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1. **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/WELCOME**

President Kirby Dyess called the meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. and asked Interim Board Secretary Stuart to note the roll. Board members present included: Kirby Dyess, Don Blair, Hannah Fisher, Jim Francesconi, Paul Kelly, Adriana Mendoza, Dalton Miller-Jones, Preston Pulliams, and Tony Van Vliet. Directors John von Schlegell and Howard Sohn were absent due to business conflicts. Due to weather conditions in the Columbia Gorge, Director Mendoza and EOU President Lund departed the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

Presidents present included: Mary Cullinan (SOU), Dave Frohnmayer (UO), Dixie Lund (EOU), John Minahan (WOU), Ed Ray (OSU), Michael Reardon (PSU), and David Woodall (OIT). Provost Lesley Hallick (OHSU) was also present.

Others present included: Chancellor George Pernsteiner, Michael Green, Ryan Hagemann, Jay Kenton, Glen Nelson, Marcia Stuart, and Susan Weeks.

2. **REPORTS**

   a. **Chancellor’s Report**

President Dyess called upon Chancellor Pernsteiner for his report. Chancellor Pernsteiner thanked Director Kelly for agreeing to serve as chair of the OIT presidential search committee. He then called upon Director Francesconi, chair of the PSU presidential search, to provide an update. Director Francesconi advised that the committee had hired the services of search firm Isaacson, Miller and has received an impressive pool of candidates, and that they were working toward recommending three to four candidates to the Chancellor in March or April.

Chancellor Pernsteiner called upon Mr. Neil Bryant to provide an update on legislative matters. Mr. Bryant advised the Board that the legislature will convene between February 4th and 29th in special session. He touched on various initiatives that will be proposed to the legislature, including mortgage lending practices, federal immigration requirements, prison sentences for first-time property offenders, kindergarten tuition, and funding for rural counties for additional state trooper support. Bryant advised that the revenue projections are anticipated to be flat, which brings cautious optimism. Once the special session has concluded, budget preparation for the 2009-2011 regular session will begin (i.e., budget-building, legislative concepts, and policy option packages). Director Francesconi asked about the timeline and was informed that
the legislative concepts for proposed statutory change will be presented to the Board in March for approval, approval of the policy option packages, operating, and capital budgets occur in June and July. The Board engaged in discussion concerning various concerns on anticipated revenue changes faced by the state in the coming months.

b. Research Council (Linton)

President Dyess called on Dr. Rich Linton, chair of the Research Council, to provide a report on the Council’s activities. Dr. Linton advised that the Council has been focusing on expanding interinstitutional collaboration and cooperation relative to research and enhancing OUS institutions’ collective competitiveness for externally-sponsored research in order to stimulate economic development within the state and connect research to the knowledge-economy more effectively. He cited the Oregon Innovation Council and ONAMI (the Oregon Nanoscience and Microtechnologies Institute) as models for enhancing Oregon’s competitiveness for federal support, developing close ties between the universities and industry, providing extraordinary leveraging of state investment, developing intellectual property, and creating and supporting new businesses within the state.

Dr. Linton announced that, using the ONAMI model in large measure, two additional signature research centers have been launched: one focused on sustainability and on drug discovery. These centers have been formed as independent, not-for-profit corporations with strong leadership that includes faculty from various institutions. Other areas that the Council has been focusing on include Oregon Climate Change Initiative and the Oregon Water Vision—focusing on the critically important water resource issues facing the state; the Oregon Transportation Research and Education Center that has been established through federal appropriated funding and has received approximately 80 proposals for federal support in a competitive process. Dr. Linton concluded by stating that statistics show that for every $1 million in research funding, about 40 jobs supported in the economy; this translates into approximately 20,000 jobs in Oregon are supported through the OUS research enterprise. With the establishment of the University Venture Development Fund, private investors have the opportunity to investment in research in higher education and receive up to 60 percent state tax credit. This creates investment focusing on entrepreneurship and the development of spin-off companies, out-licensing of technologies developed by university research, and the ability to raise monies to invest in moving inventions through commercialization to societal application. President Dyess thanked Dr. Linton for the work that has been accomplished through the Council’s endeavors.

c. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) President

President Dyess welcomed Dr. Lee Ayers, associate professor of criminology and criminal justice at Southern Oregon University, to her first meeting of the Board as the new president of the Institutional Faculty Senate (IFS). Dr. Ayers thanked Dr. Mina Carson for her outstanding leadership as the president of IFS during the 2007 calendar year. She gave a brief history on recent years in IFS and the focus that the Senate has taken during those years and concluded by
stating that the IFS is going to “dare to dream big” in the next year and will support the Board of Higher Education in its endeavors during the coming year.

d. Oregon Student Association (OSA) Chair

President Dyess called on Emily McLain for the OSA report. Ms. McLain introduced herself and thanked the Board on behalf of the Oregon students for including the OSA in the recent Board retreat. She said she was particularly encouraged by the Board’s prioritization of removing barriers to students and looks forward to the opportunity to continue working with the Board in increasing access to the OUS universities.

With regard to the proposed differential tuition policy that will be addressed by the Board, she advised that the students have felt a lack of transparency coupled with the lack of affordability due to the fact that programmatic resource fees were not factored into the final cost of education for financial aid purposes. Since the 2007 legislative session, the interinstitutional resource fee committee has successfully created a policy that not only addresses student concerns but those of the legislature as raised by the senate committee on education and general government. She noted that the proposed policy has resulted from students, administrators, and the System working together to develop a transparent policy that allows for such costs to be included in financial aid packages. She opined that concerns raised by the Board and Senate have been addressed and she encouraged the Board to approve this policy proposal.

e. Sale of the CAPITAL Center

President Dyess called upon Vice Chancellor Jay Kenton for an update on the sale of the CAPITAL Center in Beaverton. Kenton reminded the Board that the sale of the Center had been approved by the Board during 2005-06; however, the proposed sale did not materialize. Recently, the Beaverton School District signed and executed a purchase agreement, which is anticipated to close in early February. He noted that this transaction was made with the assistance of Portland Community College, with the purchase price of $15 million. The building will be converted into two magnet schools, focusing on health care and science and technology. He thanked Director Pulliams for PCC’s partnering in the sale of the building; Director Pulliams acknowledged the thanks and advised that the sale will allow PCC to move into a joint partnership for construction with another OUS institution. He commended Vice Chancellor Kenton and staff for their hard work on this sale of the CAPITAL Center during recent years. Director Miller-Jones added a footnote that the creation of the two magnate schools will introduce collaboration with Portland State and joint faculty appointments with the community college, as well as the high school, in internships, doctoral study, and research.
3. **CONSENT ITEMS**

   a. **EOU, Implementation of the Repositioning Plan (Lund)**

      **BOARD DOCKET:**

      Eastern’s proposed repositioning plan is available in the Board’s Office.

      **BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:**

      President Dyess called for discussion. Director Blair asked that Eastern’s repositioning plan be brought forward for discussion prior to the vote, noting that President Lund had presented the plan during that morning’s Finance and Administration Committee meeting. He opined that President Lund and her staff have done an excellent job in using this situation of adversity as an opportunity to redirect the University and focus on programs that will enhance the University’s mission and student demand. This translates into a reorganization of departments, focusing on partnerships with community colleges, other System universities, and businesses; with a focus on multi-modal instruction that includes distance education as well as on-campus and on-site education. Director Van Vliet said that he was impressed with the depth of work applied to the plan and the importance of recognizing that the regional institutions are important to the entire System of Higher Education.

      Following discussion President Dyess called for a motion to approve the implementation of Eastern’s repositioning plan; Director Van Vliet made the motion to approve the implementation as presented. Those voting in favor: Directors Dyess, Blair, Fisher, Francesconi, Kelly, Miller-Jones, Pulliams, and Van Vliet. Director Mendoza abstained. Motion carried.

   b. **PSU, Undergraduate Certificate in Contemporary Turkish Studies**

      **BOARD DOCKET:**

      1. *Describe the purpose and relationship of the proposed program to the institution’s mission and strategic plan.*

      The new undergraduate certificate program will enhance Portland State University’s (PSU) internationalization of curriculum, students, and faculty initiative. The new program expands the specialization options available for undergraduate students majoring in International Studies at PSU. It also creates an important international link between Oregon and institutions of higher education in Turkey by offering students and faculty opportunities for overseas experience in that country. PSU has a rich course offering in contemporary Turkish Studies across four departments and two colleges. Very few universities across the United States have comparable courses and no school has an undergraduate certificate program in Contemporary Turkish Studies in International Studies. Since PSU received two grants to create two faculty positions (one in Political Science and International Studies and
a second in Foreign Languages and Literatures), student enrollment in these courses has shown steady increase over the last nine years. Many PSU students who major in International Studies, Foreign languages and Literatures, History, and Political Science would benefit from having an option in attaining a certificate in Contemporary Turkish Studies. It will enable the students to be marketable for jobs in the private sector as well as government agencies. The U.S. federal government lists contemporary Turkish language, politics, and economics as a target field for recruitment.

2. **What evidence of need does the institution have for the program?**

Student enrollment in courses in this field has increased steadily since 1998. It is designed to strengthen the repertoire of International Studies and, therefore, of PSU, in a niche area where no other similar program exists in the United States. PSU will advertise this program on the Web, as well as through the Turkish Studies Association, and attract prospective students to the University. Already, PSU is receiving inquiries from students around the country who would like to come to the university to earn this certificate.

