STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN
HOKE HALL, EASTERN OREGON COLLEGE, LA GRANDE, OREGON

June 9, 1970

MEETING #386-1

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in
Hoke Hall, Eastern Oregon College, La Grande, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. Tuesday, June 9, 1970,
by the President of the Board, Mr. George H. Layman, and on roll call
the following answered present:

Mr. George H. Corey  Mr. John W. Snider
Mr. Chas. R. Holloway, Jr.  Mr. Loran L. Stewart
Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson  Mr. George H. Layman
Mr. Ancil H. Payne

Absent: Mr. Philip A. Joss was out of the country; Mr. Robert D.
Holmes was absent for business reasons.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities—Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Assistant Board
Secretary Jean Oglesby; Mr. Freeman Holmer, Vice Chancellor for Admin-
istration; Mr. J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning;
Dr. Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Mr. D. R.
Larson, Assistant Chancellor; Mr. H. A. Bork, Consultant; Dr. James
Beaird, Director, Teaching Research Division; Dr. Duane Andrews,
Director, Division of Continuing Education; Mr. Ralph Steetle, Director
of Program Coordination, Division of Continuing Education; Mr. J. L.
Watson, Comptroller and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration;
Dr. Carl G. Paetz, Director of Campus and Building Planning;
Mr. Keith L. Jackson, Budget Director; Dr. George Diel, Director,
Communications Development; Mr. Fred Segrest, Administrative Assistant.

Oregon State University—Acting President Roy A. Young; Mr. M. Popovich,
Dean of Administration; Mr. G. M. Robertson, Director of Business
Affairs; Dr. David B. Nicodemus, Dean of Faculty; Col. Charles H.
Blumenfeld, Executive Assistant to the President.

University of Oregon—President Robert D. Clark; Mr. J. O. Lindstrom,
Director of Fiscal Affairs; Dr. John E. Lallas, Director, Office of
Planning and Institutional Research.

University of Oregon Dental School—Dean L. G. Terkla.

University of Oregon Medical School—Dean C. N. Holman; Mr. W. A.
Zimmerman, Associate Dean for Business Affairs.

Portland State University—President Gregory B. Wolfe; Mr. W. T.
Lemman, Jr., Director of Business Affairs; Dr. Robert Low, Vice
President for Administration.
Oregon College of Education--President L. W. Rice; Dr. Ronald L. Chatham, Assistant to the President.

Southern Oregon College--President James K. Sours.

Eastern Oregon College--President A. M. Rempel; Dr. Richard S. Perry, Dean of Administration; Mr. J. C. Lundy, Business Manager; Dr. Lyle H. Johnson, Dean of Students; Mr. C. E. Zahl, Assistant to the President; Dr. Carlos Easley, Dean of Instruction; Mr. James C. Petersen, Director of Dormitories; Mr. Maurice E. Murray, Assistant Professor of Psychology.

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

Others--Dr. B. Hughel Wilkins, Professor of Economics at Oregon State University, representing the American Association of University Professors Federation; Mr. Richard Burke, Fiscal Analyst, Executive Department, Fiscal Management Division; Mr. Gilbert Polanski, Field Representative, Oregon State Employees Association; Mr. Jose' de la Isla, Director of the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) at the University of Oregon, representing the Chicano group for the Governor's Advisory Committee on Chicano Affairs; Mr. Charles R. Wilson, District Manager, La Grande Telephone Company; Mr. R. R. Carey, La Grande resident.

Student Representatives--Mr. James Davis, Chairman, Interinstitutional Union of Students of the Oregon State System of Higher Education; Mr. Ron L. Eachus, President, and Mr. Mike Kment, Vice, President, Associated Students of the University of Oregon.

The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on April 27, 1970, and approved them as printed in the preliminary minutes previously issued.

(Considered by Building Committee, May 18, 1970.)

At its January 26, 1970, meeting, the Board approved the schematic design for the proposed College Center at Eastern Oregon College and authorized the completion of the design development phase of planning. It was reported that the total gross area of the building would be about 63,237 square feet and that, if necessary, construction could be undertaken in two separate phases as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Sq. Ft. Area</th>
<th>Estimated Costs (March 1971)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>41,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>63,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phases I and II combined</td>
<td>63,237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluding site services, roads, walks, landscaping, etc.
As the design development phase of planning progressed, it was concluded after several consultations between institutional officials, the Board's Office and the project architects, that it would be much more desirable to construct the College Center as a single unit rather than to anticipate two stages of construction. It was also determined that the size of the building and the total estimated project costs would need to be reduced. Factors contributing to these decisions included the recently revised enrollment projections, problems relating to the separation of auxiliary enterprise functions between the new unit and existing Hoke Hall, and the fiscal implications of meeting certain Board standards, particularly with reference to food service operations for students living in campus residence halls.

Institutional officials and Architects Campbell-Yost & Partners have filed with the Board's Office a copy of the design development plans which reflect the revised concept of a single building. Generally, these plans conform substantially to the schematic design with the following modifications:

1. The gross area of the total project would be reduced about 10,509 square feet (from 63,237 square feet to 52,728 square feet). The reduction has been accomplished by eliminating certain areas at the east and west ends of the building and by reducing the building modules from 4'0" to 3'8".

2. The estimated direct construction costs for the building would be reduced from $2,109,500 to $1,795,000. For the adjusted gross area of 52,728 square feet, these latter costs would average about $34.04 per square foot. Inclusive of the estimated requirements for built-in kitchen equipment, the direct construction costs would be approximately $1,982,000, or about $37.59 per square foot.

3. The estimated total project would be reduced from approximately $2,820,000 to $2,520,000.

As reported during the presentation of the schematic design phase, the proposed three-level concrete and steel-framed building would be sited near the center of the campus—in an area bounded by Seventh Street, J Avenue, Eighth Street and the north edge of the existing Coliseum parking lot south of I Avenue (vacated). The assignment of interior spaces would permit a rather precise separation of the functions of the Center. The basement level would contain food service support spaces, recreation areas, the College bookstore and mechanical equipment rooms. The first level would be assigned principally to dining and lounge areas, with some meeting rooms. The top floor would include offices and activity areas for student organizations. A combination passenger and freight elevator would be provided. All of the exterior exposed concrete surfaces would receive integral color dash coat stucco to match that on other buildings on the campus. Heating and cooling would be provided from the campus central utility plant now under construction.
With the concurrence of the Chancellor, President Rempel recommended that the design development phase of planning of the proposed College Center at Eastern Oregon College be approved and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to instruct the architects to complete the construction documents phase of planning and to seek the approval of the State Emergency Board to proceed with the project during 1969-1971. Following such approval and the appropriate review of the completed plans and specifications, it is expected that the Board’s Office would solicit bids and award construction contracts within a budget total of about $2,520,000. The project would be financed from self-liquidating bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or other balances available for auxiliary enterprises. Application for an interest subsidy grant has been filed with the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Inasmuch as the funds for the design development of planning are being provided from the interest-free advance of $52,900 approved by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, it was recommended that the following resolution be approved by the Board by a roll call vote:

**RESOLUTION APPROVING THE COMPLETED PRELIMINARY PLANNING REPORT WITH AN ADVANCE FROM THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR THE STUDENT CENTER, EASTERN OREGON COLLEGE, UNDER THE TERMS OF PUBLIC LAW 560, 83rd CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, AS AMENDED**

WHEREAS, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education on behalf of Eastern Oregon College accepted an offer from the United States Government for an advance for preliminary plan preparation of a public work described as a Student Center, Eastern Oregon College, La Grande, Oregon; and

WHEREAS, Campbell-Yost & Partners, Architects, were engaged to prepare a preliminary planning report for the aforesaid public work, and said architects have completed the report and submitted it for approval; and

WHEREAS, the completed preliminary planning report has been carefully studied and is considered to comprise adequate preliminary planning of public work essential to the community and within the financial ability of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education on behalf of Eastern Oregon College to construct;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, the governing body of said applicant, that the planning report submitted by Campbell-Yost & Partners as the basis for detailed planning and construction of the Student Center, Eastern Oregon College, in connection with Department of Housing and Urban Development Project No. P-ORE-3376 be and the same hereby is approved; and that certified copies of this resolution be filed with the Department of Housing and Urban Development as a part of the preliminary planning report.
RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENTS

Project - EOC College Center

 Architects - Campbell-Yost & Partners, Portland

Legislative authorization - Requested in 1969 but not obtained; to be requested from State Emergency Board

Board's priority during 1969-1971 - Phase I - No. 12
 Phase II - No. 27 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Approximate gross area - 52,728 square feet

Estimated total project costs $2,520,000

Estimated direct construction costs

Total - $2,146,000

Total (building and fixed equipment only) $1,982,000

Average (per square foot) - $37.59

Tentative schedule:
 Bidding - March 1971
 Completion - September 1972

Tentative financing plan:
 General obligation bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or other funds available for auxiliary enterprises, including commingled student building fees $2,520,000

In response to a question during the Committee discussion, it was indicated that there had been extensive student involvement in the preparation of the plans for the College Center and that the students supported the proposed project. Also in response to a question, the Chancellor indicated that the president of the institution had the responsibility for the administration and management of the student unions at each of the institutions in the State System. However, he said that operations of the student unions are financed from different fund sources (largely from receipts from income producing activities, such as food service operations) and that this resulted in a greater interest on the part of students in the control and management of the buildings. He said that student centers on two campuses were occupied twenty-four hours a day during the recent period of student unrest but that an administrative decision could have been made at any point for the centers to be cleared.

In response to a question, it was indicated that the Eastern Oregon College project will be presented to the Emergency Board as soon as
it is feasible to do so, because it would be helpful to the state's economy if projects financed from non-state funds could be started as rapidly as possible.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented.

Upon recommendation by Director Corey and second by Director Stewart, the Board approved the recommendations as presented and the above resolution was adopted with the following voting in favor of adoption: Directors Corey, Holloway, Johnson, Payne, Snider, Stewart, and Layman.

Those voting no: None.

The President of the Board thereupon declared said resolution duly adopted by a unanimous vote.

At the March 10, 1970, meeting, the Board authorized the purchase of the Claire E. and Lola M. McManus property located within the approved projected campus boundaries at the southeast edge of the Eastern Oregon College campus, resorting to condemnation if necessary. The property consists of approximately 11.97 acres of unimproved land. At the time of the meeting, the Board's Office and the property owners could not agree as to the fair market value of the property. Subsequent negotiations authorized by the condemnation resolution resulted in the acceptance by the property owners of the Board's final offer of $33,600, the amount recommended by the Assistant Attorney General in the State Highway Department assigned to the case. Accordingly, the purchase was consummated without court action.

The property is in the area intended to provide land for athletic fields and related automotive parking, and funds were provided from the proceeds of sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds authorized in Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Oregon Technical Institute is requesting authorization to offer an option to its curricula in mechanical engineering technology which will give students completing the Bachelor of Technology degree program opportunity to elect specialization in plant engineering technology. The program will require a special appropriation by the 1971 Legislature of $58,050 to get the program underway in the 1971-1973 biennium.

The complete statement of the Oregon Technical Institute request and the analysis of the request by the Board's Office of Academic Affairs are presented in the document Request of Oregon Technical Institute To Offer an Option in Plant Engineering Technology for Students Completing a BT Degree in Mechanical Engineering Technology, prepared
for the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs for its May 18, 1970, meeting. The document referred to is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of these minutes.

The three principal areas of employment for graduates in mechanical engineering technology are product design, product manufacture, and product application.

Oregon Technical Institute offers a strong program of course work in the design area and at the present time most of the mechanical engineering graduates go into this field. Oregon Technical Institute notes three disadvantages in this emphasis in design:

1. Job opportunities in the Northwest are more numerous in application than in either design or manufacture, because this section of the country is more a user of industrial equipment than a manufacturer.

2. The Bachelor of Technology program, emphasizing preparation for supervisory and management positions, is more often useful to an individual with a product application orientation than to one whose orientation is product design, for:

   (a) supervisory and management opportunities are more numerous in the product application field than they are in the product design field,

   (b) the designer is often limited in his opportunities for advancement by lack of a baccalaureate degree in engineering, whereas this situation is less likely to occur in the area of production application.

By offering a strong option in plant engineering technology, Oregon Technical Institute believes it can direct its mechanical engineering students into areas of employment in which there are many job opportunities in Oregon and the Northwest and for which the Bachelor of Technology degree program is particularly well suited.

The objective of the plant engineering technology option is to prepare graduates for employment related to the design construction, operation, and maintenance of plant facilities. The graduate might be employed as assistant to the plant engineer or business manager in an industrial plant, business, or hospital having a large enough physical facility to justify specialized technical supervision. The need for plant engineering technologists results from the increasing complexity of industrial equipment. This increased complexity of equipment and the building of new automated plants requires technologists who understand technical principles involved. The need for plant engineering technicians has been brought to Oregon Technical Institute's attention by representatives of timber products companies, but employment opportunities would not be limited to this industry.
Graduates of associate degree programs in mechanical engineering technology and structural engineering technology will be eligible for admission to the Bachelor of Technology degree program in mechanical engineering technology with option in plant engineering technology.

