by the institution at the end of the 1993 legislative session.

5. Duplication

No other institution in Oregon offers a degree in ethnic studies. The University of Oregon offers a minor in Ethnic Studies within the department of Folklore and Ethnic Studies. As such, its offerings do not constitute a program with the depth and scope of the proposed program. Portland State University has a Black Studies Program, which offers some parallel courses, but lacks the breadth of an ethnic studies curriculum.
Program Review

The proposed program has been reviewed by all appropriate institutional committees and approved by the Faculty Senate. The proposal was also reviewed and is supported by those responsible for related programs at Portland State University and the University of Oregon. In January, it was reviewed positively by the Academic Council, which took into consideration comments from the Oregon Office of Educational Policy and Planning.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon State University to offer the B.A./B.S. degree and a minor in Ethnic Studies effective fall term 1995, with a follow-up of the program to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs during the 2001-02 academic year. The proposal should be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the next Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (February 17, 1995)

While indicating her recognition of the importance of diversity issues, Ms. Wilson questioned the marketability of a graduate with an ethnic studies degree. Dr. Linc Kesler, associate professor of English at Oregon State University, responded that some students will probably elect to have a double major. Others will decide to continue with their studies in graduate school, perhaps obtaining terminal degrees in law or business. Further, it is not uncommon for businesses to operate their own programs of diversity training, and graduates with this degree would be well positioned to enter that area of employment.

Mr. Willis asked what courses would be offered for this program. Dr. Kesler indicated that these courses were primarily multidisciplinary. Dr. Manuel Pacheco stressed the importance of the interdisciplinary nature of the courses. "One example that comes to mind is immigration and California's Proposition 187. This is a deep and complex problem. It has to do with internal problems of Mexico, their government, NAFTA, the economy, the bail-out, the history of United States-Mexican relations, the war between the United States and Mexico in 1846-48, the labor system -- all those issues. While it can be studied piecemeal in various departments of sociology, economics, and so on, only in a program or department like ethnic studies can you study the problem in-depth,
integrating all the issues holistically." Dr. Kesler added that such programs reflect the changing nature of problems and issues the academy now faces.

Dr. Aschkenasy, following up on some concerns raised by Mr. Willis, observed that it would be increasingly important for the Board to consider employment opportunities for graduates of OSSHE institutions. Therefore, questions might regularly be raised about career opportunities for graduates with degrees in new areas.

Ms. Trotman Reese expressed her support for this program. "I think that programs like this benefit the community beyond having a paying job at the end. For issues to be resolved, there needs to be something beyond just an awareness that there's a problem. People need to have a clear understanding of the issues and some clear ideas on how to resolve them. This type of program crosses a lot of different job opportunities."

Ms. Christopher indicated dismay that Oregon State University continues to be challenged by issues of attracting ethnic minority students and issues of racism on campus. Beyond approving a new program, Ms. Christopher encouraged continued vigilance in creating a welcoming atmosphere on campus. Oregon State University Provost Roy Arnold noted that data indicate progress is being made in that regard. This program is just another step in a positive direction.

Ms. Christopher and Dr. Aschkenasy asked if the students who would populate this program would be primarily students of color. Dr. Clark responded that it is an area of curriculum that is also of interest to many white students.

Mr. Richardson asked to hear from Dr. Connell about the faculty's commitment to this program because, without faculty support, the effectiveness of the program will be diminished. He also asked that the faculty diversity initiatives be presented next on the agenda. Dr. Connell responded to Mr. Richardson's concerns during the course of discussion on that topic.

Mr. Swanson indicated that, on behalf of the Board, he was proud of the program and the commitment it carried to further goals of the Board.

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

Board Discussion and Action (April 21, 1995)

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

Introduction

Oregon Health Sciences University requested authorization to establish a new instructional program leading to the B.S. degree in Physician Assistant Studies. The proposed program will enhance the delivery of primary care services to medically underserved populations of the state and advance the physician assistant profession in Oregon.

The physician assistant is a health care professional qualified by academic and clinical education and by formal certification to provide patient evaluation and care under the supervision of a doctor of medicine or osteopathy. The proposed program will emphasize primary care. It is not anticipated that subspecialties or areas of emphasis will be added as the program develops.

The proposed program will be totally supported by federal funds, supplemental grants, and tuition and fees.

The Physician Assistant Studies program will report administratively to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and will be programmatically linked to one or more primary care departments in the School of Medicine. No new administrative unit will be necessary. A copy of the proposal is included in the supplementary section of the docket. A copy of the full proposal with appendices (including the 1992 report to the Legislative Emergency Board "Establishing a Physician Assistant Training Program in Oregon") is on file in the State System Office of Academic Affairs.
Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

Establishment of a Physician Assistant Studies program is consistent with and supportive of Oregon Health Sciences University’s mission to serve the citizens of Oregon as the primary center for education in the health professions for students of the state and region. The proposed program will relate to and benefit from other baccalaureate degree programs in health care at Oregon Health Sciences University, mainly through utilization of common curricular and training site facilities. The program will become one of five degree-granting allied health programs at Oregon Health Sciences University and the program director will be a member of the Allied Health Council.