As for government identification of the need, one only needs to look at National Security Education Program (NSEP) and Fulbright applications to see that modern Turkish and understanding of contemporary Turkish studies is in the “high need” category of programs for U.S. commerce agencies, security, Treasury, and the State Department.

3. **Are there similar programs in the state? If so, how does the proposed program supplement, complement, or collaborate with those programs?**

There is no other certificate program on Contemporary Turkish Studies in Oregon or in the United States. PSU’s program would be a great complement to other certificates in International studies (e.g., Middle East Studies).

4. **What new resources will be needed initially and on a recurring basis to implement the program? How will the institution provide these resources? What efficiencies or revenue enhancements are achieved with this program, including consolidation or elimination of programs over time, if any?**

There is no new dollar cost associated with this certificate program. All the faculty and courses associated with this certificate program are already part of regular course offerings and resources of PSU.

All appropriate University committees and the OUS Provosts’ Council have positively reviewed the proposed program.
Recommendation to the Board:
The OUS Provosts’ Council recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to establish an instructional program leading to an Undergraduate Certificate in Contemporary Turkish Studies, effective Spring 2008.

BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION – please see discussion and action below c.

c. UO, Master’s Degree in Strategic Communication

BOARD DOCKET:

1. Describe the purpose and relationship of the proposed program to the institution’s mission and strategic plan.

   The main objective of the master’s degree in Strategic Communication is to prepare communication professionals to move into higher-level management positions in communications industries such as public relations, advertising, and marketing communication. The program will fill a gap in the educational offerings in the Portland metropolitan region by addressing an industry concern regarding preparation of professionals to move into managerial and entrepreneurial positions.

   The University of Oregon serves its students and the people of Oregon, the nation, and the world through the creation and application of knowledge in the liberal arts, the natural and social sciences, and the professions. This master’s program, designed specifically for working communication professionals, will serve a new audience. Specifically, this program supports the School of Journalism and Communication’s (SOJC) mission, stated as a community of scholars and professionals dedicated to freedom of expression and public service. Through advanced skills and management courses, internships, and critical and theoretical analysis, the School prepares students for professional and leadership roles in the newspaper, magazine, and book publishing industries, and in strategic communication (advertising and public relations). By integrating theory and practice, the School prepares students to become professional communicators, critical thinkers, and responsible citizens in a global society.

2. What evidence of need does the institution have for the program?

   Need is indicated by the large number of potential applicants the University of Oregon program could serve, the results of surveys that have been conducted, inquires from potential applicants, and in enrollment and participation in seminars and events offered in Portland. The SOJC has strong long-term relationships with most of the large public and private Portland-area organizations with public relations, media relations, employee communications, and advertising departments. These organizations have indicated a need for managerial training for their employees and many are willing to underwrite tuition and fee costs. Given the size and stature of Portland’s creative services professions (over 150
advertising agencies, 200 public relations firms, 6 Fortune 1,000 companies, and over 4,500 nonprofits that require strategic communication), there is every indication that a strategic communication master’s program will be as successful there as similar programs have been in other major metropolitan areas of the U.S.

3. Are there similar programs in the state? If so, how does the proposed program supplement, complement, or collaborate with those programs?

No other closely related OUS program is available. Portland State University offers an M.A./M.S. in Communication Studies aimed primarily at students focusing in areas other than strategic communication. The proposed Strategic Communication degree targets working professionals and concentrates on the public relations and advertising aspects of strategic communication. The SOJC will collaborate with the business schools at the UO and PSU for delivery of the business core courses.

4. What new resources will be needed initially and on a recurring basis to implement the program? How will the institution provide these resources? What efficiencies or revenue enhancements are achieved with this program, including consolidation or elimination of programs over time, if any?

The master's degree in Strategic Communication will be based in the SOJC's George S. Turnbull Portland Center. Current classrooms and labs at the George S. Turnbull Center are adequate to initiate the program. With the completion of the UO Portland Center facility in March 2008, the quality and quantity of classroom space, library access, and technology will be greatly increased. Faculty and staff time, supplies and services, and rental costs are shared across the various center programs. The Turnbull Center was established with a $9 million endowment, and Turnbull Center programs are supported by tuition and fees and private fundraising. The SOJC intends the master's program to be self-supporting and sustainable by year three of operation.

All appropriate University committees and the OUS Provosts’ Council have positively reviewed the proposed program.

Recommendation to the Board:
The OUS Provosts’ Council recommended that the Board authorize the University of Oregon to establish an instructional program leading to a master’s degree in Strategic Communication, effective Fall 2008.

BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:

As there was no discussion of the proposed program consent items, President Dyess called for a motion to approve the programs; Director Mendoza made the motion and Director Blair seconded. Those voting in favor: Directors Dyess, Blair, Fisher, Francesconi, Kelly, Mendoza, Miller-Jones, Pulliams, and Van Vliet. Motion carried.
4. **ACTION ITEMS**

   a. **OUS, Ratification of Sprint/Nextel EBS Lease Agreement Renewal for the Medford Area**

**BOARD DOCKET:**

**Summary:**
The Oregon University System and Southern Oregon University request that the Board ratify two Education Broadband Service (EBS) Long-Term De Facto Lease Agreements as signed by the Chancellor.

**Background:**
In 1995, under the coordination of the Oregon Wireless Instructional Network (Oregon WIN), a number of community colleges and OUS institutions filed for EBS (formerly ITFS) licenses in Salem, Eugene and Medford. Upon being granted the licenses by the Federal Communication Commission (FCC), Oregon WIN submitted a national Request for Proposal and selected American Telecasting, a wholly owned subsidiary of Sprint Nextel, to sublease excess capacity spectrum and to construct an educational network throughout the Willamette Valley and the Medford area.

Recently, Oregon WIN completed lease renewal negotiations with Sprint for EBS licenses held by SOU and OUS in the Medford area. The negotiations were completed with consultation from Todd D. Gray, Attorney at Law for DowLohnes, PLLC in Washington D.C. and with final review for legal sufficiency by Wendy Robinson, Senior Assistant Attorney General with the Oregon Department of Justice.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board:**
Staff recommended that the Board ratify the two EBS Long-Term De Facto Lease Agreements with Sprint/Nextel as signed by the Chancellor.

**BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:**

President Dyess called upon Special Assistant Attorney General Wendy Robinson, from the Department of Justice, and John Greydanus, director university media services at Oregon State, to present this item to the Board. Ms. Robinson explained that the telecommunications company of Sprint/Nextel is now requiring Board ratification of lease agreements rather than the previous procedures that only required the Chancellor’s signature. Director Greydanus added that this is simply a renewal of an agreement in the Medford area.

Following discussion, President Dyess called for a motion; Director Mendoza made the motion to approve the ratification and Director Kelly seconded. Those voting in favor: Directors Dyess, Blair, Fisher, Francesconi, Kelly, Mendoza, Miller-Jones, Pulliams, and Van Vliet. Motion carried.
b. Annual Financial Audit Report

BOARD DOCKET:

Summary:
The report titled 2007 Annual Financial Report (available from the Board’s Office) was prepared by the Chancellor’s Office and the financial statements included within were audited by Moss-Adams, LLP, under contract to the Secretary of State, Audits Division. The audit opinion issued by Moss-Adams, LLP is an unqualified opinion, which means that their opinion as to the fair presentation of the financial statements was issued without qualification.

In conjunction with the audit, Moss-Adams, LLP has issued a letter to OUS Management (see Appendix A, Attachment 1) communicating observations and recommendations relating to OUS internal controls. OUS Management has issued a letter in response to these observations and recommendations (see the following correspondence) that includes general agreement with the observations and planned actions in response. None of the observations made by Moss-Adams, LLP represented a significant deficiency or a material weakness in the design or operation of internal control for 2007.

As part of the financial statement audit, Moss-Adams, LLP is required to communicate certain matters related to the conduct of the audit to those who have responsibility for oversight of the financial reporting process.

Staff Recommendation to the Board
Subject to the report of Moss-Adams, LLP, staff recommended that the Board accept the 2007 Annual Financial Report

BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:

President Dyess called upon Controller Mike Green, Kelly Olson (Secretary of State Audits Division), and Scott Simpson (Moss Adams) to provide the annual financial audit report. Mr. Simpson advised that the annual audit report was issued in mid-November 2007 with an unqualified opinion on the financial statements. He explained that this refers to a “clean” audit opinion and that the financial statements had been presented in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles. He also advised that, although financial statements from university foundations were not part of the audit, the foundation-specific audits were reviewed by Moss Adams and found to have “clean” financial statements, as well. He noted that each annual audit is presented to System management, wherein management is provided the opportunity to present disagreements with the audit results. He was delighted to report that there were no disagreements with the 2007 financial report, adding that a very professional relationship is enjoyed by the three agencies. He also advised that no material weaknesses in internal control were noted during this audit cycle.
Following the presentation, Director Blair thanked Moss Adams for the ongoing level of communication between the auditors, Controller’s Division, and the institutions. He opined that good progress is being made in strengthening the financial and control systems at the campuses and noted that work will be beginning on the human resource planning process within the financial arena. Controller Green thanked Director Blair and the Board for their strong support for improvements made to internal controls within the System. He also commended Mr. Paul Bartlett, director of OUS accounting and reporting, for his work in gathering this information into the report. Also of note was the work on the part of institution staff members, directors of business affairs, and vice presidents for finance and administration for their cooperation in meeting deadlines.

