Report of the Meeting of the Board's Ad Hoc Committee
on Student Housing Policies

In the Division of Continuing Education Building
in Portland on November 18, 1966

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. J. W. Forrester, Jr., Chairman
Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson
Mr. Philip A. Joss
Mr. George H. Layman

Mr. Ancil H. Payne
Mr. John W. Snider
Mr. Chas. R. Holloway,
Jr.

OTHERS PRESENT:

Centralized Activities: Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary R. L. Collins;
Mr. H. A. Bork, Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs; Mr. D. R. Larson, Assistant
Chancellor; Mr. J. L. Watson, Comptroller; Mr. J. I. Hunderup, Director of Facilities
Planning; Dr. G. Benjamin Lawrence, Administrative Intern to the Chancellor; Mr. Guy
Lutz, Associate Director of the Office of Institutional Research; Mr. George Diel,
Director Communications Development; and Mr. K. L. Jackson, Budget Officer.

University of Oregon--President Arthur S. Flemming.

Oregon State University--Mr. M. Popovich, Dean of Administration; Mr. G. M. Robertson,
Director of Business Affairs; Dr. R. W. Chick, Dean of Students; Mr. T. F. Adams,
Director of Housing; Mr. James P. Duncan, Director of Residence Hall Program.

Portland State College--Dr. Brock Dixon, Dean of Administration; Mr. W. T. Lemman,
Director of Business Affairs; Mr. J. Malcolm McMinn, Director of Facilities Planning
and Operations.

Oregon College of Education--President Leonard W. Rice.

Eastern Oregon College--President A. M. Rempel.

Oregon Technical Institute--President W. D. Purvine.

Division of Continuing Education--Mr. Kenneth Ahlberg.

At the Board's meeting of March 7-8, 1966, President Holloway appointed an ad hoc
committee to consider student housing policies. He designated the chairmen of the
three major Board committees (Buildings and Physical Facilities, Finance and Business
Affairs, and Academic Affairs, Personnel and Public Affairs) together with the Presi-
dent and Vice-President of the Board as members of the ad hoc committee; the Vice-
President was designated as chairman. The committee members are:

Mr. J. W. Forrester, Jr., Chairman
Mr. Chas. R. Holloway, Jr.
Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson

Mr. Philip A. Joss
Mr. Ancil H. Payne

The Chairman asked the Chancellor to present to the committee and other Board
members present the statement on student housing policies which had been prepared
by Dr. Lieuallen at the request of the ad hoc committee.
During the presentation of the report by the Chancellor, each section and each policy statement contained in the report was discussed, and some changes in previous Board action and in the statement of policies were recommended by the committee. On the following pages is shown the statement on student housing policies as revised by the ad hoc committee at its meeting on November 18, 1966. On final consideration of the statement by the ad hoc committee, all members of the committee voted in favor of recommending the statement as revised by the committee except Mrs. Johnson. She asked that she be recorded as voting against the recommendation that the policy statement be approved by the Board. The committee recommends approval by the Board of the following statement on student housing policies, including the rescinding of certain indicated previous Board actions.
STUDENT HOUSING POLICIES

At its July 1965 meeting in Newport, the Board of Higher Education requested a study of housing policies and procedures to "provide a framework within which the various housing programs could be placed and evaluated." Categories of student housing* suggested for study included:

1. Housing for single students in residence halls.
2. Housing for married students.
3. Cooperative housing.
4. Private residence halls associated with or adjacent to university and college campuses.
5. Fraternity and sorority housing.

WHY STUDENT HOUSING?

The provision of housing for students by state-supported colleges and universities normally is based upon one or both of the following considerations:

1. Living conditions can be established in institutionally owned housing which will provide experiences essential to the educational objectives of the institution. Institutions which subscribe to this point of view and implement it fully will provide residence halls in sufficient quantity to require most students to live in a residence hall for a specified portion of the college years. Normally, exceptions are made for married students, for students residing at home, and for special cases.