In order to offer a strong option in plant engineering technology, beginning with the elective hours in the associate degree program and continuing in the technical course work in the baccalaureate degree program, Oregon Technical Institute needs 18 additional hours of course work as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thermodynamics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Circuits and Machines</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Controls</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Planning and Control</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the attractiveness of the opportunities opened up by the new option, Oregon technical Institute believes the program will not only shift student interest in the associate degree program in mechanical engineering technology from product design to product application, but will also attract new students at both the associate degree and baccalaureate degree levels.

Enrollment in mechanical engineering technology has been good. The June 1969 graduating class at the associate degree level numbered 22. Additional students at the baccalaureate level in plant engineering technology would come from the associate degree program in structural engineering technology. The June 1969 graduating class in this field totaled 18 students. Mechanical engineering technology has been one of the more rapidly growing programs at Oregon Technical Institute over the past several years and, with a new option directed toward industrial needs in the Northwest, should be even more attractive to students in future years. Oregon Technical Institute predicts that within a few years the majority of the mechanical engineering students will elect specialization in plant engineering technology.

Total cost to inaugurate the program, detailed below, would be $58,050. Oregon technical Institute states that these funds cannot be taken from the going-level budget in 1971-1973. An appropriation in this amount over the going-level budget is to be requested of the 1971 Legislature. Oregon Technical Institute would plan to incorporate costs of maintaining the program into its going-level budget in the 1973-1975 biennium.
COSTS TO INAUGURATE OPTION IN PLANT ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY IN THE 1971-1973 BIENNium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1971-72</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>Total for Biennium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$12,095</td>
<td>$12,095</td>
<td>$24,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Expense</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,525</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,525</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58,050</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board's Office Recommendation. The Board's Office recommended that the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs recommend approval of the proposed program in plant engineering technology as an option to the Bachelor of Technology degree program in mechanical engineering technology, provided necessary funds to inaugurate the program during the 1971-1973 biennium are provided by the 1971 Legislature.

Committee Discussion. The Committee noted that the option in plant engineering technology had been approved by the Committee in 1968. However, Oregon Technical Institute had been unable to put the program in operation because the program was not funded by the 1969 Legislature. In response to questions from the Committee, President Purvine affirmed that Oregon Technical Institute feels the program is an important one which will attract sufficient enrollment to carry itself as a part of Oregon Technical Institute's regular curricular offerings once the initial investment has been made to get the program underway. President Purvine said the $32,200 requested for an initial increment of equipment assumed that Oregon Technical Institute would obtain substantial contributions of equipment from industry. He said demands of the on-going program, especially the needs for instruction in computer science, made it impossible to allot money from the regular equipment budget to the proposed new program. He said a similar situation existed in the instructional budget - that funds were not available to carry the 1 FTE needed to launch the program during the first two years of the program's operation. Dr. Purvine said that once the initial investment had been made, the program would be absorbed into the regular institutional budget.

Dr. Purvine said the program had considerable support among Northwest industries who would employ graduates of the program, but that the minimum state investment proposed was essential to getting the program underway.

Recommended Board Action. The Committee recommended that the Board authorize Oregon Technical Institute to offer a program in plant engineering technology as an option to the Bachelor of Technology
program in mechanical engineering technology, provided funds to inaugurate the program are made available by the 1971 Legislature.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

(Considered by Building Committee, May 18, 1970.)

The Umatilla Branch Experiment Station was established in 1909 for the purpose of investigating the agricultural problems of sandy, coarse-textured, irrigated soils of the Columbia Basin. The station is located in Umatilla County, approximately 1-1/2 miles south of Hermiston and consists of approximately 450 acres improved with office and laboratory buildings, a modern feed-lot facility, several storage buildings and four residences. The permanent staff includes one professional scientist, one secretary and four technicians. The station research relates primarily to beef and lamb feedlot studies, swine feeding and management, weed control, and horticultural and field crop production. Increased emphasis in recent years has centered on the irrigation and crop production practices and the testing of fruit and vegetable varieties.

The lands on which the station is now located were received from the federal government in 1937, 1938 and 1963, the latter in connection with a trade with an adjacent commercial beef feedlot operator. The conditions under which the properties were transferred to the state include a reversion clause in the event the lands are not used for one year for agricultural research purposes. Moreover, any attempt to alienate or dispose of part of the lands would jeopardize the title to the property. The relocation of the right of way for the railroad serving the area has, in recent years, resulted in several small parcels being cut off from the main station and has made them unsuitable for station purposes. In addition, one large tract of approximately 145 acres has not been used for a number of years because of soil conditions. Moreover, recent trends in research involve the use of the land and equipment of grower cooperators in the area.

The Bureau of Land Management, a division of the U. S. Department of the Interior, has proposed that five parcels of unused unimproved land, totaling approximately 168 acres, be returned to the federal government so that public sale thereof can be made, resulting in the property's being developed for commercial purposes and placed on the tax rolls. Oregon State University personnel have concluded that the operations of this branch experiment station would not be adversely affected by the release of these parcels. The access to the station would remain over the existing county road.

Acting President Young, with the concurrence of the Chancellor, recommended that the appropriate Board officers be authorized to execute a deed and/or other documents necessary to return to the federal government five parcels of land containing approximately 168 acres which are not needed for the Umatilla Branch Experiment Station.
The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Easement for Underground Telephone Lines to Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company, OSU (Considered by Building Committee, May 18, 1970.)

Oregon State University officials have been advised by the Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company that in order to improve telephone service to the Lewisburg area of North Benton County, it is concluded that installing of an underground feeder line would be desirable. Such a program would require a perpetual easement over approximately 2,300 feet of Board-owned land in the Camp Adair area along Highway 99-W. The easement would permit the telephone company to construct, place, inspect, maintain, repair, replace, remove, use, operate and patrol the underground facilities within a 10-foot wide easement approximately 2,311 feet long.

The Board would not be able to blast or dig within five feet of the easement or to plant trees on the easement itself, though the right to use the property for agricultural purposes, not inconsistent with the rights of the telephone company, would be reserved. The telephone company would agree to indemnify and hold the Board, its members, officers, employees and agents, harmless from damages, claims and other actions resulting from the use of the property by the company. The telephone company would compensate the Board to the extent of $200 for the easement, or approximately ten cents per foot, which is the consideration given to other landowners adjacent to Board property. The form of the easement has been revised and approved by the Board's attorney.

Acting President Young, with the concurrence of the Chancellor, recommended that the easement be granted in a form substantially as outlined above.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Report of Bids & Award of Contracts for Arnold Cafeteria and Bloss Hall, OSU

Bids for the construction of Arnold Cafeteria and Bloss Hall at Oregon State University, which had been authorized by the 1969 Legislature, were opened in Corvallis at 8:00 P.M. on April 28, 1970. These bids may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Work</th>
<th>No. of Bids</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>High Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Cafeteria:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$591,000</td>
<td>$648,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$234,800</td>
<td>$280,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$84,895</td>
<td>$88,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloss Hall:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$1,391,000</td>
<td>$1,543,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$496,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$131,920</td>
<td>$140,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bidders for the residence hall (Bloss Hall) were given the opportunity to provide a deduction if they were awarded contracts for both buildings. While all of the bidders did not respond to this option, twelve of the seventeen bidders did indicate a deductible amount. However, the exercising of this option did not change the low bidder to whom the contracts were awarded.

Inasmuch as the sum of the lowest bids was well within the total direct construction allowance and the architects' estimates, contract awards were made and the following post-bid budget was approved:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Arnold Cafeteria</th>
<th>Bloss Hall</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct construction:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General work - Willis A. Hill, Inc., Salem</td>
<td>$591,000</td>
<td>$1,391,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less deduction for combination award</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net General work</strong></td>
<td>$586,500</td>
<td>$1,380,500</td>
<td>$1,967,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work - W. D. Claggett Mechanical Contractors, Inc., Salem</td>
<td>$234,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temp-Control Corporation, Portland</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electrical work - Ross Electric, Inc., Corvallis</strong></td>
<td>$84,895</td>
<td>$131,920</td>
<td>$216,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct construction costs</strong></td>
<td>$906,195</td>
<td>$1,912,420</td>
<td>$2,818,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>$62,248</td>
<td></td>
<td>$62,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>79,550</td>
<td>1130,121</td>
<td>209,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework (landscaping, paving, walks, etc.)</td>
<td>96,783</td>
<td>49,711</td>
<td>146,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable equipment</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>167,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies (2% of direct construction costs)</td>
<td>18,124</td>
<td>38,248</td>
<td>56,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,235,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$3,485,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total of $3,485,000 is $110,000 less than the pre-bid budget estimate of $3,595,000 for the combined work.

Plans and specifications for both projects were prepared by Architects Bear, McNeil, Bloodworth & Hawes, Portland. As indicated to the Board on April 27, 1970, in the report of the acceptance of the final plans and specifications, Arnold and Bloss Halls are to be located south of Finley Hall in the President's Residence Hall Group south of Washington Way and East of Gill Coliseum. Arnold Cafeteria
is to be a one-story structure, plus a partial basement, having a
gross area of approximately 29,500 square feet. It will provide food
service to the 744 students assigned to Finley and Bloss Halls and
will have the capacity to serve an additional 236 students who may
be accommodated in a future residence hall (Miller Hall) within this
complex.

Bloss Hall is to be a seven-story structure, plus basement, containing
approximately 84,755 gross square feet and having capacity for 372
students. The area includes 6,611 square feet of basement space
assigned for general storage. Both buildings are to be of reinforced
cement with exterior finishes featuring brick veneer and exposed
sandblasted concrete. The roof structure of Arnold Cafeteria is to be
framed of structural steel.

A grant application has been filed with the Department of Housing
and Urban Development for an interest subsidy grant. This application
has been reviewed by the agency's Seattle regional office, and notice
of concurrence in the award of the construction contracts has been
received. If the application is approved and a grant agreement is
executed thereafter, the subsidy would provide the difference between
actual interest costs on an approved base of approximately $3,000,000
and interest calculated at approximately 3 percent per year.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Arnold Cafeteria (Incl. land)</th>
<th>Bloss Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architects - Bear, McNeil, Bloodworth &amp; Hawes, Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative authorization in 1969</td>
<td>Chapter 307</td>
<td>Chapter 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's priority in 1969-1971 (Auxiliary enterprises)</td>
<td>No. 17</td>
<td>No. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate gross area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>84,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total project costs</td>
<td>$1,235,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and equipment</td>
<td>$906,195</td>
<td>$1,912,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (per square foot)</td>
<td>$30.72</td>
<td>22.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion date</td>
<td>August 1971</td>
<td>September 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative financing plan:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-liquidating bond borrowings under authority of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and balances available for auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>$1,235,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon State University, the Board's Office has accepted the final plans and specifications which Architects Jeppsen, Miller and Tobias prepared for the proposed Earth Sciences Complex. Funds in the amount of $2,450,000 were authorized for this project by the 1969 Legislature, and it is expected that a request will be presented to the State Emergency Board at its next meeting, on or about June 18-19, 1970, for the release of these funds for expenditure. Should this request be approved, bids will be scheduled to be received in Corvallis in July or August 1970.

The final plans are in substantial agreement with the revised preliminary plans approved by the Board on April 21, 1969. Some very minor rearrangements have been made to the interior offices, laboratories and utility shaft space, but without change to the overall exterior dimensions of the building. Although the Board had approved on January 26, 1970, the request of institutional officials to seek Emergency Board concurrence in the filing of an application with the National Science Foundation for grant support of approximately $760,000, which would have been used to construct an additional floor containing about 17,980 square feet for the Department of Atmospheric Science, this was denied by the Emergency Board on February 20, 1970. Consequently, the estimated gross area of the project continues to be 57,740 square feet as reported previously.

The Earth Sciences Complex would be located adjacent to the existing Oceanography Building and the recently completed Oceanography Addition at the northwest corner of 26th Street and Orchard Street. The main building would be a two-story structure with a full basement that would house the Geology Department on the basement and first floor levels, and the Geography Department on the second floor level. This building has been designed for reinforced concrete construction using the lift-slab method. It would be faced with brick on the exterior of the first floor. It would have structural capacity to accommodate three more floors for vertical expansion. If possible, one spare slab would be "parked" at the roof level at this time.

North of the main building, a one-story lecture hall unit has been planned with separate outside entrances so that it can be scheduled and secured independently of the main building. Basically, it would be a reinforced concrete building with wood facing on the exterior of the north wall. The lecture hall would provide seating for approximately 300 persons.

West of the main building there would be a three-story reinforced concrete connector attached to the two existing Oceanography buildings. This connector would provide additional spaces for the Oceanography Department, including an exhibit space and entrance lobby on the first floor and laboratory-work spaces on the upper floors.