President Dyess called for a motion to accept the 2007 Annual Financial Report. Director Blair made the motion and Director Mendoza seconded. Those voting in favor: Directors Dyess, Blair, Fisher, Francesconi, Kelly, Mendoza, Miller-Jones, Pulliams, and Van Vliet. Motion carried.

c. Amendment of Permanent Rules (OAR 580-043-0060 through 0100), University Venture Development Funds

BOARD DOCKET:

Staff Report to the Board:
Senate Bill 853 (Oregon Laws 2005, Chapter 592) directed the State Board of Higher Education to adopt policies implementing the bill. At the July 2006 meeting of the State Board of Higher Education, the Board approved an administrative rule implementing the statute. However, modifications were established in a temporary amendment to the rules in July 2007.

The permanent rules before you will establish the modifications as permanent and will implement the procedures necessary for each institution to establish a venture development fund, allocate authority to raise funds and issue tax credits, authorize the Board to reallocate this authority after two years, set forth eligibility to receive grants, detail guidelines as to how and under what conditions a tax credit certificate may be issued, establish how gross royalty income received will be handled, and set forth recordkeeping requirements.

In compliance with the requirements of the Oregon rule-making process, a public hearing was conducted on December 21, from 1:30-3:30 p.m., in the conference room of Susan Campbell Hall on the University of Oregon campus. No written or verbal testimonies were submitted during the hearing.

Staff Recommendation to the Board:
Staff recommended the Board approve, as permanent rules, modifications to Oregon Administrative Rules 580-043-0060 through 0095 and the adoption of 580-043-0100.
BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:

President Dyess called upon Deputy Chancellor Ryan Hagemann to present the amendment to the OARs pertaining to university venture development funds. Mr. Hagemann explained that the Board will be approving the permanent adoption of rules that allow campuses to establish venture development funds for the purpose of facilitating the commercialization of research and development and provide qualified grant applicants with monies to facilitate the commercialization of the institution’s research and development.

Following the presentation, President Dyess called for a motion; Director Van Vliet made the motion and Director Kelly seconded. Those voting in favor to approve the adoption and modification of rules pertaining to the University Venture Development Funds: Directors Dyess, Blair, Fisher, Kelly, Miller-Jones, Pulliams, and Van Vliet (Directors Francesconi and Mendoza was absent during the voting).

d. Amendment of Permanent Rules (OAR 580-023-0005) Employee Background Checks

This agenda item was postponed to the February 2008 meeting of the Board.

e. Resource Fees/Differential Tuition New Policy Approval

BOARD DOCKET:

The guiding principles and proposed policy changes regarding resource fees and differential tuition have been revised to address many of the concerns that were raised in the discussion at the November 2007 meeting of the State Board of Higher Education. The key change was extending the time period for campuses to eliminate resource fees and make other corresponding changes. We are now presenting these guiding principles and policy changes for Board adoption. These policies need to be adopted now in order to provide campuses with the new framework for tendering tuition and fee rates for the 2008-09 academic year as many campuses would like to begin using these new policies beginning in the 2008-09 academic year.

Guiding Principles:
1. Program costs should be transparent to students.
2. Differential program costs should not become an impediment to student choice of major.
3. All costs should be included in student financial aid budgets and packages to the extent that this is feasible.
4. Any change must be revenue neutral for the transition. Revenue neutrality will be documented through analysis that will be externally validated, but will include planned inflationary increases during the biennium.
5. All resource fees should be eliminated by Fall 2011. In doing so, it is acknowledged that some one-time resource fees associated with matriculation/transcription may continue in another form. Due to the WOU tuition promise, this will need to be phased in at WOU with new cohorts starting in Fall 2008. Finally, it is acknowledged that it is our intent to eliminate resource fees assessed for graduate programs; however, this will be subject to a study of the impact that this change will have on graduate assistant recruitment and retention.

6. Differential tuition will be allowed in certain programs (as approved by the Board, however, it is understood that the initial conversion from resource fees to differential tuition would be allowed as part of this policy change) with the understanding that: 1) An amount equal to 10 percent of such differential tuition for undergraduate programs be earmarked for financial aid funding targeted to low-income students majoring in the program(s) assessing differential tuition, such that this does not become an impediment to degree choice (Note: in order to maintain revenue neutrality during the conversion if institutions choose to do this using fee remissions, this may necessitate an increase in the tuition, over and above the amount of current resource fees); and 2) that after the initial transition, institutions will need to submit the rationale for the need for differential tuition in accordance with the proposed differential tuition policy framework outlined below.

7. The existing structures of student consultation regarding tuition, fees and services should be continued and enhanced through this transition and into the future.

Proposed Policy Changes:

1. No new undergraduate resource fees of any type (one-time, universal, or programmatic) will be initiated after this policy change is adopted.

2. All universal resource fees (technology and energy surcharges) assessed to undergraduate students will be rolled into tuition no later than Fall term 2011. Undergraduate students enrolled in the WOU tuition promise program who entered with the Fall 2007 cohort will be exempted.

3. Programmatic resource fees assessed to undergraduate students will be eliminated no later than Fall 2011 by: a) increasing tuition for all students in an amount equivalent to that generated by undergraduate resource fees; or b) by creating differential tuition for certain programs in accordance with the guidelines outlined above; or some combination of a) and b) above.

4. One-time matriculation resource fees would be replaced by an approved matriculation fee to be defined in the Academic Year Fee Book and assessed as a one-time charge for new students when they matriculate to an institution.

5. The disposition of universal and programmatic resource fees assessed to graduate students will be determined after further study by a subgroup appointed by the
Provosts’ Council and resolution of the impacts this change will have on the recruitment and retention of graduate assistants and related collective bargaining agreements.

6. Staff tuition rates and policies will need to be modified to recover lost resource fee income associated with these proposed policy changes as staff members currently pay a reduced tuition amount but 100 percent of all applicable resource fees.

**Proposed Differential Tuition Policy** (Modeled after similar policies used in Arizona and Wisconsin)

Differential tuition is defined as additional tuition that is supplementary to the base tuition level approved annually by the Oregon Board of Higher Education. Differential tuition is intended to 1) offset higher than average instructional costs; or 2) provide supplemental resources to enhance program quality; or 3) reflect the market for programs with high demand.

As provided below, universities may request OUS Board approval for differential tuition at either the undergraduate or graduate level subject to the following:

1. University(ies) considering differential tuition must develop a proposal for OUS Board consideration addressing the following criteria:

   a. Quality of the student experience:

      i. The proposal should address how differential tuition will substantially increase the quality of the learning experience for students and provide the basis for later opportunities that would not be possible without the differential revenues.

   b. Access, affordability, and student choice of undergraduate major:

      i. The proposal for differential tuition for undergraduate programs must include a financial aid plan with a minimum of 10 percent of the differential tuition set aside for need-based aid to be awarded to needy students enrolled in the program. The plan shall also include a college advising process that enables the student to anticipate future cost increases and (if necessary) seek additional aid to cover the differential amount over base tuition.

   c. Cost of Instruction:

      i. The differential tuition proposal must include a clear justification related to the variance in program cost, program demand and program graduate earnings potential compared to the funds that would be provided through base tuition.

   d. Market Pricing:

      i. There should be evidence that the differential tuition proposed is comparable to the student cost for similar programs at peer institutions.
such that the university is not placed at a competitive disadvantage in attracting the best students and that the differential tuition is appropriate to the national market. The proposal should address the elasticity of demand it its justification.

e. Student Consultation and Support:

i. All differential tuition plans must show evidence of extensive and thorough consultation with students who will be affected, both via student representative groups and via organized opinion gathering among the students that would be charged the differential.

*Staff Recommendation to the Board:*

Staff recommended that the Board adopt these guiding principles and proposed policy changes at this time. Once approved by this Board, these changes will be incorporated into instructions to campuses for tendering the 2008-09 academic year tuition and fees and will be codified in the 2008-09 Academic Year Fee Book when it is considered by this Board in June 2008.

**BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:**

President Dyess called upon Vice Chancellor Kenton to present the item. Dr. Kenton reminded the Board that at the November 2007 Board meeting, they discussed the proposed draft policy. Following that meeting, representatives from the campuses met and determined that implementation of the policy should be deferred to Fall 2011. This would allow Western Oregon University’s “Western Tuition Promise Program” to complete three cohorts for statistical purposes. Additionally, the graduate deans from OSU, PSU, UO, and WOU were tasked with determining the possible affect this policy would have on graduate tuition and fees and graduate assistant contracts.

The proposed differential tuition policy provides the campuses with the opportunity to phase-in the policy, allows programs that have high-demand or high-cost to be priced differently than other programs, and proposes the elimination of all resource fees by Fall 2011. Once approved by the Board, this fee structure will be included in the planning process for the tuition and fee rate for academic year 2008-09, which will be brought to the Board for approval in June 2008. Dr. Kenton added that discussions have been held with the Legislative Fiscal Office and the Department of Administration Services’ Budget and Management analysts concerning the budget note that limits tuition increases to the changes in the annual median family income rate. Given that the new policy does not change the spirit of the budget note, the analysts recommended providing a report to the spring Emergency Board concerning this policy.

During discussion, Director Van Vliet asked if campuses may elect to implement this policy prior to 2011. Dr. Kenton advised that it is his belief that most campuses will implement some portion of the proposed policy, whether full elimination of resource and programmatic fees and/or implementing universal fees, impacting undergraduate and/or graduate fees at different times.
He also advised that Senator Walker has asked that OUS provide an update concerning the fee process at the February Special Session.