2. Evidence of Need

Since 1987, the Oregon Legislative Assembly has demonstrated an increasing concern regarding availability of medical care for rural Oregonians. The 1991 Legislative Assembly mandated a study by the Office of Rural Health to determine the need for physician assistants in Oregon. The results indicated a need throughout the state. The 1993 Legislative Assembly requested development of a Physician Assistant program with emphasis on service to rural areas. Planning funds were provided in the amount of $150,000 for development of the program. The proposed program is a result of that effort. Fourteen hundred people have already indicated interest in the 12 potentially available student slots.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The quality of the Physician Assistant Studies program will be assured by the academic and professional activities, oversight processes, and associations of Oregon Health Sciences University. The program, as proposed, received an on-site evaluation by the Accreditation Review Committee on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA) in February 1994. On the basis of the Committee’s review of the application materials and the on-site evaluation, a Letter of Review was issued on March 12, 1994. This is the first step in obtaining accreditation. Customarily, the accreditation process is not completed until the first class has started its second
year of study. Therefore, full program accreditation is not expected until fall 1996 at the earliest.

Program graduates will sit for a national certification examination, the results of which will provide an additional measure of program quality.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. Existing faculty in the School of Medicine will participate in offering the proposed program. Dr. Ted J. Ruback will temporarily assume the responsibilities of Program Director until a permanent director can be recruited. Searches will also be undertaken to fill two additional positions, those of Academic Coordinator and Clinical Coordinator for the program.

Library. Current library collections and subscription titles are adequate to meet the curricular requirements for the proposed program.

Facilities and Equipment. The Physician Assistant Studies program will have access to lecture and seminar rooms, clinical skills laboratory, and both outpatient and inpatient care facilities. All required facilities are now available at Oregon Health Sciences University or at its off-campus clinical training sites.

Budget Impact. The proposed program budget is $376,117 for 1995-96, increasing to $462,990 in 1996-97. Funding will be provided from three sources: a federal training grant from the Health Resources and Services Administration; a three-year, renewable grant from the Bureau of Health Professions; and income from tuition and fees. No state General Fund appropriation will be requested or needed to support the proposed program.

5. Duplication

No institution in Oregon currently offers a Physician Assistant training program. The University of Washington has the only such program in the entire Northwest.
Program Review

The proposed Physician Assistant Studies program was developed with assistance from the Office of Rural Health and science faculty from community and four-year colleges. The proposed program has been reviewed by all appropriate institutional committees and approved by the faculty senate. The program proposal was also reviewed positively by the Academic Council in January.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board authorize Oregon Health Sciences University to establish a program leading to the B.S. degree in Physician Assistant Studies effective fall term 1995, with a follow-up review of the program to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs during the 2001-02 academic year. The proposal should be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the next Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action (February 17, 1995)

Mr. Richardson asked for clarification between a physician assistant (P.A.) and nurse practitioner. Dr. Ted Ruback, program director, noted that there are differences in four areas. One, nurse practitioners are all nurses first, whereas physician assistants come from a variety of backgrounds. Two, nurse practitioners are trained using the nursing model in schools of nursing; physician assistants are typically trained in schools of medicine. Three, P.A.s are required to obtain national certification. There is no national certification for nurse practitioners. The fourth difference is more a philosophical one. Nurse practitioners are more likely to go into independent practice, while P.A.s traditionally are dependent practitioners, working under the supervision of licensed physicians.

Continuing, Mr. Richardson asked that, even with those differences, aren’t the same duties performed? Dr. Ruback replied that they were, except as prohibited by law. For example, in Oregon, nurse practitioners can open their own practice whereas P.A.s cannot. However, P.A.s are licensed by the Board of Medical Examiners and, with approval, can practice independent of their physician as defined by that Board.

Mr. Swanson asked how many people applied for the program and how many slots would be open. Dr. Ruback replied that there have been 1,400 inquiries, with 12 slots open the first year and 18 in subsequent years.
Mr. Lee moved to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Lee, Miller, Richardson, Trotman Reese, Willis, Wilson, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.

Board Discussion and Action (April 21, 1995)

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

In April, the Office of Public Affairs launched the first phase of a public information campaign designed to increase awareness of public higher education in Oregon. Phase I targets high school juniors and seniors and community college students, particularly those who have not finalized their higher education planning. Students will be reached primarily through advertisements in high school and community college newspapers throughout the state. Our goal is a reduction of time lost and effort misdirected by putting accurate, up-to-date information in the hands of prospective students so that they can move effectively through the State System toward their education goals.

The ads feature a toll-free number and e-mail address with direct access to the OSSHE Office of School Relations in Eugene. Students may request information on degree offerings Systemwide or request information about specific campuses. Ads will run, and the toll-free number will be open, during the months of April, May, and June.

The newspaper advertisements represent the core of Phase I. Collateral efforts to increase awareness of the availability of the toll-free number include: a press release sent to all statewide media, high school and community college newspapers; a letter to high school and community college guidance counselors; and advertisements in targeted periodicals.

The total budget for implementation of Phase I is $50,000.

Following a mid-summer assessment of the effectiveness of Phase I, consideration will be given to a similar effort during peak Systemwide and institutional recruitment efforts in the fall.
Board Discussion

The Board reviewed the overall goals of the plan, discussed how the marketing campaign will be assessed, and discussed recruitment conducted by the individual campuses.

(No Board action required)

At a meeting of Superintendent Norma Paulus, Community College Commissioner Roger Bassett, and Chancellor Joseph Cox, the following design emerged to reconstitute the Joint Boards working relationship and the annual calendar. This proposal is suggested for a trial two-year period with the goal of moving the Joint Boards effort to a higher level of both efficiency and board and staff member confidence in the way we are proceeding and in achieving the desired outcomes.