The project would also include the provision of air conditioning equipment to be located in the mechanical room and on the roof of the Oceanography facilities recently completed. This equipment would provide air conditioning for the entire complex of buildings on this site (both new and existing buildings).
A total of approximately 863 student stations would be provided within the various classrooms and instructional laboratories to be constructed and approximately 84 additional office stations are planned.

The direct construction costs of the building and fixed equipment are estimated to be $1,898,955, averaging about $33.47 per square foot for the main building and lecture hall unit and $26.43 per square foot for the Oceanography Connector. These amounts exclude $193,860 budgeted for site preparation, utility services, roads, walks, landscaping and air conditioning equipment for the total complex.

The project would be financed from the General Fund appropriation in Section 1 of Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969 and/or bond borrowings under Article XI-G of the Constitution.

If satisfactory bids are received, it is expected that contract awards would be made by the appropriate Board officials for construction within a total project budget not to exceed $2,450,000.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF FINAL PLANS

Project - OSU Earth Sciences Complex

Architects - Jeppsen, Miller & Tobias, Corvallis

Legislative authorization - Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969

Board's priority - No. 16 in 1969-1971 (educational and general plant)

Approximate gross area - 57,740 square feet (including 4,767 square feet within connector to Oceanography units)

Estimated project costs - $2,450,000

Estimated direct construction costs:
Total (excluding $87,360 for air conditioning equipment and $106,500 for site work and utility connections) $1,898,955
Building $1,772,955
Connector 126,000

Average (per square foot)
Building - $33.47
Connector - $26.43
Building and connector - $32.89

Tentative schedule:
Contract award - August 1970
Completion - December 1971

Tentative financing plan:
State funds (General Fund appropriation and/or bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution) $2,450,000

The Board accepted the report as presented.
At the July and September 1960 meetings of the Board, approval was given to lease to the federal government three acres of land located on the south side of Jefferson Street west of the Mall at Oregon State University to provide a site for a Western Forest Biology Laboratory. The lease with the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station, Forest Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, was signed on February 3, 1961, and extends to February 2, 2011, with an option for renewal for an additional 49 years.

At the December 1960 meeting, representatives of the Forest Service reviewed with the Board their plans for the construction of the Forest Science Laboratory and described the program which would be accommodated in such facilities. Subsequently, the initial unit of the building was contracted and was completed in 1962.

In March 1967, upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the Board approved the leasing of an additional 1.9 acres of land to the federal government south and west of the original three-acre tract in order to permit the Forest Service to provide additional building facilities, outdoor research facilities and automotive parking space. Among other matters, it was indicated that the structures or other facilities to be erected on the leasehold property were to "be compatible with and in conformity to Lessor's architectural and construction standards for University facilities."

Oregon State University officials and Mr. A. T. DiBenedetto, Architect for the U. S. Forest Service, have filed with the Board's Office a copy of the final plans and specifications for the next phase of construction on which bids are to be received June 11, 1970, identified as the Forestry Sciences Laboratory Service Building. This Unit would be a two and one-half story wood frame building interconnected with a three-story reinforced concrete core structure and would be located to the west and south of the existing Forest Science Laboratory. It would be directly west of Oregon State University's new Forestry Building, now under construction. Within the proposed gross area of approximately 11,922 square feet, exclusive of the exterior covered loading dock, space would be provided for various laboratories, growth chambers, cold boxes, cone drying, plant and soil preparation, chemical and bulk storage, shop, mechanical rooms and related service areas. These facilities would be used for research activities in cooperation with universities, private industries and public agencies throughout the western region. Mr. DiBenedetto made a brief presentation regarding the plans for the building.

The proposed Laboratory Service Building is being funded by a recent congressional appropriation of $500,000. The work includes structural backfill on other portions of the site in preparation for future phases of construction, such as three additional laboratory wings, an insectary and greenhouse. The projected development, including the unit now being bid, is expected to total approximately $4,450,000.

The plans and the overall development program for the Forest Service facilities have been reviewed by institutional officials and the campus planning consultant, Mr. Louis DeMonte, and are endorsed by them as being compatible with the long-range campus plan.

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Pursuant to authorization granted by the Board, the Vice Chancellor for Administration has executed options for the acquisition of two properties, both located within the approved projected campus boundaries of Oregon State University, as follows:

1. Hoyt property, 2955 Orchard Street, Corvallis

The property consists of a lot and a portion of another, containing approximately 6,000 square feet, improved with a one and one-half-story frame residence containing several rental units. The purchase price of $24,375 is in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. The property is in an area designated for parking purposes, and funds to finance the acquisition have been provided from the proceeds of sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds authorized by the 1969 Legislature.

2. Rickabaugh property, 1714 "A" Street, Corvallis

The property consists of portions of several lots, containing approximately 5,900 square feet, improved with a single-family frame residence. The purchase price of $13,000 is in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. The property is in an area designated for future residence hall construction, and funds to finance the acquisition have been provided from the proceeds of sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds authorized by the 1969 Legislature.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

At the September 1964 meeting, the Board was advised that a portion of N.E. 17th Avenue in Portland, abutting property obtained in 1949 from the estate of Gertrude F. Collins, was being vacated. Moreover, owners of property abutting on the vacated street on the other side made a gift of the street vacation accruing to their benefit to Oregon state University. The result was that the original parcel of land located on N. E. Holman Street between N. E. 16th and N. E. 18th Avenues in Portland, grew to 34 feet by 84 feet.

There had been no interest shown by persons in the area for the property until recently, when the institution was approached by a real estate firm seeking lots for low-cost housing. The interest appeared strong enough that reappraisals of the property were made and the property offered for sale by public bid in accordance with Board action in September 1964. One bid was received at the minimum price of $1,750 and the transaction has been consummated.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by Finance Committee, May 18, 1970.)

Oregon State officials have advised of increasing problems caused by dogs and other pets being left unattended for long periods of time outside of University buildings. It is intended that unattended dogs will be turned over to the City of Corvallis for disposition in accordance with the City's ordinance.
Acting President Young, with the concurrence of the Chancellor, recommended that the Board conduct a hearing at its regular meeting of June 9, 1970, under the Administrative Procedures Act, and at said hearing enact the following regulations related to the control of dogs and other pets on Oregon State University grounds:

**DOGS AND OTHER PETS ON CAMPUS**

Dogs are not permitted on campus unless under control on a leash of not more than six feet in length and, except for seeing eye dogs when accompanying their masters, are not allowed in any University building except for approved research purposes, or for observation by veterinary clinic personnel.

Dogs will not be tethered unattended outside of any buildings or elsewhere on campus.

Dogs found on campus in violation of these regulations will be turned over to the County Dog Control Officer for impounding and disposition as provided in Oregon Revised Statutes 609.090. Owners whose dogs run at large on the campus are subject to the provision of Corvallis City Ordinance No. 50-63. Students who permit their dogs to be on campus contrary to these regulations are also subject to University disciplinary proceedings.

The regulations shown above shall apply also to other pets whose size, natural characteristics or actions damage University property, create a disturbance, or otherwise interfere with or disrupt normal University activities.

---

*Note: Notice that a public hearing on the above regulations will be held by the Board at its meeting on June 9 in La Grande was sent to the Office of the Secretary of State in order to comply with the Administrative Procedures Act.*

The Finance Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented.

President Layman indicated that presentations in connection with the hearing on the proposed regulations were in order. There being no response to his request, the Board approved the recommendation to enact the proposed regulations.

(Considered by the Committee on Academic Affairs, Personnel, and Public Affairs, May 18, 1970.)

In September 1969, in recognition of the increased activity in the specialized area of computer science, the University of Oregon trans-
ferred responsibility for work in this area from the department of mathematics to a new department of computer science, with degrees granted, as they have been over a period of years, through the department of mathematics.

The University now requests authorization for the department of computer science to offer its own degree programs leading to the BA/BS and MA/MS degrees.

The complete statement of the University of Oregon request and the analysis of the request by the Board's Office of Academic Affairs are presented in the document, *University of Oregon Request for Authorization To Offer BA/BS and MA/MS Degree Programs in Computer Science*, prepared for the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs for its May 18, 1970, meeting. The document referred to is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of these minutes.

Under this proposal, major requirements in computer science, at the baccalaureate and at the master's degree level would be:

**for the BA/BS degree**

24 hours in upper-division computer science
18 hours in upper-division courses in a field in which there is substantial use of computers

**for the MA/MS degree**

30 hours minimum in graduate course work in computer science
15 hours maximum in related field in which there is substantial use of computers.

Computer science is a rapidly developing field. At the University of Oregon, course work in computer science is offered both for students who wish to specialize in this area and for students in other fields whose work requires supporting instruction in computer science. Non-major students at the University of Oregon, and probably on most campuses, outnumber the major students. An illustration of the size of the work load in computer science at a major university the size of the University of Oregon is the fact that 20 graduate students in the department of mathematics are presently (May 1970) pursuing programs which will meet requirements for the proposed MA/MS degree in computer science.

The faculty of the department of computer science currently consists of three members of professorial rank and six instructors. All of the staff except the department head are budgeted part-time to the University's computer center. The department head is presently (1969-70) budgeted .50 to computer science and .50 to mathematics. All three of the members with professorial rank hold the Ph.D. degree. The six instructors each hold the master's degree with considerable professional experience in the field of computer science. In addition, the department has six graduate assistants.
Tentative plans for 1970-71 call for an increase in the time of the department head to .90 FTE in computer science, the assignment of .30 FTE for a fourth staff member at professorial rank from the department of mathematics, and the conversion of one graduate teaching assistant position to a part-time instructorship.

The University of Oregon offers 3 hours of lower-division course work in computer science, 19 hours of work numbered 400 (g) or 400 (C), and 3 hours of 500-level work, plus open-end numbers in research, thesis, reading and conference, and seminar. Only 7 hours of the course work was new in 1969-70, the year the prefix CS was adopted to identify work in this field. The remainder of the courses, and the work offered under open-end numbers, had been previously offered under the Mth prefix.

In 1970-71, the University will add 21 hours of credit work in computer science, 14 hours in new courses, and 7 hours in increased credit for courses already offered.

Equipment and facilities for the program are provided by the University's computer center.

Authorization of the department to offer its own degrees, rather than working through the department of mathematics, will simplify the mechanics involved in supervising degree programs and will involve no additional costs.

Recommendation of the Board's Office. The Board's Office recommended that the Committee on Academic Affairs recommend that the Board authorize the University of Oregon to award BA/BS and MA/MS degrees in computer science.

Committee Discussion. The Committee discussed briefly the development of computer science instruction over the past few years. Dean Charles Duncan, University of Oregon, observed that enrollment in computer science course work, both of students specializing in computer science and of students needing computer science courses to support their work in other fields, had grown so rapidly that both mathematics and computer science would be better served by dividing administration of the programs into two departments. Dean Milosh Popovich, of Oregon State University, said a similar move was being studied at Oregon State University involving the consolidation of work offered in the departments of mathematics, statistics, and electrical and electronics engineering. Oregon State University now offers specialization in computer science through these three departments at the baccalaureate, master's and Ph.D. levels. It was noted that Portland State University also offers work in computer science through its departments of mathematics, applied science, and, at the Ph.D. level, in an interdisciplinary program in systems science.

Recommended Board Action. The Committee recommended that the Board authorize the University of Oregon to award BA/BS and MA/MS degrees in computer science effective with the 1971-72 year. Students completing programs in the department of mathematics during 1970-71
meeting requirements for degrees in computer science may be awarded their degrees in computer science should they elect to do so.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Confirmation of Institutional Degree Lists, UO

In accordance with Board regulations, Mr. John W. Snider represented the Board at the 1969 Fall Term Commencement exercises of the University of Oregon, and Mr. Chas. R. Holloway, Jr., represented the Board at the Winter Term 1970 Commencement exercises of the University of Oregon. They acted for the Board in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas. The signed copies of the list of approved candidates are on file in the Board’s Office.

The Board confirmed the action of these Board members in approving the degree lists.

Alterations to Emerald Hall, UO

In order to provide office accommodations for members of the staff of the Comptroller’s Office who will be located on the campus of the University of Oregon, and to make other minor alterations to Emerald Hall to improve working conditions for personnel within that building, President Clark recommended that an amount not to exceed $7,500 be allotted from the Board’s Reserve for Plant Rehabilitation and Minor Capital Outlay. The Chancellor concurred in this recommendation.

During the Board discussion, it was suggested that perhaps some dormitory spaces would be available for office use and that these spaces could be used rather than to remodel Emerald Hall.

Mr. Hunderup said that the air conditioner unit will be self-contained and can be moved when it is no longer needed in Emerald Hall. He pointed out that the personnel which are occupying the remodeled spaces will be working with the records located in Emerald Hall and it would not be feasible for them to occupy space in other buildings.