President Dyess called for a motion to adopt the guiding principles and proposed policy changes to be incorporated into succeeding tuition and fees; Director Francesconi made the motion and Director Van Vliet seconded. Those in favor: Directors Dyess, Blair, Fisher, Francesconi, Kelly, Miller-Jones, Pulliams, and Van Vliet. Motion carried. (Director Mendoza was absent from the vote.)

f. Tuition and Fee Recommendations, Residence Hall and Food Service Charges, and Amendment to OAR 580-040-0035, 2008 Summer Session Fee Book

BOARD DOCKET:

Executive Summary:
The fee rates, attendant policies, and campus room and board rates for the 2008 summer session, as they are presented within the accompanying draft of the Summer Session Fee Book, represent proposed institutional charges for summer term tuition, building, resource, incidental, and health fees. The tuition and fee rates for summer session academic programs are established by student classification (undergraduate, graduate and doctoral), residency, and credit hours taken. Summer tuition and fee revenue supports the administrative and instructional mission of OUS institutions.

The proposed increases to 2008 Summer Session tuition rates over 2007 rates are 3.5 percent for resident undergraduates and 5.2 percent for nonresident undergraduates. The proposed increases to graduate tuition are 6.2 percent for residents and 4.1 percent for nonresidents.

There are no new programmatic resource fees. All resource fees with the exception of matriculation fees remained the same as the prior year.

Summer Session Background:
Prior to 1999, summer session programs did not receive direct state General Fund support. However, with the approval of the Resource Allocation Model by the Governor and Legislature during the 1999-2001 Legislative Session, funding relationships for summer session changed. Currently, the Resource Allocation Model provides state General Fund support for qualified summer enrollment and institutions retain summer term income. In addition, the Board Committee on Budget and Finance determined that existing tuition and fee approval processes should continue.

Fee Setting Process:
The process for determining summer session tuition and fee rates is based on internal and external considerations of System- and state-level funding, as well as relevant policy issues. To determine the recommended rates, institutions must balance the fiscal requirements of their summer session programs with market considerations, including tuition rates of competing
education providers. Summer session fees are established through campus internal processes that include the participation of student and staff advisory committees in developing the proposed fees.

Institutions may assess summer session tuition on the current per-credit-hour basis or align summer rates with the preceding academic year structure.

Tuition and fees for summer term are generally assessed on a per-credit-hour basis, without tuition plateaus for full-time students. Tuition and fee revenue generated by each fee element is dedicated to a specific purpose and is independent of the other components. Institutions are not required by policy to make a residency determination for summer term, but may choose to do so.

Public Hearing:
In compliance with the requirements of the Oregon rule-making process and in order to provide OUS students with sufficient opportunity to comment on the proposed tuition and fee recommendations, public hearings were conducted on December 5 and December 20, from 10–11 a.m., in conference room 214B on the Oregon State University Campus. An email reminder containing an electronic copy of the 2008 Summer Session Fee Book Draft was sent to student body presidents and campus staff prior to each hearing. No written or verbal testimonies were submitted during the hearings.

Definitions:

**Building Fee:** The building fee is the same for all institutions and in the past has been approximately 75 percent of the academic year rate. For Summer 2008, the rate will be $34 per student. ORS 351.170 allows OUS to assess up to $45 per student per term to finance debt service for construction associated with student centers, health centers, and recreational facilities constructed through the issuance of Article XI-F(1) bonds. A pro rata fee is assessed to part-time students.

**Resource Fee:** Resource fees have three forms: universal fees assessed to all students; programmatic fees assessed only to students admitted to specific academic programs; and one-time fees for first-term students. Students enrolled under the part-time student fee policy are subject to the resource fees appropriate to specific courses taken. Institutions have the option of assessing resource fees during the summer session at rates comparable to those assessed in the preceding academic year.

**Incidental Fee:** Incidental fee recommendations are made by student committees on each campus in accordance with the Board-approved incidental fee policy (OAR 580-010-0090). In some instances, student committee recommendations are supported by general campus student referenda.
Revenue generated by incidental fees are used for “student union activities, educational, cultural, and student government activities, and athletic activities.” The president of each institution reviews and submits the student committee recommendations to the Chancellor to submit to the Board for final review and approval.

**Health Services Fee:** This fee is used to support each institution’s student health services that operate as an auxiliary enterprise on a self-sustaining basis. Optional health insurance policies are also made available by some institutions. During summer sessions, student health services operations function at reduced levels or are not provided at all. The recommended rates reflect these lower levels of activity.

**Summary of Changes by Student Classification and Residency:**

**Resident Undergraduate:** The proposed 2008 Summer Session tuition rates for resident undergraduate students will increase by a Systemwide weighted average of 3.5 percent over 2007. Proposed tuition increases by campus range between 2.7 percent and 3.5 percent with the exception of Oregon State University. Oregon State’s proposed resident undergraduate summer rate will increase by an average of 4.7 percent over 2007, in accordance with their long-term strategy to align resident undergraduate summer tuition with the academic year rate.

**Nonresident Undergraduate:** The proposed undergraduate nonresident rates for the 2008 Summer Session will increase by a weighted average of 5.2 percent, with the exception of Western Oregon University’s proposed increase of 122 percent over the prior year. This is the final year of Western Oregon’s alignment of nonresident summer session tuition with the academic year. Through these proposed rate changes, nonresidents will no longer pay resident rates during summer session.

**Resident Graduate:** The proposed rates for resident graduate tuition for the 2008 Summer Session will increase by a Systemwide weighted average of 6.2 percent. Portland State University delivers 44 percent of the OUS resident graduate summer credit hours, while Western Oregon delivers 7 percent of the total. The PSU proposed increase of 8.6 percent and WOU proposed increase of 7.1 percent sets their summer session rate equal to their academic year rate.

**Nonresident Graduate:** The proposed rates for nonresident graduate tuition for the 2008 Summer Session will increase by a Systemwide weighted average of 4.1 percent. The proposed increase by campus ranges from 0 percent to 4.8 percent, with the exception of Western Oregon’s proposed nonresident graduate rate increases of 21.4 percent.

**Summary Comparison Tables:**

The following pages contain summary tables of the proposed changes for 2008 Summer Session tuition and fees. Tables 1-8 represent a comparison of 2008 proposed tuition and fees to 2007 rates for both undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at the 6, 9, 12, and 15 credit hour
levels. In addition, Table 9 displays the proposed changes by campus for 2008 summer term programmatic resource fees over 2007 rates.
### Table 1

**Summer Term 2008 Tuition and Fees**

**Undergraduate - 6 Credit Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td>$682</td>
<td>$588</td>
<td>$667</td>
<td>$710</td>
<td>$634</td>
<td>$630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$690</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td>$682</td>
<td>$2,184</td>
<td>$667</td>
<td>$980</td>
<td>$2,010</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>$151</td>
<td>$337</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Tuition and Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$797</td>
<td>$781</td>
<td>$1,019</td>
<td>$828</td>
<td>$813</td>
<td>$929</td>
<td>$794</td>
<td>$790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$797</td>
<td>$781</td>
<td>$1,019</td>
<td>$2,424</td>
<td>$813</td>
<td>$1,199</td>
<td>$2,170</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage Increase over Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>118.5% [1]</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Tuition and Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>101.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Programmatic Resource Fees. Amounts are rounded to nearest dollar.

[1] Final year of adjusting summer session non-resident rates to match academic year rates.
### Table 2
Summer Term 2008 Tuition and Fees
Undergraduate - 9 Credit Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$1,035</td>
<td>$945</td>
<td>$1,006</td>
<td>$882</td>
<td>$964</td>
<td>$1,052</td>
<td>$931</td>
<td>$945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$1,035</td>
<td>$945</td>
<td>$1,006</td>
<td>$3,276</td>
<td>$964</td>
<td>$1,457</td>
<td>$3,015</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$352</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$1,154</td>
<td>$1,110</td>
<td>$1,358</td>
<td>$1,168</td>
<td>$1,181</td>
<td>$1,271</td>
<td>$1,109</td>
<td>$1,123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage Increase over Prior Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>123.0% [1]</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Tuition and Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>109.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Programmatic Resource Fees. Amounts are rounded to nearest dollar.

[1] Final year of adjusting summer session non-resident rates to match academic year rates.
### Table 3
**Summer Term 2008 Tuition and Fees**  
**Undergraduate - 12 Credit Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$1,380</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
<td>$1,330</td>
<td>$1,176</td>
<td>$1,261</td>
<td>$1,394</td>
<td>$1,228</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$1,380</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
<td>$1,330</td>
<td>$4,368</td>
<td>$1,261</td>
<td>$1,934</td>
<td>$4,020</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fees</strong></td>
<td>$131</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$329</td>
<td>$223</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td>$196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Tuition and Fees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$1,511</td>
<td>$1,438</td>
<td>$1,697</td>
<td>$1,505</td>
<td>$1,484</td>
<td>$1,613</td>
<td>$1,424</td>
<td>$1,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$1,511</td>
<td>$1,438</td>
<td>$1,697</td>
<td>$4,697</td>
<td>$1,484</td>
<td>$2,153</td>
<td>$4,216</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage Increase over Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>125.3% [1]</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Tuition and Fees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>113.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Programmatic Resource Fees. Amounts are rounded to nearest dollar.