2. Since it is not feasible to establish institutions providing the full range of educational opportunities within commuting distance of all communities in the state, it is essential that student housing be provided at those institutions designed to serve students beyond the commuting range. To illustrate, Southern Oregon College is a regional state college planned to serve some of the higher education needs of a large geographical area of Oregon. Residence halls appear to be necessary at Ashland because Ashland is unable

*The term "student housing" is intended to be sufficiently broad in meaning to include food services where appropriate.
to absorb the large number of non-commuting students. To illustrate further, Oregon State University is planned to serve selected higher education needs of the entire state. In view of the fact that Corvallis is unable to absorb the large numbers of non-commuting students, residence halls at Oregon State University are necessary.

The Board of Higher Education bases its student housing planning primarily on the second of these two considerations: namely, that the provision of some student housing is essential if educational opportunity is to be extended to students of all geographical regions in Oregon. The Board recognizes that some institutions will need to enroll more commuting students than others; some institutions will be located in communities better able than others to absorb students in private housing; some institutions will have more fraternity and sorority housing than others; and some institutions will enroll a large proportion of undergraduate, and hence younger, students than others. The percentage of the student bodies, therefore, to be housed in residence halls and other institutionally owned housing will vary and will be determined independently for the several institutions by the Board of Higher Education.

WHO SHOULD PAY FOR STUDENT HOUSING?

The degree of self-support assumed by student housing varies widely among colleges and universities -- and has changed markedly in the State System during recent years.

In some institutions and systems of higher education, residence halls are declared to be self-supporting through board and room charges when in fact some of the operating costs are met from other funds. Such other operating costs may include maintenance and repair, some administrative costs, various utility costs, grounds care, and supervisory and educational counselling.

In some institutions and systems of higher education residence halls are declared to be self-liquidating through room and board charges when in fact some of the capital costs are met from other funds. Such other costs may include land costs and costs of site development. Other funds may include student building fees charged all students.

In the System the practice has swung from partial self-support and self-liquidation a few years ago to nearly total self-support and self-liquidation at present. A few years ago utility costs of student housing were absorbed in
the unrestricted institutional budgets; land for sites for student housing was acquired with state funds; and building fees charged all students were used for debt service. Currently, however, charges to occupants cover all direct operational and capital costs. The only expenses not being charged to student housing operation are indirect administrative costs, some general institutional services such as watchmen and police and grounds maintenance.

Comparisons with institutions in other states suggest that the System has moved further toward total self-support and self-liquidation than have other similar institutions.

In the State System it is expected that, separately for each institution, the rates of charge for student housing shall be such that the income will be sufficient to make each category of housing -- married student, regular residence halls, and cooperative living units -- self-supporting and self-liquidating. Only exceptional or emergency circumstances should lead to authorization by the Board's Office to use income from one category to support the operation of another. Furthermore, only exceptional or emergency circumstances should lead to authorization to use commingled student building fees to assist with the financing of any housing units.

The self-supporting concept, as applied to student housing, anticipates that there shall be sufficient total income from use or service charges to pay all direct costs and designated apportioned major physical plant costs. The apportioned costs would include those for heat, utilities, repairs, insurance and grounds maintenance. The remaining income shall be identified as "net income." In recognition of the regular and frequent use of housing facilities for general institutional purposes, the housing income is not to be charged for minor physical plant costs nor for an apportionment of the administrative cost of the institution and Board's offices. This policy of charging for all direct costs and also for apportioned major indirect physical plant costs is designed to meet the self-supporting requirement of the Constitution.

The self-liquidating concept, as applied to student housing, anticipates that the "net income" shall be sufficient to meet depreciation costs on buildings and structures as well as to provide a reasonable return on the capital investment value. Determination of "reasonable return" shall be based upon (a) the estimated current market value of the land, (b) the estimated cost of replacing the facilities and equipment which usually will be related to the value at which insured, and (c) the composite interest rate of Board of Higher Education bond borrowings under Article XI-F(l) of the Constitution. This "reasonable return,"
presently approximating 6 percent of the capital investment value, will be available for debt service where applicable, thereby meeting the self-liquidating requirement of the Constitution.

In implementing the above policy, it is anticipated that the rates of charge in the regular residence halls within the System and within an institution generally shall be similar. Reports are to be made to the Board periodically regarding the adequacy of earnings and of any needed changes in the percent of earnings.