President Clark also indicated that if the two veteran's dormitories are removed this summer there will still be a shortage of office space on the campus.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Report of Land Acquisitions, UO

Pursuant to authorization granted by the Board, the Vice Chancellor for Administration has executed options for the acquisition of two properties, both located within the approved projected campus boundaries of the University of Oregon, as follows:

1. Jones property, 1691 Moss Street, Eugene

The property consists of a lot, containing approximately 4,300 square feet, improved with a one and one-half-story frame residence. The purchase price of $13,750 is in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. The property is in an area designated for future student housing and funds to finance the acquisition have been provided from the proceeds of sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds authorized by the 1969 Legislature.
2. Wengert property, 1629 Moss Street, Eugene -

The property consists of a lot, containing approximately 9,600 square feet, improved with a two-story frame residence. The purchase price of $16,750 is in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. The property is in an area designated for future student housing and funds to finance the acquisition have been provided from the proceeds of sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds authorized by the 1969 Legislature.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

The capital outlay program which the 1969 Legislature approved for the Board included $3,765,000 for the construction of the Classroom, Office, Teaching Center: Southwest Campus (Behavioral Sciences) and $2,915,000 for the College of Education Building (excluding $405,000 for Phase III of Central Cooling) at the University of Oregon. Inasmuch as the proposed facilities would share a site in the southwest portion of the campus and because of the integration of their design concept, the preparation of working drawings and specifications was undertaken simultaneously, and the bids for construction thereof are expected to be coordinated within one bid invitation for concurrent construction.

Upon the recommendation of University of Oregon officials, the Board's Office has accepted the construction documents phase of planning which Architects Lutes and Amundson completed for the behavioral sciences and education facilities. Requests for the release of funds for expenditure for both projects were included on the agenda of the State Emergency Board on May 21, 1970, but consideration thereof was deferred to the next meeting on or about June 18-19, 1970. Should the requests be approved at that time, bids for the simultaneous construction of both projects would be scheduled in Eugene in July or August 1970. If approval is received for only one of the proposed projects (most likely the behavioral sciences unit since it had a higher priority than the College of Education Building in the Board's listing of educational and general plant projects for 1969-1971), it may be necessary to delay the bidding until September, or later, depending upon the time required by the architects to revise the plans and specifications.

The construction documents are in substantial agreement with the design development phase of planning approved by the Board on July 21, 1969, except as follows:

1. Because of higher-than-anticipated construction cost estimates, a physical reduction of space in each unit at the upper level was necessary. One wing in the education unit and two wings in the behavioral sciences unit have been omitted from the basic bid requests. However, additive alternates are being provided in the bid documents so that these spaces can be included in the contract if satisfactory bids are received.
2. Certain audio and intercommunication equipment items have been included within the bid documents. These items had been budgeted originally under the equipment category rather than as direct construction costs.

The following table compares the areas and direct construction costs for both buildings for the design development and construction documents phases of planning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Sciences</th>
<th>Design Development</th>
<th>Construction Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross area (including exterior corridors @ 1/2)</td>
<td>109,757</td>
<td>96,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross area (excluding exterior corridors)</td>
<td>98,175</td>
<td>83,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,996,000</td>
<td>$3,053,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and fixed equipment only</td>
<td>$2,906,000</td>
<td>$2,963,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average direct construction costs per square foot:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based upon gross area including exterior corridors @ 1/2</td>
<td>$ 26.48</td>
<td>$ 30.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on gross area excluding exterior corridors</td>
<td>$ 29.60</td>
<td>$ 35.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross area (including exterior corridors @ 1/2)</td>
<td>90,606</td>
<td>83,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross area (excluding exterior corridors)</td>
<td>77,106</td>
<td>69,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,325,000</td>
<td>$2,311,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and fixed equipment only</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$2,221,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average direct construction costs per square foot:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based upon gross area including exterior corridors @ 1/2</td>
<td>$ 24.83</td>
<td>$ 26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on gross area excluding exterior corridors</td>
<td>$ 29.18</td>
<td>$ 32.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The basic structural, mechanical and electrical systems and the exterior design characteristics are similar to those described at earlier Board presentations. The reinforced concrete structural system would be designed with a potential for vertical expansion.
All spaces within the buildings would have provision for heating and air cooling, utilizing steam and chilled water from the campus utility plant.

The first level of the behavioral sciences facility would contain interdepartmental spaces such as classrooms and lecture rooms, an animal laboratory section, undergraduate laboratories for psychology and related service spaces. The second level would contain undergraduate teaching laboratories for anthropology, office laboratories, graduate student research laboratories for physical anthropology, a psychology clinic, resource materials center, offices and related service spaces. The third level would contain offices, office-laboratories for the Psychology Department, and related service spaces.

Within all three floor levels, a total of approximately 99 office stations, 299 classroom student stations and 160 laboratory student stations would be provided.

In order for the current direct construction cost estimate of the architects and their consultants to be maintained within the budget allowance of about $2,963,041 for the building and fixed equipment, it would appear necessary to omit two sections of the third floor level. For the tentative gross area of 83,087 square feet, exclusive of covered exterior corridors and the area of approximately 9,226 square feet within these two third floor sections, the estimated direct construction costs would average about $35.66 per square foot. Institutional officials and the architects will make provision for several deductive alternates in the bidding documents in order to assure reasonably the receipt of bids within the funds available.

The first level of the College of Education Building would contain interdepartmental spaces such as audio-visual facilities with various laboratories and special purpose areas, a preschool demonstration and research center and related service spaces. The second floor level would contain counseling and educational methods laboratories and classrooms and lecture rooms, the general administrative offices for the College of Education and the University Summer School and related service areas. The third floor level would contain offices of the various departments within the College for their respective faculty members, graduate assistants and staff.

The proposed project would assist in meeting a portion of the overall needs of the University by providing approximately 461 classroom student stations, 70 laboratory student stations and about 245 office stations.

Based upon current estimates, in order to stay within the direct construction budget allowance of $2,221,517 for the building and fixed equipment, it appears necessary to omit from the project the third level of the south wing of the building, thus reducing the gross area by approximately 7,897 square feet from that contemplated in
earlier phases of planning. For the total gross area of approximately 69,079 square feet, reflecting the elimination of this area on the third level and omitting the space within exterior corridors, the estimated direct construction costs would average about $32.16 per square foot.

If bids are favorable and the alternate areas can be included within contract, the average direct construction cost per square foot would be reduced. Subsequent to the receipt of satisfactory bids, it would be expected that contract awards would be made by the appropriate Board officials for construction within total project budgets not to exceed $3,765,000 for the Classroom, Office, Teaching Center: Southwest Campus (Behavioral Sciences) and $2,915,000 for the College of Education Building (exclusive of $405,000 for Phase III of Central Cooling being designed by others).

Both projects would be financed from the General Fund appropriation in Section 1 of Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969 and/or bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution and Section 6 of the 1969 Act.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects - UO</th>
<th>Classroom, Office Teaching Center: SW Campus (Behavioral Sciences)</th>
<th>College of Education*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architects - Lutes &amp; Amundson, Springfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative authorization - Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969, Section 2 of the Act</td>
<td>Subsection (1)(b)</td>
<td>Subsection (1)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's priority in 1969-1971 (Educational &amp; General Plant)</td>
<td>No. 11</td>
<td>No. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate gross square foot area: Including exterior corridors @ 1/2</td>
<td>96,655</td>
<td>83,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding exterior corridors</td>
<td>83,087</td>
<td>69,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total project costs -</td>
<td>$3,765,000</td>
<td>$2,915,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated direct construction costs: Total (including site costs)</td>
<td>$3,053,041</td>
<td>$2,311,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and fixed equipment only</td>
<td>$2,963,041</td>
<td>$2,221,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (per square foot): Including exterior corridors @ 1/2</td>
<td>30.66</td>
<td>26.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding exterior corridors</td>
<td>35.66</td>
<td>32.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tentative schedule:
Bidding – July or August 1970
Completion – Summer 1972

Tentative financing schedule:
General Fund appropriation and/or bond borrowings under
Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution
$3,765,000
$2,915,000

*Data exclude Phase III of Central Cooling

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Over a period of time officials of Lane County, the Eugene Water and Electric Board, and the University of Oregon have been attempting to work out a cooperative arrangement for the development of a pedestrian bridge across the Willamette River to Autzen Stadium and Baker Park on the north side of the river. Details of the arrangements are being developed at the present time and certain tentative proposals were transmitted to the Board prior to the June 9 Board meeting.

President Clark, with the concurrence of the Chancellor, recommended that the Board authorize the Executive Committee of the Board to take final action approving such easements or other contract matters as may be required in order to accomplish the objective of building this bridge across the Willamette River. It was indicated that the contribution by the university would involve payment of approximately $6,000 per year until the principal sum of $60,000 has been repaid to Eugene Water and Electric Board. Funds for the University's share of the costs would come from funds available to the athletic department from the abandonment of bus servicing or from other resources which might be available.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented, with the understanding that the final details concerning the construction, easements, contract matters, and financial arrangements will be reported to the Board after they have been approved by the Executive Committee of the Board.

(Considered by Building Committee, May 18, 1970.)

On December 10, 1969, a report was made to the Board that Architects Broome, Selig & Orefinulpsh had been commissioned to design and supervise the construction of the proposed addition and alterations to the Dental School Building for which legislative authorization is expected to be requested in 1971. Based upon price levels applicable at that time, it was estimated that the direct construction costs for the building addition of about 43,000 square feet would be approximately
\$1,567,278, and that the alterations to about 22,138 square feet of the existing building would involve direct construction costs of approximately \$402,539.

Institutional officials and the project architects have filed with the Board's Office the schematic design phase of planning for the addition and alterations work. Although the proposed new area of 46,272 square feet corresponds quite closely to the program for increased space, as adjusted for additional mechanical space, the scope of remodeling has been enlarged considerably and the estimated direct construction costs (both for new construction and alterations) are substantially higher than had been anticipated. In the judgment of the Board's staff, it will be necessary to divide the work into two or more phases of construction if a relatively high priority is to be assigned to any portion of the work in the requests for capital outlay for the educational and general plant during 1971-1973.

Members of the Board will recall that the Dental School moved into its present building in 1956. Since that time, departments have been added in oral diagnosis, dental materials, endodontics, biostatistics, general education, preventive dentistry, physiology and gerodontology. Several graduate programs have also been added, such as operative dentistry, dental materials, orthodontics, pedodontics and periodontology. Research activities have increased significantly, and the existing facilities are crowded. They do not allow for small-group teaching vital to a health-oriented educational program, nor do they allow the faculty to adopt newer concepts in dental education such as those of sit-down, four-handed dentistry, which involves the use of dental auxiliaries in the training of students.

As noted in the descriptive materials furnished to the Joint Committee on Ways and Means during the 1969 Legislature in support of this project (assigned priority No. 22 in the listing of educational and general plant requests for 1969-1971 at an estimated cost of \$2,360,000), the proposed addition to the Dental School Building was expected to provide:

1. The expansion and rearrangement of the patient treatment clinic to provide additional service area and critically needed clinical demonstration and consultation rooms.

2. The development of a dental practice simulation clinic.

3. The expansion of the existing library to include additional stacks and student study carrels.

4. The expansion and modernization of the Department of Continuing Education.

5. The relocation and expansion of the Child Study Clinic, Departments of Pharmacology, Preventive Dentistry, Biostatistics, General Education and Nutrition.
6. The development of an administration core area to serve more adequately the needs of the students, faculty and patients.

Similarly, it was indicated to legislators in 1969 that the released space in the existing building was expected to be reassigned to expand and improve facilities in the following departments:

1. The Department of Periodontology would be moved into the existing Continuing Education facility.

2. A graduate clinical center, including the Departments of Orthodontics, Pedodontics and Endodontics, would be moved into space now occupied by Illustration, Child Study, and Nutrition.

3. There would also be additional space available for the expansion of the Department of Dental Materials.

4. The space vacated by the Department of Pharmacology would be used for the expansion of the Department of Physiology and Biochemistry.

Briefly stated, the schematic design which has now been prepared by the Architects contemplates the physical expansion of the first and second floor levels on the east and south sides (including the construction of new enclosed space on the roof of the clinic), the construction of the first level of a future "expansion tower" at the southwest corner of the building, and the remodeling of 58,015 square feet of area within the basement, ground, first, second and sixth floor levels. As remodeled and expanded, the spaces on these floors would be assigned principally as follows:

a. Basement: Continuing Education

b. Ground floor: Graduate Departments, including graduate clinic and recall clinic; Dental Materials

c. First floor: Undergraduate clinic (expanded from 152 to approximately 185 chairs); oral diagnosis and X-ray facilities; supply, central sterilization, records, reception and waiting areas

d. Second floor: Administrative and faculty offices; "scramble-type" cafeteria; student lockers and lounge areas; dental technique laboratory; auditorium (existing). Also on this level would be the first unit of the future "expansion tower," assigned to the pharmacology and child study departments. This structure would cover part of the existing street system and the main entry to the building at the ground level.
e. Sixth floor: Enlarged library; graduate study area; audio-visual department. (As noted above, the administrative offices currently occupying a portion of the sixth floor would be relocated to the second floor.)