[1] Final year of adjusting summer session non-resident rates to match academic year rates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU Promise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$1,725</td>
<td>$1,575</td>
<td>$1,654</td>
<td>$1,438</td>
<td>$1,558</td>
<td>$1,736</td>
<td>$1,525</td>
<td>$1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$1,725</td>
<td>$1,575</td>
<td>$1,654</td>
<td>$5,460</td>
<td>$1,558</td>
<td>$2,411</td>
<td>$5,025</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$49</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fees</strong></td>
<td>$131</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$382</td>
<td>$329</td>
<td>$223</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$214</td>
<td>$214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Tuition and Fees*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$1,856</td>
<td>$1,753</td>
<td>$2,036</td>
<td>$1,767</td>
<td>$1,781</td>
<td>$1,955</td>
<td>$1,739</td>
<td>$1,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$1,856</td>
<td>$1,753</td>
<td>$2,036</td>
<td>$5,789</td>
<td>$1,781</td>
<td>$2,630</td>
<td>$5,239</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Increase over Prior Year</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>126.8%</td>
<td>[1] 0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Tuition and Fees*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>116.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes Programmatic Resource Fees. Amounts are rounded to nearest dollar.

[1] Final year of adjusting summer session non-resident rates to match academic year rates.
The following tables summarize summer session tuition and fee rates for full-time graduate students enrolled for 6, 9, 12, and 15 credit hours and compares rates with the 2006 Summer Session:

### Table 5
**Summer Term 2008 Tuition and Fees**  
**Graduate - 6 Credit Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$1,356</td>
<td>$1,416</td>
<td>$1,294</td>
<td>$1,566</td>
<td>$1,561</td>
<td>$1,293</td>
<td>$1,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$1,356</td>
<td>$1,416</td>
<td>$1,294</td>
<td>$2,484</td>
<td>$1,561</td>
<td>$1,563</td>
<td>$2,622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$27</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 18</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fees</strong></td>
<td>$107</td>
<td>$151</td>
<td>$337</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$146</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Tuition and Fees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$1,463</td>
<td>$1,567</td>
<td>$1,631</td>
<td>$1,806</td>
<td>$1,707</td>
<td>$1,512</td>
<td>$1,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$1,463</td>
<td>$1,567</td>
<td>$1,631</td>
<td>$2,724</td>
<td>$1,707</td>
<td>$1,782</td>
<td>$2,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage Increase over Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Tuition and Fees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Programmatic Resource Fees. Amounts are rounded to nearest dollar.
### Table 6
Summer Term 2008 Tuition and Fees
Graduate - 9 Credit Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$2,034</td>
<td>$2,124</td>
<td>$1,924</td>
<td>$2,349</td>
<td>$2,305</td>
<td>$1,923</td>
<td>$2,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$2,034</td>
<td>$2,124</td>
<td>$1,924</td>
<td>$3,726</td>
<td>$2,305</td>
<td>$2,328</td>
<td>$3,933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Incidental</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Student Services/Rec Ctr</th>
<th>Total Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>$38</td>
<td>$41</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Tuition and Fees*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$2,153</td>
<td>$2,289</td>
<td>$2,276</td>
<td>$2,635</td>
<td>$2,522</td>
<td>$2,142</td>
<td>$2,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$2,153</td>
<td>$2,289</td>
<td>$2,276</td>
<td>$4,012</td>
<td>$2,522</td>
<td>$2,547</td>
<td>$4,111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage Increase over Prior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>Energy</th>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Incidental</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Registration</th>
<th>Student Services/Rec Ctr</th>
<th>Total Tuition and Fees*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Tuition and Fees*

*Excludes Programmatic Resource Fees. Amounts are rounded to nearest dollar.*

**Note:** Changes to the fee schedule are highlighted in yellow and were modified subsequent to the publication of the Board docket materials.
### Table 7
Summer Term 2008 Tuition and Fees
Graduate - 12 Credit Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$2,712</td>
<td>$2,832</td>
<td>$2,554</td>
<td>$3,132</td>
<td>$3,049</td>
<td>$2,553</td>
<td>$3,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$2,712</td>
<td>$2,832</td>
<td>$2,554</td>
<td>$4,968</td>
<td>$3,049</td>
<td>$3,093</td>
<td>$5,244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fees</strong></td>
<td>$131</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$329</td>
<td>$223</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>$196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Tuition and Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$2,843</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
<td>$2,921</td>
<td>$3,461</td>
<td>$3,272</td>
<td>$2,772</td>
<td>$3,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$2,843</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
<td>$2,921</td>
<td>$5,297</td>
<td>$3,272</td>
<td>$3,312</td>
<td>$5,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage Increase over Prior Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Tuition and Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Programmatic Resource Fees. Amounts are rounded to nearest dollar.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$3,390</td>
<td>$3,540</td>
<td>$3,184</td>
<td>$3,651</td>
<td>$3,793</td>
<td>$3,183</td>
<td>$3,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$3,390</td>
<td>$3,540</td>
<td>$3,184</td>
<td>$6,210</td>
<td>$3,793</td>
<td>$3,858</td>
<td>$6,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Fees | $131 | $178 | $382 | $329 | $223 | $219 | $214 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Tuition and Fees*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Increase over Prior Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Rec Ctr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Tuition and Fees*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes Programmatic Resource Fees. Amounts are rounded to nearest dollar.
### Table 6

**Summer Term 2008 Tuition and Fees**  
Graduate - 9 Credit Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>$2,034</td>
<td>$2,124</td>
<td>$1,924</td>
<td>$2,349</td>
<td>$2,305</td>
<td>$1,923</td>
<td>$1,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>$2,034</td>
<td>$2,124</td>
<td>$1,924</td>
<td>$3,726</td>
<td>$2,305</td>
<td>$2,547</td>
<td>$2,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Fees**           |     |     |     |     |     |    |     |
| Energy             | $-  | $-  | $-  | $-  | $-  | $- | -   |
| Technology         | $38 | $41 | $45 | $65 | $56 | $40 | $54 |
| Building           | $34 | $34 | $34 | $34 | $34 | $34 | $34 |
| Incidental         | $47 | $40 | $148| $79 | $62 | $45 | $49 |
| Health             | $-  | $50 | $120| $100| $65 | $82 | $41 |
| Registration       | $-  | $-  | $5  | $-  | $-  | $-  | $-  |
| Student Services/Rec Ctr | $- | $- | $- | $8 | $- | $18 | - |

**Total Fees**  
$119 $165 $352 $286 $217 $219 $178

**Total Tuition and Fees**  
Residents  $2,153 $2,289 $2,276 $2,635 $2,522 $2,142 $2,101
Nonresidents $2,153 $2,289 $2,276 $4,012 $2,522 $2,766 $2,506

**Percentage Increase over Prior Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>-28.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Fees**           |     |     |     |     |     |    |     |
| Energy             | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Technology         | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 20.8% | 3.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Building           | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Incidental         | 4.4% | 0.0% | 9.1% | -21.0% | 0.0% | 4.7% | 6.5% |
| Health             | 0.0% | 0.0% | 15.8% | 11.1% | 0.0% | 7.9% | 2.5% |
| Registration       | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Student Services/Rec Ctr | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |

**Total Tuition and Fees**  
Residents  2.7% 0.0% 5.7% 8.5% 3.1% 4.0% -10.0%
Nonresidents 2.7% 0.0% 5.7% 1.4% 3.1% 12.2% -26.6%

*Excludes Programmatic Resource Fees. Amounts are rounded to nearest dollar.*
## Table 9
### 2008 Summer Programmatic Resource Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>% Change from 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOU</td>
<td>Matriculation Fee (one time - all new and transfer students)</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Matriculation Fee (one time - all new and transfer students)</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Professions and Engineering Professions</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transcript Fee (one time on all new students)</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU - Main</td>
<td>Pre-engineering ($20 per credit hour up to $205 per term)</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering ($44 per credit hour up to $433 per term)</td>
<td>$443</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA Students ($35 per credit hour up to $350 per term)</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weatherford Residential College</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts upper division courses</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Art</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Science upper division courses</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Human Development &amp; Family Sciences majors</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Design and Human Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apparel Design</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Studies</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merchandising Management</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Resources</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honors College</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculation Fee (one time on all new and transfer students)</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU - Cascades</td>
<td>Department of Art</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Resources</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculation Fee (one time on all new and transfer students)</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>School of Business ($10/$35 hour up to $100/$350 per term)</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sch. of Engineering &amp; Computer Science ($35/hr to $350/term)</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School of Fine &amp; Performing Arts ($5/hr up to $50 per term)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speech &amp; Hearing Sciences</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculation Fee (one time - all new and transfer students)</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOU</td>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fine &amp; Performing Arts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art, Music, Theater, Communication ($5/cr, $50 cap)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate in Nonprofit Management (9+ Credit Hours)</td>
<td>$167</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate in Nonprofit Management (1-8 Credit Hours)</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master in Business Administration</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master's in Management ($20/hr up to $160/term)</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Arts in Teaching ($15/hr up to $120/term)</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Applied Psychology:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Health Counseling ($37 per cr hr up to $333/term)</td>
<td>No charge summer term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization Training &amp; Development ($33/hr to $300/term)</td>
<td>No charge summer term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services ($30/hr up to $300/term)</td>
<td>No charge summer term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculation Fee (one time on all new and transfer students)</td>
<td>$212</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Matriculation Fee (one time - all new and transfer students)</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOU</td>
<td>Matriculation Fee (one time - all new and transfer students)</td>
<td>$106</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2008 Room and Board Rates

Summer Session room and board accommodations on each campus vary according to the need and demand of each campus community. They may include rates by day, week, multi-week or term. A combined room and board rate is typically offered, as well as rates for room only, board only, conference activities, etc. Rates are generally comparable to those for the academic year. Student housing facilities operate as auxiliary enterprises and are intended to function in a self-supporting manner.

