STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN
CASCADE DORMITORY COMPLEX, SOUTHERN OREGON COLLEGE, ASHLAND, OREGON

July 26, 1971

MEETING #397-1 A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Cascade Dormitory Complex, Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oregon.

ROLL CALL The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. Monday, July 26, 1971, by the President of the Board, Mr. George H. Layman, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. George H. Corey  Mr. John D. Mosser
Mr. Robert D. Holmes  Mr. John W. Snider
Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson  Mr. Loran L. Stewart
Mr. Philip A. Joss  Mr. George H. Layman

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary R. L. Collins; Mr. Freeman Holmer, Vice Chancellor for Administration; Mr. J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Dr. Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Mr. H. A. Bork, Consultant; Mr. D. R. Larson, Assistant Chancellor; Mr. J. L. Watson, Controller; Mr. Keith L. Jackson, Budget Director; Dr. George Diel, Director of Communications Development; Dr. Duane Andrews, Director, Division of Continuing Education; Mr. Paul Wurm, Assistant Director, Division of Continuing Education; Mr. Kenneth Ahlberg, Manager of Business Affairs, Division of Continuing Education; Mr. Raymond P. Underwood, Assistant Attorney General; Mr. John Richardson, Administrative Assistant; Mr. Guy Lutz, Director, Office of Institutional Research; Mr. Allen McKenzie, Contracting Officer and Assistant to Vice Chancellor for Administration; Mr. Richard Zita, Director of Publications.

Oregon State University—President R. W. MacVicar; Mr. N. Popovich, Dean of Administration; Dr. David B. Nicodemus, Dean of Faculty; Dr. Charles F. Warnath, Professor of Psychology; Mr. Will H. Post, Assistant to the President; Dr. Stuart E. Knapp, Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

University of Oregon—President Robert D. Clark; Dr. Harry Alpert, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. Ray Hawk, Vice President for Administration and Finance.

University of Oregon Dental School—Mr. Eugene Bauer, Assistant Dean for Business Affairs.

University of Oregon Medical School—Dean C. N. Holman; Mr. W. A. Zimmerman, Associate Dean for Business Affairs.
The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting of the Board held on June 9, 1971, and approved them as previously distributed.
Resolution in Memory of Mr. Chas. R. Holloway, Jr.

President Layman said that the Board noted with sadness the death of Mr. Chas. R. Holloway, Jr. He said that Mr. Holloway was the senior member of the Board and that not only have all of the members served with him, but none has served without him. Mr. Holloway was in his third term as a Board member, having served sixteen years. Mr. Layman said that Mr. Holloway had served as chairman of the Executive Committee and the Finance Committee and was exceedingly active in business and civic activities in the state as a whole, as well as in higher education. Mr. Layman said that the Board would miss Mr. Holloway's experienced advice and his calm counsel in times of stress. Mr. Layman then requested Mrs. Johnson, now the senior member of the Board, to present the following resolution in memory of Mr. Holloway:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Charles R. Holloway, Jr., senior member and past president of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, died in Portland, Oregon, on July 21, 1971, following injuries sustained in a fall at his home; and

WHEREAS, the death of Mr. Holloway is a great loss to the entire State of Oregon; and

WHEREAS, it is fitting that there be public recognition for Mr. Holloway's outstanding contributions to higher education; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, in regular session at Ashland on July 26, 1971, as follows:

1. That members of the Board express publicly their deepest respect and affection for their late associate, and their sorrow upon his untimely death.

2. That commendation be given for Mr. Holloway's devoted service to this Board, as a member since 1955, as chairman of the Executive and Finance Committees, and as President for a period of three and one-half years when many trying problems confronted higher education.

3. That the citizenry of this state, and especially the thousands who have been involved directly or indirectly in higher education, owe gratitude to Mr. Holloway for his constant efforts to increase educational opportunity for Oregon citizens and to improve its quality.

4. That members of the Board express deep sympathy to Mrs. Holloway and other members of the family in their bereavement; and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of the Board to Mrs. Holloway.

Upon motion by Mrs. Johnson, the above resolution was adopted unanimously by the Board.
It was indicated that the Chas. R. Holloway Memorial Fund had been established for individuals who wished to make contributions in his memory. Mr. Collins indicated that the endorsement on all checks received would indicate clearly that they were contributions to the Chas. R. Holloway Memorial Fund.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

The Chancellor announced that the 1971 Legislature had specifically assigned to the Educational Coordinating Council the responsibility for attending meetings of the State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education. Dr. Floyd Stearns, Executive Director of the Coordinating Council, will be attending Board meetings as the representative of the Council in compliance with the new legislation. He introduced Dr. Stearns later in the meeting.

Attendance of ECC Representative at Board Meetings

The Chancellor stated that the three universities were moving toward an administrative organization which involved the designation of administrative positions as vice presidents which are new to Oregon higher education. He then recommended the following personnel adjustments for approval by the Board:

Portland State University

Appointment of Dr. E. Dean Anderson, Assistant to the President and Director of University Relations, as Vice President for University Relations at an annual salary of $24,540.

Oregon State University

Establishment of the position of Dean of Undergraduate Studies at Oregon State University, effective July 1, 1971, and appointment of Dr. Stewart Knapp, currently Professor of Veterinary Medicine, to this position at an annual salary of $22,212.

University of Oregon

Appointment of Dr. Harry Alpert, Dean of Faculties, as Vice President for Academic Affairs, at an annual salary of $34,500.

Appointment of Dr. N. Ray Hawk, Dean of Administration, as Vice President for Administration and Finance, at an annual salary of $31,000.

Appointment of Dr. Gerald K. Bogen, Special Assistant to the President, as Vice President for Students, at an annual salary of $24,500.

Designation of Dr. John E. Lallas, Assistant to the President, as Executive Dean, at an annual salary of $25,000.

The Board approved the recommended positions and appointments at the indicated salary rates.
At its July 6, 1971, meeting, the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs received the report of Southern Oregon College on the first year of operation of Southern Oregon College's authorized experimental change in general education requirements for BA/BS degrees in the arts and sciences. The Committee also considered the request of Southern Oregon College for authorization to extend the experiment to secondary education majors for the remaining two years of the experiment, beginning fall term 1971.

A summary of the document presenting the report, and the request for an extension of the experiment to secondary education, titled First Annual Report of Southern Oregon College on Experimental Change in General Education Requirements and Request of the College for Authorization To Extend the Experiment to Secondary Education Majors, dated July 6, 1971, is submitted to the Board in the following paragraphs to become an integral part of the minutes of the July 26, 1971, meeting.

Summary of the Report

At its January 1970 meeting, the State Board of Higher Education authorized Southern Oregon College to change general education requirements for BA/BS degrees in the arts and sciences in the manner outlined below for a three-year period. The College was to make annual reports during the three years on the experiment, including the nature of the students' selections of general education work when they were freed from sequence requirements, the numbers of students who met English composition and speech requirements by demonstrated proficiency, and the effect on enrollments in physical education activities when this course work was no longer required. At the end of the three-year period, Southern Oregon College was to make a recommendation to the Board as to whether the changes in general education requirements should be adopted on a permanent basis for the entire undergraduate student body.

Southern Oregon College estimated in January 1970 that the experimental program would affect approximately one-third of the student body, based on previous enrollment experience. Since 1968-69 enrollment in liberal arts programs has more than doubled, while enrollment in business and teacher education has remained fairly stationary. By 1970-71, about one-half of Southern Oregon College student body was enrolled in undergraduate arts and science programs.

The changes in general education requirements, as authorized by the Board in January 1970, were as follow:

1. The requirement in English composition was changed from nine hours of English composition to a proficiency requirement in oral and written communications which might be met through demonstrated competency judged by a committee of the faculty, or through the completion of six hours of writing courses numbered above 100 and three hours of speech numbered above 100.
2. Requirements for work in each of the broad areas of knowledge (humanities, social sciences, and sciences) were changed from two sequences (18-24 hours) in each area, including a year of literature and, in general studies curricula, specified course work in social science and science-mathematics, to 18 hours of work in each area (without the requirement, as at present, that these be sequence), with some work taken in at least two departments in each of the aforementioned broad areas of knowledge.

3. The total number of hours required for graduation was reduced from 192 to 186.

4. Minimum hours required in upper-division course work was changed from 45-60 hours (depending on the curriculum) to a uniform requirement of 60 hours.

5. The requirement of six hours of physical education was dropped.

Southern Oregon College's freshman class fall term 1970 numbered 2,029. Of these, 1,211 (59.7 percent) declared themselves as majors in the arts and sciences, either in general studies, departmental, or preprofessional programs. These 1,211 students constituted the first group of freshmen to come under the new, experimental general education requirements.

The proficiency examination in writing skills was administered by a three-man committee, appointed from members of the staff of the Department of English.

The committee reviewed the high school English grades of all eligible freshmen, and individual letters inviting participation in the proficiency examination were mailed to 170 entering students with exceptionally high high-school grades. The proficiency examination was announced in both the faculty bulletin and in the student newspaper, emphasizing that the examination was open to all arts and science students.

Two methods of demonstrating proficiency were provided, (a) a satisfactory score (77th percentile on national norms) on the Houghton-Mifflin College English Placement Test, or (b) unqualified recommendation of a full-time college faculty member who had had opportunity to know the quality of the student's written work.

The committee administered the first screening examination fall term 1970 to 103 students, all who had applied. Of these 103 students, 41 (39.8 percent) were exempted from taking further writing courses. An additional six students were exempted during 1970-71 on the basis of faculty recommendation.

The speech department set up a screening procedure to identify proficiency in speech, but no students applied for exemption from the speech requirement.
A comparison of enrollments in Southern Oregon College's traditional general education sequences in 1969-70 and enrollments in these same courses in 1970-71 reveals little change in total numbers of students enrolled, indicating that losses because of the new requirements were about balanced by increases resulting from a larger student body.

### ENROLLMENTS IN TRADITIONAL GENERAL EDUCATION SEQUENCES, 1969-70 AND 1970-71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>1969-70</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intro. to Literature/World Literature</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>745(^1)</td>
<td>825(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. General Biology</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fund. of Physical Science</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>135(^2)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. History of Western Civilization</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. History of the United States</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>3,056</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>2,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change 1969-70 to 1970-71</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)English Department scheduled Eng 106 winter term, 105 spring term, a reversal of the usual scheduling sequence.

\(^2\)Because of staffing problems, Southern Oregon College was unable to accommodate 50 students who wished to enroll in the second term (chemistry) of Physical Science winter 1971. These students were enrolled in mathematics and geology courses.

The change in general education requirements which caused the most concern because of its potential effect on teaching assignments was the dropping of the requirements for six terms of physical education activity course work. Actually, despite the fact that 1,211 freshmen (60 percent of the class) and possibly another 400-500 sophomores and upper-classmen (who had not yet completed the requirement) suddenly were no longer required to take physical education, total enrollment in physical education activity courses registered a 3.0 percent increase from 1969-70 to 1970-71.

While Southern Oregon College reports little change in enrollment patterns as a result of the change in general education requirements, some students - Southern Oregon College says these are the more able - enrolled in 1970-71 in course work other than the traditional courses to which Southern Oregon College students have been largely restricted.
Southern Oregon College reports no evidence of students switching from subject to subject after completion of the first term of a sequence, although undoubtedly some students who might not have done so under the old requirements dropped out of a sequence which they found uninteresting.

Southern Oregon College further reports no evidence of any sudden popularity of any particular field of study as an alternative to the more traditional fields, although it does indicate that the decline in enrollments in biology and fundamentals of physical science from 1969-70 to 1970-71 from 3,527 to 3,414 was largely balanced by increased enrollments in lower-division courses in mathematics and geology.

Request for Authorization To Extend Experiment to Secondary Education Majors

Southern Oregon College states that the new degree requirements have caused difficulty for the student transferring from a major in one of the liberal arts fields, where his program has been designed to meet the new general education requirements, to a secondary education program, usually in the same field, where he is required to meet the old requirements. Southern Oregon College would like to eliminate the doubling up of general education requirements for these students (which may be only a few hours for some students but may present a serious problem for others) by permitting secondary education majors to meet the same general education requirements as do liberal arts majors. The result of this action would be to add some 800-900 students to the experimental group. With this addition, the experiment would cover about three-fifths of the Southern Oregon College student body during its second and third years.

Board's Office Recommendation

The Board's Office recommended that the Committee accept the report of Southern Oregon College and that it recommend that Southern Oregon College be authorized to extend the new general education requirements to include students majoring in secondary education for the second and third years of the experiment, effective with the 1971-72 year.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mrs. Johnson commented that she was surprised at how relatively few of the academically superior students invited by Southern Oregon College to consider meeting the English requirement through examination or faculty recommendation took advantage of the opportunity to do so, and how relatively few of those who sought exemption from the required English courses through this route actually qualified for exemption—particularly in view of the fact that the cutting score on the examination was not placed higher than the 77th percentile. She said that this evidence appeared to confirm her feeling that even the apparently superior students from high school do need additional instruction in writing.
She also observed that with the leeway given students in the Southern Oregon College experiment, the quality of counseling service provided students becomes the crucial factor.

She questioned moving secondary education majors into the experimental group on three grounds: (a) students preparing to be teachers should have more than minimal competency in writing, (b) the experiment is already involving a larger proportion of the student body than contemplated when it was originally approved, and (c) the transfer would reduce the size of the control group. She suggested that Southern Oregon College retain its regular general education requirements for secondary education majors, taking care of hardship cases through waivers.

Dr. Arthur Kreisman, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Southern Oregon College, responded that students are never left to drift at Southern Oregon College - in liberal arts fields for example, they have three advisers: a personal adviser, a departmental adviser, and the dean's office. He said Southern Oregon College's old general education requirements are very rigid, that these requirements left advisers no opportunity to make adjustments for the backgrounds and interests of individual students. He added that bringing secondary education majors under the new requirements would not change major requirements for these students, that students at Southern Oregon College preparing to become English teachers are required to complete 12 hours of writing.

Mr. Mosser said he felt the Board should have general education requirements for degrees, but these should be stated so as to permit development of programs recognizing differences in student backgrounds and needs. He added that a student should not be required to repeat work in his freshman year he has already covered in some depth in high school.

Committee Recommendation

The Committee, by a vote of two to one, Mrs. Johnson opposing extension of the new requirements recommended that the Southern Oregon College report be accepted and that the new general education requirements be extended to secondary education majors for the remaining two years of the experiment.

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Johnson explained that her opposition was not to the concept that Southern Oregon College is trying to develop. She said it is important that the institutions and the Board keep thinking in terms of making changes but that these changes should perhaps be different from simply removing old requirements and allowing freedom of choice for students from the same selection of courses. She said that perhaps, as Mr. Mosser suggested, closer consideration should be given to two things: (1) What constitutes a core program for a liberally-educated person, not in specific courses, but perhaps in survey courses or interdisciplinary approaches; and (2) What should be the requirements for high school
students who arrive at State System institutions with a high proficiency level in some of these core areas. She said she was thinking in terms of credit by examination and proper placement of students, including not only those who have a high proficiency level, but also those who might not be able to start at the level of the core curriculum.

Mrs. Johnson stated that she would prefer to have Southern Oregon College maintain a larger control group which was subject to the regular requirements and to continue its thinking in the development of a core program for a liberally-educated person graduating from that institution.

Mr. Snider moved that the Board adopt the Committee recommendation that the report be accepted and that the new general education requirements be extended to secondary education majors for the remaining two years of the experiment.

The Board approved the motion as presented. Mrs. Johnson voted against the motion.

Mr. Joss and Mr. Holmes expressed approval that the physical education requirement was dropped.

Mrs. Johnson restated the reasons for her negative vote as indicated during the Board discussion. She emphasized the need for continued planning with respect to the requirements that should be made of persons being graduated from State System institutions with the expectation that they are liberally-educated individuals. She mentioned that only a small number of people took the examination for advanced placement in writing and speech skills, and of those presumably outstanding students at the high school level, very few had attained the necessary proficiency level on the examination.

President Layman said that a special item of business was a presentation concerning the Swedenburg House at Southern Oregon College. He said that Mr. Eric Allen, a resident of Medford and immediate past president of the Southern Oregon Historical Society, and Mrs. John Cotton, a resident of Ashland and member of the Southern Oregon College regional advisory committee, had requested an opportunity to appear before the Board to discuss the Swedenburg House and respond to questions.

Mr. Allen said that he represented the "Save the Swedenburg House and Grounds Committee," which is composed of representatives of the Southern Oregon College student body, the faculty, alumni, and residents of Ashland, Medford, and Jacksonville who are interested in the preservation of historic sites, and particularly the Swedenburg House.

Mr. Allen then read the statement of the committee which is printed in full as Supplement A to these minutes.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Layman said that the disposition of the Swedenburg House had been considered at a prior Board meeting and deferred until there had been an opportunity for the Board to visit the site at the time of the Ashland Board meeting. He said that the site inspection had been scheduled following the close of the Board meeting and therefore no action would be taken at the July meeting, but the matter would be considered further at a subsequent Board meeting.
In April 1971, Adult Student Housing, Inc., filed applications with the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for loan assistance under Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, to cover the major portion of the estimated cost of acquiring sites, planning, constructing and equipping 150 apartments for married students at the University of Oregon and 160 units for married students at Southern Oregon College. This organization and/or its affiliates currently provide similar housing for students at several community colleges and at a private four-year college in Oregon. The corporation was organized in September 1970 under the provision of Chapter 61, Oregon Revised Statutes (Oregon Nonprofit Corporation Act) and operates as a nonprofit corporation. The principals of ASH, Inc., have also been engaged in other large housing developments, including various turnkey low-income projects for Housing Authorities of Portland, Clackamas County and Polk County.

The proposed new projects for married student apartments would be constructed on land which the corporation would purchase within a few miles from the campus of each individual institution. At the University of Oregon, it is proposed to construct 30 three-bedroom units, 90 two-bedroom units and 30 one-bedroom units. At Southern Oregon College, it is proposed to construct 32 three-bedroom units, 96 two-bedroom units and 32 one-bedroom units. It is contemplated that bids for each facility would be solicited following the completion of the plans and specifications by Architects DeKanter and Holgate and the final approval of contract arrangements with the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Ordinarily, the federal government requires that its agreement with a nonprofit student housing corporation be co-signed by the institution at which the corporation is located. An alternate procedure is provided in those instances where state law does not allow the educational institution to sign such an agreement. In the alternate procedure, "approval of the corporation and of the project by the institution" may be accepted. (This alternate procedure was followed in connection with the federal loans to Portland Student Services, Inc., and Co-Resident Women, Inc., for construction of student housing. These items were the subject of Board actions on January 25 and April 30, 1971, respectively.)