HOUSING FOR SINGLE STUDENTS IN RESIDENCE HALLS

No effort has been made to reconstruct in detail the early history of residence hall housing. For purposes of this report it should suffice to note that the several institutions comprising the State System of Higher Education when it was created, with the exception of Southern Oregon College, were then providing residence halls with accompanying food service. As the institutions have increased in size the number of housing units has grown, but not in direct proportion. To illustrate, the number of occupants of residence halls on the several campuses in 1933 and the current number are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name Of Institution</th>
<th>Number of Occupants 1933</th>
<th>Percentage of Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Occupants 1965</th>
<th>Percentage of Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3,133</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon College</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Technical Institute</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Portland State College was established, it was declared by statute to be an urban college not of the "campus-type." In other words, it was created to serve Portland area students who could live at home and commute. Consistent with the Board's conclusion that student housing is to be provided for the primary purpose of extending educational opportunity, and since educational opportunity does not appear to be impeded by the absence of student housing at Portland State College, the Board has no plans for constructing housing for students at Portland State College.

When Oregon Technical Institute was established, it was planned to serve the entire state and, hence, included residence halls.
It is the policy of the Board to provide residence halls for single students at all institutions in the System with the exception of Portland State College. The institutions are expected to maintain services and establish regulations which will permit residence hall living to contribute to the institution's educational objectives.

HOUSING FOR MARRIED STUDENTS

Immediately following World War II, the Board acquired a number of temporary housing units at several campuses to provide housing for veteran married students. As the veteran student enrollment diminished, the housing units were used for non-veteran married students and, occasionally, for temporary housing for new faculty members.

In October 1959 the Board requested a report on the "apparent continuing extent of need for married student housing facilities," and the following December adopted a recommendation by the Chancellor

"that when new married student housing facilities are proposed by an institution, a formal occupancy policy applicable to the new housing be presented to the Board for review and approval. Such a policy might, for example, indicate that, to the extent practical, priority will be given first to graduate and research assistants and fellows, then to institutional personnel for a designated maximum period of time, then to other graduate students, seniors and juniors, in that order. This procedure would assist in attracting graduate students and fellows and in helping newly employed personnel from distant locations in securing satisfactory living conditions for a year or longer."

At its December 1960 meeting the Board considered a request for the appointment of an architect for planning the replacement of married student housing units at Eastern Oregon College and adopted the following policy statement:

"As general policy at all of the institutions, if there were a choice between various types of projects to be undertaken, the greatest emphasis should be placed first upon providing living accommodations for single students, then for other facilities such as student centers and health services, and thereafter for family housing. If married student housing units were to be provided, the need therefore should be based principally on the requirements for graduate students, particularly graduate assistants and fellows, rather than for undergraduate students. It recognized, however, that at the regional colleges a significant portion of the undergraduate student body might be older and more mature than at the other institutions. Consequently, there would be merit in helping to meet the housing need for such students. It was concluded that it might be appropriate to plan for the
replacement of the existing temporary facilities for married students at the regional colleges without increasing the total number of such housing units ultimately expected to be available."

To implement the above policy statement, and in accepting the March 13, 1962, report on married student housing, the Board recommended "that the institutional executives proceed as rapidly as possible with the replacement of temporary housing for single and married students." A year later, in March 1963, the Chancellor recommended that institutions "be authorized to proceed with the replacement of temporary housing for both single and married students as rapidly as it is found to be financially feasible." The Board approved the recommendation with emphasis that the "primary purpose of the married student housing program is to provide housing for married students."*

The following table reveals the status of married student housing on the several campuses as of fall term 1965:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOC</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Student Enrollment</td>
<td>11,906</td>
<td>12,248</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>30,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male Student Enrollment</td>
<td>7,965</td>
<td>7,512</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>19,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Married Male Student Enrollment</td>
<td>1,601</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percentage of Male Students Married</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Occupancy of Institutional Housing Units:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Male Students</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Students</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Occupants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Institutional Housing Units Available</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>793</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,168</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is assumed that this emphasis was provided to make clear that no married student housing should be justified on the need to provide temporary housing for new staff members.*
The rationale for providing housing for single students is contained in the section "Why Student Housing?" where it is stated "...that the provision of some student housing is essential if educational opportunity is to be extended to students of all geographical regions in Oregon." This rationale applies also to the provision of some housing units for married students. In addition, however, the Board believes that housing units for married students are needed at the two universities, and to a lesser extent at other institutions, to encourage the enrollment of those able graduate students who qualify as teaching and research assistants.