The following table shows comparative examples of room and board rates for a basic dorm room with double occupancy. Each institution offers a variety of room and meal options at rates above and below those listed. Please refer to page 31 of the 2008 Summer Session Fee Book Draft for an extensive list of available room and board options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Summer Housing Rates</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Percent Change from Summer 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOU Eight Weeks (includes meals)</td>
<td>$924</td>
<td>$972</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT Eight Week - Double (room only)</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$560</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Eight Week - Double (includes meals)</td>
<td>$1,186</td>
<td>$1,232</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU Eight Weeks - Ondine Multiple (room only)</td>
<td>$1,026</td>
<td>$1,061</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOU Eight Week - Multiple (includes meals)</td>
<td>$1,506</td>
<td>$1,595</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Eight Week - Multiple (includes meals)</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td>$1,680</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOU Eight Week - Heritage Multiple (no meals included)</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>$624</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Recommendation to the Board:

The staff recommended that the Board approve the proposed 2008 Summer Session tuition, fees, and related policies incorporated in this docket. Specifically, an amendment to OAR 580-040-0035 to read as follows:

“The document entitled Summer Session Fee Book 2008 dated January 04, 2008, is hereby amended by reference as a permanent rule. All prior adoptions of summer session fee documents are hereby repealed except as to rights and obligations previously acquired or incurred thereunder. Through the OAR amendment, the Board adopts the document entitled 2008 Summer Session Fee Book. The Chancellor is authorized to implement minor clerical adjustments to the final document, if necessary.”

BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:

President Dyess called for Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget Operations Glen Nelson to present the proposed 2008 Summer Session fee rates. Mr. Nelson summarized the proposed fees by stating the resident undergraduate tuition rate will increase by 3.5 percent over the 2007 summer session; graduate tuition will increase by 6.2 percent; nonresident tuition will increase by 4.1 percent. All resource fees, with the exception of matriculation fees at several
campuses, remain at the 2007 rates. Director Fisher inquired as to the reason for the high percentage rate climb; Mr. Nelson replied that as summer session fees are not affected by the legislative budget note that is applied to the academic year rates, the summer session rates are set to what the market will bear to cover the costs of the programs and bring campuses’ summer session rates into alignment with the academic year rates.

Following discussion, President Dyess called for a motion to adopt the Summer Session Fee Book for 2008; Director Pulliams made the motion and Director Miller-Jones seconded. Those in favor: Directors Dyess, Blair, Fisher, Francesconi, Kelly, Miller-Jones, Pulliams, and Van Vliet. Motion carried. (Director Mendoza was absent from the vote.)