It was recommended that the following resolution be adopted by roll call vote:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Adult Student Housing, Inc., under the provisions of the College Housing Act, has filed an application for the reservation of funds, interest subsidy or other assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to assist in financing the construction of a married student housing project; and
WHEREAS, the review of the application and the commitment or release of funds, pursuant to Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations, requires approval of the corporation and of the project by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (since neither the institution nor the Board is empowered to co-sign the loan agreement);

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education acting for Southern Oregon College finds that Adult Student Housing, Inc., is a well-established, competent and responsible organization with continuity of operation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the married student housing project proposed by Adult Student Housing, Inc., having been reviewed, is hereby approved for the purpose of a loan, interest subsidy or other assistance under the College Housing Act; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the housing which Adult Student Housing, Inc., proposes to build will supplement and not compete with the long-range plans for the provision of housing for married students at Southern Oregon College.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Hunderup reported that subsequent to the preparation of the docket item, notification had been received by Adult Student Housing, Inc., from the Department of Housing and Urban Development that an interest-subsidy commitment had been made for the Southern Oregon College project. He indicated that the most recent applications by the nonprofit corporation were likely to be approved for interest-subsidy grants rather than loan agreements. The projects may ultimately become the property of the sponsoring institution after the principal and interest is paid.

Mr. Hunderup said that the three directors of Adult Student Housing, Inc., are Mr. Philip A. McLennan, Mr. Fred H. Bender, and the attorney for the corporation, Mr. Donald H. Burnett.

In response to a question concerning the need for more than one corporation in developing various student housing projects, Mr. McLennan explained that the private institutions were required by the federal government to co-obligate, whereas the State System and other publicly-supported institutions do not assume a financial obligation in connection with the projects. Consequently, it appeared advisable to have one corporation to handle projects at those institutions which assume a financial obligation and one for those institutions in both Oregon and Washington which approve the project but do not assume a financial obligation. He indicated that his organization had also established a separate corporation in Tennessee, Adult Student Housing of Memphis, Inc., in order to meet certain requirements of Tennessee law in connection with a project in that state. He also commented that the current federal regulations permit a nonprofit corporation either to retain title to a project after the debt has been paid or to transfer title to the sponsoring institution.
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Mr. Hunderup said that the corporation operates in a manner similar to the State System in terms of planning, bidding and construction of the projects. The corporation is also required by the federal government to accumulate debt service reserves and repair and replacement reserves which will be maintained until the mortgage is paid and be available at that time.

Mr. McLennan said that the projects would be bid competitively to general contractors and that they would meet the wage and labor requirements of the federal government. With respect to management, he said that the corporation has established a set of rules and regulations for the operation of the projects and that it hoped to work through an administrative council at each of the institutions.

He said that in formulating bond repayment schedules it is assumed that property tax payments will be required, although effort will be made to obtain tax exemption.

Mr. Mosser asked whether one project is liable for the financial difficulties which might occur in the operation of another project. Mr. McLennan said that in the case of the Mt. Hood and Clatsop Community College projects, cross security was provided. However, in the case of State System institutions, a cross securing of the mortgages was doubtful because the applications for federal assistance are being processed for interest-subsidies and projects will be handled individually. He then indicated the occupancy level and rental rates which were anticipated in determining the financial program for the projects. As an example, he said the rental rate for a two-bedroom unit of about 675 square feet would be about $115 per month.

Mr. Hunderup said that the institutions had submitted requests to at least three legislative sessions for married student housing units but they had not been approved. It appears unlikely that expenditure authorizations will be forthcoming to the institutions in the near future for married housing and the institutions were pleased with the opportunity to have these units made available through private enterprise. Dr. Hawk said that the University of Oregon would be concerned if these units were to be rented to single students rather than to married students, because then they would be in direct competition with institutional housing for single students. Mr. Hunderup said that the recommendation is predicated on the assumption that the units will be exclusively for married student families and will not be used for single students. The corporation is also required under the college housing program to limit occupancy to individuals who are connected with the campus.

Mr. McLennan said that the units are unfurnished except for carpets, drapes, ranges and refrigerators. An optional rental arrangement for furnishings has been worked out with furniture suppliers at a charge in addition to the basic rental rate.

In response to a question as to the economic benefit to the promoters in the case of a nonprofit corporation, Mr. McLennan said that the two individuals serving as developers or managers of the organization expect to receive a salary based on a rate of $5,000 per $1,000,000 of investment in projects developed, managed, and administered.
Mrs. Johnson asked if the corporation were considering the development of a housing project at Oregon State University. Mr. Hunderup said that Oregon State University is currently considering other alternatives but that the information has been made available to them.

Mr. Joss asked if the administrative officials of the University of Oregon and Southern Oregon College were in favor of the projects.

Mr. Hawk and Mr. Lewis indicated that they were.

With respect to the understandings between the corporation and the institution, Mr. McLennan said there was no request on the part of the corporation for institutional guarantees of occupancy and that there was no other commitment asked from the institution that was not defined in the discussion or laid out in the resolution.

Mr. Hunderup said that he had checked with Pacific University as to the married student housing project which the principals of the nonprofit corporation constructed on that campus and he was satisfied with the information obtained. He said the Mt. Hood and Clatsop projects had just started, but that he would contact those institutions as requested by Mr. Joss.

Mr. McLennan said that a lease was available if the student wanted one, but it was not required. He said that the corporation plans to keep the rent for an individual student at the same rate during the period that the student is working without interruption, except for summer recess, toward his degree. He also said that if the institutions wanted the units rented on a particular priority basis, the corporation would be willing to work this out as long as the occupancy rate was maintained.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented and that the resolutions be adopted on a roll call vote.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Joss indicated that consideration of the resolution with reference to the University of Oregon had been deferred.

Upon motion by Mr. Joss, the Board accepted the report and adopted the above resolution, with the following voting in favor of adoption: Directors Corey, Joss, Mosser, Stewart, and Layman.

Those voting no: Directors Holmes, Johnson, and Snider.

The President of the Board thereupon declared said resolution duly adopted by a vote of five to three.
In explaining her negative vote, Mrs. Johson said that, in her opinion, the Board should be seeking private development of housing, particularly for married students and perhaps even for other student housing. She said her reservations involved the fact that the resolution requires approval of the corporation and of the project and that she hesitated to vote for the wording in the resolution when she had no real knowledge of the corporation and very little about the project except what was provided by one of the incorporators.

Mr. Mosser commented that his favorable vote did not necessarily indicate his approval of having private industry select the sites for housing projects designed primarily for students. He said the best way would probably be for the Board to pick sites and integrate them with its own campus development, but to be more up-to-date and less in loco parentis than it has in past housing operations.

Mr. Joss then presented the following resolution which stated the basis on which the Building Committee had recommended approval of the above resolution:

RESOLVED, that neither the State Board of Higher Education nor Southern Oregon College is to assume any obligation or have any responsibility, financial or otherwise, or make any representation to Adult Student Housing, Inc., or any of its officers, with reference to the proposed married student housing project at Southern Oregon College.

Upon motion by Director Joss, the Board adopted the resolution as presented.

In response to a question prior to the adoption of the resolution, it was indicated that both resolutions would be forwarded to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, but that a roll call vote would not be necessary on the second resolution.

Mr. Joss indicated that his purpose in submitting the second resolution was to place on record the understandings that went into the approval of the first resolution.

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board, arrangements have been made for the acquisition of two properties at Southern Oregon College which are located within the approved projected campus boundaries. A summary of these acquisitions follows:

1. Wolfe Property - Lots One (1) and Two (2) in Block "F" of Fairview Addition, Ashland

The property consists of two lots, containing about 9,955 square feet, improved with a three-bedroom house and garage. The purchase price of $19,000 was in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. The property is in an area designated for the proposed Perimeter Road project, and the funds to finance the acquisition were provided from the General Fund appropriation in Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969.
2. Silverwood Property - 580 Elkader Street, Ashland

The property consists of a lot, containing approximately 6,000 square feet, improved with a small single-story, wood-frame, three-bedroom house with partial basement and attached one-car garage. The purchase price of $12,500 was in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. The property is near the Science buildings in an area designated for educational and general purposes, and the funds to finance the acquisition were provided from the General Fund appropriation and/or Article XI-G bond borrowings authorized within Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by Committee on Academic Affairs, July 6, 1971.)

Oregon Technical Institute requests authorization to award the associate in arts degree to students successfully completing two-year curricula in (a) nursing and (b) college transfer programs.

The document presenting the request, together with the analysis of the Board's Office, titled Request of Oregon Technical Institute for Authorization To Award the Associate in Arts Degree to Graduates of Nursing and Transfer Programs, dated July 6, 1971, is submitted to the Board for designation as an integral part of the minutes of the July 26 meeting.

Oregon Technical Institute will inaugurate two new associate degree programs with the opening of fall term, 1971 - (1) a two-year program to prepare graduates to take the examination for licensure in registered nursing, authorized by the Board March 10, 1970, and (2) two-year transfer programs in liberal arts and selected professional areas, authorized January 25, 1971.

Oregon Technical Institute now presents specific degree requirements for these programs for the approval of the Board.

Degree Requirements in Nursing

Oregon Technical Institute proposes to award the associate in arts degree in nursing to students successfully completing a program of study involving some 57 hours of course work in nursing and 51 hours in general education and supporting subjects. The proposed program has been developed in consultation with the State Board of Nursing and is similar to ADN programs offered elsewhere, all of which must meet requirements of registration boards. The program is almost identical to that offered at Southern Oregon College.

Oregon Technical Institute is requesting authorization to award the AA (associate in arts) degree to its ADN graduates, rather than the associate of applied science (AAS) degree awarded graduates in health
science programs already offered at Oregon Technical Institute or the associate in science (AS) degree used by Oregon community colleges and Southern Oregon College.

Oregon Technical Institute has no strong preference for the AA degree designation. Oregon Technical Institute suggests it only because this is the degree awarded by institutions in California and Washington with which the consultants to the Oregon Technical Institute programs have been most familiar.

Degree Requirements for College Transfer Students

In January 1971, after several months of study including a public hearing in Klamath Falls, the Board authorized Oregon Technical Institute to enroll students in college transfer programs to the extent that it can serve these students within its budgeted capabilities and physical facilities.

The transfer programs offered by Oregon Technical Institute will be similar to the two-year transfer programs offered by the Oregon community colleges. Requirements for the associate degree will also parallel those of the community colleges' associate in arts degree. These requirements as proposed by Oregon Technical Institute, are:

General Education Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Composition</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/Mathematics</td>
<td>3-term sequence (minimum, 9 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>3-term sequence (9 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>3-term sequence (9 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year major sequence in liberal arts (Western Civilization or humanities) or science/mathematics or as indicated in recommended transfer program</td>
<td>9 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Education</td>
<td>52 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total hours</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>two terms, including the last one (a minimum of 24 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade point average (cumulative)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practice in Oregon in Respect to Associate Degrees

There is no precedent in Oregon for awarding the associate in arts degree in the area of nursing. The six community colleges offering two-year nursing programs award the associate in science degree, as does Southern Oregon College.

There is considerable precedent in Oregon for awarding the AA degree to students completing requirements as proposed by Oregon Technical Institute for its transfer programs. Although under State Board of
Education requirements, a community college may be authorized to offer the AA degree for vocational-technical programs which include a minimum of 18 hours of general education, the community colleges in Oregon have generally reserved the AA degree for college transfer programs incorporating a broad program of general education paralleling that proposed by Oregon Technical Institute.

Board's Office Recommendation

The Board's Office recommended that Oregon Technical Institute be authorized to award the associate in science (AS) degree to students completing the two-year registered nurse program and the associate in arts (AA) degree to students completing two-year college transfer programs.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mrs. Johnson asked if it would be possible for the four-year institutions to award an AA degree at the end of 90-93 hours of work. She observed there was great interest nationwide in making it easier for students to move in and out of educational programs, and the awarding of an AA degree to affirm completion of certain requirements would give students who did not want to continue straight through for baccalaureate degrees something to show for the work they had done.

Chancellor Lieuallen responded that some years ago the institutions in the State System awarded an associate degree on request upon completion of the first two years of college work. He said that it would be appropriate to consider doing so again.

Dr. Romney reported that he had begun the exploration of this question with institutional representatives some weeks ago. Limited exploration suggests an interest in this possibility among some of the institutions. He observed also that the community colleges would need to be reassured, if the State System institutions make a point of offering the associate degree to students.

The Committee on Academic Affairs recommended that the Board authorize Oregon Technical Institute to award the associate in science degree to students completing requirements in nursing, and the associate in arts degree to students completing requirements in college transfer programs, as proposed, effective with the 1971-72 year.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.
In accordance with provisions of ORS 526.225 the Board of Higher Education approved the establishment on June 13, 1961, of two advisory committees at Oregon State University: The Forest Products Research Advisory Committee and the Forest Management Research Advisory Committee. It was recommended that the two advisory committees be merged into one committee to be known as the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee. The Board's Chief Counsel, Mr. Ray Underwood, has advised that the proposed change in the committee structure is in accordance with the general authority provided to the Board in ORS 526.225.

The following appointments to the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee for the period July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1974 were recommended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Professional Affiliation</th>
<th>Nominated by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Clarence W. Richen, Vice President Crown Zellerbach Corporation</td>
<td>Pulp &amp; Paper Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fred Sohn, Sun Studs, Inc.</td>
<td>Western Forest Industries Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gene D. Knudson, President Willamette Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>Industrial Forestry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. H. E. Morgan, Jr., Senior Vice President, Wood Products Weyerhaeuser Company</td>
<td>American Plywood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John C. Hampton, President Willamina Lumber Company</td>
<td>Western Wood Products Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. L. L. Stewart, President Bohemia Lumber Company, Inc.</td>
<td>Western Wood Preservers Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Aaron U. Jones, President and General Manager Seneca Sawmill Company</td>
<td>West Coast Lumber Inspection Bureau; Northwest Timber Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul R. Doe, Vice President and General Manager Olson-Lawyer Lumber Company</td>
<td>Southern Oregon Timber Industries Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Archie D. Craft, State Director Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rexford A. Resler, Regional Forester Region 6, U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>U. S. Forest Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. J. E. Schroeder, State Forester Oregon State Department of Forestry</td>
<td>Oregon State Department of Forestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board approved the recommendation as presented. Mr. Stewart
Purchase of Richter Property, OSU

(Considered by Building Committee, July 7, 1971.)

It was recommended that authorization be given to purchase the Richter property at 2827 N. W. Orchard Street, Corvallis, which is within the approved campus boundaries of Oregon State University. The owner has indicated a desire to sell and has executed an option in the amount of $27,100. This amount is in line with appraisals obtained by institutional officials. The property consists of a lot containing about 8,250 square feet improved with a one and one-half story wood-frame house with basement. This house has four bedrooms and also contains a small two-bedroom apartment in the basement. The property is located in an area designated for the future development of parking. In the interim, it would be used as a rental. Funds to finance this acquisition would be provided from proceeds of Article XI-F(1) bonds authorized by Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Easements to City of Corvallis through South Farm, OSU

(Considered by Building Committee, July 7, 1971.)

Property to the south and west of the South Farm of Oregon State University has been annexed to the City of Corvallis, and a comprehensive sewer system has been planned to serve residences and other facilities in the area. According to City officials, the project is expected to begin in the very near future, and would require two easements for the use of Board property within the South Farm. One easement would be a permanent right-of-way 15 feet wide and about 814.74 feet long with an additional 10-foot width on a temporary basis for construction purposes. The second easement would begin at the east end of the first one and would grant a permanent right-of-way 50 feet wide extending about 1481.88 feet then reduced to a 20-foot right-of-way extending 600 feet further. During the period of construction, the City would be permitted to use a wider strip of land not exceeding 20 feet on each side of the area within the second permanent easement.

It is expected that the University's assessment from the City for the proposed sewer system would be about $19,000. However, officials of the University have indicated to the City that such funds are not available to the Agriculture Experiment Station and would need to be requested within the biennial budget to be presented to the 1973 Legislature.

It was recommended that the easements be granted for three reasons:

1. The proposed sewer systems would provide for the straightening and rip-rapping of the Squaw Creek, which now meanders through the property. The straightening of the water course would benefit Oregon State University;
2. If improvements are made to the South Farm at some future time, they would need to use the sewer system; and

3. The University wants to cooperate with the City of Corvallis in providing the sewer system for service to adjoining residences and other facilities.

The form of the easements would be subject to approval by the Board's attorney prior to execution by the appropriate Board officers.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented, with Mr. Mosser voting against the motion.

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Forestry Building Renovation, OSU

In accordance with the program authorized by the Board on June 9, 1971, and by the State Emergency Board on June 11, the final plans and specifications for the renovation of the old Forestry Building at Oregon State University were completed and bids for the project were received in Corvallis on June 24. As adjusted for one of the deductive alternatives, the two bids received were in the amounts of $69,898 and $70,965. A contract award was made to the low bidder and the following budget was approved:

Direct construction costs:
  Renovation work - Tee & Jay Constructors, Corvallis $69,898
  Fire sprinkler system work (to be bid and contracted separately) 5,000

Physical Plant costs (planning, construction supervision, moving, etc.) 3,602

Contingencies 3,500

Total 82,000

Of the total requirements, $60,000 is being provided from state funds authorized by the 1971 Legislature for capital outlay alterations and rehabilitation work, $4,000 was allocated previously from the Board's reserve for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay, and the remainder is being financed from balances available from the 1970-71 operating budget of the institution. In the event that the bids for the fire sprinkler work exceed the budget estimate of $5,000 noted above, institutional officials have indicated that such excess would be absorbed from the contingency reserve or would be financed from other institutional sources (such as building use credits or the 1971-72 Physical Plant budget).
Upon completion of the project later this summer, the space within the old Forestry Building will be assigned to the English and Psychology Departments. The staff and activities of the School of Forestry have been moved into the new Peavy Hall.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented. Mrs. Johnson called attention to the fact that this project involved the renovation of space already available at a much lower cost than the construction of new space. In response to a question, Mr. Hunderup said that the cost per square foot was relatively small because the rehabilitation work was minimal.

Release of Board's Interest in Invention of Dr. W. Curtis Johnson, Jr., OSU

Oregon State University officials report that Dr. W. Curtis Johnson, Jr., Assistant Professor of Biochemistry-Biophysics, has discovered a process entitled "A Circular Dichroism Spectrometer for the Vacuum Ultraviolet." The discovery was submitted to Battelle Development Corporation in accordance with the patenting and marketing agreement, but said corporation has declined to accept the process for patenting and developing because of doubtful patentability. The inventor believes that some benefit can be derived from the development of this process by his own effort and expense.

It was recommended that the Board authorize the release to Dr. W. Curtis Johnson, Jr., of any interest it might have in the invention in accordance with Section 64.140, Paragraph 4, of the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Retroactive Award of JD Degree, UO

The University of Oregon requests authorization to award the Doctor of Jurisprudence (JD) degree to all graduates of the University of Oregon Law School holding the Bachelor of Law (LLB) degree, and to award the JD degree with honors to all graduates who received the JD degree prior to 1967, the year the University adopted the policy of awarding the JD degree as the sole first professional degree in law.