The architects have indicated that the new additions would be constructed primarily of concrete with brick to relate to the existing structure. The new addition over the clinic floor (existing and expansion) would be framed with light-weight steel to allow construction on existing columns and footings. Interior finishes would correspond with those in existing spaces, but "open landscaping" systems are proposed for office, conference, and service spaces where full-height partitions are not required. Utility systems would be integrated with services furnished from the central plant in the Teaching Hospital of the University of Oregon Medical School. Some additional boiler capacity may be required. Air conditioning chillers and heat rejection equipment would be located on the ground floor level. If a cooling tower is to be used, it would be located outside on the ground. Substantial changes in the electrical systems would be made to increase lighting levels from the existing 35 foot candles to 100 foot candles or more in all clinical areas with increases in other remodeled or enlarged areas also.

Based upon the price level expected in August 1970, when the preliminary planning report is to be filed with the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the architects estimate that the direct construction costs for the new addition would be approximately $1,727,930, averaging about $37.34 per square foot for the proposed gross area of 46,272 square feet. Similarly, the estimated direct construction costs of $1,177,007 for the alterations work would average about $20.27 per square foot for the area of 58,069 square feet. The total budget requirements, including not only the direct construction costs but also professional services fees, construction supervision, movable equipment, contingencies, etc., would be approximately $3,610,000. Adjustments would be required for price escalation between August 1970 and the date of bidding following appropriate legislative authorization.

In view of the apparent need to divide the work into two or more phases of planning and construction, it is proposed that the initial project be limited to the construction of approximately 36,272 square feet of new area plus the remodeling of about 36,820 square feet, principally within the first, second and sixth floors. This would accommodate the most urgently needed expansion of the undergraduate clinic areas, the library, and related service areas, and would also permit the relocation of the administrative and clinical departmental offices to the second floor. If possible, the "scramble-type" cafeteria would be installed on this floor level as part of Phase I construction.
For the work contemplated in Phase I, based upon the August 1970 price
level, it is estimated that the direct construction costs, including
fixed equipment would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average (Per sq. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$1,271,868</td>
<td>$35.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations</td>
<td>728,132</td>
<td>19.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total budget requirements would be approximately $2,515,000.

Plans to assign all of the basement floor to the Continuing Education
Department would be deferred. Furthermore, the start of the "expansion
tower" at the southwest corner of the building would be incorporated
within a later phase of planning and construction, thus delaying comple-
tion of permanent quarters for the Pharmacology and Child Study Departments.

With the concurrence of the Chancellor, Dean Terkla recommended that
the schematic design of the proposed addition and alterations to the
University of Oregon Dental School Building be approved and that the
appropriate Board officials be authorized to instruct the architects
to complete the design development phase of planning for those por-
tions of the project which are expected to be included in the initial
phase of construction and remodeling, as described above.

**RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGN**

**Project** - UODS Dental School Building Additions and Alterations

**Architects** - Broome, Selig & Oringdulph, Portland

**Legislative authorization** - None (requested in 1969, but not approved)

**Board's priority** - No. 22 in 1969-1971 (Educational and General Plant)

**Estimated gross areas:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New addition</td>
<td>46,272</td>
<td>36,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations</td>
<td>58,069</td>
<td>36,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>104,341</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,092</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated total project cost:**

- Total: $3,610,000
- Phase I only: $2,515,000

**Estimated direct construction costs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New addition</td>
<td>$1,727,930</td>
<td>$1,271,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations</td>
<td>1,177,007</td>
<td>728,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,904,937</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average direct construction costs (per square foot):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New addition</td>
<td>$37.34</td>
<td>$35.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>19.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative schedule (Phase I):
Bidding - April 1972
Completion - April 1974

Tentative financing plan (Phase I):
State funds (General Fund appropriation and/or bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution) $2,515,000

In response to a question during the Committee discussion concerning the possible priority number for this project in the 1971-1973 capital construction list, it was indicated that it could not be determined at this time. The project was assigned Priority No. 22 in the 1969-1971 list but it was not funded by the 1969 Legislature. In addition, the recent freezing of funds by the Governor and Emergency Board for the majority of projects approved by the 1969 Legislature causes further uncertainty as to the relative priority the Dental School Building Addition and Alterations may have in the 1971-1973 capital construction requests. Mr. Hunderup indicated that under normal conditions a project which had not been funded by a previous legislature would be higher in the priority requests for the succeeding biennium. However, this may not be true in the case of the Dental School Addition since the appropriations have not been released and construction started on most of the projects approved by the 1969 Legislature, which might cause a number of 1969-1971 projects to remain ahead of the proposed 1971-1973 request for Dental School construction.

It was stated that the possibility of federal funding for a portion of the Dental School project is unlikely because federal programs at present include a requirement that additional dental students receive training as a result of the proposed construction. Efforts are being made to have this requirement modified on the basis that it might be equally advantageous to make the practicing dentist more efficient by providing better training, including the use of dental technicians, thus enabling him to care for more patients.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.
Pursuant to the disposition agreement for land entered into with the Portland Development Commission, as reported at the December 9, 1968, meeting of the Board, the tenth and eleventh acquisitions of land have been consummated. The transactions (No. 2-70 and No. 3-70) consisted of eight parcels involving a total of $278,972.50, summarized as follows:

1. One parcel in Block 190 consisting of 5,000 square feet at a total price of $46,715.
2. One parcel in Block 188 consisting of 6,000 square feet at a total price of $53,800.
3. One parcel in Block 267 consisting of 5,000 square feet at a total price of $36,805.
4. One parcel in Block 269 consisting of 13,000 square feet at a total price of $60,180.
5. Two parcels in Block 240 consisting of 7,000 square feet at a total price of $32,410.
6. Two parcels in Block 232 consisting of 15,600 square feet at a total price of $49,062.50.

Funds to finance the acquisitions will be provided from proceeds of the sale of the 1966 issue of Article XI-G bonds for acquisition of land in the area of development of Portland State University.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

The Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education has inaugurated a series of activities that will result in national standards for automatic data processing in administrative aspects of higher education. Portland State University is one of eleven institutions selected to test a "Resource Requirements Prediction Model."

The total costs of Portland State University participation in this activity are estimated to be $53,179, of which $35,638 is expected to come from an Office of Education grant to WICHE. The difference should probably be funded by the State System, since the work being performed at Portland State University will be of ultimate benefit to all of the institutions in the System.

At the request of Portland State University, the Vice Chancellor for Administration, with the concurrence of the Chancellor, recommended that $17,541 be allocated from the Board's Unappropriated Fund to assist in meeting the costs at Portland State University of the pre-implementation phase of the WICHE RRPK-1 project.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.
On April 27, 1970, upon the recommendation of Oregon College of Education officials, the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning inspected and accepted the work performed by the three principal contractors for the Science Building, subject to the completion of a few minor items. A revised semifinal budget for the project is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on September 9-10, 1968:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Increase (or Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General work - Robert D. Morrow, Inc., Salem</td>
<td>$1,099,084</td>
<td>$1,022,400</td>
<td>$(13,316) (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work - Bowen Bros. Plumbing &amp; Heating, Inc., Salem</td>
<td>431,840</td>
<td>431,508</td>
<td>332 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work - Marion Electric, Salem</td>
<td>146,004</td>
<td>146,237</td>
<td>(233) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$1,676,928</td>
<td>$1,600,145</td>
<td>$(13,217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - Change order credits (approximate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net direct construction costs</td>
<td>$1,654,928</td>
<td>$1,577,891</td>
<td>$9,037 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs and landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes reinstatement of house structure, a planter and installation of additional see changes incorporated within e:

(2) Includes the provision f hood exhaust fans; the rough coolers in the greenhouse pl tions to the fire sprinkler ceiling diffusers; and othe change orders.

(3) Includes electrical w other changes incorporated

(4) Includes fees for ls systems.

(5) Reflects reinstatement from initial post-bid b
Plans and specifications for the Science Building at Oregon College of Education were prepared by Architects Hewlett, Jamison & Atkinson (formerly Hewlett & Jamison) of Portland. The reinforced concrete building is located near the intersection of Jackson Street and Monmouth Avenue and provides facilities for general biology, botany, zoology, general chemistry, organic chemistry, microbiology, geology, analytical and physical chemistry, and physical science. Exterior finishes of the building include brick veneer with some precast exposed painted concrete. The building is ventilated mechanically using air heated from exchange units which utilize steam from the central heating plant. Air cooling is provided by an integral chiller system having a cooling tower on the roof. An elevator has been provided to serve all floor levels including the roof level.

Mechanical and storage spaces, laboratories with related staff offices, photo laboratories, an electronics and computer shop, a natural history laboratory, an audio-tutorial laboratory and quarters for small animals are in the basement level. At the first floor level, two demonstration lecture halls provide seating for 66 and 108 students, respectively. This floor also includes a general-purpose classroom, teaching laboratories, offices and related service areas. An administrative office, conference room and the main entrance lobby are located in the connector between the lecture hall wing and the main building. The second floor level includes laboratories, a general-purpose classroom, offices and related service spaces. A greenhouse has been provided on the roof. Approximately 254 classroom student stations, 280 laboratory student stations, and 28 office stations are provided within the project.

For a gross area of 46,927 square feet, the direct construction costs of $1,586,928 average about $33.82 per square foot, including built-in laboratory fixtures and equipment.

Sources of funds for the project included about $1,191,458 from the General Fund appropriation authorized under Chapter 404, Oregon Laws 1967, $6,875 from building use credits and about $571,667 from a federal grant under Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended. These amounts are subject to adjustment following the final audit of the Office of Education in connection with the original federal grant and a supplemental grant application being processed by the Oregon Educational Coordinating Council.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OCE Science Building

Architects - Hewlett, Jamison & Atkinson, Portland

Legislative authorization - Chapter 404, Oregon Laws 1967

Board's priority - No. 10 in 1967-1969

Approximate gross area - 46,927 square feet

Total project costs - $1,770,000
Estimated direct construction costs:
- Total: $1,586,928
- Average (per square foot) - $33.82

Tentative financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation authorized by Chapter 404, Oregon Laws 1967: $1,191,458
- Building use credits: $6,875
- Federal grant under Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended: $571,667
- Total: $1,770,000

During the Board discussion, Mr. Hunderup expressed appreciation to the students and staff at Oregon College of Education who had helped to make the transition into the new building as successful as it was. He said there was a tremendous amount of volunteer effort expended to transfer from the old Administration Building the science apparatus that was to be used in the new building. The students provided much of the initiative and most of the work necessary to do this moving and he suggested that the record should show an expression of appreciation for their assistance. He also commented that the new building appeared to be a very well designed unit which would be satisfactory for the teaching of college level science.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by the Committee on Academic Affairs, Personnel, and Public Affairs, May 18, 1970.)

Southern Oregon College requests authorization to offer an undergraduate major program in geology, leading to the BA/BS degree, effective with the 1971-1973 biennium. Southern Oregon College estimates that the major program will cost $31,450 in 1971-72 and $20,800 in 1972-73 over the amount budgeted for geology instruction in 1970-71. This is a total of $52,250 for the 1971-1973 biennium which Southern Oregon College would need to get the program under way, to be requested as a special appropriation by the 1971 Legislature.

The complete statement of the Southern Oregon College request and the analysis of the request by the Board's Office of Academic Affairs are presented in the document Request of Southern Oregon College for Authorization To Offer a BA/BS Degree Program in Geology, prepared for the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs for its May 18, 1970, meeting. The document referred to is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of these minutes.

The program proposed by Southern Oregon College would be similar in its requirements to other baccalaureate degree major programs at that institution. Each student would complete all college and general education requirements as prescribed by the institution for liberal arts majors and major requirements prescribed by the Department of Geology.
The University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University offer baccalaureate degree programs in geology. The University of Oregon and Oregon State University offer graduate work through the Ph.D. level. Portland State University offers a master's degree program, beginning with 1970-71.

The number of degrees granted in geology has increased rather markedly over the past five years, both within Oregon and in the nation. Baccalaureate degrees granted in Oregon increased from 16 in 1964 to 57 in 1969, an increase of 256.3 percent. Nationally, baccalaureate degrees in geology increased from 1,087 in 1964 to 1,689 in 1968, the most recent year for which figures are available, an increase of 55.4 percent. Comparable percentage increase for Oregon for the years 1964 to 1968 was 150.0 percent. In 1968, Oregon, with approximately 1 percent of the nation's population, produced 2.37 percent of the nation's baccalaureate degree graduates in geology.

Master's degrees granted fell in number both in Oregon and nationwide in 1965 and 1966. Oregon production in 1968 was 12, the same as the number produced in 1964. Nationally, production had increased from 519 in 1964 to 591 in 1968, an increase of 13.9 percent. During three of the last five years, Oregon has produced over two percent of the nation's production of master's level geologists.

Production on the doctoral level in the nation as a whole has held fairly level at around 250 a year. Oregon production has been erratic, ranging from none to 3, less than might be expected on the basis of population.

Southern Oregon College now offers the freshman and sophomore years of a major program in geology.