5. **REPORT ITEMS**

```
a. Investment Earnings Legislative Progress Update

BOARD DOCKET:

During the 2007 Legislative Session, the Board’s legislative request to retain investment interest on all OUS funds, which was encompassed in House Bill (HB) 2198, was not formally heard in committee, despite strong support from the Governor, OUS student leadership, and key legislators. The Legislative Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education did hear testimony from OUS and receive written reports supporting the concept. As was highlighted by staff to the Board in May 2007 in their presentation on new treasury management strategies, this testimony and these reports indicated that changing treasury management processes could result in significant incremental investment earnings to the state. It was estimated that pooling OUS funds for investment purposes and changing the investment strategy employed could generate as much as $14.9 million in investment earnings per biennium over what is currently being earned. Despite the magnitude of the potential incremental revenues, the 2007 Legislature did not act on HB 2198. Instead, it directed the Legislative Fiscal Office and the State of Oregon’s Treasurer’s Office, via budget note, to examine the concept in more detail and report to the legislature prior to the supplemental session in February 2008.

To prepare their report, LFO and Treasury asked OUS a series of questions to obtain additional information and better understand our request. A focus of the questions was to understand what changes in banking processes and statutes would be required to fully implement our concepts. While we believed that HB 2198, along with flexibility already present in statutes, would have allowed OUS to attain most, if not all of our goals with respect to banking and investing, further review and discussion with Treasury raised new questions about banking process and statutory changes that might be needed. In order to answer these questions, we asked Public Financial Management, Inc. (PFM), our financial advisors, to review our current banking structure and recommend changes to most effectively and efficiently meet our
treasury management goals. Their report is included as Attachment 1 of Appendix C. In short, PFM recommended elimination of many of the bank accounts currently managed by OUS and consolidating the related balances for investment purposes. Furthermore, our assigned DOJ counsel worked with Treasury’s assigned DOJ counsel and the Oregon State Treasury’s Director of Cash Management to draft the statutory changes needed to create the account structure to allow for a pooled investment approach. The recommended statutory changes are included as Attachment C2. Those changes eliminate the statutory language mandating the maintenance of separate bank accounts at Treasury and create a single OUS account that would be invested by the Oregon State Treasury. OUS would have flexibility to establish any needed sub-accounts within the OUS books that would allow for the separation of the various cash accounts within the accounting records and the attribution of investment earnings without the currently required separation of balances and related investments at Treasury.

The resulting LFO and Treasury report, which is included as Attachment C3, concluded the following:

- Both LFO and Treasury recommended against allowing OUS to retain Investment income on all of its funds for the specific purpose of providing an incentive to improve cash management practices. In addition, LFO recommended that OUS be directed to include any cash management improvement concepts as policy option packages, regardless of where investment earnings are directed, in its 2009-2011 biennial budget build-up.
- Both LFO and Treasury recommended approval of the concept of pooling funds to allow stratified investing to maximize investment earnings.
- LFO recommended that policy decisions relating to the disposition of Investment earnings on OUS funds be reviewed within the context of a comprehensive review of state agency Investment earnings, and not as an independent issue.
- LFO recommended against any action that reduces General Fund resources in favor of dedicated funding, unless there is a Legislative finding that there is a compelling reason to do so.
- Both LFO and Treasury agreed that, should the legislature grant OUS the authority to retain all investment earnings, the revenue loss to the General Fund should be offset with a reduction in the OUS General Fund appropriation.
- LFO recommended that, should the legislature grant OUS the authority to retain all investment earnings, a portion equal to the amount of General Fund appropriation to total OUS revenues be refunded to the General Fund.

LFO and Treasury presented their report to the Interim Joint Committee on Ways and Means (Committee) on December 6, 2007. Our response to their report, which was also provided to the Committee, is included as Attachment C4. The Committee accepted the report without further action.

1 Attachments are available from the Board’s Office and online at http://www.ous.edu/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddoc080104.pdf
**Next Steps:**

OUS is prepared to implement the treasury management changes needed to increase investment earnings to OUS and the State of Oregon. While we await the necessary legislative action to make these changes, we are moving ahead with evaluating changes in our debt management processes to take advantage of the authority to enter into certain types of variable rate debt that was encompassed in HB 2199, passed by the 2007 Legislature. Our financial advisors, PFM, are developing analyses of our current Article XI-F(1) debt outstanding to explore different scenarios for implementing the pooled debt management approach, including issuance of variable rate debt and implementing a blended cost of capital. We are also preparing to hire a new head of the treasury function within OUS to provide the leadership and experience necessary to reengineer this process and attain cost savings and improve campus flexibility in financing projects. What remains to be seen is whether the significant cost savings that analysis shows is available through the pooled debt management approach can be attained without the concomitant change in cash and investment management discussed above to hedge variable rate interest cost risk.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

President Dyess called upon Associate Vice Chancellor and Controller Mike Green to bring the investment earnings legislative progress update. Mr. Green provided the Board with additional brief background material. He then noted a budget note was included in the 2007 budget requiring a study be completed by LFO and Treasury, then reported to the Interim Ways & Means Committee in December 2007. A study was completed by the PFM Group (OUS’ financial advisory) who conducted a review of OUS banking processes and subsequently recommended the significant streamlining of those banking processes. OUS then consulted with DOJ and Treasury submitted recommended statutory changes needed to implement HB 2199 (investment earnings). LFO and Treasury also submitted a report to the Interim Ways & Means Committee containing a number of conclusions, including: that OUS should not receive interest earnings as an incentive to change behavior; that OUS should pool funds for investing but that the interest should go directly to the General Fund; and that policy decisions relating to this investment earnings on state funds be applied to all state agencies. They also recommended against action that reduces the General Fund in favor of targeted or dedicated funds. LFO and Treasury agreed that OUS would be granted the authority to retain all investment earnings but that OUS would have an offset for EBL in the amount of the lost earnings and that an analysis be conducted every biennium wherein OUS would then rebate to the General Fund the portion of interest earnings earned on the appropriation monies received from the state. Following this report to the Interim Ways & Means Committee, no action was taken by the Committee other than to accept the report.

Green then described the next actions OUS will take: implementation to issue variable rate debt and looking at the debt portfolio approach, with the key pieces to hedge variable rate exposure with interest earnings on the cash investment side. Since OUS does not have the authority to do
that, it makes it somewhat more difficult and, perhaps, more risky to implement a large variable rate debt exposure without a reserve cushion. PFM has been tasked with examining and studying the outstanding Article XI-F(1) debt to begin to model different approaches to variable rate debt exposure to understand the impact to the capital cost—essentially, who would be the winners and the losers among the campuses—and look for ways to implement that process even without the interest earnings.

Vice Chancellor Kenton noted that, even though Controller Green seems a bit frustrated at the process, progress has been made. He recommended the continuing submittal of the statutory changes, resubmitting it as a legislative concept in the next session. Discussion was held as to the disconnect that the legislature seems to have concerning the fact that the interest earned is earned from the students’ tuition and fee monies. President Dyess stressed how the students should be informed of the situation and thanked Vice Chancellor Kenton and Controller Green for the report and their work in the process.

b. UO, Basketball Arena Update

BOARD DOCKET:

At its November 2007 meeting, the Board authorized the Chancellor or designee to seek legislative approval for increase of $200 million additional expenditure authority and bond limitation for the construction of the University of Oregon arena.

The Board President asked the University to provide an update at the January 2008 meeting. President Dave Frohnmayer will provide an oral report, including the results of the feasibility assessment conducted by outside consultants, project update, and steps to date in gaining legislative approval.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

President Dyess called upon University of Oregon President Dave Frohnmayer for an update on the arena project. President Frohnmayer’s report was comprised of three items: legislative approval, property acquisition, and the status of the legacy fund.

The first issue on which President Frohnmayer addressed the Board regarded the status of legislative approval of the project. He indicated he had briefed and met with Ways & Means, the Governor’s delegation and staff, DAS, and the LFO and indicated there would be a hearing before Ways & Means in mid-month. He expects the arena bonds to be included in the omnibus bonding bill forwarded by Ways & Means to the full legislative assembly during the February special session; if successful, President Frohnmayer will return to the Board for approval to sell the bonds. He also indicated there had been a number of campus and neighborhood conversations regarding the project.
President Frohnmayer continued with an overview of the report from the UO’s consultant, CSL, regarding projected economic success of the arena venture and invited Board members and presidents to review CSL’s report, which indicated that revenue estimates were higher than those made by the UO Athletic Department. President Frohnmayer believes revenue and annual contributions will provide the revenue to service the estimated $11.25 million annual debt payment for the bonds that would be used to fund the arena while continuing to allow the UO Athletic Department to be self-supporting. He indicated that the time period between project approval and completion would allow for continued market research targeting income for the arena, which will be the largest venue in southern Oregon (south of Portland) and northern California.

President Frohnmayer then moved on to the issue of property acquisition for the arena project noting that the UO has reached an agreement for voluntary acquisition of the Wagenknecht property but is in continuing negotiations for the 7-Eleven property, which has more encumbrances on its title than its appraised value and, for that reason, may be the subject of a condemnation proceeding. The acquisition process for the remaining parcels is proceeding appropriately in light of the upcoming Olympic Trials and proposed construction schedule.

President Frohnmayer concluded his presentation with a summation of the role of the Legacy Fund in obtaining legislative approval during the February session, noting that UO has signed letters of intent for about $107.5 million; he believes there will be further funds forthcoming over and above that figure. The letters of intent have been provided to the Board, the Chancellor’s Office, the LFO, and DAS.

Director Van Vliet inquired how the students feel about the arena project, to which President Frohnmayer replied all indications are they are excited. He notes that campus residence hall officials are concerned about noise, litter, etc., but he has not encountered any significant opposition to the project from that quarter. Director Van Vliet recounted information from a news report that only 1,900 students would be allowed into an event which seemed fairly low for a 20,000 student body. Director Frohnmayer responded that he believes the UO will actually be able to allow a larger percentage of students to enjoy a game than is possible with the current McArthur Court facility.

Director Kelly then questioned President Frohnmayer about the feasibility of CSL’s revenue projections. President Frohnmayer commented that he has taken the CSL report as affirmative in concluding that the numbers are feasible and actually higher than the Athletic Department’s own estimates; and may indeed be conservative. He noted that the revenue capacity of McArthur Court is maxed out and has limited concession space; in contrast, the new arena would expect revenues from these various subcomponents.

Director Miller-Jones noted his previous concern that the UO campus be broadly engaged, especially in relation to the academic mission, and expressed appreciation that his previous concerns had been both listened and responded to. President Frohnmayer indicated his intention to continue taking the advice and concerns into consideration and reiterated the
character of the project as being donor supported and the project being able to generate revenues.

Director Francesconi then reminded the Board and presidents that he had raised a condition to the project at the September 2007 Board meeting in Bend; he called out congratulations to the Board for its willingness to authorize condemnation to, in essence, set the state for property acquisition negotiations. He noted with approval the study and the highly qualified organization who performed it, and concluded that the study supports proceeding in the way President Frohnmayer has recommended. He did pose the question of sustainability, however. President Frohnmayer, in response, said the design was in progress so it’s premature to predict LEED ranking but pointed out that the UO campus historically has taken sustainability seriously. He believes the design and function of the arena will be such that it will be sustainable beyond two or three times what has been the character of arenas elsewhere in the country and his philosophy is to “do it right the first time.” Director Francesconi then asked specifically about energy costs and pointed out the arena project is an opportunity for the UO to brand itself as a sustainable university. President Frohnmayer stated the Board would have an opportunity to revisit the project at the time the bond sale issue is brought before it and hopefully the design will be far enough along that there can be a more firm answer provided to the sustainability question. President Ray supported this with recent information that Oregon State University and the University of Oregon had been identified in the top 25 universities committed to sustainability so there appears to be a culture and commitment to doing things in a sustainable manner and the arena really is a model for others on what should be done with these sorts of structures.

Director Fisher and Vice Chancellor Kenton commented that in the Board docket there was a proposal (based in the Governor’s Executive Order a year or two ago) that all state facilities would meet at least 70 or 80 LEED, further noting that all new buildings built since that time have met the requirement. President Dyess commented that universities in general have been innovative and suggested the business school at the University of Oregon as illustrative of sustainability. Chancellor Pernsteiner added that the state’s standard is actually a minimum but many existing buildings have actually exceeded those minimums.

In response to a request from Chancellor Pernsteiner, Vice Chancellor Kenton, who reported on the financial aspects of the project and called out CPA Dave Sparks in approval of his work and others on Sparks’ staff, as well as Michael Redding, Allen Price, and UO General Counsel Melinda Grier, noting that he and all of these individuals have reviewed pertinent documentation and feel comfortable with the project, believing that the representations made are accurate and trusts that the consultant’s report is accurate. He indicated there had been extensive meetings with the legislature, Treasury, and bond counsel and believes they are also comfortable with the transaction. In summary, he indicated they have done quite a bit of due diligence and he thanked President Frohnmayer and his staff for allowing him, as well as the aforementioned consultants and officials, to be part of such an exciting opportunity for Oregon.