The document presenting the request, together with the analysis of the Board's Office, titled Request of University of Oregon To Award the Doctor of Jurisprudence (JD) Degree to All Graduates Now Holding the Bachelor of Laws (LLB) Degree, dated July 6, 1971, is submitted to the Board for designation as an integral part of the minutes of the July 26 meeting.
Background of the Request

Prior to 1949, the University of Oregon Law School, as was common with law schools of the time, required only two years of post-high school preprofessional education for admission. Since the law school program then (as now) was a three-year program, the graduating law school student had completed what was essentially a five-year baccalaureate degree program for which he was awarded a Bachelor of Laws (LLB) degree.

Students wishing to earn the Doctor of Jurisprudence (JD) degree were required to: (1) complete three years of preprofessional work before admission to the law school, (2) earn the bachelor's degree (BA/BS), which was awarded the student upon the completion of the first year of law school, (3) write an acceptable thesis, (4) achieve in the three-year law program a superior academic record.

In 1949, the University of Oregon Law School established as an admission requirement three years of preprofessional work. Students were awarded a bachelor's degree (BA/BS) at the end of their first year of law school and the professional degree, Bachelor of Laws (LLB), on the completion of the full three-year law school program. Those students desiring to earn the JD degree were held to: (1) the writing of an acceptable thesis, and (2) the achievement of a superior academic record in the law school.

In 1967, the law school (1) with limited exceptions, made a bachelor's degree a requirement for admission, (2) dropped the LLB degree, and (3) made the Doctor of Jurisprudence (JD) degree its sole first professional degree in law (awarded to all students upon completion of the three-year law program). All students have since been required to satisfy substantial writing requirements.

In taking the foregoing action, the University of Oregon school placed itself among the ranks of the great majority of law schools approved by the American Bar Association, both as to the preprofessional education admission requirements (bachelor's degree) and as to the degree granted (JD) as the first professional degree in law.

When the JD degree became, in many law schools, the sole or principal first professional degree (awarded after the completion of three years of professional preparation as was formerly true in the case of the Bachelor of Laws (LLB) degree), many of the LLB graduates of earlier years felt that they were unjustifiably disadvantaged.

The response by many law schools has been to offer to former LLB graduates the opportunity to receive the JD degree, upon application and payment of a required fee. A survey of approved law schools by the Oklahoma State Regents in 1969 revealed the fact that the retroactive granting of the JD degree is now very widespread, including some of the most prestigious schools of law. The survey found that of 134 responding law schools, 103 (77 percent) (including such schools as Columbia, Harvard, Stanford) reported having awarded the
JD degree to all or some previous graduates. Of those 103 schools of law awarding the degree retroactively, 78 (including Columbia, Harvard, University of California at Berkeley, University of Michigan) have made it available to all alumni, five have awarded it only to those who entered the law school after having completed a previous bachelor's degree, and 11 awarded it to all those who were able to complete the requirements for a baccalaureate degree prior to completion of the first professional degree in law, and an additional two universities reported that they planned to follow this latter practice. A few of the responding institutions awarded the degree retroactively on some basis other than the above.

Of the 134 responding institutions, 126 (94 percent) reported that the JD degree is the only earned degree they have offered retroactively.

An earned degree is awarded in recognition of specific academic accomplishment. Awarding a degree retroactively is presumably done on the assumption that the work completed by the recipient (in this case, an LLB graduate of another day) represented a reasonable equivalent of that presently required of the students in earning the degree that it is proposed be awarded retroactively (the JD degree in the present instance). This raises the question as to how one measures comparability of achievement. One aspect of that measure is the number of years preparation required. A second is the degree requirements, per se, and a third, the level of achievement required during the years of preparation.

Insofar as the length of the professional preparation per se leading to the law degree is concerned (three years), the requirement has remained the same since the early days of the University of Oregon Law School. What has changed over the years has been: (1) the requirements in the professional program, and (2) the extent of the preprofessional work required before entering upon the professional program.

- The requirements in the professional (three-year) program have changed primarily in that since 1967, when the University of Oregon Law School made the JD degree the sole first professional degree in law, all students are required to satisfy substantial written assignments. Prior to 1967, a thesis was not required to satisfy substantial written assignments. Prior to 1967, a thesis was not required of any but the JD-aspirants.

- As earlier noted, the preprofessional work required has increased from two years (required up until 1949) to three years (beginning in 1949) and since 1967 to a baccalaureate degree (four years).
Board's Office Recommendation

Several alternative responses to the University of Oregon request suggest themselves:

1. Authorize the University of Oregon to award the JD degree retroactively to graduates of the University of Oregon Law School who meet the present standards of the JD degree, i.e., graduates who entered law school with a baccalaureate degree.

2. Authorize the University of Oregon to award the JD degree retroactively to former graduates holding the LLB degree who have met the resident study requirements (three years preprofessional, three years professional) which formed the basis for granting the JD degree at the University of Oregon in former years.

3. Authorize the University of Oregon to award the JD degree retroactively to all of its former graduates holding the LLB degree, including those who have only five years of resident study (two years of preprofessional study, three years of professional study).

The University of Oregon proposes alternative three on the grounds that the years of professional preparation required for the JD degree (three) have remained unchanged through the years. This being so, they would urge, the University should belatedly recognize that those students who completed the three-year professional program before the JD degree became the sole first professional degree at the University, have a right to the degree; that if the University does not thus recognize the similarity in preparation of its law students before and after 1967, by awarding the JD degree retroactively, it disadvantages the LLB degree holders in an unjustifiable manner. It is this same view that has led a substantial majority (103 schools) of the 134 law schools included in the Oklahoma Regents study to grant the JD degree retroactively to former graduates.

If the Board authorizes the University of Oregon to award the JD degree retroactively, the University would propose to notify each eligible graduate that he may receive a certificate evidencing the conferring of the JD or JD with honors upon application and payment of charges to be set by the University. The certificate would indicate the date of the original LLB or JD degree awarded and the date of the JD degree issued in substitution.

The number of former LLB graduates who might be affected by the decision to grant the JD degree to all University graduates holding the LLB degree totals 671:

- In the period from 1930 to the close of 1948, during which period the degree requirements were two years of preprofessional education and three years of professional study, the University of Oregon awarded a total of 303 law degrees. Of these, 243 (80 percent) were LLB degrees; 60 (20 percent) were JD degrees.
In the period from 1949 to the close of 1966, during which period the degree requirements were three years of professional education and three years of professional study, a total of 490 degrees in law were awarded. Of these 428 (87 percent) were LLB degrees; 62 (13 percent) were JD degrees.

It was the Board's Office recommendation that the Board adopt alternative No. 3 above, namely, to authorize the University of Oregon to award retroactively the JD degree to all University of Oregon graduates holding the LLB degree and the JD degree with honors to all of its graduates awarded the JD degree prior to 1967.

Mr. Corey, a graduate of the University of Oregon School of Law, abstained from the discussion. Mr. Mosser observed that he did not believe the title of the degree made any difference to practicing attorneys, but that it might be important to those in government or academic positions. Dean Scoles affirmed that the request was made in order to avoid any possible discrimination against past graduates. He said there had been very active interest in the University's proposal on the part of some of the school's alumni. In respect to the charge to those applying for the retroactive award of the degree, Dean Scoles said this had not been determined, that the charge made by other law schools varied.

Committee Recommendation

The Committee recommended that the Board authorize the University of Oregon to award the JD degree retroactively to all graduates holding the LLB degree, and the JD with honors to those graduates awarded the JD degree prior to 1967.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the report as presented. Mr. Corey and Mr. Layman abstained from the discussion and voting on the recommendation because they were graduates of the University of Oregon Law School and would be affected by the decision.

Report on Grading System, UO

(Considered by Committee on Academic Affairs, July 6, 1971.)

The Board may recall that the University of Oregon, in 1970-71, modified its grading system, retention policies, and graduate requirements in a number of particulars - allowing students to earn 96 credit hours of the required 186 hours for graduation in courses graded pass-no pass, substituting the grade of N (no credit) for the present grades of D and F, and a number of other modifications, which it is important to understand in evaluating the University of Oregon's grading policies.

The Board, at its July 27, 1970, meeting in Ashland, taking note of the number of changes being proposed by the institutions in basic degree requirements, asked that during 1970-71 the University of Oregon prepare a report and evaluation of the application of the new grading standard, particularly as it affects problems related to transfer.
In response to the foregoing request, the University of Oregon prepared, and the Board's Office now presents to the Board, the report of the University on its experience with the new grading policies, prepared under the direction of Dean Charles Duncan.

The University report, together with background information prepared by the Board's Office, titled University of Oregon Report of Its Experience with the Grading Policies in Effect in 1970-71, dated July 6, 1971, is submitted to the Board for designation as an integral part of the minutes of the July 26 meeting.

Grading Policies in Respect to Pass/No Pass in Other System Institutions

All of the undergraduate institutions in the State System except Oregon Technical Institute have some provision for optional Pass/No Pass grading:

Oregon State University. Undergraduate students may elect to complete up to three hours of work per term (a maximum of 36 hours) graded on a Satisfactory- Unsatisfactory (S-U) basis. S is the equivalent of A, B, or C. U is the equivalent of D or F. Oregon State University has some 20 courses, including student teaching, which are graded only on a Pass-No Pass basis. P = A, B, or C; N = D or F. The courses graded P-N do not count toward the student's 36-hour limit on courses graded S-U.

Portland State University: Undergraduate students may elect a maximum of 18 hours of work to be completed on a P-NP basis in addition to PE 180 and PE 190 and other courses offered only on a P-NP basis. P = A, B, or C; NP = D or F.

Southern Oregon College. Undergraduate students may elect up to one course per term (a maximum of 12 courses) on a Pass-No Pass basis. In addition, certain courses, such as student teaching and field studies, are graded on a Pass-Fail (P-F) basis, only. These courses do not count toward the student's 12 course maximum of elective P-NP. P = A, B, C. NP = D, F.

Eastern Oregon College. Undergraduate students may elect up to a maximum of 36 hours on the S-U basis. No more than 12 S-U hours may be taken any one year. S = A, B, C; U = D or F. Courses offered only on an S-U basis, such as practice teaching, are not counted toward the 36-hour maximum.

Oregon College of Education. Undergraduate students may elect to complete any elective course on a Pass-No Pass (P-N) basis. Excluded by this provision are all courses taken in completion of general education, major, and minor requirements. A few courses, including student teaching, are offered on a P-N basis only. When a course is offered on a P-N basis only, the instructor is responsible for establishing the level of competency necessary to receive a P grade.
Oregon Technical Institute. Oregon Technical Institute has no provision for optional P-N grading. A few courses are offered on a Pass-Fail basis. Several non-credit courses, of a remedial nature, are offered on a Pass-Withdraw basis. P indicates that the student met requirements of the course. W that he did not.

Report of the University of Oregon

The University of Oregon reports in tabular form the number of hours of graded and pass/no pass course work completed by undergraduate students fall 1969 through winter 1971, the number of hours with grades of D/F or N earned in pass-differentiated courses, and the grade-point-average of pass-differentiated grades. The table (Table I, p. 14 of the report) shows no major shifting by students to the P/NP option. The percentage of work completed with pass/no pass grades during each term of 1969-70 (before the new grading system went into operation) and each term of 1970-71 (the first year under the new system), was reported as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of grades assigned in pass-differentiated courses also showed little variation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level, P/NP Courses</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effect of the new grading system on selection of candidates for graduation with honors or for other honors which were formerly based largely, if not entirely, on the GPA is being studied by a special faculty committee. The committee is charged with recommending new guidelines for such selection processes for consideration fall term, 1971.

The registrars' and admissions' offices report no problems or discernible adverse effects of the new policy on the transfer of students into or out of the University. Departmental requirements provide that most of the work completed for a major must be taken in a graded (pass-differentiated) basis so the P/NP option has not affected the portion of the record most useful in admission to graduate schools.

The most significant change reported by the University is a marked increase in the number of "academic warnings" in 1970-71 over 1969-70. Under the new grading system, a student must complete a minimum of 85 percent of all work attempted with grades of A, B, C, or P. A student is automatically issued a warning any term in which his total accumulation of N grades becomes 2/3 of the total number which would make him subject to probation, or in which he earns 6 or more N grades during the term, or in which he completes less than 65 percent of all
The number of students disqualified under the new system increased somewhat:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ad hoc committee of the University of Oregon faculty is to be appointed annually, for at least five years, to study the effects and consequences of the new grading system, with reports of its findings and recommendations for change made to the faculty and to the Board.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Members of the Board discussed various aspects of the University of Oregon's new grading policies with Mr. Spencer Carlson, Registrar of the University, who presented the report. Mrs. Johnson said she had grave reservations about the number of hours (96) which could be completed on a P basis, even though the first year of experience had shown no great shift to P/NP grades. She noted also that the new grading system reduced the grading options available to an instructor by taking away the grade of D, which, she said, was a useful grade for the student who was trying and was just on the edge of doing satisfactory work.

The Committee accepted the report and transmits it herewith for acceptance by the Board.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report and directed it be placed on file.

(Considered by Building Committee, July 7, 1971.)

In order to provide electrical service to the Bio-Social Research Center at the University, which is to be located on a two and one-half acre site in the northeast sector of the University of Oregon campus, north of the millrace and south of the Southern Pacific Railroad line, the City of Eugene, acting by and through the Eugene Water and Electric Board (EWEB) has requested that the Board grant a permanent easement for the use of a strip of land for the installation of electrical service lines and equipment.

Because of the benefits which such service would provide to the proposed facilities, it was recommended that the appropriate Board officers be authorized to execute the easement for the installation and maintenance of power poles and lines with the understanding that the form of the document, to be drafted by EWEB, shall be satisfactory to the Board's attorney.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented. It was requested that information be provided at the Board meeting as to the comparative cost of putting the power lines underground as opposed to the installation of power poles and lines above ground.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hunderup said that further negotiations with the National Science Foundation and Eugene Water and Electric Board had resulted in an agreement that the electrical service would be provided underground. He said it was intended that the detailed arrangement for underground service would be worked out with Eugene Water and Electric Board.
Easement to
City of Eugene
from Garden
Avenue to the
Millrace, UO

Mr. Joss indicated that he would prefer to have the easement which is ultimately prepared specify that the service be underground.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

(Considered by Building Committee, July 7, 1971.)

In order to install a new storm sewer for adequate drainage from Garden Avenue north to the northerly part of the Millrace within the campus of the University of Oregon, the City of Eugene has requested that the Board provide a permanent right-of-way and easement for the use of a strip of land about 10 feet wide and extending approximately 270 feet. During the period of construction, the City would be permitted to use a wider strip of land not exceeding 20 feet, abutting the east side of the proposed permanent easement.

No portion of the cost of the new storm sewer line would be assessed against the University. Consequently, in view of the benefit of the project to the public and the University, no charge would be made to the City for the easement.

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officers be authorized to execute the easement for the proposed storm sewer with the understanding that the form thereof shall be satisfactory to the Board's attorney.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Agreement with
Oregon Fish
Commission
for Site of
Research
Facility at
Institute of
Marine Biology,
Charleston, UO

(Considered by Building Committee, July 7, 1971.)

When the tract of land forming a part of the Coos Head River and Harbor Reservation was conveyed to the University of Oregon by the Secretary of War on January 18, 1932, one of the features of the quitclaim deed was as follows:

"The lands herein shall be used by the University of Oregon solely for scientific and educational purposes subject, however, to the right of the United States..."

The Fish Commission of Oregon recently requested permission from the University of Oregon to lease about 10,400 square feet of the property as the site of a research facility which would be financed from a State of Oregon General Fund appropriation. Such an arrangement would be of mutual benefit to the Fish Commission and the University because of the close association of research personnel and the exchange of scientific information.
Inasmuch as the quitclaim deed from the federal government indicated "that if the University of Oregon shall, at any time, attempt to alienate said lands the same shall revert to the United States," University officials sought and received written approval from the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army to make a land lease with the Fish Commission.

An agreement has been prepared, and has been signed by the State Fisheries Director, setting forth the conditions and understandings under which a parcel of land at the Institute of Marine Biology would be made available to the Fish Commission for the construction and operation of the proposed research facility.

The main features of the Agreement, which has been reviewed by the Board's attorney, are as follows:

1. The Oregon State Board of Higher Education, on behalf of the University of Oregon, would make available to the Fish Commission a triangular site of about 0.2 acres at the Institute of Marine Biology in close proximity to the University's building presently occupied by the Commission. In addition, underground utility lines and associated access roads would be available to service the facility.

2. The gross area of the proposed building and future office expansion would be approximately 2,600 square feet. Plans for the building and the exact site are to be reviewed and approved by University and Board officials. The Agreement would be terminated if the Fish Commission has not commenced construction for the building prior to December 31, 1974.

3. The new facility would be operated by the regular personnel of the Fish Commission for the regular business of the Commission in compliance with policies and procedures established by the University for administration of the Institute of Marine Biology. The Commission will reimburse the University monthly for an appropriate share of certain common operating costs, such as the maintenance of service roads, parking lots, sewage disposal system, water, electricity, watchmen, grounds care, etc.

4. The Commission would make the building available to the University for its use in the event the proposed facility becomes excess to the Commission's needs.

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be empowered to complete and execute the proposed Agreement between the Board and the Fish Commission for the use of leased land at the Oregon Institute of Marine Biology for the construction and operation of a research building in accordance with the program outlined above.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Hunderup said that the length of the agreement would be for 49 years, with an optional renewal for an additional 49-year period.

The extent of the commitment under this agreement to the continued existence of higher education facilities on the site at Charleston was discussed. It was indicated that the agreement would not require the continued commitment for use of the site by the University of Oregon or the State System of Higher Education and that if the property were returned to the federal government, the Fish Commission could enter into negotiations to retain a portion of the site for its use.

The Committee approved a motion by Mr. Joss that the lease agreement include a provision that the Board of Higher Education would have no obligation to the Fish Commission under this agreement if the Charleston facilities ceased to be operated by the Board.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations, subject to the change indicated above.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hunderup said that subsequent to the Committee meeting the lease agreement had been amended to include the following statement: "The University shall have no obligation to the Commission under this agreement if the Charleston facility ceased to be operated by the State Board of Higher Education."

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

To assist the staff of the University of Oregon in the preparation of plans, specifications and cost estimates for the proposed remodeling of portions of John Straub Hall for use by the Psychology Department and for minor alterations to space within the Psychology Clinic at 1679 Agate Street, arrangements have been made for the professional services of Lutes & Amundson, Architects, Springfield. The work within Straub Hall is expected to include revisions in the ventilation system, particularly to serve the proposed research areas, as well as improvements and additions to electrical service, some partition changes, redecorating, etc.