It is agreed that under normal circumstances over the course of this approximately 18-month cycle, two Joint Boards meetings per year will be sufficient to accomplish our work. These meetings will consist of one meeting, the primary purpose of which will be identification and discussion of issues (this meeting will occur in the early fall following the legislative session); and a second decision-making meeting to be scheduled in the fall of the next year. The success of these meetings will depend absolutely on adherence to the following process and schedule. Additional Joint Boards meetings could be scheduled by the two board presidents if needed. The Joint Boards Working Group, perhaps modified, will continue to function as a steering committee, serving a coordinating function.

Phase 1

During the summer following the regular legislative session, the Joint Boards co-chairs, after discussion with their fellow board members, will identify a short list of topics/items proposed for Joint Boards study and action during the legislative interim. (See the attached schedule for possible "examples." The CEOs of the three sectors would then provide the Joint Boards co-chairs with recommendations and rationale for such a list. (See stage one of the cycle.) The agenda would be developed around the concepts or issues to be addressed, work to be accomplished, and outcomes to be achieved.
The views and ideas of all members of both boards on each proposed topic/item will be solicited by the co-chairs and used to frame the working assignments for staff and working groups in consultation with the sector CEOs. Each board president would be at liberty to involve his/her executive committee or others as they wished.

At a fall meeting of each board, the sector head would conduct, with input from staff, an initial briefing for his/her board on the agenda topics, issues, background, and potential outcomes. Then at the Joint Boards meeting, board members would be invited to discuss the topics, the proposed approaches, the desirable outcomes, and staffing and budget considerations. The Joint Boards will provide guidance to the appropriate staff to continue the effort. (See stage two of the cycle.)

Phase 2

At the same time, the Joint Boards would make a decision based on CEO recommendations about whether a single work team with membership from each sector would be established to complete the current work or whether, by the nature of the agenda topics, multiple teams would be more appropriate.

Joint working teams (appointed by the three CEOs) would develop each issue, assemble or conduct needed research, and frame a set of alternative actions for consideration by the Joint Boards. (See stage three of the cycle.) The members of that team would come from sector offices, institutions, or might include representation of other interests (e.g., the private sector, independent colleges, etc.) or could involve outside consultants as appropriate. The team(s) would bring their work to fruition in the spring.

The position papers or other outcomes produced by the work teams would be forwarded to the sector heads, who would place them on the agenda for a Joint Boards meeting to be held in the early fall. There will be a considerable ramping up of effort between the time the teams finish developing background statements on the issues (and necessary white papers, etc.) and the fall Joint Boards meeting.
Phase 3

Each board should be well prepared in advance to come together at the second meeting to review, deliberate, and decide the policy questions developed during the interim.

**Cycle Stages**

1) Discussion and identification of a limited (two to three?) set of topics/items the Joint Boards intends to make during a particular decision cycle;

2) Board discussion and guidance to staff on each issue;

3) Joint Boards discussion and debate of alternative decision proposals, as researched and recommended by staff;

4) Joint Boards decision;

5) Periodic reports of progress implementing the decision.

This calendar would result in more focused efforts by the two boards and a more productive Joint Boards meeting cycle, with designated teams interacting with board members to produce real progress on two to three major issues each interim.

Focusing on specific issues to be addressed, work needed to be done, and outcomes to be achieved will, we believe, raise the general sense of accomplishment and completion by both board members and staff.

**EXAMPLES OF POSSIBLE JOINT BOARDS OF EDUCATION 1995-1997 WORK TEAM POLICY QUESTIONS**

**ARTICULATION**

- Adopt guidelines specifying transfer of Associate of Arts degree with junior standing.
- (Alternatively) Adopt guidelines allowing transfer of all credits after one year with sophomore standing.
TEACHER EDUCATION

- Adopt standards, based on the work being done by Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and the Teaching Research Division of Western Oregon State College, for the preparation and performance of the 21st century teacher.
- Adopt a model forecast (annually updated) of the demand for new teachers through the year 2010.
- Recommend the number of teachers to be prepared for each year of the forecast and the distribution of that number among teacher preparation programs.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

- Update the Joint Boards' foreign language requirement; adopt a revised implementation schedule and a plan for providing the capacity to meet the revised requirement.

EDUCATION TELECOMMUNICATIONS

- Approve a single education telecommunications plan.

COLLEGE DEGREE CAPACITY

- Adopt guidelines for college degree capacity, combining the locations and resources of community colleges and OSSHE.
- Adopt one or more regional plans for achieving the guidelines.

EXPANDING ACCESS TO COLLEGE-READY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

- Consider questions of funding the programs wherein high school students engage in college level work provided by the OSSHE institutions and community colleges.

Board Discussion

Mr. Bailey indicated support of the change in direction for the Joint Boards of Education, particularly in three areas: increased involvement from the CEOs (Chancellor, Superintendent, and Commissioner of Community Colleges), clarified and focused issues being identified, and clarification of staff responsibility and roles. Mr. Bailey's one concern is
that the role of the Joint Boards Working Group is not defined. He expressed concern that there not be a reversion to the previous levels of minimal involvement by members of the two boards in this process. "My main concern is, if we don't have board members who take an interest in following up, then internal staff discussions, decision-making, and report delivery will have very little impact on changing direction or education policy in Oregon."