G 201, 202, 203 Geology, 4 hours each (freshman year)
G 311, 312, 313 Mineralogy and Lithology, 4 hours each (sophomore year)

Southern Oregon College was authorized to offer a third sequence for geology majors, G 341, 342, 343 Introduction to Paleontology-Stratigraphy, effective with the 1969-70 year but has not scheduled the course because increased enrollments in the nonmajor course G 100 Fundamentals of Geology; G 201, 202, 203; and G 311, 312, 313 provided a full teaching load for the two geologists on the Southern Oregon College staff.

In order to inaugurate a major program in geology, Southern Oregon College will need to activate the sequence in paleontology-stratigraphy and add 18-21 hours of course work and open-end numbers in research, reading and conference, and seminar.

Southern Oregon College's geology staff consists of two professors, each of whom holds the Ph.D. degree. These professors are fully employed with the present program. A third staff member with specialization in structural geology would be required to offer the major program. He would teach the three new junior year courses and help with the lower-division instruction, thus releasing a portion
of the time of one of the present staff members to offer the course in Paleontology-Stratigraphy. Southern Oregon College does not believe it can justify the third staff member during the 1971-1973 biennium on the basis of enrollments in the major program. It therefore requests that the cost of this person be provided by special legislative appropriation. The position will be picked up in the going-level budget in 1973, 1975. Amount to be requested for this position for 1971-1973 is $24,800.

It is anticipated that a sequence in petrology and petrography would be added as soon as funds and enrollment permit employment of a fourth staff member. This would possibly occur in 1973-74. An allotment for equipment for this course is included in the proposed budget.

Mr. Norman Alexander, Southern Oregon College library director, estimates that $3,000 would be required to bring the library collection up to a minimum level permitting inauguration of a major program. An expenditure of $1,500 would be required annually to develop and maintain the collection. Southern Oregon College does not feel it can take the sums needed to build up a minimal starting library to inaugurate the program out of its regular library allotment. It therefore asks that the Board approve a request to the legislature for a special appropriation of $4,500 for this purpose.

Equipment needed to establish the proposed major program including equipment for the proposed new courses, some additional material for the paleontology-stratigraphy course, and equipment for the desired sequence in petrology-petrography would require $13,450 in 1971-72 and $6,000 in 1972-73, a total of $19,450 to be requested of the 1971 Legislature. A portion of this expenditure could be delayed, if the petrology-petrography course is not instituted the third year of operation of the programs now planned, but Southern Oregon College points out that the geology staff feels that this sequence is necessary to a sound program in geology.

Geology offices and laboratories are housed on the first floor of the new science building at Southern Oregon College. The space is adequate to house the program during its first years; however, additional office space would be needed soon. This will be provided from space made available in the science building by transfer of staff into the new classroom-music building when it is completed.

Several circumstances favor establishment of an undergraduate major program in geology at Southern Oregon College:

1. Southern Oregon College has attracted two young, well-trained geologists to its staff. The department, though small, is active and contributes to the academic quality of Southern Oregon College.
2. There is considerable interest in geology in the southern Oregon region with the result that enrollment in geology courses at Southern Oregon College is excellent, especially considering the fact that Southern Oregon College does not offer a major program in this field.

3. The geologic setting of Ashland provides a wide variety of rock types and structure within a short distance of the campus.

4. The University of Oregon uses the Southern Oregon College facilities for its summer geology field camp. The University of Oregon department reports that it finds the geologic resources of the area and the facilities provided by Southern Oregon College "unusually good" and plans to continue the arrangement. Southern Oregon College geology majors will be welcome in the University of Oregon summer field course.

Southern Oregon College points out that geologists are employed in Oregon in a wide variety of positions. Employment opportunities are not restricted to mining and petroleum companies although nationally these remain the largest employers of geologists in the United States as a whole. Southern Oregon College states that the irregular hiring practices of the mining and petroleum industries, which have resulted in alternating periods of surplus and shortage of geology graduates, have leveled off. This is confirmed by experience at the University of Oregon.

However, the University of Oregon reports the total job market for master's and doctoral degree graduates has decreased because of the decrease in the number of new positions in geology in higher education.

The University of Oregon experience also supports Southern Oregon College's analysis of the job market in respect to professional employment. The University of Oregon reports that the master's degree is required for employment as a geologist. Baccalaureate degree graduates who do not go on to graduate work find employment in sub-professional activities in industries employing geologists, or in various capacities in business and industry and government where a background in geology, while not required, is helpful; or in positions unrelated to geology requiring a baccalaureate degree.

Southern Oregon College places considerable emphasis in its presentation on the need for earth science teachers in the public schools. Space exploration and emphasis on the environment have given new interest to studies in the earth sciences. However, at the present time there is no provision in the teacher certification requirements for work in the earth sciences.

Discussion by the Committee. Dr. Romney recalled for the Committee that some years ago the Board established the policy that undergraduate programs in the liberal arts should be established at the regional colleges as funds were available and needs were apparent.
Through implementation of this policy, Southern Oregon College now offers 15 different baccalaureate degree majors in the liberal arts in addition to programs in the professional fields of education, business administration and law enforcement. All 15 programs developed to date are in areas in which the institution offers substantial programs for the preparation of teachers. The impact of adding a baccalaureate degree major in an area where the institution has substantial resources in support of its programs in teacher education is primarily a more economic use of these resources. The present request, Dr. Romney pointed out, is the first request for a departmental degree major in a field in which the institution does not offer a program in teacher education. Thus the department have already developed resources in an upper-division enrollment of students pursuing a teaching major.

Dr. Romney pointed out that Southern Oregon College considers geology a useful and desirable offering which is justified to round out the curriculum in an institution of 4,000 students. He said while the program would be small, it was expected to grow so that during the second (1973-1975) biennium it could be supported from the regular institutional budget. Possibly enrollment at that time would support the addition of a fourth staff member.

Members of the committee pointed out that the amount of money involved is about the same as the amount needed to inaugurate a program in plant engineering technology at Oregon Technical Institute, but that the situation was somewhat different in that there was no program in plant engineering technology available at present in the state while there were three programs in geology.

Dr. McGill said Southern Oregon College placed a high priority on development of the program in geology, but he did not feel that the third faculty member needed to get the program underway during the 1971-1973 biennium could be taken from the new positions allotted to Southern Oregon College as a part of the regular budget.

In respect to other programs not yet offered by Southern Oregon College, Dr. McGill said that during the next few years requests would be made for baccalaureate degree programs in Spanish, French, and German and for a basic norm program in counseling. Sometime in the next five years Southern Oregon College may request a baccalaureate degree in philosophy.

Dr. William Purdom, associate professor of geology at Southern Oregon College, said enrollment in geology courses offered to date showed considerable interest among students who did not intend to major in geology. He noted that geology was the only science offered by the Division of Science at Southern Oregon College in which there was no major program.

Chancellor Lieuallen suggested that the Board might consider a third alternative, since Southern Oregon College did not believe it could undertake the program out of its going-level budget, and since there appeared to be some reluctance to ask the legislature to provide
financing for the program during the next biennium. This third alternative, he said, would be for the Board to encourage Southern Oregon College to develop its resources in geology, as funds and enrollments would permit, with the anticipation that once these resources were developed to the level required for a major program, the program would be authorized.

Dr. McGill said another possibility would be to ask the legislature for a special appropriation for all the proposed budget but the new staff member, with the understanding that if the budget for the 1971-1973 biennium provides staffing at the going-level as requested, Southern Oregon College would allot one of these positions to geology, but if the staff requested is not provided, the additional 1,00 FTE required to inaugurate the program in geology would need to be provided by special appropriation.

Recommendation of the Committee. Mrs. Johnson and Mr. Layman indicated that they were reluctant to take action on a recommendation to the Board since Mr. Snider had had to leave before some of the alternatives to the proposal had been discussed. It was therefore decided that a recommendation would be made orally at the June 8, 1970, meeting of the Board.

Board Discussion. Mrs. Johnson stated that the Committee on Academic Affairs recommended that Southern Oregon College's request for a BA/BS in geology not be approved at this time. She said the committee recognized Southern Oregon College's strong interest in geology and the proximity of geological resources in the southern Oregon region, but did not feel there had been demonstrated a need and urgency for the development of a major program to warrant a separate request for funding to the 1971 Legislature.

President Sours commented that he hoped the staff's disappointment in not getting a major program in geology would not discourage further development of work in the area. He asked if the Board would look favorably on Southern Oregon College's exploring the possibility of a cooperative program with the University of Oregon.

Mrs. Johnson said she felt the Committee on Academic Affairs would be receptive to such a proposal. Mr. Stewart suggested that Southern Oregon College talk also with Portland State University and Oregon State University concerning the possibility of cooperative arrangements.

The Board concurred in the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Affairs that the request of Southern Oregon College for a BA/BS in geology not be approved at this time.
Pursuant to authorization granted by the Board, the Vice Chancellor for Administration has executed an option for the acquisition of the following property located within the approved projected campus boundaries of Southern Oregon College:

**Stroup property, 668 Roca Street, Ashland**

The property consists of a lot, containing approximately 39,432 square feet, improved with a one-story frame residence. The purchase price of $13,000 is in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. The property is in an area designated for future educational and general facilities and funds to finance the acquisition have been provided from the General Fund appropriation within Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969, or the equivalent.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by Building Committee, May 18, 1970.)

On October 24, 1961, the Board received the transmitter building and land of the KEX-FM radio station from the Westinghouse Broadcasting Company. Since that time the property, consisting of approximately 1.5 acres, has become the site of the KOAP-FM radio station operated by the Division of Continuing Education. The three property owners adjacent to the Board's property on the north, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Condit, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Schmeer, and Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Zimmerman, have become concerned because of a 1-1/2 foot overlap of the boundary lines. It appears that the overlap occurred as a result of an error in platting property within the Slavins Addition in the early 1880's and the platting of Healy Heights presumably sometime thereafter. The area involved is approximately 1-1/2 feet wide and some 330 feet long, less about 80 feet for two platted streets, or about 375 square feet of land. The strip has been incorporated as part of the landscape development of the three residential properties and is not needed as part of the transmitter site.

Rather than to involve the title insurance companies in litigation for such a nominal overlap, one of the property owners, Mr. Schmeer, has offered to pay the Board $150 for quitclaim deeds to each of the property owners for the indicated overlap.

Director Andrews, on behalf of Vice Chancellor Romney, recommended, with the concurrence of the Chancellor, that upon receipt of the $150 payment from Mr. Schmeer, appropriate Board officers be authorized to quitclaim title to that portion of Block 13 and Lot 4 of Block 12 of Slavins Addition lying within Lot 1 of Block 6, Lot 1 of Block 7 and Lot 1 of Block 8 of Healy Heights Addition.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented.

During the Board discussion, Mr. Payne asked whether there were any restrictions as to sale in the original conditions under which the property was given because property is sometimes given subject to restrictions on subsequent sale.
Mr. Hunderup responded that it was his understanding that this point had already been cleared but that he would check further with the Board's attorney to be certain.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

The Committee on Academic Affairs, Personnel, and Public Affairs met for a regular meeting at 11:00 A.M., May 18, 1970, at the University of Oregon Medical School. The Committee considered the following matters:

1. Chancellor Lieuallen's statement re campus disturbances. The report follows on this page and succeeding pages.

2. University of Oregon request for authorization to award BA/BS and MA/MS degrees in computer science.

3. Oregon Technical Institute request for authorization to offer an option in plant engineering technology for its bachelor of technology program in mechanical engineering technology, provided funds to inaugurate the program in the 1971-1973 biennium are made available by the 1971 Legislature.

4. Southern Oregon College request for authorization to offer BA/BS degree programs in geology, provided funds to inaugurate the programs in the 1971-1973 biennium are made available by the 1971 Legislature.

A report of the Committee's meeting is presented in the document Report of the Meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs, May 18, 1970. This document is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of these minutes.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

At the meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee on May 18, 1970, Mrs. Johnson said that campus disorders had occurred during recent weeks on campuses all over the country. Specific incidents during the previous two weeks had resulted in a request from the Committee on Academic Affairs for the Chancellor to present a report to the Board on the situation in State System institutions. She said that many of the problems which lead to campus disorders originate outside the campus but they have nevertheless created considerable problems within it.

In response to this request, the Chancellor presented the following report:

The recent disorders which struck most of our campuses profoundly shocked both the academic community and the general public. The actual physical injury and property damage at Portland State University and the loss of lives on campuses in other states, coupled with major interference with educational processes, have produced intense and widely varying reactions from many sources, including students, faculty members, administrators, parents, public officials, and other taxpayers.
Although most of the counsel from public officials has been moderate, and has urged a "cooling-off" period before reaching decisive conclusions, some persons have expressed a basic lack of confidence in administrative responses to the many crises which have confronted us.

The Board's Office and Board members have received expressions from over 1,000 persons, most of whom are in profound disagreement with the actions we have taken. The Governor's Office, too, has been inundated with protests over the conditions existing, or alleged to exist, on the campuses of the State System.