Chancellor Pernsteiner offered that the Board had asked him and the Vice Chancellor Kenton to consider two things: the consultant’s study and the gift instruments as they exist. He pointed out that the consultant’s study does not rely upon the gifts to make the debt payment but rather the gifts are the safety valve if the levels of estimated revenues fail to meet expectations. He indicated that funds generated need be only at the $6 million mark and, as such, is not going to cause deleterious impacts on the rest of the budget. In response to a question from Director Blair for clarification, Chancellor Pernsteiner added that his figure is the spend-down rate of any of the foundations, which are relatively conservative.

President Dyess summarized by noting she is pleased to hear about the gift documentation and appreciated the update.

6. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

a. **OUS, Strategic Planning**

**BOARD DOCKET:**

The Board of Higher Education’s strategic planning work session on December 6-7, 2007, identified six areas for major board focus during 2008 and Board President Kirby Dyess assigned Board members to lead the work in these areas. The focus of January’s Board discussion will be on the organization and deliverables for these areas:

1. **Constitutional and/or statutory changes for improved efficiency:** Rethink OUS’ relationship with the state regarding funding, legal status, and operating flexibility, seeking constitutional and/or statutory provisions where needed to improve efficiency and financial sustainability, in return for which OUS would commit to an agreed upon set of outcomes.

   Lead: John von Schlegell

2. **Address barriers to student participation and success:** Address affordability, academic preparation, and retention barriers that affect both student participation and real and perceived potential for success and completion. Strengthen connections between OUS universities and PK-12 schools and among OUS colleges of education to address issues of student success.

   Lead: Dalton Miller-Jones (continuation of Student Participation and Completion Subcommittee)

3. **Smaller universities:** Clarify the mission, role, program focus, learning delivery, operating support, and organization of OUS’ smaller universities so that they achieve educational attainment goals for their regions and are financially viable over the long term.
Lead: Don Blair

4. **State funding for graduate education and research**: Secure state funding for graduate education, research, and innovation within OUS.

   Lead: George Pernsteiner

5. **Portland higher education initiatives**: Continue the refinement and execution of Portland higher education initiatives, including a framework for higher education in Portland and development of an education and research corridor focused on life sciences and sustainability disciplines. Foster partnerships with Portland area community colleges for the provision of degrees in the Portland metropolitan area; strengthen connections with area K-12 schools.

   Lead: Jim Francesconi (continuation of the Portland Higher Education Subcommittee)

6. **Board, Chancellor, and institution roles and relationships**: Clarify and revise the current roles and relationships among the Board, Chancellor, and institutions to achieve the Board’s strategic priorities as described in the Board’s Long-Range Plan.

   Lead: Paul Kelly

In addition to the six areas identified above, other important areas were noted as items requiring a plan from institution and Chancellor’s staff within the next few months. These areas include, but are not limited to:

- Sustainability education and research – creating a System reputation (each university and all universities together) for excellence in sustainability education and research.
- PK-12 education – building and strengthening productive collaborations among OUS colleges of education and between OUS faculty and PK-12 schools and manifesting a commitment to PK-12 quality in Oregon as a critical OUS mission.
- Academic program review process – developing a clear academic program review process as a critical infrastructure element in managing and sustaining the OUS portfolio.
- New approaches to learning outcomes and assessment – within the Board’s framework of performance measurement, identifying key learning outcomes and ways of measuring and reporting them.

Chancellor’s staff will continue to work with OUS presidents, provosts, vice presidents, and others to develop plans in these areas.
BOARD DISCUSSION:

President Dyess clarified that there were six items that came out of the strategic planning session and more that came out of subcommittee discussions and she would like that work to go forward. She also wanted to reiterate the legislative schedule so that the issue groups and subcommittees gained a sense of the timeline.

President Dyess continued with noting the first major direction in strategic planning concerned constitutional or statutory changes for improved System efficiency, noting that Director von Schlegell continues to lead that effort in this focus group (not yet a formal committee of this Board). The second major direction is Director Miller-Jones’ work on student participation and success and pointed out that he, with the help of Di Saunders, has really engaged the entire state in this discussion and developed some excellent recommendations that need to be considered as legislative concepts. Director Miller-Jones’ committee is being formalized as a Board committee. The third focus is the regional universities – to clarify their missions and roles and explore the possibility of sharing administrative functions. Director Blair is heading this focus group and she noted she is looking for a report from Director Blair on these issues. Fourth in focus is state funding for graduate education and research, under the joint efforts of Dr. Rich Linton, the Research Council, the Provosts’ Council, and Chancellor George Pernsteiner. This focus group is not yet a formal Board committee. Director Dyess then stated that the Portland higher education focus group, under the direction of Director Francesconi, has done a phenomenal job of engaging the subgroups as well as the entire community in their discussion and established that focus group as a formal committee of the Board. President Dyess summarized by anticipating reports from these groups and committees as well as recommendations from the Board for discussion and decision.

President Dyess also addressed a number of other areas including sustainability and, in particular, pre-K-12 education as being key to the OUS mission. She noted the involvement of the Unified Education Enterprise as well as portfolio group and suggested that their work continue; she indicated she hoped the education deans would present more formalized proposals to the Board in the future. In response to a question from Director Blair, she indicated that the provosts were working on academic program review and feedback from the provosts was expected along with, specifically, a report on the role Eastern is playing in this ongoing review. Director Blair suggested that Southern’s President Cullinan may wish to connect with Eastern’s Provost Michael Jaeger or with President Lund on the process.

Director Francesconi pointed out that some of the issues overlap committees and the same people on different committees may be bringing these issues forward. Director Blair agreed and some of these are being considered at the System-level, rather than at campus level, to potentially figure out how to address these across institutions – defining these issues not just at the campus-level but at the System-level. President Dyess noted that President Cullinan is already headed in that direction and can add a lot of value to the discussion. Vice Chancellor Weeks added that the recommendation coming out of the Portfolio Subcommittee has a Systemwide focus. Director Blair offered an additional comment regarding the desirability of
being able to link the System investment with each credit hour and degrees awarded to be able to determine the investment being made in each degree or even in each student. He notes that there are low enrollment programs that might have associated low costs but there are others that are high cost programs – he would like to be able to analyze demand levels and the strategic elements of how they connect with institutional strategies in light of the investments made by the System; he believes these analyses may highlight some places where there are opportunities.

President Dyess continued with the final area, new approaches to learning outcomes and assessments, and linked this area with the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate report relative to quality as heard earlier in the meeting. Director Miller-Jones requested that he be included in this at some level. She concluded her summary by noting that the strategic initiatives committee has been disbanded.

President Dyess then called upon Chancellor George Pernsteiner for a brief report on legislative time frames. In response, Chancellor Pernsteiner noted that proposals for statutory changes are due to DAS by April 1 (i.e., proposed new statutes, not budget items), so legislative concepts should be agreed upon at the March Board meeting to meet that deadline and backing that up to have the ideas identified by February 15. He reiterated that this schedule does not apply to budgetary items. Vice Chancellor Jay Kenton concurred and indicated there will be a capital budget brought to the Board in June and July with additional capital construction plans submitted to DAS by the end of August. He alerted the Board that the Governor’s budget will come out around December 1.

Chancellor Pernsteiner added that the Portland group is also looking at capital projects. President Dyess indicated that items coming out of subcommittees might need review by Ryan Hagemann, Deputy Chancellor for Legal Affairs.

b. SOU, Revised Mission Statement

BOARD DOCKET:

SOU Mission Statement

Southern Oregon University is an inclusive campus community dedicated to student success, intellectual growth, and responsible global citizenship.

Commitments

Southern Oregon University is committed to

- a challenging and practical liberal arts education centered on student learning, accessibility, and community engagement;
• academic programs, partnerships, public service, community outreach, sustainable practices, and economic development activities that address regional needs; and

• outstanding programs that draw on and enrich our unique arts community and bioregion.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

President Dyess then called upon President Mary Cullinan to discuss the proposed mission statement for Southern Oregon University. President Cullinan outlined the newly revised mission statement. She noted that development of the new mission statement involved highlighting Southern’s focus on student learning and community and Southern’s role in relation to the broader community and the entire state, as well as the two major academic areas in which SOU specializes – the arts and the bioregion – and noted that she was pleased to be able to articulate those so clearly. She disclosed a planned new website with links to each of the crucial phrases in the mission statement as part of Southern’s marketing strategy – and that it’s a student project. In response to a question from Director Blair, President Cullinan clarified that it is not just student success, student intellectual growth, and student responsible global citizenship but indeed the whole campus involvement. Director Blair pointed out that he didn’t see anything about teacher education in the mission statement and had been under the impression that was a key element of the Southern mission. President Cullinan responded that Southern’s mission statement had been developed in a broader sense to not seemingly exclude any areas of focus by directly identifying a specific focus. Director Blair countered that as the arts were included, he felt that Southern’s teaching mission should be specifically called out. Chancellor Pernsteiner opined that calling out the arts was more of a hallmark of the institution but that as the regional universities originally began as teaching institutions, they needed to reflect that core element in the mission statements. Director Miller-Jones concurred that it was a matter of perspective. Director Blair reiterated there is important symbolism in naming the teaching focus to which President Dyess added nursing and business as a regional mandate. President Cullinan explained that in framing its mission, Southern is trying to say that it is committed to the region. Director Fisher supported this by noting it really draws from Southern’s communities, specifically the arts community. President Dyess summarized by asking President Cullinan to take the mission statement back to the campus and discuss calling out the pillars of excellence as discussed here. Director Kelly made an additional suggestion, that of clarifying the language of the mission statement for global intellectual growth, citizenship, and success; that it reflect the broader academic community (as President Cullinan had pointed out) rather than just students. Director Francesconi was reluctant to micromanage the development of Southern’s mission statement, noting it is more than merely words; it also represents the process but suggested an alternate approach of discussions with other institution presidents and reviewing their mission statements before going back through the process. Director Blair summarized by indicating that what is really important is that people really understand the impact of the mission statement when they read it. President Cullinan agreed to take the statement back to the campus for further work. The other regionals weighed in with specific programs listed in their mission statements. President Dyess closed the
discussion by noting that there has been sufficient input and the goal is to make the regional focus more crisp. President Cullinan requested a bit more clarification about including specific professional programs and President Dyess suggested that these be called out in the mission statement.

7. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

a. **Standing Committee Reports**

President Dyess inquired of Director Blair whether further comments were necessary involving the Finance and Administration Committee; Director Blair responded there were not, unless anyone not present at the Finance and Administration meeting earlier in the day had questions. There were no questions.

b. **Other Board Committees**

President Dyess called upon OHSU Provost Lesley Hallick to speak briefly regarding the torte-cap decision. Provost Hallick indicated the 5-year financial plan for OHSU would need to be revisited as a result of the decision and noted the huge impact upon it has on OHSU—venturing it to be in the tens of millions. President Dyess indicated it would take a while to reduce that number. She also suggested developing synergy between the OHSU Board and this Board, with which Director Francesconi concurred.

In response to an inquiry from President Dyess, Director Van Vliet indicated that the Board’s Oversight Committee on Sexual Assault was planning its first committee meeting.

President Dyess noted there were no reports from either Joint Boards or College Savings committees. Director Miller-Jones indicated some of the issues involving these committees have been taken to the Provosts’ Council.

8. **PUBLIC INPUT**

President Dyess indicated there was no public input requested for this meeting.

9. **BOARD COMMENTS**

Director Miller-Jones reminded the Board of an event on January 17 to which all are invited and tickets to the event will be in the mail.

10. **DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO BOARD’S EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

President Dyess called for a motion for delegation of authority as follows:
“Pursuant to Article II, Section 5 of the Bylaws of the Board of Higher Education, the Board delegates to the Executive Committee authority to take final action as here designated or deemed by the committee to be necessary, subsequent to the adjournment of this meeting and prior to the Board’s next meeting. The Executive Committee shall act for the Board in minor matters and in any matter where a timely response is required prior to the next Board meeting.”

Director Van Vliet so moved and Director Miller Jones seconded his motion. Those voting in favor included all directors remaining present at the meeting, Director Mendoza having departed the meeting early due to adverse travel weather conditions: Don Blair, Hannah Fisher, Jim Francesconi, Paul Kelly, Dalton Miller-Jones, Preston Pulliams, Tony Van Vliet, and Kirby Dyess.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.