Mr. Swanson echoed Mr. Bailey's comments. "I think the advantage of this proposal is that it gets the three CEOs involved, which requires some decisions to be made about staffing. So we select three or four issues that we're serious about, the CEOs get involved, make staffing decisions, and bring those three or four areas to some resolution. Staff will come to the boards, separately, with some preliminary options and discussion, so that the boards can be educated to the point that decisions about policy direction can be made. Once policy decisions are made, then we can give direction to staff to get the job done. We can come back for final discussion and action at the Joint Boards meeting.

"One of the problems with the Joint Boards is that we're operating with separate staff (no joint staff). We haven't committed funding specifically to Joint Boards operations."

Ms. Wilson supported the revision and also agreed with Mr. Bailey that board members need to continue their active involvement. Mr. Bailey elaborated. "One of the problems now is that we [Joint Boards Working Group] spend most of our time in our meetings talking about procedures and who is going to do what. If we can hand that off to the CEOs, then we can deal with policy issues. We have ended up doing busy work, trying to coordinate things rather than getting on with the policy issues. I think we'll find board members much more actively involved if they can deal with the issues rather than the procedures."

Mr. Miller questioned the real authority of the Joint Boards and wondered about the impact of the group. Mr. Bailey responded that beyond authority is the political impact and the relationship building with other sectors that is accomplished through the Joint Boards process. It opens and maintains lines of communication with decision-makers in other areas of education. Ms. Puentes indicated her belief that it is a crucial link with K-12 and community colleges.
Dr. Thompson pointed out that one result of the changing direction is the elimination of the May 1995 Joint Boards meeting.

(No Board action required)

Mr. Bailey, committee chair, indicated that the search is proceeding slightly ahead of schedule. He recognized the hard work of Dr. Thompson, Ms. Christopher, and Dr. Hunt, provost at Western Oregon State College and the committee. There have been 130 applicants for the position. That pool was reduced to 20. Three-member teams were sent across the country to personally interview 19 of the candidates. Generally, each team was composed of a Board member, a faculty member, and either a community or administrative member. Interviews for the semifinalists -- approximately ten individuals -- are scheduled to occur within two weeks. The current group of people are very diverse. The goal is to convene an executive session of the Board at the end of May to make a selection.

(No Board action required)

President Swanson named the nominating committee. Ms. Puentes and Mr. Bailey will serve on the committee, and Mr. Miller will serve as chair. Mr. Swanson asked the committee to report to the Board at the June meeting.

There was significant activity during the past six months on Board-approved capital construction projects, with 21 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 they are occupied and all artwork, accounting, construction claims, and other transactions have been finished. Seven projects reached this stage during the past six months.

Seven projects moved into construction during the past six months. These included Phase II of the University Hospital’s NeuroSensory Research Center and Outpatient Clinic, Southern Oregon State College’s Stevenson Union Basement Addition, Memorial Union Renovations at Oregon State University, Johnson Hall Handicap Access and Erb Memorial Union Small-Scale Energy Loan Program (SELP) at the University of Oregon, and the Harrison Hall project at Portland State University. Many repair projects also began.
Design work for the expansion and renovation of Oregon State University's Kerr Library continues, and the University Hospital's Pediatric Relocation moves from design to awaiting construction.

As required by state law, balances were canceled for several projects with limitations that had expired.

The dispute between the University of Oregon and the architect associated with a student housing project continues. Demolition at the University's Amazon Housing facility was halted due to action by the state Land Use Board of Appeals. The University of Oregon is anxious to proceed with a plan to redevelop Amazon and, under the terms of an agreement with the City of Eugene and St. Vincent de Paul, move five of the structures to a city-owned site. The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) has been issued to solicit qualified firms for the design and construction of this project.

A final agreement regarding claims and costs was concluded among the State System and the contractor, architects, and engineers associated with the construction of the Basic Science Addition/Center for Research on Occupational and Environmental Toxicology (CROET) project at Oregon Health Sciences University.

Remodeling continues on the CAPITAL Center. This project represents a joint venture in education by OSSHE and Portland Community College. Construction will be completed late this summer. Initial OSSHE tenants include Oregon Center for Advanced Technology Education, Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering, Oregon Executive MBA program, Lintner Center, NERO project, Joint Schools of Business, University of Oregon Continuing Education program, and Oregon Institute of Technology.