A portion of the funding for the project would be provided from state funds authorized for capital outlay by Chapter 709, Oregon Laws 1971, supplemented by balances available to the University from building use credits and from possible allocations from the Board's reserve for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay during 1971-1973.

The architects are to be compensated on a time and materials basis, including reimbursement for the fees of engineering consultants, within a limitation of $12,000.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Upon the recommendation of University of Oregon officials and Architects Morin-Longwood-Edlund, the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning inspected and accepted the work performed by the construction contractor for the Computing Center Addition and Alterations as of June 23, 1971, subject to the completion of a few minor items. A revised semifinal budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on July 27, 1970:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Revised Budget 6/23/71</th>
<th>Original Budget 7/27/70</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Arnt</td>
<td>$292,571</td>
<td>$285,364</td>
<td>$7,207 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ree &amp; Son, Eugene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>$23,655</td>
<td>$23,655</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable equipment</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision, Physical Plant costs and miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>$14,774</td>
<td>$13,713</td>
<td>$1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$352,000</td>
<td>$352,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes an increase of testing allowances to confirm structural adequacy of roof slab on initial building; increase in exterior security lighting, rerouting of duct work; modification to roof edge detail; furnishing and installation of a roof hatch and battery operated emergency lights; removal of asphalt residue on existing roof deck and other changes included within seven approved change orders.

Plans and specifications for the Computing Center Addition and Alterations were prepared by Architects Morin-Longwood-Edlund of Eugene. The addition of a second floor and the alterations on the first floor were essential to provide space for the expanded staffs of both the Computing Center and the Department of Computer Science and for housing the new PDP-10 computer and equipment which was provided by the grant of the National Science Foundation. (The existing IBM 360/50 was retained for service functions to instruction, research and some business operations.)

Interior alterations on the first floor level included removal of some partitions for expansion of the work areas, the provision of two customer engineering areas, the addition of a vault to provide protection of magnetic tapes and other data, a new shipping and receiving area and other related service spaces, as well as two new stairways.

The second floor level contains about 15 one-man offices, 14 two-man offices and one six-man office for the staffs of the two occupying departments. Additionally, the central core contains five administrative offices, secretarial space, a conference room, a laboratory containing about sixteen teletype units, three seminar rooms and related service areas.

The building is framed with fire-proofed structural steel with concrete floor and roof slabs, enclosed with brick veneer facing. All materials and systems match those included in the existing unit. The
building is completely air-conditioned. The existing mechanical equipment is sized adequately to serve the remodeled ground floor level, including the cooling requirements for the second computer. The second floor is ventilated with new equipment placed on that floor. A shaft for a future service elevator is provided.

Direct construction costs applicable to the addition, excluding alterations, were about $231,657. For the gross area of approximately 10,802 square feet of new space, these costs averaged about $21.45 per square foot. Approximately $60,914 was allocated for the alterations work performed on the first floor. Based upon a gross area of 10,849 square feet on this level, these costs averaged about $5.61 per square foot.

All of the funds required for the planning and construction were provided from the science improvement grant which the National Science Foundation made available to the University.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UO Computing Center Addition and Alterations

Architects - Morin-Longwood-Edlund, Eugene

Legislative authorization - State Emergency Board (June 19, 1970)

Board's priority - Part of Priority No. 24 in 1969-1971 (Educational and General Plant)

Approximate gross area:
  Addition - 10,802 square feet
  Remodeling - 10,849 square feet
  Total - 21,651 square feet

Total project costs - $352,000

Direct construction costs:
  Addition
    Average (per square foot) - $21.45
  Remodeling
    Average (per square foot) - $5.61
    Total

Financing plan:
  Grant from National Science Foundation

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented,
Upon the recommendation of University of Oregon officials and Campbell-Yost & Partners, project architects, the work performed by the general construction contractor for the Architecture and Allied Arts Addition was accepted as of May 24, 1971, subject to the completion of a few minor items. The work performed by the mechanical and electrical contractors had been accepted on December 23, 1970. The Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning inspected the work on behalf of the Board. A revised semifinal budget is shown below in comparison with the one reported to the Board on September 8, 1969:

### Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revised Budget 5/24/71</th>
<th>Original Budget 9/8/69</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>$874,787</td>
<td>$869,650</td>
<td>$5,137 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work - Chase Company, Eugene</td>
<td>$212,957</td>
<td>$201,906</td>
<td>$11,051 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work - McSheeters Electric Co., Eugene</td>
<td>$93,089</td>
<td>$87,728</td>
<td>$5,361 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct construction costs</td>
<td>$1,180,833</td>
<td>$1,159,284</td>
<td>$21,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees, including soil investigations, etc.</td>
<td>$92,627</td>
<td>$91,352</td>
<td>$1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable equipment</td>
<td>$50,500</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>($6,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>($4,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>$36,540</td>
<td>$14,415</td>
<td>$22,125 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>33,949</td>
<td>33,949</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$1,362,000</td>
<td>$1,362,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes an adjustment for additional work caused by encountering unknown underground utility lines (from original heating plant) during excavation; modifications to glazing, hardware and counter tops and other changes incorporated within six approved change orders.

(2) Includes the relocation of water meters, water main, storm sewer; the provision and installation of new water main and tubing; and other changes incorporated within seven approved change orders.

(3) Includes modifications to campus distribution system to accept electrical loads; revisions to fixtures and receptacles; changes directed by the field inspector of the Bureau of Labor and other changes incorporated within five approved change orders.

(4) Includes additional building permit fees, moving costs and various other expenses, some of which resulted from delays in completing the project in accordance with the original schedule.

Plans and specifications for the major additions to the architecture building, Lawrence Hall, were prepared by Architects Campbell-Yost & Partners of Portland. The addition contains a gross area of approximately 43,688 square feet within four floors plus a partial basement (for mechanical equipment). The first floor includes a 294 seat lecture room with lobby and display spaces adjacent to the existing building.
The three upper floors house the departmental library, fine arts laboratory and review rooms, drafting rooms, studios, staff offices and related service spaces.

The building is of reinforced concrete construction with utilities exposed in most rooms. Only the lecture room area and library have interior finishes typical for instructional space. Full ventilation and cooling is provided throughout the new area, utilizing steam and chilled water from the central heating, power, and cooling plant. An elevator for service and passenger use is at the north end of the new wing near the loading dock. New stair towers at each end of the building provide the major vertical circulation. Connections with the present Lawrence Hall are made at both the first and second floor levels and only minor alterations were performed in the existing facilities to accommodate changes required for the new facilities. (Remodeling work on the first floor included the expansion of the administrative office area, conversion of storage areas into a laboratory and the provision of additional ventilation. On the second floor, the former library area was converted into studio and office space, a large drafting room was converted into a laboratory, studio and workroom and studio areas were converted into offices.)

In addition to the 294 student stations mentioned previously, the total project provided approximately 181 classroom and laboratory student stations and 39 office stations.

Based upon the gross area of 43,688 square feet, the direct construction costs of $1,119,845 applicable to the new building, excluding the remodeling, averaged about $25.63 per square foot.

The project budget of $1,362,000 was financed from the General Fund appropriation of $441,636 within Chapter 404, Oregon Laws 1967, and $920,364 of bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution. (The expenditure limitation of $1,645,000 approved by the 1967 Legislature included an allocation of $283,000 obligated previously for the relocatable Fine Arts units constructed north of the Millrace. A report of the inspection and acceptance of this earlier phase of the work was made to the Board on June 10, 1969.)

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UO Classroom, Office, Teaching Center: Architecture and Allied Arts and General Purpose Educational

Architects - Campbell-Yost & Partners, Portland

Legislative authorization - Chapter 404, Oregon Laws 1967

Board's priority - No. 15 in 1967-1969

Approximate gross area - 43,688 square feet

Total project cost (exclusive of $283,000 allocated for North Site Arts Buildings) $1,362,000
Direct construction costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,180,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>$1,119,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (per square foot)</td>
<td>$25.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodeling</td>
<td>$60,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund appropriation in Chapter 404, Oregon Laws 1967</td>
<td>$441,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General obligation bond borrowings under Article XI-G of Oregon Constitution</td>
<td>$920,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,362,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

At the December 8, 1970, meeting, the Board reviewed and approved the schematic design phase of planning for the Erb Memorial Union Addition and Alterations at the University of Oregon and authorized Board officials to instruct the project architects to complete the design development phase of planning within a total budget of $3,395,000. It was indicated to the Board that legislative authorization would be requested from the 1971 Oregon Legislature. The project subsequently was authorized and included within Chapter 709, Oregon Laws 1971, but a restriction included within the budget report of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means on House Bill 2038 noted that a request to the Emergency Board to approve the construction of these facilities would not be presented until July 1, 1972.

Institutional officials and Associated Architects Colburn and Sheldon of Portland and Lutes & Amundson of Springfield have filed with the Board's Office a copy of the design development phase of planning which is in general agreement with the schematic design phase. The site continues to be on the east side of the Erb and utilizes a portion of Onyx Street and the quad facing Carson Hall. (Onyx Street is to be vacated between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Avenues.)

The revised gross area of 54,624 square feet of new construction differs slightly from the earlier estimate of 52,303 square feet reported to the Board. The difference reflects an enlargement of area assigned to arts and crafts and to the married student center, both of which are on the lower level, and to the slight decrease of deck area in exchange for an enlarged area for the relocated store on the second level. (If 25 percent of the area of the covered walks and open decks were included, the "adjusted" gross area would be about 56,188 square feet compared with a similar computation of 54,955 square feet reported when the schematic design phase of planning was completed.)

The proposed addition would encompass the following to expand and complement major facilities within the existing union:

1. Arts and Crafts Center - To accommodate students who wish to engage in the creative arts, even though they are not
art majors, areas for painting, sculpture, framing, ceramics, jewelry, leathertworking, woodworking, and photography would be provided, as well as storage and supervisory space.

2. **Student offices** - To replace inadequate and poorly located space, and to provide for expanding programs of student government, about 6,000 net assignable square feet of student office space would be provided. The allocated space would be flexible and could accommodate future changes in the amount of space needed for each separate organization.

3. **Married Student Center** - To meet particular needs of the large number of married students, the proposed married student center could provide short term care for their children as well as a focus for such students on campus.

4. **Meeting Rooms** - To augment existing facilities in helping accommodate the University's public service and conference programs, a large meeting room would be located on the main floor, and six small meeting rooms would be provided on the upper level. Each of the areas would be adaptable for overflow dining purposes or would serve as lounge areas when not scheduled for meetings.

5. **Dining Facilities** - To accommodate more people and permit more rapid service, a new serving kitchen and additional dining areas would be provided. The eating areas would be located adjacent to a series of ramps leading down from the upper floor serving area. (The ramps would connect all levels and provide for quick orientation for the patron looking for an open table or for friends as he proceeds from the serving lines.)

6. **Lounges** - To offset the existing inadequacy of lounge space in the present union, lounges would be provided at all levels of the building. Typically, most would be adjacent to and part of the circulation system. These spaces are conceived as playing a highly functional role of providing "living room" space for non-structured inter-personal contact between students, faculty and staff. (Corridor and lobby areas in the addition would be spacious enough to serve as secondary lounge-study, exhibit and gallery space.)

7. **Outdoor Terraces and Lounges** - To supplement the heavily used existing terrace and exterior court, these spaces would provide an expansion for exterior functions during good weather. Also they would provide further additional exit passages from the upper floors of the addition.

The structure would be designed for two-way slab and post-reinforced concrete construction. Brick to match the existing building is proposed for the north wall only. The balance of the exterior would be exposed concrete with color anodized aluminum and glass window walls. The interior walls would be of wood or gypsum board. Some of the floor areas would be carpeted, others would feature industrial wood flooring or left as exposed concrete. All building areas would be air
conditioned with chilled water from the central plant. Mechanical space would be located at roof level. Both a passenger and a service elevator are proposed.

Some remodeling of the existing structure would be undertaken simultaneously with the addition. Additional entrance and lobby space would be provided as well as clarification of basic circulation patterns to relieve the congestion at the existing entry areas. Similar to the schematic design, the design development phase of planning continues to call for lowering the northwest forecourt to provide a new entryway to the basement activity areas of the existing union. This new lobby and entrance would tie in with the lower level of the proposed addition and also would provide an exterior pedestrian route for persons moving between the other areas of the campus who wish to by-pass the union, thus relieving substantially the congestion within the circulation areas, "Fishbowl," Snack Bar, etc., on the first floor of the existing building. A free-flow ("scramble-bar") cafeteria serving area, additional kitchen storage and freezer capacity, a new dishwashing facility and other remodeling would be provided. The Emerald, the school newspaper, would move from academic space in Allen Hall to the third floor of the existing building in the space presently occupied by student offices.

Based upon the price level expected to prevail in July 1972, when it is expected that bids may be solicited, the direct construction costs for the proposed addition are estimated to be approximately $2,224,014, excluding site work, utilities and landscaping. For the gross area of approximately 54,624 square feet, these direct construction costs would average about $40.71 per square foot.

For the "adjusted" gross area of approximately 56,188 square feet, these direct construction costs would average about $39.58 per square foot. Remodeling costs are budgeted to be approximately $339,334, including built-in food service equipment. For the approximate 21,370 net square feet of remodeling, these costs would average about $15.88 per square foot. The exterior work, which is a major element of the design and is planned to enhance effectively the outdoor facilities and provide a cross-campus pedestrian way, and the utilities and landscape work are estimated to be about $237,252. The estimated total project cost continues to be $3,395,000, as indicated when the schematic designs were approved by the Board.

Funds for planning and construction of the Erb Memorial Union Addition and Alterations are expected to be provided from self-liquidating bond borrowings to be issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available for auxiliary enterprises. The Board's Office has submitted an application for federal assistance (interest subsidy or direct loan) for the project under the Department of Housing and Urban Development's College Housing Program.
REGOPI.TLATION UPON COMPLETION OF DESIGN DEVELOPMENT

Project - UO Erb Memorial Union Addition and Alterations

Architects - Colburn and Sheldon, Portland, and Lutes & Amundson, Springfield, Associated Architects

Legislative authorization - Chapter 709, Oregon Laws 1971

Board's priority - No. 7 in 1971-1973 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Approximate areas:
  - Addition - 54,624 gross square feet
  - "Adjusted" - 56,188 gross square feet
  - Remodeling - 21,370 net assignable square feet

Estimated total project costs: $3,395,000

Estimated direct construction costs:
  - Addition
    - Average (per square foot) - $40.71
  - Remodeling
    - Average (per square foot) - $15.88
  - Site development and utilities
    - Total $2,800,600

Tentative schedule:
  - Bidding - July 1972
  - Completion - May 1974

Tentative financing plan:
  - General obligation bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $3,395,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by Finance Committee, July 7, 1971.)

DMSO Royalty Sharing Agreement with Stanley W. Jacob, M.D., UOMS

Pursuant to the then existing Patent Policies of the Administrative Code and with Board approval, an agreement for patenting and exploitation of inventions relating to uses of Dimethyl Sulfoxide (DMSO) was entered into with Crown Zellerbach Corporation (Crown) on November 30, 1963. The agreement provided, in part, that Crown would arrange for patenting and licensing of the inventions and would share royalties equally with the Board on those inventions where Board personnel were co-inventors.

Recently, two U. S. patents have been issued involving Medical School personnel. In all U. S. and foreign patents issued, except one which does not appear to be income-producing, the only Medical School staff member involved is Stanley W. Jacob, M.D., Associate Professor of Surgery. In accordance with Section 64.310 of the Administrative Rules,
Dr. Jacob has now requested that he be given a 30 percent share of the net patent income from those inventions in which he is the only Medical School staff member named in the patent. His request has been endorsed by the Dean of the Medical School.

Subsequent to the 1963 agreement, Crown has paid to the Medical School approximately $87,500, representing 50 percent of the advance on royalties received from several licenses. Introduction of the inventions into commercial use has been limited by governmental regulation.

It was recommended that the Vice Chancellor of Administration be authorized to develop and enter into an agreement with Dr. Stanley W. Jacob to permit payment of 30 percent of the net patent income hereafter received by the Board on patents issued to Crown personnel and Stanley W. Jacob alone. It was understood that amounts already received in the form of advance royalty income would not constitute net patent income for purpose of the royalty sharing agreement.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

On March 9, 1971, the Board approved the preliminary plans which Architects Campbell-Yost & Partners had prepared for the South Park Blocks Mall Development at Portland State University. These plans had been approved previously by the Portland Development Commission. The Board also authorized the appropriate Board officials "to cooperate further with the Portland Development Commission in the completion of planning and the execution of the work with the understanding that the funds required for the Board's share of approximately 16.03 percent would be provided from balances available from the bond borrowings authorized for land acquisition and related costs at Portland State University." It was reported at that time that the estimated total direct construction cost of the improvements would be approximately $497,000. Of this amount, the Board's share was expected to be slightly less than $80,000 for those portions of the work ineligible for consideration within the Urban Renewal project.

Within the last few days, institutional officials have advised the Board's Office that the final plans and specifications for the improvements have been completed and that the Portland Development Commission expects to receive bids therefor on or about August 3, 1971. Although the scope of the work remains substantially the same as that which had been incorporated within the preliminary plans, with only minor modifications, the architects have increased their estimate of the direct construction costs from $497,000 to approximately $623,400 and, with the concurrence of the Portland Development Commission, have included within the bid invitation several additive alternates. It appears likely that if these estimates are confirmed by the bids now being solicited, and if the sewer connections proposed
as part of the project are determined to be ineligible for federal assistance, the Board's share of the contract amount could range from $100,000 to $140,000 or so. Funds are available from the sale of Article XI-G bonds authorized by the 1965 Legislature for land acquisition and related costs at Portland State University.

It was recommended that the authorization granted by the Board in March 1971 be confirmed even though the estimated costs of the South Park Blocks Mall Development at Portland State University exceed the amounts previously reported.

Board Discussion and Action

During the Board discussion, Mr. Mosser questioned the advisability of letting contracts at this time because the construction could not be completed before the start of school this fall. In addition, he said that the contractors in the Portland area have very full schedules for the remainder of the summer and it would be unlikely that many bids would be received or a favorable price obtained at this time.

It was indicated that the scheduled date of completion was in late October. Mr. Hunderup said that this was a project of the Portland Development Commission and that a number of contractors have the drawings for the project and have expressed an interest in it. He indicated that recent bid experience in the State System has been more favorable than in the recent past.

President Wolfe said that the Development Commission had advanced the starting date to August 3 at the request of Portland State University officials and the University concurred with that date.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

(Considered by Building Committee, July 7, 1971.)