Only sheer arrogance could lead us to dismiss the criticisms and defend our administrative decisions as being wholly appropriate and fully responsive. We were faced with conditions during the past two weeks which are unprecedented in higher education. If mistakes had not been made, it would have been miraculous. I am persuaded that administrative mistakes, at both the institutional and Board's Office levels, were made. If we do not learn from those administrative mistakes, it will be inexcusable.

One thing more about administrative error. Campus disorder, including campus closures and physical injury to participants, bystanders, and law enforcement officers, has spread across the nation, and even around the world. Not all of that disorder resulted from administrative error. Much of that disorder resulted from circumstances related to issues over which higher education officials could exert little or no control.

In addition to allegations of inept management by administrators, some public reaction has been directed toward the Board itself. Questions have been asked, both privately and publicly, about the alleged failure of the Board to make management decisions during the campus crises.

In our many discussions with Board members about the appropriate role of a governing board, as distinguished from the appropriate role of paid administrators, you have emphasized repeatedly the policy making role of the Board. The staff, the Board has declared in both its verbal directives and its policy statements, is to be held accountable for making administrative decisions consistent with Board policy. With this judgment I heartily concur.

Thus, rather than asking why the Board "failed to take adequate administrative action" during the crises, more appropriate questions would be, first, "Were the administrative decisions consistent with Board policy?" and, second, "Is Board policy fully adequate in view of the current circumstances?"

And it is to these two questions that I believe the Board should address itself.

I. The first question, then, is "Were the administrative decisions consistent with Board policy?"
The essential policy statements germane to this question appear to me to be contained in the document the Board approved December 9, 1968, when it considered the student role in academic governance. In that document the Board declared, among other things, the follow-
ing:

a. "The president is the chief executive officer of the institution over which he presides. He is... responsible to the Chancellor and the State Board of Higher Education for all aspects of the institution's operation..."

b. "Institutional rules and regulations governing student participation and conduct should reflect the institutions' obligations to..."4. Preserve and protect the right to assemble peaceably, and the right to petition authorities.

But resorting to violence, physical abuse of persons, or threats of such abuse, destruction of property, or overt interference with the operation of the institutions is contrary to the spirit and freedom of the academic community and should be dealt with by appropriate institutional and/or legal sanctions..."

In order that the Board satisfy itself that these policies have been followed, I suggest that the Academic Affairs Committee direct the Board's Office to report to the Board at its June meeting and to speak especially to the following:

1. To what extent was the Board's policy, as stated in (b) above, violated on the several campuses under the Board's jurisdiction?

This section of the report should identify instances of physical violence, destruction of property, and interference with the operation of the institutions.

2. Were any of the administrative decisions in violation of the Board's policy as stated in (b) above?

3. Did any of the members of any of the faculty groups participate in or encourage any disruptive activities?

4. To what degree were non-students involved in the disorders?

II. The second basic question to which the Board should address itself is, "Do we need any further policy statements to guide the institution heads in carrying out their administrative responsibilities?"

I suggest that the Academic Affairs Committee direct the Board's Office to prepare a response to that question to be submitted to the Board at its June meeting.
The response should take into account issues such as the following:

1. What is the acceptable role of members of a faculty during a strike or threatened strike?

2. Under what circumstances should members of a faculty have their pay suspended?

3. Under what circumstances, if any, should normal educational activities and procedures of an institution be modified?

I have scheduled a staff meeting for tonight at which time I will meet with the institution heads. We will have an opportunity at that time to discuss the reports which you might direct us to make and to examine the need for more precise policy statements.

In the meantime, it is my expectation that the institutions, as institutions, will continue to remain neutral on external public issues, and will devote their resources to carrying out the instructional, research, and service functions assigned to them by the Board of Higher Education and by the people of Oregon.

It was moved by Mr. Layman that the Committee request the Chancellor to prepare a report for the June 9 Board meeting in accordance with the suggestions contained in the Chancellor's statement. Mr. Stewart indicated that he would suggest that consideration be given to conditions under which a faculty member should be suspended as well as conditions under which his pay should be withheld. He said conditions for the suspension of students should also be indicated. He said there are some circumstances involving participation in campus disorder in which the faculty member or student should be suspended from the institution. The Chancellor indicated that it would be possible to explore these two questions in addition to the ones mentioned in the report.

Mrs. Johnson commented that there have always been divergent views in an academic community and the right to express these viewpoints has been accepted under the tenets of academic freedom. However, she stated that the kinds of disruptions and the kinds of change in institutional responses which are currently being faced strike at the heart of academic freedom itself. She said that some recent writers have indicated that even the structure of the university may be at stake in terms of its mission and operation as it has previously been understood. Mrs. Johnson said that there is a real problem in dealing with the presence of nonstudents which appears to be a factor in campus disorders at nearly every institution. Furthermore, the disruptions have arisen nationally on a timing schedule which indicates that there are ramifications beyond any individual campus or any individual state.

Mr. Payne said the Chancellor's report was timely and germane but that it should be remembered that higher education is not the only institution which has been affected by disruptions.
Mr. Holmes commended the report but said that he objected to assuming that mistakes were made in handling the disruptions at the institutions and the Board's Office level, particularly before all of the evidence is available.

The Chancellor responded that he was not prepared to cite specific instances but rather to indicate that it would be very unusual if no mistakes were made in the complicated circumstances which were faced and which required rapid decisions.

Mr. Layman pointed out that the motion merely asked for a further report and did not officially approve the present report which included the statement that mistakes may have been made.

Mr. Snider said that it would be difficult to be sufficiently objective to evaluate the campus disorders which occurred on State System campuses and said that he would favor the appointment of a blue-ribbon committee to evaluate the situations which had occurred. Mr. Holmes indicated that an internal evaluation should be made first and then outside help should be sought if it then appears to be necessary.

The Chancellor said that Mr. Snider's suggestion had been considered and that such a recommendation may be part of the report on June 9. However, the obligation to evaluate the recent disorders as soon as possible seemed to make it advisable to undertake an internal study immediately.

Mr. Stewart said that the statement that mistakes may have been made and that a study is being conducted would be helpful in terms of public relations. He requested that the question of an outside committee be discussed further at the June 9 meeting.

Mr. Corey said there would be some merit in having an outside committee but the Board should have more knowledge of the facts before reaching a decision on whether to refer the study to an independent group.

Mrs. Johnson said there is a real problem in the ability of institutional executives to look at next year and manage the situation in a way which would keep within the bounds which it is decided are appropriate for a college or university. She pointed out that the pressures on the institutional executives were tremendous and that college presidents might need some additional help. She said that the goals and aims of the institution must be defined as clearly as possible and then consideration must be given to strengthening the institutions in whatever ways are necessary in order to make it possible to achieve the goals and aims of the institution. She said that recent events have made it imperative that certain guidelines must be clearly defined and that if these guidelines are not observed, certain sanctions or changes must follow.
Mr. Holmes said that it was the responsibility of the Board to investigate these disorders and make recommendations, and that if some outside group such as the legislature is not satisfied and chooses to make an independent investigation, that is its privilege. However, first the investigation should be handled under existing procedures through the Board of Higher Education as part of the Executive branch.

Mr. Payne pointed out that the incidents in Oregon have been minor compared to those which have occurred in many other places. He said it is largely a problem of international turmoil that will only be settled on a long-term basis.

Mrs. Johnson added that she thought the concern of parents went beyond the physical safety of their children to a concern with the outlook of the students upon the country in which they live, the government of which they will be citizens, and the quality of an education that they will have to handle the complicated problems that will demand the very best that educational institutions can produce. She said there is a very grave crisis in what is going to constitute the kind of education that is provided in the institutions of higher education and she questioned whether some of the activities that have occurred during these periods of stress would rank very high as far as quality of education is concerned.

The Academic Affairs committee approved the motion of Mr. Layman that the studies that are proposed in the report of the Chancellor on campus disorders be undertaken. It was further understood that the reports of the results of these studies would be available in advance of the June Board meeting so that Board members could study them thoroughly before considering action to be taken.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

The recommended studies on campus disorders were considered as a part of the Chancellor's report and appear below.

Unrest at State System Institutions - A Progress Report

The Chancellor stated that at the May 18 meeting of the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs, Personnel, and Public Affairs the Committee had, at his suggestion, directed the Board's Office to prepare a report on the episodes which occurred on the several campuses within the two weeks prior to the May 18, 1970, Committee meeting. The report entitled, Unrest at State System Institutions - A Progress Report, dated June 9, 1970, is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of the minutes of the June 9 meeting of the Board.

The Chancellor commented on two of the findings which appeared in the report. The first stated, "That the institutions have made substantial strides toward bringing their policies and regulations into conformity with the Board's policy statement on governance." He
said that more progress was needed in order to assure that those persons who violated the Board and institutional policies with respect to violent or disruptive activities be subjected to more prompt and appropriate discipline. He said that the policies and regulations probably need further strengthening but also the implementation of these policies must be improved.

The Chancellor said that a second question to be answered in the report was whether during these episodes of disruption the administrative decisions violated Board policy. He said it was clear that the Board policy was violated but that concluding that administrative decisions contributed to the violence or were contrary to the Board policy would need to be based on the judgment that the timing of the decisions contradicted Board policy. Specifically, this would relate to the point at which police were asked to clear a building and whether it is an administrative error to exercise what is thought to be forbearance in the hope of avoiding or reducing physical injury and property damage. The Chancellor said that he shared in these decisions and must share the responsibility for such forbearance. In retrospect, he said that he believed the timing of some of the actions might have been different but he could find no basis for concluding that the State System's administrators acted in violation of the Board's policy. Further, he said he believed that the institutional administrators performed extremely well under unprecedented circumstances, and that their judgments, exercised under very great pressures, probably did minimize physical damage and injuries to persons and interference with the institutional operation.

The Chancellor distributed for Board consideration several recommendations, together with a proposed change to Section L-3-FF of the Board's Administrative Code. Included in these recommendations were the following: (1) that the Board amend the Administrative Code, Section L-3-FF, to eliminate the provision that the staff member against whom dismissal charges are brought must be present when testimony is heard; (2) that the provision be made for the Board to assume jurisdiction in certain exceptional cases related to dismissal charges under the general standard of conduct "flagrantly unbecoming a faculty member;" and (3) that the Board establish an ad hoc committee of the Board to examine the provisions of the Administrative Code referring to the termination of employment and determine whether additional changes may need to be made in the Code.

President Clark urged that the Board continue to operate with the present policy under which the institutions handle cases of faculty dismissal in accordance with procedures established by the American Association of University Professors. He said that the jurisdiction in these matters should remain with the institutions unless the faculty were unwilling or unable to act responsibly in such cases, and he contended that the faculty has acted responsibly in the one case which has come before it in connection with disruptive activities. He said that further study should be given to the recommendation and that there will be adequate time to do this and have any changes ready by the opening of the fall term. President Clark recognized that although the democratic procedures move slowly in these cases,
it was his opinion that they could move rapidly enough to solve the problems which might arise.

Mrs. Johnson said that the institutions really belong to the general public and that the Board is vested with far more power and authority than it has wanted to assume. However, the Board is now in the middle between the institution and the public which is becoming increasingly dissatisfied with activities at the institutions.

President Clark responded that the Board presently has the power to take action against a person but that the Board also needs to protect the preliminary due process proceedings within the institutions. There was a general discussion of whether the provision for the Board to assume jurisdiction implied "original jurisdiction" in cases of faculty discipline.

It was also stated that if the Board approved the recommendation to assume jurisdiction in certain exceptional cases it would then be necessary for a set of rules to be adopted by the Board covering due process regulations at the Board level for notice and hearing for such cases.

Mr. Stewart emphasized the urgency of the situation with respect to public opinion involving campus disruption and said that these incidents must be stopped or the State System would face serious difficulties in the next election and the 1971 Legislature.

Mr. Payne said that there was no question but that the Board would take a number of actions that would be addressed to the problem of campus unrest. But he said the Board should be very careful that in its desire to meet this problem it did not destroy the basic institutions themselves. He said that the democratic process is slow but that he would be opposed to any dictatorial types of processes designed to speed up these actions. He indicated that he would favor a suggestion made earlier by Mr. Corey that the recommendation be considered together with the proposed change in the Code itself, the language of which is yet to be developed.

Acting President Young and President Wolfe indicated their general agreement with President Clark's statements and with the suggestion that the recommendation concerning Board jurisdiction be considered with the specific Administrative Code provision to implement the recommendation.

President Wolfe mentioned that there had been an urgent need for legal counsel to be available directly at the institutional level because legal assistance through the Chancellor's Office many times could not be close enough or prompt enough to meet the situation in terms of the administrative problems that related to the enforcement of the Code and its proper application and scope in dealing with colleagues, students and the city.
The Board adopted the recommendation to eliminate the provision in the Administrative Code that the staff member against whom dismissal charges are brought must be present when testimony is heard.