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

Balances as of February 28, 1995

($ in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coll/Univ</th>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Limit/Appn</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1983-1985 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Inst Adv Biomed Rsrch</td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$21,011</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Hosp/Clinic Rehab</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>$17,195</td>
<td>$81</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1985-1987 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Utility Improvements</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>$2,940</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Ag Sciences II</td>
<td>GF, Fed, Gift</td>
<td>26,360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Parking Improvements</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>3,665</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>Balance Cancl*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Basic Sci/CROET</td>
<td>GF, Fed, WC</td>
<td>28,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Univ Hosp/Clincs</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>12,090</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Mill Library Add</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>11,080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1987-1989 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Asbestos Abatement</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>$2,062</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>Now Open*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Repair &amp; Modernization</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Parking Impmts</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Kerr Library</td>
<td>GF, Gift</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>In Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Cold Storage Addition</td>
<td>Lottery, Gift</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Balance Cancl*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Seed Warehouse Replc</td>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>Await Const</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSE</td>
<td>KSOR Satellite Stn</td>
<td>Federal, Gift</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Some eqpmnt inst; Some on order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1989-1991 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Knight Library Addtn</td>
<td>GF, Gift</td>
<td>26,620</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>Ph II under construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7,063</td>
<td>Ph I open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>GF, Federal</td>
<td>13,825</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Parking Structure #5</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU</td>
<td>Hospital Renovations</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>5,979</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>PCAT Remodel</td>
<td>Fed, Inst Funds</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1991-1993 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS</td>
<td>Land Acquis, etc</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Transferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>Hoke Hall Addition</td>
<td>BF, Housing</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>Health Services Addtn</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Envrn Computing Ctr</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>FRL Lab Renovation</td>
<td>Inst. Funds</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Mitchell Gym. Rehab</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>S. Oregon Exp Stn</td>
<td>Gift, Inst.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Women's Bldg Lab</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>In Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Meeting #639

**April 21, 1995**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Stg.</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Ped Safety</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Expansion</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Under Const*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center Renov.</td>
<td>XI-(1) Bonds, OF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Nat Hist</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longhouse</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Campus Relocation</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Services Bldg</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>4,710</td>
<td>Bldg. Acq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities System Rehab</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem Lab Renov.</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,199</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMU SELP</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeuroSensory Ctr Ph I</td>
<td>25,400</td>
<td>10,115</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeuroSensory Ctr Ph II</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>17,459</td>
<td>Under Const*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Struc #5</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>No Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Renovations</td>
<td>8,256</td>
<td>2,715</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Wing Addition</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>7,209</td>
<td>Under Const.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dotter Expansion</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Now Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>19,040</td>
<td>18,858</td>
<td>On Hold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1993-1995 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Renovation</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>$ 2,160</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>No Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Modern.</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Transferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Improv.</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>Transferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Part Transf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSOR Improvements</td>
<td>Grant, Gift</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>No Activity*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson Union Add.</td>
<td>BF, Auxiliary</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Under Const*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts Complex</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>Pt Under Cst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap Access</td>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Facil.</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>In Planning*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Union Renov.</td>
<td>BF,SELP,Inst.</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>Under Const*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafoods Lab</td>
<td>Grant, Gift</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seafood Ed Center</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy Lab Renov.</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Await Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langton/Women's Access</td>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr/Kidder Energy</td>
<td>SELP</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerr Lib. Expan/Remod.</td>
<td>Gift, XI-G Bonds</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>In Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Theater Renov.</td>
<td>Gift</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>In Design*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Innovation Ctr</td>
<td>Grant,Inst,Rent</td>
<td>8,775</td>
<td>In Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Library Add.</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac./Staff Child Care</td>
<td>Gifts, Fees</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>Await Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIMB Add/Alts</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Await Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Hall Add/Alts</td>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>Some Compl*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Housing, Ph II</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>RFQ Issued*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International College</td>
<td>GF/Housing/Lott.</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>In Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Campbell Access</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Hall Access</td>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Under Const*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NeuroSens. Ctr, Ph III</td>
<td>Gifts, Hosp.</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>No Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SUMMARY OF FACILITIES CONTRACTING ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Contracted Amount</th>
<th>Financing Source</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Housing Redevelopment, Phase I Project, UO</td>
<td>$369,664</td>
<td>Housing funds</td>
<td>Complete*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Exterior Signs, Parking Project, OHSU</td>
<td>$162,632</td>
<td>Parking funds</td>
<td>In Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn Motor Test Lab Project, OSU</td>
<td>$162,632</td>
<td>Grant funds</td>
<td>Under Const*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gains Hall Reroofing and Structural Reinforcement Project, OHSU</td>
<td>$145,341</td>
<td>Article XI-G bonds</td>
<td>Under Const*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates change in status since previous report.

---

**Staff Report to the Board**

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

### Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

#### Award of Construction Contracts

**Amazon Housing Redevelopment, Phase I Project, UO**

On March 2, 1995, Babb Construction doing business as Delta Construction Co., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $369,664. Financing will be provided from housing funds.

**Campus Exterior Signs, Parking Project, OHSU**

On March 2, 1995, C.K. Doty & Associates of Washington, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $162,632. Financing will be provided from parking funds.

**Dearborn Motor Test Lab Project, OSU**

On February 3, 1995, Linnco Electric Company was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $162,632. Financing will be provided from grant funds.

**Gains Hall Reroofing and Structural Reinforcement Project, OHSU**

On January 21, 1995, Acme Roofing Company of Lake Oswego, Oregon, was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $145,341. Financing will be provided from Article XI-G bonds.
Harrison Hall Project, PSU
On January 21, 1995, OTKM Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $1,476,193. Financing will be provided from Article XI-F(1) bonds.

NeuroSensory Research Center Phase II, Penthouse and Shaft Mechanical/Electrical Construction Project, OHSU
On February 6, 1995, Total Mechanical, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $1,937,000. Financing will be provided from federal funds.

Science Building 1, Chiller Installation Project, PSU
On February 8, 1995, Hydro-Temp Mechanical, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $148,800. Financing will be provided from capital repair funds.

Stevenson Union Addition Completion Project, SOSC
On January 9, 1995, Ausland Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $565,770. Financing will be provided from building fees and auxiliary reserves.