On December 7-8, 1964, the Board approved the long-range development plan of Oregon College of Education which had been prepared with the assistance of Architects Lutes and Amundson, Springfield. This planning report entitled, "A Small College Grows," gave consideration to the following items:

1. Various stages of growth to accommodate enrollments of 2,000, 4,000 and 6,000 students, preserving, to the extent possible, the quality of a small liberal arts college with special emphasis on the preparation of elementary and secondary teachers and research in teacher education.

2. The area within the approved campus boundaries and programmed phases for the expansion of those boundaries, such as to include additional acreage at the northwest edge of the campus to be used for residence halls, athletic fields and a new by-pass route for vehicular traffic.
3. A priority for removal of certain buildings such as:
   (a) remaining portion of Campbell Hall, (b) Jessica Todd Hall, (c) Senior Cottage, (d) Maple Hall, and (e) others.

4. The four major zones of general use: (a) academic zone, (b) housing and food service, (c) physical education - athletics, and (d) student services.

Subsequently, in four separate actions on January 25-26, 1965, September 11-12, 1967, October 23-24, 1967, and September 8, 1969, the Board approved the expansion of the campus boundaries and various property purchases. The present area of the College may be summarized as follows:

| Area owned by College | 116.13
| Area within campus boundaries but not owned by College | 0.88
| Area of streets and right-of-ways | 5.82
| Total area within approved campus boundaries | 122.83

Institutional officials and the campus planning consultants recently filed with the Board's Office draft copies of a new brochure entitled, A Small College in the 70's, intended to reflect the revised and updated plan for the long-range physical development of the College. The narrative includes a history of the College, a list of planning assumptions and planning objectives upon which the updated plan is based, resource analyses, space projections, development staging and implementation strategies.

Generally, the contents of the brochure include the following:

I. Planning assumptions and objectives, which had been approved by the Board on October 26, 1964, and which had formed the bases of the earlier plan, were reviewed and most of them were reaffirmed. Some new assumptions and objectives have been added, and others have been modified. Briefly, new items or modifications are summarized as follows:

A. Planning Assumptions - OCE would:

1. Assume an expanded role in the area of adult education.

2. Expand resources in media and materials for both staff and student preparation, including an increase in the use of audio-tutorial methods of instruction.

3. Analyze the relationships of its program to vocational education and prepare teachers for community colleges.
4. Attempt to provide housing for approximately 30 percent of its students rather than the earlier figure of 40 percent. A program would be developed for providing married student housing, primarily for graduate students, only (underlining added) if private development should fail to respond adequately to the housing need.

B. Planning Objectives

1. Rather than planning for physical development to accommodate 2,000, 4,000 and 6,000 students, the planning would now assume stages of 5,000, 6,000 and 7,500 FTE students. As before, the plan would be open ended.

2. Building heights would be limited to three stories rather than four.

3. The ratio of vehicular parking spaces to numbers of FTE students, faculty and staff would be one to two and one-half (1 parking space per 2.5 FTE) rather than one to three.

II. Land use and circulation and parking plans are identified as follows:

A. Land Use Plan - The plan projects areas of principal land use for campus growth:

1. The academic area plan would be based upon concentrated expansion of the present academic facilities. To permit class changes within allotted time, academic buildings would be grouped to provide a maximum walking time of ten minutes between the most distant buildings.

2. Off-street parking would be concentrated around the academic area providing a majority of such spaces within a ten-minute walking distance to all academic buildings.

   In addition, parking would be located between major use areas to support more than one campus function, particularly parking located between the academic, laboratory school, physical education, student center and dormitory areas.

3. Single student housing and food service facilities would be located north of the academic and student center areas. Well defined pedestrian linkages to the academic area would be provided to encourage pedestrian, rather than automobile, circulation between housing and instructional areas.

4. Major student support services would be located centrally to the academic, physical education and housing areas.
5. Should private enterprise fail to meet married student housing requirements adequately, a neighborhood site adjacent to the campus, reserved for this purpose, may be developed.

B. Circulation and Parking Plan - the plan indicates that:

1. Campus circulation systems would be based upon the separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic and by-passing arterial traffic to facilitate the closure of Monmouth Avenue and Church Street.

2. Major arterial traffic presently carried by Monmouth Avenue through the campus would be re-routed via a by-pass street following the northern and western boundaries of the campus. (As reported to the Board on April 30, 1971, general agreement of this alignment has been reached between the City of Monmouth and the College. However, funds appropriated for the project in 1969 were cancelled by Chapter 40, Oregon Laws 1971, so further legislative authorization will be required.)

3. Local traffic movements would be provided by local streets and well defined loops serving parking lots from local streets.

4. Parking lots would be located primarily at the perimeter of the academic core, which would permit easy pedestrian access to classroom buildings and dual support to physical education, laboratory school, academic core and housing areas. Separate areas would be provided for vehicular building service and visitor parking.

5. Vehicle-free pedestrian precincts would be created for the academic-student service, physical education, laboratory school and student housing areas.

6. Campus visitors would enter the academic precinct from either the north or south and adjacent to the Administration Building.

III. Staged growth has been identified to accommodate future construction during various stages:

A. Stage I - 3,490 FTE (Fall 1969) to 5,000 FTE

1. Key elements of this stage include:

a. Provision for a by-pass route along the north and west campus boundaries from Monmouth Avenue to Church Street, to eliminate through traffic which bisects the campus. As noted, this by-pass would
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provide for the future closure of Monmouth Avenue and Church Street, thus unifying the campus by excluding through traffic from the academic core.

b. Off-street parking
c. Essential internal automobile and service vehicle circulation
d. Relocation and construction of a new Campus Laboratory School
e. Fine Arts complex
f. New classroom and office buildings
g. Second phase of Physical Education complex
h. Relocation of major athletic facilities

2. With the removal by the College of the war surplus apartment units called The Village, the private housing market should be carefully evaluated for its ability to provide adequate and necessary married student housing at a rental rate commensurate with student incomes. If the supply is inadequate, an initial phase of 30-36 married student housing units could be constructed on College-owned land west of Stadium Drive.

3. It is anticipated that the population growth of Monmouth will generate medical facilities that will support College requirements. However, if these fail to materialize, the College will require additional Health Service space as projected in accordance with the Board's standards.


5. Two parcels of land totaling 0.48 acres would be added within the campus boundaries.

B. Stage II - 5,000 FTE to 6,000 FTE

1. Under Stage II, the plan provides for the closure of Monmouth Avenue and Church Street to vehicular traffic and the construction of the principal walkways which would link together and unify the campus. A major north-south walk would replace Monmouth Avenue and connect to east-west walks at prominent courts adjacent to the Library and the College Center.
2. Also projected for construction during this phase are the following:

a. Science Building addition
b. Conversion of the Campus Elementary School Building to classroom and office use
c. College Center addition
d. First phase of a new Physical Plant warehouse building
e. Development of the second quarter of the dormitory expansion area to accommodate approximately 310 students

3. To accommodate new construction, Arnold Arms, West House and two adjacent residential structures and the old Physical Education building would be demolished.

4. Two more parcels of land, totaling about 0.40 acres, would be added to the southern portion of the campus.

C. Stage III - 6,000 FTE to 7,500 FTE

1. Projected for construction during this phase are the following facilities:

a. Phase III of the Physical Education complex
b. Phase II of the Physical Plant warehouse
c. Third addition to the Library
d. A three-story classroom-office building west of the Science Building
e. A one-story classroom-office building northwest of the proposed Science addition
f. A three-story classroom-office building north of Campbell Hall
g. Another addition to the College Center
h. A stadium, two softball diamonds, soccer field and courts
i. Development of remaining dormitory expansion area for about 600 students

2. Further evaluation of the private housing market would be recommended at this time to determine if 12-18 additional married student housing units should be constructed.
3. The construction of new facilities during Stage III would require the demolition of Todd Hall, the Cottage and a wood-frame building south of the Library.

The narrative within the planning report calls attention to development concepts that would emphasize the unity and enhance the relationship of the campus to the environment of the Willamette Valley. The College administration and others responsible for future campus design are directed to be concerned with the following parameters to correct existing deficiencies and to make a significant contribution to the appearance of the Oregon College of Education campus:

1. Scale of buildings
2. Materials
3. Color
4. Landscape
5. Lighting
6. Signing (Graphics)
7. Circulation

The campus unification theme of the campus planning consultants is concluded with the following statement:

"The most important contribution to campus unification is the assurance that each building and site development project is considered as one development increment in the total scheme of ultimate campus development. Each increment must pass the test of (1) Does it conform to campus development objectives? (2) Does it relate to and integrate well with adjacent development and support systems? and (3) Is it considered in a comprehensive manner and not as an isolated building development project?"

It was recommended that the updated long-range development plan, as prepared with the assistance of Architects Lutes and Amundson, be approved for use as a guide to the future physical development of Oregon College of Education.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

During the Committee discussion, Dr. Paetz explained the planning assumptions and objectives upon which the proposed campus development plan was based. It was indicated also that the plan for physical facilities must be based upon the approved academic program. Therefore, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs had been consulted in connection with the master plan so that it would be consistent with the academic program for Oregon college of Education.

Mr. Mosser said that planning was important but that it should be coordinated with the growth schedule anticipated for enrollment. He indicated that he would not want to approve a plan for 7,500 students at this time.

President Rice said that the architects visit the campus almost every quarter to study developments which would affect the long-range plan. Then when new architects are selected for a specific project, the
master planners confer with them to be certain that the project architects are aware of the long-range planning. In addition, long-range planning provides guidance for future construction and helps to eliminate the possibility of errors in planning which otherwise might be made if there were no coordinated plan.

During the presentation of the master plan, it was stated that buildings would be limited to three stories in order to avoid a change in the fire rating for the City of Monmouth and the necessity for additional fire equipment which would need to be acquired for taller buildings. Mrs. Johnson suggested that it might be worthwhile to compare the cost factors of limiting buildings to three stories versus sharing in the cost of the necessary fire fighting equipment.

Mr. Mosser emphasized the need to construct the bypass highway route. Mr. Hunderup indicated that the Ways and Means Committee had said that street improvements for both Monmouth and Ashland should be funded from some source other than the General Fund. He said that these funds have not yet been identified and made available.

Mr. Mosser said that, in view of the urgency of the bypass route, it was his opinion that every effort ought to be made through the Legislative Fiscal Office and, if necessary, the Emergency Board, to see that this project is completed.

The Committee agreed that many factors still under study could have a definite effect on the plan as presented. Consequently, the Finance Committee recommended that the Board receive and accept the plan, rather than to approve it at this time, for use as a guide to the future physical development of Oregon College of Education.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board approved the recommendation of the Committee as presented.

(Considered by Finance Committee, July 7, 1971.)

On February 4, 1967, the Board authorized concurrent enrollments at various institutions and in courses offered by the Division of Continuing Education, with the understanding that the maximum charges (except for students enrolled at the Medical School and the Dental School) shall not exceed the rate of charge for a full-time student at Oregon State University, University of Oregon and Portland State University. A program has been implemented by providing that the home institution pays, for each student concurrently enrolled, $6.00 for each credit hour to the institution providing the instruction.

It is apparent that the Division of Continuing Education will be expected to become wholly self-supporting and the rate provided for concurrent enrollment may not be sufficient to obtain that objective. It was therefore, recommended that the Division of Continuing Education may be exempted from participating in the concurrent enrollment procedures with the colleges, universities and the technical institute.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Report of Meeting of Academic Affairs Committee

The Academic Affairs Committee met in regular session at 9:00 A.M. July 6, 1971, in Room 327, Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, to consider the following matters:

1. Division of Continuing Education Organization, 1971-72.


4. Request of Oregon Technical Institute for Authorization To Award AA Degree to Graduates of Nursing and Transfer Programs.

5. Request of University of Oregon for Authorization To Award the Doctor of Jurisprudence (JD) Degree to All Graduates Now Holding the Bachelor of Laws (LLB) Degree.


7. Recommended Amendments to the Board's Administrative Rules.

8. Recommended Amendments to Board's Policies Concerning Immunization.

A complete report of the meeting, titled Report of the Meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs, July 6, 1971, is submitted to the Board for designation as an integral part of the minutes of the July 26 meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Amendments to Immunization Requirements in State System Institutions

(Considered by Committee on Academic Affairs, July 6, 1971.)

At its meeting on December 13, 1960, the Board approved compulsory pre-entrance physical examination requirements as follows:

For protection of the public health, the Board requires a physical examination of all students as a condition of entrance to institutions under the control of the Board.
All students must present proof to the satisfaction of the institutional physicians of the following immunizations and tests, within the period and in the manner specified:

A. Smallpox — within five years.
B. Diphtheria-tetanus — within four years.
C. Tuberculosis — by intradermal tuberculin test, or chest film, or both, within six months prior to registration.

If so specified by the school catalog, the tuberculosis testing will be accomplished on the campus by the health service.

In addition, immunization against poliomyelitis is recommended within one year.

The physical examination will be repeated at a five-year interval, or at the discretion of the institutional physician. A summary interval history should be recorded on the health service report when a student transfers to another institution in the System.

Students who decline immunization because of religious conviction may be admitted, but only on the condition that they, and in the case of minor or dependent students, their parents or guardians with them, agree in writing to assume all expenses in connection with their care and isolation should they acquire smallpox, diphtheria or tetanus while students at the institution.

The directors of the health services in the State System institutions recommended to the Board that the foregoing statement be amended to delete all reference to smallpox immunization.

This recommendation was based upon the following:

1. The current U. S. Public Health Service recommendations for smallpox vaccinations in adults warns against revaccination unless for foreign travel, since the risk of complications from smallpox vaccination in an adult is greater than that of contracting smallpox within the United States.

2. The most knowledgeable consultants in the state, i.e. Department of Preventive Medicine, UOMS, and the Oregon State Epidemiologist concur with this recommendation.

3. The requirement as presently enforced leaves the State System in an untenable situation should any complications of this vaccination arise among those vaccinated to meet the Board’s present requirements.

Changes proposed for adoption by the Board were:

1. To delete item A of the statement and to renumber items B and C, making them items A and B.
2. In the next to the last line of the aforementioned statement, to change the word "acquire" to "contract," and to remove the word "smallpox."

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Academic Affairs Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

President Layman indicated that presentations in connection with the proposed requirements were in order. There being no response to his request, the Board approved the recommendations as presented.

Amendments to Administrative Rules

(Considered by Committee on Academic Affairs, July 6, 1971.)

The need for several amendments to the Board's Administrative Rules has become apparent since they became effective on January 25, 1971. The following amendments were recommended by the Chancellor following consultation with Chief Counsel Underwood who has approved the form of the proposed changes:

1. Amend AR 33.010:

   a. AR 33.010 presently reads as follows:

      33.010 **Discrimination Based on Race, Color, or Religion**

      There shall be no discrimination based on race, color, or religion on any campus of any of the institutions under the control of the Board.

      Recognition of any fraternity or sorority whose national charter requires local chapters to restrict their members on the basis of race, color or religion will be withdrawn, and no fraternity or sorority, the charter of which contains any discriminatory clause, will be recognized.

      b. It was recommended that AR 33.010 be amended to read as follows:

         33.010 **Discrimination Based on Race, Color, Religion or National Origin: Charter of Fraternity or Sorority**

         No fraternity or sorority whose national or local charter requires local chapters to restrict its members on the basis of race, color, religion or national origin will be recognized by the Department of Higher Education.
2. Add a new section on discrimination:

42.510 No Discrimination Based on Race, Color, Religion, National Origin or Sex

There shall be no discrimination based on race, color, religion, national origin or sex in the Department of Higher Education.

3. Add a new section on conflict of interest:

42.610 Employment of More Than One Member of a Household - Conflict of Interest To Be Avoided

In the appointment of its academic staff members, the Department of Higher Education seeks those persons most qualified to fulfill its teaching, research and service obligations. Accordingly, members of the same family may be appointed to academic staff positions when it has been determined that they are the most qualified candidates for the positions.

No academic staff member without prior written permission from his immediate superior shall participate in a transaction involving the Department of Higher Education in the consequences of which, to his actual knowledge, any of the following persons have a direct and substantial economic interest:

(a) his spouse or child; or
(b) any person in whom he has a substantial economic interest of which he may reasonably be expected to know.

The following are considered as among transactions involving a direct and substantial economic interest: the appointment, termination of appointment, promotion, demotion, approval of salary increase or decrease, of academic staff members employed by the Department of Higher Education.

4. Repeal AR 41.070, which reads as follows:

41.070 Employment of Family Members

Employment of two or more members of an immediate family by the Department of Higher Education is regarded as exceptional and shall be reported by the department heads concerned and the business manager to the executive head of the institution for his consideration.
5. Amend AR 10.160 to read as follows:

10.160 Standing Committees

In addition to the Executive Committee, the standing committees of the Board shall consist of:

1. The Committee on Finance and Business Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the Committee on Finance);

2. The Committee on Buildings and Other Physical Facilities (hereinafter referred to as the Committee on Buildings);

3. The Committee on Academic Affairs, Personnel and Public Affairs (hereinafter referred to as the Committee on Academic Affairs); and

4. The Committee on Public Service Activities. (NEW)

Each standing committee shall consist of three Board members and one alternate, and one or more staff officers in the office of the State Department of Higher Education shall be assigned as consultants to each of the four committees.

6. Add a new section for Deans of Medical and Dental Schools:

12.160 Deans of University of Oregon Medical and Dental Schools

Unless the context clearly indicates differently, the word "President" as used in these Rules shall include within its meaning and reference the Dean of the University of Oregon Medical School and the Dean of the University of Oregon Dental School.

7. Amend AR 30.110 regarding nonresident students to read as follows:

a. AR 30.110 presently reads as follows:

30.110 Nonresident Students

A nonresident student is defined as:

1. An unemancipated student whose parent or legal guardian is domiciled outside of Oregon at the time of the student's registration; or

2. An emancipated student who is domiciled outside of Oregon at the time of his registration. An emancipated student is one who is over the age of 21 or a minor student whose domicile is independent of that of his parent or legal guardian.
b. It was recommended that subsection 2., above, be amended to read as follows:

2. An emancipated student who is domiciled outside of Oregon at the time of his registration. An emancipated student is one who is over the age of 21 or, if under the age of 21, is married or has a domicile independent of that of his parent or legal guardian.

8. Add subsection 5 to AR 30.125 as follows:

5. Marital status, in and of itself, shall have no effect in determining residence or domicile.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee on Academic Affairs recommended that the Board approve the recommendations as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

President Layman indicated that presentations in connection with the hearing on the proposed amendments were in order. There being no response to his request, the Board approved the recommendations as presented.

Report on Instruction in Personal Health

(Considered by Committee on Academic Affairs, July 6, 1971.)

At its July 27, 1970, meeting, the Board requested that a study be made of the personal health education requirements in the State System institutions, with particular reference to the nature of the personal health course(s) being offered and the advisability of requiring a timely, relevant course in personal health as a precondition to graduation from State System institutions.