The Board then discussed certain changes in wording to the proposed modification to Section L-3-FF, 3(g), third paragraph, and adopted the amendment to this section of the Administrative Code as it appears below:

At the hearing, the testimony of witnesses and other evidence concerning any disputed facts shall be received by the committee. The staff member shall have the right to appear and to participate in the hearing and to present relevant evidence to the committee; and he may be represented by counsel with or without the presence of the staff member. Witnesses before the committee are subject to cross-examination. The staff member and the administration shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit rebuttal testimony or other evidence. At the conclusion of the testimony, the committee may permit each side to make an oral or written summation; if this privilege is extended to one side, it must be extended to both. When the committee is satisfied that all pertinent and available evidence has been received, and that such summations as it deems appropriate have been presented, the hearing will be adjourned. The committee will then go into executive session for the purpose of deliberation.

The Board then considered the proposed amendment to the Code to provide for the Board to assume jurisdiction in certain exceptional cases. Amendments were proposed to the suggested wording to reflect the Board's concern with the adoption of procedural rules or procedures for handling such cases. The following amended recommendation was adopted by the Board: "That the Board amend the Administrative Code to provide procedures for the Board to assume jurisdiction in certain exceptional cases related to dismissal charges under the general standard of conduct 'flagrantly unbecoming a faculty member'."

The Board approved the recommendation that the Board establish an ad hoc committee of the Board to examine the provisions of the Administrative Code which refer to "Termination of Employment" and determine whether additional changes are needed in the Code. It was also requested that institutional executives report to the committee any cases of disruptive activity by any faculty member.

The Board then approved the recommendation providing that the student conduct codes be reviewed by the institution and the necessary steps taken to provide effective and prompt administration of the codes. The Board indicated that these codes should be on file and the Board should be aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the codes so that it can give the institutional staff whatever strengthening it needs in order to be effective.

The Board approved the recommendation reaffirming the obligation to keep the colleges and universities open and functioning on a regular
basis and the conviction that a faculty member must meet his professional obligations and assignments or face loss of pay or dismissal. The recommendation as approved included the deletion of the word "continued" from the suggested wording.

In the discussion of this recommendation, President Wolfe pointed out that a faculty member's obligation and assignment goes beyond the time units involved in class instruction. Mrs. Johnson also pointed out that there is an obligation for the faculty member to be accountable for what goes on in the classroom so that he is teaching the subject he is hired to teach rather than holding seminars during regular class hours on some subject which may be of local or national interest.

President Wolfe said that a faculty member who fails to meet his scheduled class assignment soon begins to lose his student audience. He said also that a faculty committee on faculty conduct was formed prior to the May disruptions and that this committee is addressing itself to the problems of conduct flagrantly unbecoming a faculty member and to the failure to meet the obligations of a faculty member.

The Chancellor said that it would be easy to overestimate the extent to which faculty members have not met their responsibilities. He said it is a matter for presidential administration to be certain that the situation is not excessive or perhaps does not exist at all. If it did become serious enough for Board action, the Chancellor said he would expect the presidents to refer the matter to the Chancellor's Office and the Board.

Mrs. Johnson said that indications are that unusual changes are ahead in higher education and that she regards the whole idea of restructuring or reconstituting higher education as something that needs to be done with some orderly process or the whole concept of the university or college will be changed and in the process the freedom of a great many people will be destroyed.

The Board reaffirmed the policy that the State System institutions, as institutions, must not become instruments of political action nor may their resources be diverted to partisan political use.

The Chancellor referred to the recommendations that studies be prepared dealing with the presence of nonstudents on the campuses, the relationships with local and state government, and campus security. He said that time had not permitted preparing detailed recommendations in connection with these three topics.

The Board approved the recommendations.

With reference to the relationship with local and state governments, it was indicated that a formal request would probably be filed by the City of Eugene for the added costs to the city for police protection during the University of Oregon incidents. It was stated that the
recommended study should include information from the local, state and institutional personnel who are concerned with the problems of campus unrest. It was also mentioned that the University of Oregon School of Law has been meeting with Oregon lawyers on the subject of student unrest and the various codes covering faculty and students. It was suggested that the report or other material which results from this meeting should be considered.

Mr. Layman said that he recognized that cities also have budget problems and that this expense would be a great burden on a medium-sized city. However, he said that he had never known a city or state agency to bill a private firm for maintaining law and order in any part of the city or community and that it would seem there would be even less precedent for billing another public agency. He said it was a tremendous departure from previous practice.

The Chancellor said that the recommendation for a study dealing with campus security would include the need for increased numbers of security staff, and increased security of records and physical facilities.

President Wolfe said that he is seeking an emergency appropriation of $100,465 to cover the additional patrolmen and logistical support needed to provide adequate campus security.

In the general discussion of student unrest, Mrs. Johnson said that although Oregon had comparatively minor problems, the incidents had to be considered in relationship to the size of the state and the number of students. She said that an additional percentage of students might be involved in other issues, particularly if outside security has to be called to the campus. She pointed out that State System campuses had instances in some degree of almost everything that has happened nationally. Mrs. Johnson and other Board members commended the administrators for their handling of extremely difficult situations. Mr. Payne added that it must be kept in mind that many of the incidents occurred in the community and not on the campus and consequently were not under the control of the Board. In the case of the damage to the ROTC buildings, law enforcement agencies have not yet determined that students or faculty were involved, so that the responsibility for the control of these actions has not yet been established.

Mr. Corey pointed out that some of the recommendations were for continued investigations and the development of policies.

Mr. Layman indicated that the record should show that the report itself was being filed for informational purposes and that Board approval related only to the recommendations which were approved either as presented or as amended by specific motions.

The following recommendations as presented and accepted by the Board reflect the Board actions which were taken to approve or modify the original recommendations, as reported in the discussion of this report.
Recommendations

1. Changes in the Administrative Code
   a. That the Board amend the Administrative Code, Section L-3-FF, to eliminate the provision that the staff member against whom dismissal charges are brought must be present when testimony is heard.
   b. That the Board amend the Administrative Code to provide procedures for the Board to assume jurisdiction in certain exceptional cases related to dismissal charges under the general standard of conduct "flagrantly unbecoming a faculty member."
   c. That the Board establish an ad hoc committee to examine the provisions of the Administrative Code which refer to "Termination of Employment" and determine whether additional changes are needed in the Code.

2. Changes in Student Conduct Codes
   That the institution analyze the effectiveness of their student conduct codes and take the steps necessary to provide effective and prompt administration of the codes.

3. Non-students
   That the Board's Office develop a report on the nature and extent of problems created by nonstudents on our campuses, and develop alternate proposals for handling these problems.

4. Keeping the Colleges and Universities Open
   That the Board reaffirm the obligation to keep the System's colleges and universities open and functioning on a regular basis; that the Board reaffirm its conviction that each faculty member has professional obligations and assignments, and that if he declines to meet those obligations, he should go without pay for the time missed; and that deliberate refusal to meet those obligations constitutes appropriate grounds for dismissal for cause.

5. Political Action
   That the Board affirm that the System's colleges and universities, as institutions, must not become instruments of political action; and that their facilities, supplies, equipment and other resources must not be diverted to partisan political use. (This provision is not intended to interfere with the traditional use of the campus facilities as public forums nor with the political rights of faculty members and students.)
6. Relationships with Local and State Government

That the Board's Office initiate a study of the issues affecting the relationships of the institutions with units of local government and with agencies of state government.

7. Campus Security

That the Board's Office initiate a study of campus security requirements including, but not limited to, security staff, security of records, and security of physical facilities.

Mr. Layman said that Governor McCall had requested an opportunity for a representative of the Chicano group to appear before the Board regarding educational opportunity for Spanish-speaking American citizens. Mr. Layman introduced Mr. Jose' de la Isla, Director of the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) at the University of Oregon, to make the report.

Mr. de la Isla said that it is difficult to define the goals of higher education since the breadth of such an education is beyond boundaries. However, it is possible to refer to the ambitions of the citizenry to have a technically and professionally qualified corps of service workers who perform specific functions for the continuation and perpetuation of society. He mentioned the continuing need for professional workers - doctors, lawyers, teachers. Recent reports tend to indicate that the employment market is now being saturated with such persons, but their career training has not sensitized them to the needs of the poor and the American minorities for whom there still are not enough professional workers.

It was indicated that there are approximately 32,000 Mexican-Americans who are permanent residents of Oregon and an additional 50,000 who enter the state to engage in farm work during the year and contribute to the economy of the state through such labor. Mr. de la Isla said that the most realistic strategy for elevating the economic situation of this minority group is that of education.

Mr. de la Isla stated that it is estimated that from 400-500 Mexican-American children drop out of Oregon public schools annually and the drop-out rate is attributable to economic and cultural factors facing these children in school. The State Board of Education has responded to this problem through their recent resolution to adopt bilingual instruction. Early indications are that because some efforts are being made, a vitalized interest in education is developing among the Mexican-Americans.

With respect to higher education, it was stated that not one undergraduate degree is known to have been awarded to a Mexican-American in Oregon last year and that except at the University of Oregon, the number of undergraduates is negligible. He pointed out that the State System is not sensitive to the fact the Mexican-Americans are the largest minority group in the state and therefore they have the greatest educational need. Even at the University of Oregon where a
supportive services program is available, no state funds have been committed to the program, and the entire operating budget for the supportive services program has been contributed by students and staff.

Mr. de la Isla referred to that portion of the Democratic Party platform which recommended additional aid and supportive services for tutoring and counseling for students in the disadvantaged programs. He said that these recommendations constituted an ambitious but not unrealistic program and that the creation of higher educational opportunities offers a societal "Safety valve" where individual talents and aspirations for social mobility can be enhanced.

Mr. de la Isla then suggested that the Board would be wise to consider and adopt the following recommendations:

1. The State Board of Higher Education should adopt a policy of supporting the existing programs for the disadvantaged and allowing admissions on the basis of financial aids available to the disadvantaged students.

2. Since higher education for Mexican-Americans is dependent on the financial aids available, the Board should advise the Oregon Congressional delegation, along with the Governor, to oppose any measure which strives to convert the present federal system of financial assistance to one strictly on a loan basis.

3. The tradition of the Oregon Mexican-Americans should be transmitted to all students in this state.

4. The State Board should encourage a more plural ethnic composition in its institutions.

5. The Board and the Chancellor should provide avenues for making the needed perspective on the problems of the Mexican-Americans available. He stated that graduate schools throughout the state have closed their doors to the very persons who could help develop comprehensive planning and projection to fill the needs of all Oregonians.

Mr. de la Isla said that the Chicano community wants to face the great issues of the times from the perspective of knowledge and expertise alongside all other Americans. He said the State Board of Higher Education can maintain the confidence of the state's largest minority group if it proceeds in creating educational opportunities. However, he said that unless the Board takes a strong posture in advocacy for expanding educational opportunities the forces of repression and educational curtailment will reign victorious.
Mr. de la Isla concluded his remarks with the following statement: "The educational future of Mexican-Americans can be either bright or blighted, depending upon the foresight of the public institutions. We are at that juncture in the history of our country when every decision determines heavily the quality of life future generations will experience. There is time, still, for all Oregonians to participate in the educational process, and from the experience to contribute to the well-being of our society. Mexican-Americans can and will be a part of that future; it is now a matter of how our contribution will be encouraged. We look forward to a future where free men participate fully in the affairs of their state. And on that belief we declare to you our ambition: We want education. We want good education. We want access to good education."

Mr. Layman thanked Mr. de la Isla for attending the meeting and making the presentation concerning the educational opportunities for Mexican-Americans.

Revision of Priorities for Capital Outlay Program for 1969-1971

On May 21, 1970, the State Emergency Board deferred consideration of the ten agenda items submitted by the Chancellor's Office for capital construction projects. Members of that Board requested that the priorities of all facilities authorized by the 1969 Legislature which are not yet under construction be reviewed prior to their next meeting (tentatively scheduled for June 18-19, 1970), so that if any adjustments in the priority ordering of the remaining projects appeared to be advisable, they could be identified. Accordingly, the Office of Facilities Planning has re-examined the listing of capital outlay items approved by Chapters 307, 308, 645 and 664, Oregon Laws 1969, and with the concurrence of the Chancellor recommended that the following modifications be approved:

1. Assignment of a lower priority to the proposed EOC Education Building in view of reductions in the projected requirements for classrooms, laboratories and offices, particularly if student union functions can be transferred to the new College Center Building, thus releasing space within Hoke Hall for temporary use for instructional purposes.

2. Minor change in the priority assignment of the UO Utility Extensions which had been related originally to the proposed UO Administrative Services Building (a project not authorized by the 1969 Legislature), but now required in connection with the behavioral science unit.

3. Request for the EOC College Center Building at an estimated total project cost of $2,520,000, in accordance with the recommendations outlined in a separate agenda item reviewed and approved by the Committee on Buildings and Other Physical Facilities on May 18, 1970.

4. Request for the UO Recreational Facilities at a cost of $580,000 exclusive of the $50,000 budgeted as part of the UO College of Education Building for the replacement of eight tennis courts which will be cleared from the site of that structure.