Acceptance of Projects

Basic Science Building, Floors 2 through 4, Restoration for School of Medicine Project, OHSU
This project is complete and was accepted on March 28, 1995. The final direct construction costs were $93,499.06. Financing was provided from gifts.

Bean Hall Reroofing Project, UO
This project is complete and was accepted on January 31, 1995. The final direct construction costs were $439,923. Financing was provided from housing building repair reserves.

Central Plant Boiler #1 Replacement--Installation Project, UO
This project is complete and was accepted on September 30, 1994. The final direct construction costs were $1,289,999. Financing was provided from a SELP loan.
Marquam II HVAC Upgrade Project, OHSU
This project is complete and was accepted on March 28, 1995. The final direct construction costs were $116,584. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

Parker Stadium Grandstand Seating Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on January 31, 1995. The final direct construction costs were $225,989. Financing was provided from an OSU Foundation loan and operating funds.

Rogers Hall Reroofing Project, OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on January 9, 1995. The final direct construction costs were $143,320. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

University Hospital South, 12A Nursing Unit Alterations Project, OHSU
This project is complete and was accepted on March 28, 1995. The final direct construction costs were $118,821. Financing was provided from Hospital Omnibus Article XI-F(1) bonds.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Board
Staff reported at the October 1994 Board meeting on efforts by the Chancellor’s Office and campuses to implement the Oregon Assessment Model adopted by the Academic Council in fall 1993. This framework stipulates that, in addition to traditional assessments on a course-by-course basis, OSSHE undergraduates will be assessed to provide evidence about student performance at three critical transitions: admissions, midpoint, and graduation. This model allows OSSHE campuses to develop assessment activities appropriate to their institutional missions within the context of the model to provide quality assurance. OSSHE’s assessment initiative is designed to serve dual functions: (1) improve the lives of students, including their retention, learning, and success; and (2) demonstrate accountability to students and their parents, elected officials, other agencies, and employers.

Despite recent and fast growth in state-mandated assessment of college students and graduates, OSSHE took a different approach largely because of the abysmal failure in other states of assessment approaches that used single externally mandated instruments. The OSSHE approach is
consistent with the observations of Donald M. Stewart, president of The College Board in New York, that for assessments to be useful for improving higher education, they should be campus-based, faculty-developed, and mission-related (Trusteeship, March/April 1995). These qualities do not appear to describe the simple solution that some states demand. But they do describe the State System's approach to assessment. OSSHE's assessment activities are related to efforts to raise productivity in higher education -- serving more students, improving student performance, and providing a more valued mix of services relative to costs.

In the fall of 1994, incentive funds were given to each campus to support the implementation of the Oregon Assessment Model. Each campus developed a proposal to begin assessments related to the three checkpoints in the model not covered by their ongoing assessment efforts. The Chancellor's Office targeted $200,000 for special projects in undergraduate student assessment. Most of these projects were completed in February 1995 and were used to develop an accountability report for the 1995 Legislative Session. Staff promised to share with the Board information about the outcomes of these projects at a later date.

Although the undergraduate curriculum is designed to have accumulative effects on general education and major field learning, the focus of traditional assessment is on what students learn (theories, concepts, and skills) on a course-by-course basis. The faculty member evaluates the work of the student and assigns a grade based on the professor's judgment about the quality of the work. This assessment results in a transcript of courses taken, their credit value, and earned grades. Upon completion of the published program requirements and standards, a degree is conferred. As evidence of productivity, colleges and universities report the number of degrees earned by students each academic year. OSSHE conferred 13,457 degrees in 1993-94.

By its nature, this traditional approach to assessment takes a narrow view of how students change and grow in college. However, the results of participation in higher education are many and include changes in a number of dimensions including: general knowledge, major field knowledge, social functioning skills, professional/occupational skills, personal goals and aspirations, general attitudes, attitudes toward self and others, and relationships with employers, family, community, and society (Ewell, 1984).
The assessment demonstration projects undertaken by OSSHE campuses embrace this broader perspective of higher education outcomes and rely on a variety of assessment approaches to capture the full range of student abilities. Campuses gathered evidence about the effects of higher education on student performance in a number of dimensions.

**General Knowledge and Abilities.** More than half of the campuses used performance-based examinations (some used commercially available standardized tests and others used faculty-developed tests) to measure critical thinking, communication, and problem-solving skills of undergraduates. These data will be used as a baseline to determine the value added to abilities given entering student characteristics.

**Learning Environment.** Several campuses are monitoring instructional practices that are associated with increased student learning effects. Currently enrolled students find their classes supportive and engaging. Self-reported gains in skills are high.

**Major Field Knowledge.** A number of approaches — standardized objective tests, portfolios, senior capstone experiences — are being used to assess major field knowledge, including the application of learning in real-world settings, by all OSSHE campuses.

**Degree Completion.** About half of the students who entered as a first-time freshman (in fall 1987) at an OSSHE institution earned a bachelor's degree at the institution they entered or another OSSHE institution within seven years or less. Other students left to complete two- or four-year degrees elsewhere.

**Professional Licensure in Selected Programs.** OSSHE students who take professional licensure examinations tend to have pass rates substantially higher than national averages.

**Employment.** More than 2,500 baccalaureate graduates were surveyed. At the end of the first year, 95 percent of OSSHE baccalaureate recipients were employed or continued their education, primarily in a graduate program. Of those employed, 80 percent found jobs in Oregon.