The report, titled Report on Undergraduate Degree Requirements in the Area of Personal Health, is submitted to the Board for designation as an integral part of the minutes of the July 26 meeting.

The report consists of four parts:

- Background information concerning instruction in personal health in the State System, and summary of issues involved, prepared by the Board's Office.

- Background information on the history and status of health education instruction in the nation, the health needs of college and university students, and the effectiveness of instruction in personal health prepared by Dr. Robert E. Kime, Professor of Health Education at the University of Oregon, the institution having primary allocation in health education in the State System.
A report by Oregon State University on OSU's experience with a revised program of health and physical education during the 1970-71 year. It was the request of Oregon State University at the July 1970 meeting of the Board for authorization to drop the graduation requirement of one term of health education that prompted the Board to request the present report.

Observations as to the health education needs of students, by the directors of health services of the several State System institutions. By the nature of their duties, the health directors become acquainted with health problems of large numbers of students.

Summary of the Report

The report provides information on four major aspects of the question under consideration.

1. **Health education requirements currently in effect (1970-71) in the State System institutions**

Five institutions in the State System, OSU, UO, PSU, EOC, and OTI, require, as a requirement for graduation, one term of personal health education.

- At OSU, men may meet this requirement with one-, two-, or three-hour courses. Women must complete either the two- or three-hour course. The one-hour course was not offered 1970-71.

- UO offers both men and women the option of meeting the health education requirement with either a two- or three-hour course.

- PSU offers a one-hour and a three-hour course. Either course meets requirements for men and women.

- EOC offers a single course, for two hours credit.

- OTI offers a single course, for two hours credit.

Southern Oregon College and Oregon College of Education do not require a health course for graduation. Both institutions offer a two-hour service course titled Personal Hygiene. Southern Oregon College will accept this course in lieu of one term of the required six terms of physical education for majors in the professional fields. (Arts and science majors at Southern Oregon College are not required to complete work in physical education under Southern Oregon College's new, experimental general education requirements.) Oregon College of Education does not permit substitution of personal hygiene for one term of its required six terms of physical education activity courses.

2. **Trends in required health education**

Health education has been considered a part of a liberal education in America since the early part of the 19th century. Harvard College, the earliest proponent of general education in this country, required lectures on hygiene for all senior students as early as 1818. By
1884, hygiene instruction was required in 28 of the 46 leading col-
leges and universities in the United States. Surveys completed in
1910 and 1953 found that over half of higher education institutions
required course work in health.

More recent studies show a rapid decline in the numbers of institu-
tions requiring work in health, from 53 percent in the 1953 study to
21 percent in a survey reported in 1963. The decline in the number
of institutions offering a general health education course was less
severe, from 80 percent in the 1953 study to 60 percent in 1963.

According to Dr. Kime, and other authorities, there are several factors
involved in the decline in health education instruction for the general
student body: (a) institution faculty criticism and health education
faculty insufficiencies, (b) lack of commitment of the administration
to a basic program in health education, and (c) inadequacies in the
health education course itself.

In discussing these factors, Dr. Kime notes that there is a serious
nationwide shortage of qualified health instructors and that many
departments find themselves required to teach personal health to
large numbers of students with staff which must be recruited from
seemingly related specialties. As evidence of the shortage of quali-
fied staff in this field, Dr. Kime reported that all of the five
doctoral candidates in health education completing their work this
spring and summer (1971) at the University of Oregon were able to
choose from a number of professional opportunities. All graduates
with master's degrees except one have been placed. Lack of qualified
health education staff contributes to the unfavorable image of health
education among many college faculties.

The nature of the commitment of the administration to the health educa-
tion course is also an important factor in whether or not the health
education requirement is retained as a requirement, Dr. Kime points
out. If teaching of personal health is regarded as an onerous task,
a filler to piece out teaching loads, without adequate staff and
resources of its own, the course is not likely to survive. Dr. Kime
notes that at his own institution, where required health education
has had strong votes of confidence from both faculty and students
as recently as spring term 1971, the department of health education,
while very proud of its undergraduate major program and its graduate
program leading to the Ph.D., sees as its primary concern "adequate
health knowledge for all University of Oregon students." The courses
(HE 150 and HE 250) are taught by the entire professional staff of
the department, including adjunct medical doctors, as well as teaching
assistants.

1May 12, 1971, the University faculty voted by a substantial margin
to retain the University's requirement in health and physical educa-
tion (five terms physical education activities, one term health).
Just prior to this vote, the student body, at its annual primary
election voted to retain the requirement in health (60 percent of the
3,734 votes cast).
However, Dr. Kime observes, the most important factor in the effectiveness and acceptability of a course in health for the general student body is the quality of the course itself. This point is emphasized in the literature on the subject, in the experience of the institutions of the State System, and in the observations of the health service directors.

3. Student health needs.

Dr. Kime's report presents detailed information concerning health misconceptions and lack of health knowledge among the college-age population. He notes that the college-age student is in a formative period of his life, when he is deciding upon life goals. The college years thus offer a unique opportunity to influence patterns of health behavior that may pay great dividends during productive adult life.

Health concerns of the college-age student change. Hence, a flexibility must be maintained if the course is to be relevant and vital.

The letters from the directors of student health services are unanimous in their support of the importance of a good, relevant well-taught course in personal health available to - if not required of - all undergraduate students. This reflects the support physicians, as expressed through the American Medical Association and local medical associations, have long given instruction in health education. As a practical matter, Dr. Kime observes:

Students who receive help with their personal (health-related) problems, either through classroom teaching or counseling, will have a better chance of success in both college and life itself. Today, campus counseling centers cannot cope with the large numbers of students needing aid. They must be given help by other departments on the university campus. Health education departments can do much in this area by teaching students ways in which they can solve many of their health-related problems.

4. Attitude of State System institutions toward instruction in personal health.

The Board's Office reports that informal discussions with informed persons on the several campuses of the State System indicate the general status of health education, as of 1970-71, as follows:

University of Oregon. The University of Oregon thinks well of its instruction in health education. The health education staff reports that it considers presentation of effective instruction in this area for the general student body its first responsibility. The instruction appears to have the support of both the general University faculty and the student body.

Oregon State University. Oregon State University is not renewing its request (made in July 1970) for authorization to drop the requirement in personal health. During the past year the one-hour course, which
had incurred the most complaint from students, was not offered. Students meeting the health education requirement were enrolled in the two-hour course, H 160, or the three-hour course, H 170.

In response to the request of the Board that Oregon State University attempt to develop a required course that would be satisfying to Oregon State University, the OSU department of health completely revised H 160, using materials which had been developed over the past year in the effort to upgrade instruction in health education. Approximately 1,000 students enrolled in H 160 each term during 1970-71. Students were offered two alternatives as to scheduling - approximately 500 were enrolled in a large lecture section meeting twice a week, and the remainder were enrolled in traditional class sections of approximately 40 students each. The same textbook and course outlines were used in all sections. Emphasis in the course was on current, relevant health problems of college students, including drug abuse, human ecology and communicable diseases, sex education, and factors relating to emotional well-being. The traditional class sections were taught by individual instructors from the department of health. The 500-student section presentation consisted of a series of lectures by recognized authorities, coordinated by Dr. Roy A. Foster, professor of hygiene and health education and head of the department. All speakers were persons who had frequent contact with young adults. Speakers included Oregon State University professors from the departments of foods and nutrition, physical education, pharmacy, sociology, and the school of science; physicians from Corvallis and Portland; and staff members of the State Board of Health. President MacVicar collaborated with Dr. Ronald H. Winters, pharmacy, in presenting one of the discussions on drug abuse.

Student evaluation of the special section was good. Oregon State University plans to continue the course and scheduling format during the 1971-72 year. Beginning with the fall term 1971, all H 160 students will be given a pre-test, the results of which will be compared with a test given at the end of the term. This testing plan is expected to provide some basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the course, for revising it to meet the revealed needs of the students, and for comparing the relative effectiveness of the special section and the traditional classes.

Portland State University. Courses in health satisfying the health education requirement at Portland State University are taught by qualified members of the health education staff. The head of the department of health and physical education, Dr. Lee V. Ragsdale, and the vice president for academic affairs, Dr. Joseph C. Blumel, affirm Portland State University's interest in offering a current, relevant, and effective course. The Portland State University staff is making special effort to keep the course up to date, e.g. during spring term 1971, health education instructors and a group of students participated in a weekend retreat devoted to discussion of student personal health problems. This information will be used in revision of course emphasis for 1971-72. Dr. Blumel notes that Portland State
University has offered from time to time a number of highly effective courses in areas of personal health, for example a course now being offered in sex education taught by a group of well-known Portland physicians. He would hope that any system-wide requirement in health education would be worded so as to permit the institutions flexibility in determining the specific course work acceptable toward meeting the requirement.

Oregon College of Education. Oregon College of Education dropped required work in personal health in 1955, when its curriculum was expanded to include preparation of secondary teachers. All elementary education majors are required to complete a three-hour course in School Health Programs, but other than this there is no health education requirement at Oregon College of Education. Nonetheless, enrollment in the basic course, HE 151 Personal Hygiene, averages 100 students per term.

Oregon College of Education's present degree requirements stipulate that each student complete six terms of physical education activity courses. However, Oregon College of Education is working on a revision of its general education degree requirements which will tie each student's program to a list of objectives Oregon College of Education believes express characteristics of the liberally educated person. The objectives, as presently formulated, include the provision that each student shall, in his program of study at Oregon College of Education, strive to develop:

- A fixed pattern of sustained physical and mental vigor through regular physical activity and through application of good mental and personal health practices.

Oregon College of Education does not anticipate that this objective can be met solely through enrollment in six terms of physical education activity courses as specified in present degree requirements. Rather, according to Dr. Bert Y. Kersh, Dean of Faculty, Oregon College of Education would expect students to meet the requirement through (a) five terms of physical education activity courses and one term of personal hygiene, or (b) five terms of physical education activity courses and two health-related courses in specialized areas, such as nutrition, mental health, marriage and the family, first aid, or independent study at the upper-division level involving a health problem.

Dr. Kersh says Oregon College of Education is moving toward this kind of requirement, which he feels would meet the Board's objectives in personal health should the Board wish to make health education a system-wide requirement. In line with the institutional objective in respect to personal health, Oregon College of Education is revising and upgrading its Personal Hygiene course.
Eastern Oregon College. Dr. Carlos Easley, dean of instruction, states that it has been his observation that good instruction in personal health can change young people's living patterns, that poor instruction incurs student resentment. Eastern Oregon College is not entirely satisfied with its present course. However, the administration is convinced that the course can be an important and effective part of the curriculum, and wishes to retain the requirement. Dr. Easley reports that time and energy is being devoted to identifying changes necessary to make the general education course an effective one.

During 1970-71, one section of the course each term was taught by Miss Georgia Osterholme, associate professor of health education and hygiene and director of the college health service. Miss Osterholme developed an entirely new outline for her course, drawn from her knowledge of student health problems. Student response was excellent. Dr. Easley says he does not feel that Miss Osterholme's course outline and presentation can be duplicated with the same results by another instructor. However, Eastern Oregon College is convinced that the course can be made both relevant and effective, and over the next several years changes can be made that will upgrade all instruction in this course.

Southern Oregon College. Although Southern Oregon College does not require a course in personal health, 40 percent of the new freshmen from high school enroll in the course each year. To accommodate these students, Southern Oregon College offers three or four sections each term taught by members of the staff of the department of health and physical education. Southern Oregon College does not have a specialist in health education on its staff, but all staff in the department are selected for their competence in the combined health and physical education program. Should the Board establish a System-wide requirement in personal health, Southern Oregon College would need to more than double present instruction in this area.

Oregon Technical Institute. In an effort to upgrade instruction in personal health, Oregon Technical Institute has discontinued its one-hour course in this area, effective fall term 1971. The old course had been criticized by students as covering material they had already covered in high school. The course will be replaced by a new two-hour course which will place emphasis on personal health problems of today's college-age students. Mr. James F. Partlow, former chairman of the division of physical education and health, has been assigned full responsibility for the preparation and instruction of the new course.

Recommendation of the Board's Office

The Board's Office recommended that the Board express itself as being desirous that students who are graduates of the institutions of the State System of Higher Education have a substantive knowledge of good health practices, and then look to the institutions to determine how they can best ensure the desired outcome.
Discussion of the Committee

Mrs. Johnson said that she would like to see the Board move a bit further than the recommendation of the Board's Office would suggest. She leaned, she said, toward asking that institutions have a personal health education requirement, as most of the institutions in the State System presently do.

Dr. Romney said that the Board's Office felt that a knowledge of personal health is of great importance to individual well-being, but that it also felt that the Board could achieve the aim of encouraging the development of that knowledge among students of the State System if it expressed its great desire that students graduating from the State System institutions be well endowed with such knowledge, and then left to the institutions the responsibility for ensuring that the aim of the Board in this area is realized. He noted that if the Board wished periodically to ask the institutions generally, or specific institutions, to report to the Board the nature of the provisions being employed in the institution to ensure that students acquire the knowledge as to personal health that the Board is desirous graduates of State System institutions have, the Board could very reasonably ask the institutions to submit reports as the basis for discussions of the issues. Mrs. Johnson expressed the view that perhaps such an approach could be made effective.

Mr. Snider indicated his general approval of the approach being suggested. He observed that the problem will be to make the programs developed by institutions to meet the Board's requirement, programs that will be recognized by students as of interest and worth.

President Sours expressed the hope that the Board would not require every institution to offer a required course in personal health. He said such a requirement would cause Southern Oregon College very serious staffing problems. He said that if the institutions were requested to report to the Board what they were doing to ensure that students graduating have substantive knowledge as to personal health, it would be necessary for the Board or the Board's Office to provide guidelines to the institutions as to the Board's expectations. It would be difficult, he said, for an institution to report what it was doing to implement the Board's objectives unless guidelines were provided the institutions.

Dr. Romney observed that, the Board having expressed its desire that institutions provide for their students means of acquiring a grasp of personal health knowledge, and having asked an institution to report to the Board what provisions it was making to recognize the Board's desire in this respect, the institution would, he assumed, develop a report setting forth in systematic, orderly fashion what it was doing either in a curricular or extra-curricular way to provide students the desired knowledge and what it was doing to evaluate the effectiveness of its approach to health education.
Mrs. Johnson said that basic knowledge of health is a criterion of a liberally-educated individual, and that the proposed action of the Board is consistent with the statement found in Southern Oregon College's new general education requirements. In respect to staffing, she said that she did not understand why Southern Oregon College's staffing problems in this instance would be any more difficult than problems caused by other shifting of enrollment patterns.

Mr. Mosser said he favored flexibility as to the means by which the requirement would be met. He suggested that health education was an area that lent itself to presentation through a series of stimulating lectures, and that many students would be interested in such a presentation. An alternative for students who wished more extensive exploration of the subject could be one or more courses. It had been his observation, he said, that a single prescribed course is a characteristic way to make instruction deadly.

Mrs. Johnson said that recognizing the varying levels of health knowledge on the part of students coming from high schools and a wide variety of transfer institutions, unless there is some requirement built into degree requirements, there is no assurance graduates will have this proficiency. She said she would like the recommendation to the Board to be worded so that a basic knowledge of health be a requirement for all baccalaureate degrees awarded by institutions of the State System, but that how this is implemented be left up to the individual institutions.

Mr. Snider said he would prefer to allow the Committee and the Board additional time to study the report. He said he felt that the Board should adopt a policy which would apply to all institutions in the System uniformly, that relevance of health knowledge to an individual's well-being, mental and physical, was considerable.

Committee Recommendation

In accordance with Mr. Snider's proposal, the Committee commended the report on undergraduate degree requirements in the area of personal health to the Board for further discussion and action.

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Johnson said that as a result of discussion at the Committee meeting, Dr. Romney had subsequently prepared the following restatement of the Committee's recommendation.

The Academic Affairs Committee recommended to the Board of Higher Education that in accepting the report on instruction in personal health education, referred to on page 52a of the July docket, it affirm the following:

1. That effective health practices are basic to effective living - both in a personal and a social sense.

2. That effective health practices are learned.
3. That major emphasis on health education ought to be upon personal health and the responsibility of the individual for protecting and promoting his own health and the health of others.

4. That the Board expects that institutions of the State System will in some systematic way make available to their students effective, up-to-date instruction in health education; that each institution will, by whatever means seems most promising to the institution, seek to ensure that students graduating from the institution have acquired the health knowledge basic to sound and effective health practices; that the means employed by the institution to achieve this end will be open to periodic review by the Board.

At the request of President Sours, the Board postponed consideration of the recommendations until there had been an opportunity for further study by the institutional executives and the Board.

Mr. Mosser commented that he would prefer to delete the requirement in statement four above which refers to institution's ensuring that students will have acquired knowledge of sound and effective health practices.

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board on December 8, 1970, the Chancellor has made the following allocations from the Board's reserve for physical plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay for some of the most critical needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Outlay</th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th>1971-72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of safety hazards in Mitchell Playhouse electrical system</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of two heaters in McArthur Court</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Medical School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of fire escape at Clinical Laboratory Building</td>
<td>3,783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,783</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,232</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action
The Board accepted the report as presented.
**Condition of Board's Unappropriated Fund and Special Reserves**

Estimated as of July 26, 1971, for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1972

---

### I. Board's Unappropriated Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance from year 1970-71 reported as of June 9, 1971</td>
<td>$22,551.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Amount transferred to balances and carried forward as a resource for 1971-72 budgets</td>
<td>$22,551.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of 1970-71 funds remaining at June 30, 1971</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Amount proposed as a Board's reserve in the budget plan recommended for year 1971-72</td>
<td>$45,811.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available as of July 26, 1971, if the recommended budget is approved</td>
<td>$45,811.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Board's Reserve for Plant Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance reported as of June 9, 1971</td>
<td>$105,984.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Projects approved by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning from 1970-71 funds reported in the July docket</td>
<td>$9,783.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount transferred to balances and carried forward as a resource for 1971-72 budgets</td>
<td>$96,201.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of 1970-71 funds remaining at June 30, 1971</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Amount proposed as a Board's reserve in the budget plan recommended for year 1971-72</td>
<td>$450,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Project at EOC reported by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning in the July docket</td>
<td>$4,232.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance available as of July 26, 1971, if the above recommendations are approved</td>
<td>$446,468.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board accepted the report as presented.
At the May 18, 1971, meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Affairs, report was made of proposals by an interinstituitional committee that when residence hall spaces are used for educational or administrative purposes on a temporary basis, two principles be observed:

1. That the cost of utilities and maintenance costs applicable to residence hall spaces used for "educational and general" purposes should be charged to the Physical Plant budget.

2. Payment should be made to the residence hall account for such use, based on the lesser of:

   (a) The board and room charge for the space occupied, less the food service cost applicable to similar spaces; or
   (b) The rental value of comparable space in the community.