Thus, the replacement of temporary housing units for married students with permanent facilities, and the construction of additional units where the need can be demonstrated, is encouraged. Such replacement and additional construction must be fully self-supporting and self-liquidating.

The Board believes the restrictions earlier imposed on institutional management of married student housing projects are unduly restrictive and should be removed. Hence, the actions taken in October 1959 and December 1960 (quoted on a preceding page) which suggested occupancy priorities and which specified that "greatest emphasis should be placed upon living accommodations for single students, then for other facilities such as student centers and health services, and thereafter for family housing" are hereby rescinded.

The Board will leave the determination of priorities to the institutional executives to be determined in view of the conditions which exist at the various institutions.

**COOPERATIVE HOUSING**

Before policies can be identified and/or proposed for cooperative housing a distinction must be made between the traditional kind of "coop housing" which has existed on most campuses for many years and another kind of "coop housing," which has been emerging during the past 12-15 years at the two universities. The gradual development of this newer kind of housing is characterized by the establishment of Azalea House at Oregon State University by women of the Home Extension Service; the subsequent building of Heckart and Reed at OSU in 1954; and, more recently, the planning and construction of Avery and Dixon at OSU. At the University of Oregon, the initial steps toward this newer kind of housing occurred when the University leased space in Hendricks Hall to Co-Ed Housing, Inc.,
a cooperative which has operated for several years in various buildings adjacent to the campus. More recently, the University of Oregon has proposed the construction of residence halls designed to accommodate students who would provide a substantial share of their own services in an effort to reduce costs.

Whereas the traditional kind of "coop housing" was largely independent of the institutions, the newer kind of "coop housing" occupies structures built on institutionally-owned land; State of Oregon bonding capacity has been used in providing funds for construction; and institutional residence hall balances have been used to establish the two-year debt service reserves. These residence halls are, then, not separate from the institutions -- they are a part of them.

It is for these institutionally-owned "coop houses" that policy is discussed.

The Board has approved cooperative housing projects at the two universities with the conditions that:

1. the institutions select the students to occupy the units;
2. rental contracts be between individual student occupants and the institutions; and
3. the units be wholly self-supporting and self-liquidating as defined in the section headed "Who Should Pay for Student Housing?"

PRIVATELY OWNED RESIDENCE HALLS

In an earlier section of this report it was noted that the capacities of the several communities to absorb students vary widely in accordance with a number of factors. One of these factors is the availability of adequate privately-owned housing facilities. Privately-owned residence halls, especially designed for and limited to students, constitute an important element of "privately-owned housing facilities" and hence will be a significant factor in determining a community's capacity to absorb students.

It is the policy of the Board to encourage the investment of private capital in residence halls under the following conditions:

1. the facilities shall be constructed on privately owned land;
2. the institution accepts no responsibility for the maintenance of minimum occupancy levels; and
3. the facilities shall meet minimum health and safety standards.
FRATERNITIES AND SORORITIES

The presence of fraternity and sorority houses at the two universities has been a major factor in meeting the housing needs of those two institutions. In fact, fraternities and sororities accommodated 2,430 students at Oregon State University and 1,629 students at the University of Oregon fall term 1965.

Guidelines for fraternity and sorority living are the following:

1. **Fraternities and sororities shall comply fully with the Board's anti-discrimination policies;**
2. **the existence of fraternities and sororities shall be compatible with the educational objectives of the appropriate institution;**
3. **fraternities and sororities shall be housed in privately-owned facilities constructed on privately-owned land; and**
4. **the institution shall be responsible for judging the adequacy of the fraternity and sorority houses for off-campus living for its students.**

In carrying out its responsibilities under (4) above, the institution shall require minimum health and safety standards and assurance that residence in the fraternity or sorority house not interfere with the student's educational objectives.