**Customer Satisfaction.** More than 4,500 students, recent graduates, and alumni of OSSHE colleges and universities were surveyed this year. They reported high levels of satisfaction with the contribution
the collegiate experience made to their preparation for life. Surveys of employer satisfaction will be completed by the end of the year.

The focus of assessment is on strengthening undergraduate education. These assessment activities are having an impact on OSSHE campuses. OSSHE colleges and universities are rethinking traditional ways of structuring collegiate learning environments and finding ways of actively involving students in their education to enhance student retention and learning. Using the experience gleaned from the assessment demonstration projects, the Academic Council is now considering the next steps for campus- and state-level assessment. OSSHE submitted a proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to extend the development of the Oregon Assessment Model. If funds are received, this project would develop a viable statewide assessment system for postsecondary education that is sample-based, involves faculty at two- and four-year public institutions in Oregon in its development, allows parallel assessments at the System and campus levels, permits campus choice, and involves Oregon employers in discussions about knowledge and abilities college graduates need to be successful in the workplace.

In sum, strategies for improving higher education productivity require mechanisms for gathering information from a variety of sources and on an ongoing basis. OSSHE's assessment and programmatic efforts are critical to developing a supportive learning environment in which students persist, make changes, grow intellectually, earn degrees, and bring their talents into Oregon's workforce. Assessment plays an essential role in determining the success of our efforts and demonstrating accountability to our customers and investors.

A full report of OSSHE's assessment activities is included in the supplementary section of the docket.

Board Discussion

Dr. Nancy Goldschmidt pointed out that one area not included in the report relates to what employers say. "We think this is a very important part, but it's much harder to access employers. There are several projects related to this aspect. For example, Oregon Institute of Technology, in collaboration with a commercial testing firm, is developing an instrument to survey employers about graduates and their preparedness for the workplace. Also, at Oregon State University, the Survey Lab is conduct-
Dr. Goldschmidt indicated that the assessment work is consistent with national activity. However, many other states have imposed a single instrument across the whole system, which has proven to be both costly and ineffective. "What you see from our approach is that it is campus based and mission driven, so it recognizes campus diversity, and combines direct and indirect methods. At this point, there is no single instrument available that people think is worthwhile in capturing the whole dimension of student behaviors and student growth."

Mr. Miller applauded Dr. Goldschmidt's ongoing work in this area.

(No Board action required)

Mr. Grattan Kerans briefed the Board on current legislative activities. Senate Bill 2 was sent from the Education Subcommittee with unanimous support the morning of April 21, 1995. The Oregon Health Sciences University budget was, as a result, removed from the OSSHE budget.

Mr. Kerans reported that there is majority support by the Education Subcommittee of Senate Bill 271, the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act. The Chancellor made a presentation to the subcommittee in response to Jon Yunker, director of the Department of Administrative Services, and amendments that he presented. The budget is still being discussed by the subcommittee.

Regarding the six other bills introduced by the State System: one has been signed by the Governor and all the others are moving through the legislative process.

"The Republican leadership released their budget this morning. OSSHE is at the Governor's recommended level with a final PERS adjustment and the add-back of approximately $14 million for the statewide public services. In their budget there are a dozen or more agencies caught below the Governor's budget, the Department of Economic Development being the worst case.

"At the bottom of the budget is an add-back list. Of the $50 million in their add-back reserve, they've identified a maximum of $91 million worth
of targeted spending. Those are: $0-50 million for salaries, $0-11 million for community mental health, and $0-30 million for higher education."

Mr. Kerans identified two major reasons higher education's budget challenges this session. One is lack of leadership at the gubernatorial level, which presents a budget at a 14.7 percent reduction level. "That is a very difficult thing to overcome. When the Governor says you're going to take a 14.7 percent cut and publishes the budget at that number, breaking through that ceiling is extremely difficult. The second thing is that the leadership has a series of political values that have higher-resonance with them than does higher education and some other things in the budget. The legislative leadership is set on accomplishing its major mission of no new taxes, giving back the tax surplus, having a short session, and funding K-12 education. We will be left to compete against the needs of community mental health and our own employees in order to get something out of the add-back reserve." Mr. Kerans concluded his comments by noting that "the problem is not one of having them understand the value of higher education; it is that they are rewarding something of higher value first."

Ms. Christopher asked how Senate Bill 271 has been changed. Chancellor Cox indicated that it has not been compromised in any essential areas.

Chancellor Cox added to Mr. Kerans' comments relative to pressing the legislature in the area of faculty salaries, "which still remains our most significant and serious problem. It's appropriate that we have the work session today because, when we get to that point, I will suggest (at least for discussion) that the General Fund will continue to go down. If you look at the next biennium, there's already a $330 million hole created by actions taken this time. The University of Michigan at this time gets ten percent from the General Fund. I think it raises some fundamental questions about how we approach budgeting. I will suggest during the work session, at least for beginning discussion, that as we become less public in the sense of General Fund support, we're going to have to completely rethink how we regard revenue. If we were the private system of Oregon public higher education (an oxymoron), we would regard revenues as revenues. The state has given us all kinds of constraints on how we have to regard income. I will submit that we are fast approaching the time when we must begin to look at tuition we're getting to fund our own faculty salaries." Dr. Cox reassured Dr. Connell and the IFS that the
State System has protected the $25 million in the budget for salaries for recruitment and retention.