Subsequent to the May 18 meeting, alternative proposals have been considered:

(c) The payment would be based upon the proportional debt service requirement (132%) for the space used, with the addition of the insurance costs and perhaps some portion of the administrative costs.

It was recommended that the Committee concur in the staff recommendation that the payment for 1970-71 be not less than debt service plus insurance costs. For 1971-72 and subsequent years, the Committee may wish to suggest other possible alternatives as a basis for such payments.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Holmer indicated that $29,000 had been transferred from current resources at the University of Oregon to residence hall operations, with the result that all residence halls in the State System have now met expenses and 100 percent of debt service.

Mr. Mosser said that, in his opinion, rents paid for residence hall spaces utilized temporarily for other purposes should be on the same basis as the rates for those used for residence hall purposes. He said these charges should be sufficient to cover insurance and other costs, utilities and administration. He said that if different rates are set, the students may resent it and the legislators will question it. He stated that if there is a two-year debt service reserve already accumulated, the rental schedule should only include the full annual cost of the debt service for that year.

Dr. Hawk said that remodeling had been kept to a minimum in using dormitory spaces for other purposes, but that future plans would require more extensive and costly remodeling, particularly to provide wiring and heating in Straub Hall. Dr. Hawk said there was a problem in deciding whether the rates should be comparable to those for other
office spaces or should they be at a level which would merely provide some income to help the dormitories meet their costs. He expressed concern about the amount of money which is drained from the General Fund when it is anticipated that the spaces will again revert to dormitory uses.

The Finance Committee approved a motion by Mr. Mosser that it recommend to the Board that the payments for administrative or academic use of dormitories should cover utilities, maintenance, insurance, administrative costs, and the same rate of debt service that is required for the space used as dormitories.

The Finance Committee also recommended that the Board instruct the Vice Chancellor for Administration to examine the charge set for debt service and where reserves appear to be adequate to meet two years' debt service that a proposal be brought to the Board to reduce the 132 percent requirement to 100 percent or some other percentage that affords adequate assurance of maintenance of the required reserves.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

(Considered by Committee on Academic Affairs, July 6, 1971.)

At its May 17, 1971, meeting, the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs began a consideration of the guidelines for the Division of Continuing Education for the 1970's. The report on the Division of Continuing Education presented to the Committee on that occasion concluded by placing before the Committee recommended guidelines for DCE.

The report, titled The Division of Continuing Education, dated May 17, 1971, and the addendum to the report, titled, The Division of Continuing Education, an Addendum to the May 17, 1971, Report to the Academic Affairs Committee, dated July 6, 1971, is submitted to the Board for designation as an integral part of the minutes of the July 26 meeting.

Since the May 17 discussion of the Committee, the legislative assembly has acted upon DCE's budget for the 1971-1973 biennium. The legislative action has so modified DCE fiscal support as to necessitate a complete re-thinking of the DCE budget, indeed, of the total organization of the division.

Basic to the legislature's action on the DCE biennial budget were two legislative decisions: (1) to remove the Oregon Education Broadcasting (OEB), with a $1.5 million General Fund budget, from DCE's administration and to place OEB within the Board's Office for administrative purposes, and (2) to require that during the 1971-1973 biennium, the remaining aspects of DCE (i.e., state-wide extension programs - both credit and noncredit, independent study programs, instructional materials service, film library service, and institutional programs - primarily credit offerings on the campuses) become self-supporting, that is, operate without any General Fund support from the state.
Recognizing that the movement to a completely self-supporting basis would represent a very great change in DCE's operations, the legislature did not strip DCE totally of the $3.5 million in General Fund support that it had enjoyed, but reduced it to $500,000 for the biennium with the stipulation that during 1971-1973, DCE should place itself on a self-supporting basis. Following the transition period (1971-1973), DCE is thus thrown back totally upon tuition and contract income and upon such other nonlegislative income as DCE can turn up.

Use of the legislative appropriation in the 1971-1973 biennium will permit DCE to accomplish two important purposes:

- It will enable DCE to salvage some socially significant programs that would be casualties if DCE were to be required to move immediately, for the 1971-72 school year, to a full self-support basis. With a transition, however, DCE will seek to identify and to rally important fiscal resources from non-DCE sources in support of a number of socially significant programs which have in the past been subsidized by the state through DCE but which, under DCE's financial strictures, can no longer be.

- It will also permit the retention in the service of the State System of a significant number of valuable, well-qualified employees of the State System. The transitional year is important to the State System's efforts to retain the services of these employees. For these staff members have been employed in the past in planning, promoting, and supervising programs which have to the present been subsidized by DCE (e.g., programs in the arts and humanities). With the changed policy which requires DCE to become fully self-supporting, these employees need time to make the transition which they will do: (1) by cultivating other sources through which to subsidize the kinds of programs they have been associated with, or by seeking to develop among the clientele of these programs a willingness to pay the full cost of the program, or (2) by developing programs in other areas of study in which the demand appears to be such as to give promise that the programs can be self-sufficient by 1972-73. Or, finally, some of these employees, having clearly established their value, will be employed in State System institutions which will, in 1972-73, be looking for the proven producers to be found among successful DCE staff members.

**Budgetary Status of DCE Programs, 1971-1973**

The budget for the Division of Continuing Education for the 1971-72 year, as recommended by the Board's Finance Committee, provides that only one (institutional programs) of the five major DCE program divisions (statewide extension, independent study, instructional materials and service, film library service, and institutional programs) will have sufficient fee-income to cover the expenditures budgeted, even with the drastic reduction in staff (11,83 FTE academic, 29,00 FTE classified) incorporated in the budget proposal.
A further reduction of 19.5 FTE academic staff will be necessary the second year of the biennium unless sources of income to offset funds previously received from the state are found.

DCE Programs

Statewide Extension

These activities consist of credit and noncredit courses and programs offered throughout the state (exclusive of those offered through DCE on state system campuses). They account for just over half DCE's total budget for 1971-72. Two-thirds of this expenditure will go to support the credit program, one-third to noncredit classes.

The statewide credit program has in the past been subsidized by fee income from the institutional programs and by legislatively-appropriated funds. The smaller, noncredit program has been more nearly self-supporting, but still has been dependent on a state subsidy.

Of the credit programs to be offered through statewide extension in 1971-72, approximately 60 percent will be services to schools and teachers, 28 percent liberal arts and community service, 8 percent services in engineering and applied science, and the balance in other fields of service. Noncredit services to be continued during 1971-72 will be one-third in the field of management and public administration (completely self-supporting), just under one-third in liberal arts and community service, and 16 percent in engineering and applied science.

Every effort will be made by DCE, drawing upon all of the cooperating resources it can identify, to keep operative state-wide programs having substantial social significance. At present (1970-71) there are a number of socially significant programs which have been offered in the past on a subsidized basis (considering the total costs attributable to them) that must, given the present financial strictures, be considered subject to discontinuance unless support which has hitherto not been revealed can be identified or developed.

Illustrative of these programs are:

a. The alcohol and drug education programs consist of credit and noncredit courses organized primarily for personnel who work in preventive and rehabilitation programs relating to alcohol and drug abuse. Clientele served have generally been employees of health, educational, social service agencies which have given no evidence of an ability to meet the full cost of the program directly. Nor have the registrants paid sufficient to make these courses self-supporting, when the administrative costs of DCE must be counted as part of the cost.
b. Continuing education for pharmacists. Community-based pharmacists and medical personnel have provided effective instructional personnel for the alcohol and drug abuse programs. The coordinator of the alcohol and drug abuse program has, in conjunction with Oregon State University, developed professional programs for pharmacists. These programs have been only marginally self-supporting even when no general administrative costs have been charged to them.

c. Allied health sciences. Activities in the allied health fields at present and in the past include courses in language disorders, aphasia, rehabilitation, social and health implications related to gerontology, and special courses for medical technologists, radiologists, physical therapists, and mental health workers.

d. Continuing education for nurses. Programs for nurses have not been self-supporting because the activities are highly specialized and serve health agencies and personnel that are not prepared to pay the total cost of the continuing education programs.

e. Gerontology. During recent months DCE personnel have worked cooperatively with the Center for Gerontology at the University of Oregon in developing a program to extend the educational opportunities of the center to communities of the state. The program is presently in the developmental stages and would require an investment in instructional resources which DCE is not, under present circumstances, in a position to provide.

f. Arts and humanities programs. Arts and humanities programs tend not to be self-supporting and in a period of financial strictures, are therefore among the most vulnerable of the DCE programs. Illustrative of the worthwhile programs in these areas that are to be dropped unless other sources of subsidization can be found are the several contemporary lecture series which have each year brought to citizens throughout Oregon series of lectures from distinguished faculty on the State System’s campuses.

g. Women’s programs. DCE has been offering a subsidized program for women who are returning to school or work after having raised a family, or who find it necessary to change their primary role in life. The program offers counseling, testing, and instructional activities to assist women in solving their problems. Clients are generally unable to pay the cost necessary to make these programs self-supporting. Most frequently the women who use the services of the women’s program office are seeking educational opportunities which lead to employment.

Institutional Programs

Institutional programs are credit programs offered under the administrative aegis of DCE on the campuses of four of the institutions of the State System: PSU, OCE (work offered primarily in Salem), UO, and OTI (summer). These programs account for more than one-third of the 1971-72 budget. Two of these programs (PSU and UO) are expected to have fee income in 1971-72 in excess of budgeted expenditures, two (OCE and OTI) will need some subsidization.
Guidelines being proposed for Board consideration (Appendix B to these minutes) would transfer from the Division of Continuing Education to the respective institutions responsibility for credit courses offered on campus. This would involve budgetary adjustments over several biennia. Because of the numbers of students involved, and substantial budgetary entwinement developed over a period of time, the problem is particularly complicated in respect to the Portland Center program operated on the Portland State University campus. Along with the presentation of guidelines for the Division of Continuing Education, the Board's Office presents for the Board's consideration, specific proposals for the development of future relationships between Portland State University and Portland Center of the Division of Continuing Education, for implementation beginning with the 1971-1973 biennium. (Appendix C to these minutes).

Future developments in respect to the University of Oregon and Oregon College of Education programs can proceed in accordance with the proposed guidelines, if approved, within the context of budgetary requirements. The Oregon Technical Institute program consists largely of courses extended to the OTI campus during the summer from other institutions, and, given the requirement of complete self-support, the future of the OTI summer program as it is now constituted must be carefully reviewed.

Other Programs

Of the remaining major activities of DCE (film library service, instructional materials and equipment services, independent study), two - film library service and the instructional materials and equipment services - have been organized on a self-supporting basis in the past. But in the past, only direct costs of these programs have been included in calculating the budget. No portion of DCE's administrative overhead has been included. Under new accounting procedures, in which DCE's administrative overhead is apportioned among the operating units, the fee income from these two programs must be increased if they are to be self-supporting. Fees for these services will be adjusted during the 1971-1973 biennium so that by 1972-73 the services will be fully self-supporting in this total-cost sense.

The third of these statewide services, independent study program, offers a variety of types of instruction leading to a variety of ends. Traditional correspondence courses are available through the independent study office. But there are also available independent study courses which place much less emphasis upon the submission of written exercises by the student and much more upon reading and passing of examinations. And there is available an array of programmed instruction courses, some involving the use of multi-media materials (books, tapes, films, etc.). The courses available lead either to: (1) college credit, (2) high school credit, or (3) no credit.

It is projected that in the 1971-1973 biennium just over 6,000 registrants will be served through the independent study program.
The independent study program has traditionally been subsidized in part by the state. The budget approved by the governor and submitted to the legislature for DCE for the 1971-1973 biennium included a budget request for independent study of $370,338, of which it was proposed 59.4 percent ($220,000) be realized from fee income, 40.6 percent ($150,338) from legislative appropriation.

In the presently proposed budget for 1971-72 the independent study program is budgeted at $169,601, which includes all of the direct costs of the program, plus the program's fair share of the DCE administrative overhead. Fee income is estimated at $110,000.

Volume of enrollments is an important factor in making financially feasible the design and production of correspondence and other independent study courses.

Enrollments in the independent study program have declined somewhat over the last decade. Factors which are believed to have affected enrollments are: (1) the rapid expansion of a network of community colleges in Oregon, (2) rising tuition charges, and (3) too little upgrading and diversification of the offerings of the independent study program to attract new and expanded clientele.

During the 1971-1973 biennium, effort will be made to reverse the downward trend of enrollments through establishment of tuition charges that will provide maximum net return to DCE and through investment of some funds developed by DCE in other aspects of its programs in the diversifications and upgrading of independent study offerings.

Relationships Between DCE and System Institutions

The relationships between DCE and the institutions of the State System have, as a matter of course, been re-examined from time to time over the years by the Board's Office, DCE, and the institutions of the State System, as well as by the Board of Higher Education, with a view to assessing the effectiveness of these relationships and considering how they might be changed to provide for improved effectiveness in the development of continuing education in Oregon.

Over the years, the same issues recur. In this, Oregon is not unique. These recurring issues in Oregon are recurring issues in every other state in the nation. They include, for instance:

- The issue as to how to provide for the people of the state the most effective program of continuing education, without unnecessary and unwise duplication of effort and cost, and without dampening the ardor of the colleges and universities for continuing education.

- The issue as to whether continuing education programs ought to be carried on as an overload by college and university professors or as an in-load activity.
The issue as to how to coordinate the planning and developmental activities of the various educational and other institutions and agencies having an interest in continuing education.

In considering these issues, it is useful to refer back to the work of an interinstitutional committee appointed by the Chancellor in 1967, which reported its findings in December 1968. The committee restated these recurring issues in the context of the State System, as they saw the issues from the vantage point of the institutions of the State System.

It is important to distinguish between what the interinstitutional committee visualized as desirable over the long haul from what it saw as feasible in the immediate future.

Over the long haul the committee hoped to see the colleges and universities of the State System assume a greater interest in and responsibility for the planning, development, and administration of continuing education services. They hoped to see the institutions recognize continuing education to be an integral part of their obligations to the people of Oregon. They looked to the day when enrollments in continuing education courses and programs would be credited to the institutions as they were not then (and are not now, for the most part). And, finally, they anticipated the time in the future when the legislature would recognize the desirability of funding continuing education on an in-load basis as it does the other educational programs offered in its colleges and universities, rather than on an over-load basis as at present.

But the committee recognized that, given the financial strictures of the state, there was little likelihood that the continuing education programs could be put on an in-load basis without a resultant serious reduction in the range and extent of continuing education offerings and opportunities in Oregon. Hence, the committee concluded, the move to an in-load basis of support for continuing education must be a long-range, gradual process. This is the conclusion to which the Board's Office has come each of the numerous times that it has, over the past decade, considered this issue.

It should be emphasized that although the committee wished to see the institutional role in continuing education fleshed out more than at present, it was clearly aware of the value of a centralized agency, such as the Division of Continuing Education, having responsibilities for providing statewide coordination, and, when needed, administrative assistance to the institutions in the development of their continuing education programs. The strengths of such centralized responsibility were seen by the committee to include:

- The ability of a centralized agency to respond quickly and imaginatively to changing needs and conditions, a capacity that the centralized agency was conceded by the committee to have to a greater degree than the institutions of the State System acting individually in an uncoordinated fashion.
The ability to coordinate the planning, development, and administration of continuing education within the total state framework. It would be impractical and certainly uneconomical for each institution to seek to maintain in the several regions of the state, personnel who could, through their contacts with potential clients of continuing education, keep abreast of the needs in the various areas of the state. And the coordination of offerings within the state is difficult indeed without the resources of some coordinating agency.

The guidelines for DCE (Appendix B) proposed for Board consideration, present what the Board's Office considers to be the appropriate working relationships between the Division of Continuing Education and the institutions of the State System, as well as between the Division of Continuing Education and the community colleges of the state.

The Board's Office recognizes that funding and administrative relationships between Portland Center of DCE and Portland State University present special problems which warrant review. Such a review has been underway for some months. As a result of these studies, the Board's Office proposes new policies to govern the PSU-Portland Center (DCE) relationships consistent with the proposed guidelines. (Appendix C).

Board's Office Recommendation

The Board's Office recommended approval of the statements.

Committee Discussion

The Committee discussed a number of aspects of the DCE operation, including (a) the historical development of the relationship between DCE and PSU, (b) the System's relationship to the need of nonmatriculated students for lower-division courses, (c) the reasons for offering credit courses on campuses on overload basis, (d) the enrollment of matriculated and nonmatriculated students in the same class, and other matters of interest.

In respect to the offering of lower-division work, Chancellor Lieuallen observed that, by agreement, the community colleges had primary responsibility for these offerings. However, he observed, the need for education is so great, particularly in the metropolitan areas, that the community colleges have not yet been able to assume the entire responsibility for this work. The bulk of the credit work offered through DCE, however, he noted, is at the upper-division and graduate level, the State System institutions being the only public institutions offering such work.

In responding to another question, Dr. Romney observed that one reason the System had not been able to move in the past to scheduling all credit courses offered on campus on an in-load basis was that the
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The state had not been able to provide funds to support continuing education courses at the same level it supported course offerings for regularly matriculated students. By offering some course work through continuing education on an over-load basis, at substantially below the in-load costs, the System has been able to offer greatly expanded educational opportunities to the people of the state.

The enrollment of matriculated and nonmatriculated students in the same class section, while it appears confusing, permits the state to provide maximum educational opportunities with the resources available. Dr. Pierson pointed out that some matriculated students find a class offered in the evening fits their schedule better than one of the in-load sections scheduled by the institution. Permitting these students to enroll in continuing education classes when there is room is more economical than setting up special sections in which enrollment might be small.

A complete report of the Committee's discussion of these several aspects of the DCE activities, and related matters, is presented in the minutes of the July 6 meeting.

The Committee observed that the services and financing of DCE are complex. Members suggested that the legislature may not have understood the nature of some of the activities of the division that would be in jeopardy under a full-self-support policy. Mr. Holmes and Mr. Mosser emphasized that the actions of DCE and the Board during the 1971-1973 biennium will be very important in determining policies of future legislatures in respect to DCE activities. Members of the Board present expressed particular concern about some of DCE's socially significant programs that now appear to be in jeopardy. Mr. Mosser said it was for this reason he felt it imperative that $150,000 of the $500,000 transitional money be reserved for use in the second year of the biennium to give some of these programs additional time to build other sources of support and to keep them in operation at least at a minimal level in order that the 1973 Legislature may have an opportunity to consider the possibility of some state support.

Dr. Romney said DCE is sensitive to the fact that these programs are important to the state, and he assured the Board that program administrators will strive to identify other means of support. He said he felt Mr. Holmes' observations concerning the need to be well prepared to explain the operations and services of DCE to the 1973 Legislature were extremely important. In this regard, he said, the development of a further report on DCE for the committee was already underway and would be brought to the committee for its consideration in the fall, very probably at the November meeting.