(No Board action required)

Budget Rescissions

The first round of congressional budget activity began with rescission bills that propose spending cuts to programs with unspent FY95 funds. The rescission process begins in the House, and then bills are sent to the Senate for consideration. The Senate may propose its own rescissions. Both chambers must agree to the same level of spending cuts before a bill can be sent to the President for signature.

The House rescission bill included cuts to several higher education programs. OSSHE has concentrated its efforts on proposed cuts to student financial aid programs. In the House, those cuts included a proposed elimination of the State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) program and elimination of the increase in the TRIO program. The Senate restored full funding to SSIG as well as partial funding of the increase in the TRIO program. The House also proposed elimination of $20 million in funding for the State Postsecondary Review Entity (SPRE), while the Senate rescission bill included a restoration of $10 million in funding for SPREs.

OSSHE estimates that elimination of the SSIG program would have an immediate effect on the number of students receiving state need grants. Approximately 800 students attending OSSHE schools would not receive financial awards. Elimination of SSIG funds could also lead to a decrease in state General Fund support as a result of a "maintenance of effort" requirement within the federal program that provides an incentive to the state to maintain its level of funding for scholarships.

Elimination of the increase in TRIO programs would put at risk the funding for grant proposals currently under review that were submitted by Southern Oregon State College, Eastern Oregon State College, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon. TRIO programs are designed to create opportunities for students dealing with academic barriers and invisible barriers such as class and culture. The majority of students served by TRIO programs are low-income or first-generation college students. Members of the House and Senate Appropriations committees will meet in conference to work out a compromise later.
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When Congress returns from its spring recess, it will resume the budget process with consideration of FY96 budget resolutions. Additional cuts to higher education programs, including student financial aid, are likely at that time. A budget resolution is expected to include proposed elimination of the in-school interest loan subsidy.

Staff estimates that elimination of the interest subsidy would result in an 18.6 percent increase in total individual student indebtedness. For all OSSHE students, a loss of the in-school interest subsidy would result in a total increase in student indebtedness over a four-year academic period of approximately $28 million. These estimates are based on an assumed level of borrowing that is the same as 1993-94 with no tuition increases.

(No Board action required)

WORK SESSION  

Dr. Gerald Kissler, senior vice provost for planning and resources at the University of Oregon opened the work session with a presentation, "Oregon in Transition." The presentation basically focused on the short- and long-term economic future of Oregon and the role of higher education in that context.

In introducing the slide presentation, Dr. Kissler reminded the Board that higher education is a business where the business and rational arguments are absolutely crucial. In a political forum, however, the message we send is only part of the solution -- having political muscle is what is required to go the whole distance in a legislative arena. There are three key policy issues in the present legislative session, according to Dr. Kissler. They are public safety, the economy and jobs, and education.

Following the formal presentation, Dr. Aschkenasy commented that there did not appear to be a solution to the funding dilemma since it seemed likely there will be no additional resources. Dr. Kissler pointed out that one possible avenue for financial stability is for the Board and the State System to find ways to become more self-sufficient.

President Gilbert asked what percentage of the business community would think it advantageous to have a strong higher education system versus the percentage for whom it might be more advantageous to have a very low-wage, low-benefit state. Dr. Kissler indicated that, for a series of reasons, a strong higher education would be beneficial to all, creating the kind of research that would fuel their own companies and would create a broader set of key industries that, in turn, would be advantageous in building a
stronger economy. To clarify, however, it was pointed out that there is a difference between "business" and "industry." It is in the area of key industries (not small businesses) where higher education and, in particular the research resources it generates, provides the greatest advantage.

President Swanson observed that Oregon is one of very few states that has decreased expenditures for higher education. This, he postulated, requires a dual strategy of doing things on our own and not expecting other people to do it for us while at the same time continuing with the strategy of getting higher education back to the quality Oregon citizens need.

President Ramaley remarked that higher education has to demonstrate the link between the high-end positions and the companies that are growing in a "21st century" mode. The public needs to become aware of the ways in which smaller companies "feed" on successful larger ones. In addition, it seems clear, Dr. Ramaley observed, "that we have a dysfunctional or out-of-balance educational system" relative to the kinds of jobs that will be available. "There is also a horrible conclusion that might be reached: growth leads to good jobs, which leads to an influx of outsiders, which leads to loss of jobs for Oregonians. Therefore, we don’t want to support growth and therefore we wouldn’t want to support higher education, which is responsible through its research and educational mission for sustaining that growth. I don’t know if that’s a true reasoned argument, but it is one that is being used."

Picking up a theme from the Kissler report, President Byrne indicated his deep concern that unless something is done with regard to faculty salaries in the next few months, the State System is going to lose its quality because it will continue to lose good faculty -- the outstanding teachers and researchers. This theme was reinforced by several others who indicated that the quality of education in Oregon will suffer and this will cause the greatest damage to Oregon.

It was generally agreed that it is crucial for the State System to develop a "Higher Education Act for the 21st Century" that would lay out a vision, build on and complete the work of the Higher Education 2010 Advisory Panel, and that would be used to gather support from the business community and other statewide entities. Mr. Miller pointed out that it was easy to intellectualize about what needs to be done, but finding an effective argument that can counter, for example, the appeal of K-12 is the problem.
ADJOURNMENT  The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.
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