Recommendation to the Board

The Committee noted that it was difficult to understand all the ramifications of the proposed guidelines and the statement of the relationship between DCE in a single session. However, Mr. Layman urged approval of the proposed statements concerning organization and guidelines, the financial aspects of which he said would be subject
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Investment Policies - Amendment of Part VI, Administrative Rules

(Considered by Finance Committee, July 7, 1971.)

The Committee on Finance and Business Affairs has considered investment policies relating to the several funds managed by the Board. With the passage of Chapter 339, Oregon Laws 1971, authorizing the Board to purchase corporate stocks under specified conditions with moneys received from gifts and bequests, it was recommended that Section 60.400 of the Administrative Rules be repealed and that simultaneously a new chapter be added to Part VI which, with the approval of the Committee, would be recommended for adoption by the Board at its July 1971 meeting. The contents of the Rules are intended to embody sufficient summary factual information and the related continuing policy of the Board expressed in the form of a Rule. The proposed revised rules have been approved as to form by Chief Counsel Ray Underwood. It is intended to review annually with the Board specific details with regard to securities investments for the various funds and to make such modifications as changing conditions warrant, but probably not to embody such changes in the Administrative Rules.
PART VI

Chapter 66

SECURITIES AND INVESTMENTS

Section 66.000 - Statutory Guidelines, Oregon Revised Statutes

66.010 - Encouragement of Gifts to Institutions - ORS 351.130

66.011 - Gifts Investments Pursuant to Prudent Man Rule - ORS 128.020

66.012 - Unauthorized Deviations from Terms of Gifts and Bequests - ORS 128.030

66.013 - Court Authorized Deviations from Terms of Gifts and Bequests - ORS 128.040

66.014 - Governance of Previous and Future Gifts and Bequests - ORS 128.050

66.015 - Investments of Gifts and Bequests in Corporate Stock Authorized - ORS 293.790 (1) and (2), as Amended by Oregon Laws 1971, Chapter 339

66.020 - Higher Education Bond Building Fund - ORS 351.450

66.030 - Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund - ORS 351.460(1)

66.040 - Board and Oregon Investment Council May Contract for Investment of Board Funds or Moneys - Section 2, Oregon Laws 1971, Chapter 339

Section 66.100 - Investment Funds

66.110 - Endowment Fund

66.111 - Quasi-Endowment Fund

66.112 - Current Donation Fund

66.113 - Higher Education Bond Building Fund

66.114 - Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund

Section 66.200 - Investment Management

66.210 - Employment of Investment Counsel

66.220 - Investment Responsibilities of the Vice Chancellor for Administration
66.221 - Delegation of Investment Authority
66.222 - Reports on Investments
66.223 - Custody of Board Securities
66.224 - Voting Stock Ownership
66.230 - Investment Pools and Participation Units
66.231 - Endowment Fund Investments
66.232 - Quasi-Endowment Fund Investments
66.233 - Current Donation Fund Investments
66.234 - Higher Education Bond Building Fund Investments
66.235 - Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund Investments
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Chapter 66

SECURITIES AND INVESTMENTS

Section 66.000 - Statutory Guidelines

66.010 Encouragement of Gifts to Institutions - ORS 351.130

351.130. Encouragement of gifts to institutions; use of gifts. The board of higher education shall encourage gifts to the institutions by faithfully devoting such funds to the institution for which intended and by other suitable means. All gifts raised by any institution or given to it shall be held for the exclusive use of such institution, subject to the terms of gift. Subject to such terms, such gifts to the institutions and the Department of Higher Education may be invested in securities which constitute legal investments for trust funds held for charitable or educational purposes, in lawfully issued interest-bearing bonds or obligations of the State of Oregon and in real property.

66.011 - Gifts Investments Pursuant to Prudent Man Rule - ORS 128.020

128.020. Investments by fiduciaries; "prudent man" rule. In acquiring, investing, reinvesting, exchanging, retaining, selling and managing property for the benefit of another, a fiduciary shall exercise the judgment and care under the circumstances then prevailing, which men of prudence, discretion and intelligence exercise in the management of their own affairs, not in regard to speculation but in regard to the permanent disposition of their funds, considering the probable income as well as the probable safety of their capital. Within the limitations of the foregoing standard, a fiduciary is authorized to acquire and retain every kind of property, real, personal or mixed, which men of prudence, discretion and intelligence acquire or retain for their own account, including but not limited to:

(1) Bonds, debentures and other corporate obligations;

(2) Stocks, preferred or common; and
(3) Contracts of life insurance as defined by ORS 731.170, issued by authorized insurers as defined by ORS 731.066.

**66.012 - Unauthorized Deviations from Terms of Gifts and Bequests - ORS 128.030**

128.030. Deviation from instrument as to fiduciary's duties and powers not authorized. Nothing contained in ORS 128.020 to 128.050 authorizes any departure from, or variation of, the express terms or limitations set forth in any will, agreement, court order or other instrument creating or defining the fiduciary's duties and powers, but the terms "legal investment" or "authorized investment" or words of similar import, as used in any such instrument, shall mean any investment which is permitted by the terms of ORS 128.020.

**66.013 - Court Authorized Deviations from Terms of Gifts and Bequests - ORS 128.040**

128.040. Deviations authorized. Nothing contained in ORS 128.020 to 128.050 restricts the power of a court of proper jurisdiction to permit a fiduciary to deviate from the terms of any will, agreement or other instrument relating to the acquisition, investment, reinvestment, exchange, retention, sale or management of fiduciary property.

**66.014 - Governance of Previous and Future Gifts and Bequests - ORS 128.050**

128.050. Fiduciaries under present and future instruments governed. The provisions of ORS 128.020 to 128.050 govern fiduciaries acting under wills, agreements, court orders and other instruments existing on July 5, 1947, or thereafter made.

**66.015 - Investments of Gifts and Bequests in Corporate Stock Authorized - ORS 293.790 (1) and (2), as Amended by Chapter 339, Oregon Laws 1971**

293.790. Holding and disposing of corporate stock. (1) Under authority of section 6, Article XI of the Oregon Constitution, the state, subject to subsection (2) of this section, may hold and dispose of the stock of any company, association or corporation, including stock already received, that is donated or bequeathed and the state, acting by and through the State Board of Higher Education, subject to subsection (2) of this section, may invest and reinvest in the stock of any company, association or corporation, any funds or moneys of the State Board of Higher Education that:
(a) Are or have been donated or bequeathed for higher education purposes; or
(b) Are the proceeds from the disposition of stock that is donated or bequeathed for higher education purposes, including stock already received; or
(c) Are dividends paid with respect to stock that is donated or bequeathed for higher education purposes, including stock already received.

(2) The state, including any of its agencies having control of, or authority to invest and reinvest in any stock described in subsection (1) of this section, in holding, disposing of or investing and reinvesting in such stock, shall be governed by ORS 128.020 to 128.050, notwithstanding the date of acquisition of such stock. Moneys received from the disposition of such stock, including dividends, hereby are appropriated continuously for the purposes of the donation or bequest and of the investments and reinvestments authorized by subsection (1) of this section and by ORS 351.130. Except as specifically authorized by law, the state or any of its agencies may not purchase stock.

66.020 - Higher Education Bond Building Fund - ORS 351.450 and House Bill 2038, 1971 Legislative Assembly

351.450. Higher Education Bond Building Fund. The moneys realized from sales of bonds issued to construct, improve, repair, equip and furnish buildings and other structures for higher education, and to purchase and improve sites therefor shall be credited to a special fund in the State Treasury separate and distinct from the General Fund, to be designated Higher Education Bond Building Fund. In the Higher Education Bond Building Fund there shall be a separate subfund for the credit of moneys realized from the sales of bonds issued pursuant to Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution, ORS 351.350 and 351.420; and there shall be a separate subfund for the credit of moneys realized from sales of bonds issued pursuant to Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution, and section 1 of chapter 584, Oregon Laws 1963. The moneys received from the issuance of temporary bonds under ORS 351.470 for the purpose of interim financing pending the sale of the bonds shall also be credited to the appropriate subfund of the Higher Education Bond Building Fund. The moneys in the fund hereby are appropriated to defray the costs of the projects to be financed through sale of the bonds and for the purpose of retiring temporary bonds issued under ORS 351.470, and shall not be used for any other purpose, except that such moneys may, with the approval of the State Treasurer, be invested until needed in obligations of the State of Oregon or of the United States Government, or
both, having maturity dates of not to exceed two years. If a surplus remains after application to such purpose, the surplus, and earnings from temporary investments, shall be credited to the Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund by the appropriate subfund.

Sections 12 and 13 of House Bill 2038 of the 1971 Legislative Session, as approved by the House and Senate, provide that ORS 351.305 to 351.560 is to include the following: "Whenever bonds are issued pursuant to the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution, all undistributed bond funds and revenue received as payment, if invested, shall be invested to produce a yield less than the yield produced by arbitrage bonds as defined in subsection (d) of section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

66.030 - Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund - ORS 351.460(1)

351.460. Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund. (1) The board shall maintain with the State Treasurer, a Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund, separate and distinct from the General Fund. The Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund shall comprise two separate subfunds to provide for the payment of the principal of and the interest upon the bonds issued under authority of Article XI-F (1) of the Oregon Constitution, ORS 351.350 and 351.420, and under authority of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution and section 1 of chapter 584, Oregon Laws 1963. The moneys in said sinking fund hereby are appropriated for such purposes. The said fund may be invested by the board in bonds issued or guaranteed by the United States or in bonds of the State of Oregon, and the earnings from such investments shall be credited to the appropriate subfunds of such fund.

66.040 - Board and Oregon Investment Council May Contract for Investment of Board Funds or Moneys - Section 2, Chapter 339, Oregon Laws 1971

The State Board of Higher Education and the Oregon Investment Council may contract for the investment and reinvestment by or through the council of any funds or moneys of the board lawfully available and designated from time to time by the board for investment and reinvestment. Such investment and reinvestment shall be accomplished pursuant to the same standard of judgment and care in investments as is provided in subsection (1) of ORS 293.726 (prudent man rule applied to Oregon Investment Council).
Section 66.100 - Investment Funds

66.110 - Endowment Fund

Includes all donations and bequests given with the stipulation that the principal is to be maintained inviolate and in perpetuity with the income from investments available for current expenditure. Capital gains and losses are to affect only the principal.

66.111 - Quasi-Endowment Fund

Includes gifts and bequests which with the approval of the Board have been designated as a quasi-endowment with the expectation that only the investment income is to be currently expended. The Vice Chancellor for Administration may permit the expenditure of all or part of the principal in accord with Board policy or directive.

66.112 - Current Donation Fund

Includes donations and bequests received under terms that provide for current expenditure of the moneys compatible with purposes intended by the donor.

66.113 - Higher Education Bond Building Fund

Proceeds from the sale of bonds to finance the cost of buildings and other capital outlay projects may be invested temporarily pursuant to ORS 351.450 pending the actual need for disbursement for capital outlays (see 66.020, supra).

A separate subfund is maintained for self-supporting and self-liquidating capital outlay projects financed by the sale of bonds authorized by Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution. A separate subfund is maintained for capital outlay projects other than for those which are self-supporting and self-liquidating financed by the sale of bonds authorized by Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution.

66.114 - Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund

Funds accumulated for the redemption of higher education building bonds and payment of interest. Moneys may be temporarily invested pursuant to ORS 351.460 (1) (see 66.030, supra).

A separate subfund is maintained for moneys accumulated for payment of principal and interest on bonds sold pursuant to Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution for capital outlay projects which are self-supporting and self-liquidating. A separate subfund is maintained for moneys accumulated for payment of principal and interest on bonds sold pursuant to Article XI-G of the Constitution for capital outlay projects.
other than for those which are self-supporting and self-liquidating.

Section 66.200 - Investment Management

66.210 - Employment of Investment Counsel
Subject to prior approval by the Board, the Vice Chancellor for Administration may enter into contracts or other agreements with the Oregon Investment Council and/or with other professional investment counselors or managers for the investing of endowments in securities, pursuant to law.

66.220 - Investment Responsibilities of the Vice Chancellor for Administration
Except for contracts or agreements entered into pursuant to Administrative Rule 66.210, the Vice Chancellor for Administration is authorized to act on behalf of the Board with respect to purchase, sale or exchange of securities for the Board. Purchases made under this authorization are subject to the prior approval of the President of the Board or the Chairman of the Committee on Finance and Business Affairs, as is appropriate, with respect to any transaction involving amounts in excess of $20,000, except that approval is not required for purchases of securities of the United States, its agencies, or Certificates of Deposit of Oregon banks.

The Vice Chancellor for Administration is authorized to transfer, endorse, sell, assign, set over, and deliver any and all shares of stocks, bonds, debentures, notes, evidences of indebtedness, or other securities standing in the name of or owned by the Board, and to make, execute, and deliver any and all instruments necessary to effectuate such authority.

The Vice Chancellor may designate members of his staff to act on his behalf for specifically identified transactions or limited responsibilities referred to above. Each designation shall be reported in writing to both the President of the Board and the Chairman of the Finance and Business Affairs Committee.

66.221 - Delegation of Investment Responsibility
Subject to such conditions as he may impose, and compatible with laws and Administrative Rules, the Vice Chancellor for Administration is authorized to delegate to the Controller responsibility for the management of investments of the Higher Education Bond Building Fund, the Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund and the Current Donation Fund.

66.222 - Reports on Investments
The Vice Chancellor for Administration shall report to the Board not less than semi-annually on corporate stocks investment status and transactions, pursuant to contractual
arrangements with an investment counselor or counselors. The report shall among other matters provide information with regard to the market and book values of the stocks, the current dividend rate, purchases and sales, and gains and losses.

The Vice Chancellor for Administration shall report to the Board at least annually on all investments of all funds, with such recommendations as are appropriate.

66.223 - Custody of Board Securities

Custody of the Board's securities is placed with the Controller and the Director of the Accounting Division, and authority is granted them, subject to approval by the Vice Chancellor for Administration, to make arrangements for safety deposit boxes or for other safekeeping arrangements.

The Controller is authorized and empowered to obtain, deposit, and release securities from banks to protect funds for the Department.

(Formerly AR 60.430.)

66.224 - Voting Stock Ownership

Except as otherwise provided by law, by direction of the Board or its Committee on Finance and Business Affairs, or by terms of a contract or agreement with the Oregon Investment Council or other investment counselors, the Vice Chancellor for Administration is authorized to vote stock ownership in accord with the recommendations of corporate management. In the absence of such recommendation or if he deems it prudent to deviate from management recommendations, the Vice Chancellor shall consult with the President of the Board or the Chairman of the Committee on Finance and Business Affairs before voting the affected stocks.

The Vice Chancellor may seek the assistance and counsel of such persons as he deems advisable.

66.230 - Investment Pools and Participation Units

In managing gifts and bequests available for investment, the following pools shall be established and maintained to assure conformity with restrictions relating to the gift or bequest:

1. A corporate stock pool for Endowment Fund accounts

2. A bond-mortgage pool for accounts in either the Endowment or Quasi-Endowment Fund
3. A corporate stock pool for the Quasi-Endowment Fund accounts

4. A dollar-obligation pool for the Current Donation Fund

The equity of each account in each pool may be expressed in terms of "participation units" for purposes of periodic allocation of dividends and interest and estimation of changes in equity value.

The estimate of the market value of the equity of each account in each pool shall be determined not less than semi-annually.

Recommendations will be made annually to the Board of detailed standards of security holdings for all funds, such as minimum required ratings of bonds, ranges of maturities for dollar obligations, and similar factors.

66,231 - Endowment Fund Investments

The total market value of the equity of the Endowment Fund shall be represented by approximately equal amounts in the corporate stock pool for Endowment accounts and in the bond-mortgage pool. Periodically, if a material change has developed in the indicated percentage distribution of the values of the two pools, appropriate steps shall be taken to realign the investments.

The objectives of investment in corporate stocks for the Endowment Fund accounts are to secure the maximum current dividend income consistent with sufficient growth in the principal value of the investments to maintain (so far as possible) the purchasing power of future income therefrom.

The number of shares of voting stock owned in any one company shall not exceed 5% of the total number of outstanding voting shares.

Prudence shall be followed to avoid investing an unreasonable percentage of funds in the securities of any one corporation or organization.

Periodically, the Vice Chancellor for Administration is to distribute to the endowment accounts the appropriate portion of estimated dividend and interest income for the current fiscal year. The estimates of income shall be adjusted at the end of each year to give effect to over- or under-realization.
It is expected that each institution will administer the expenditures of endowments in such a way as to assure the existence of a balance in each endowment operating account at the end of a fiscal year, and will recognize that with investment in corporate stocks, related dividend income will fluctuate and may be less or more than originally estimated.

Some gifts or bequests are subject to investment conditions stipulated by the donor which prevent the investment of moneys in security pools. The investment program for said gifts and bequests shall be as directed by the terms of the gift or will, and pursuant to law and Board policy.

66.232 - Quasi-Endowment Funds

The total market value of the equity of the Quasi-Endowment Fund accounts shall be represented by approximately equal amounts in the bond-mortgage pool and in the corporate stock pool for Quasi-Endowment Fund accounts.

Periodically, if a material change has developed in the relationship of the market value of the two pools, appropriate steps are to be taken to realign the investments.

The objective of the prudent investment in corporate stocks for the Quasi-Endowment accounts is to obtain the benefit of expected increases in corporate earnings which may be evidenced by increasing dividends, and also by increases in the market value of the investments. Conversion of the latter may be effected by periodic sales of shares of stock and all or part of capital gains made available for current expenditures.

The number of voting shares of stock owned by the Board in any one company shall not exceed 5% of the total of outstanding shares of such stock.

Prudence shall be followed to avoid an unreasonable percentage of funds being invested in securities of any one corporation.

The Vice Chancellor for Administration shall authorize the expenditure of moneys from the various Quasi-Endowment accounts pursuant to the Board approved or authorized budget program for the current fiscal year, subject to the exercise of prudent judgment.

For those Quasi-Endowment gifts or bequests which are subject to investment conditions of the donor, there shall be compliance with the terms of the gift or will, and pursuant to law and Board policy.
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66.233 - Current Donation Fund Investments

The investment of moneys in the Current Donation Fund shall be in dollar obligations pursuant to law and board action.

66.234 - Higher Education Bond Building Fund Investments

Investments shall be in dollar obligations with maturities of no more than two years, and pursuant to law and Board action.

66.235 - Higher Education Bond Sinking Fund Investments

Investments shall be in dollar obligations with maturities of no more than five years and pursuant to statute and Board action.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Finance Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendations and that a public hearing on the proposed changes in the Administrative Rules be held at the time of the July 26, 1971, Board meeting. Suggestions made by the Finance Committee during the discussion are incorporated in the rules as stated above.

Board Discussion and Action

President Layman indicated that presentations in connection with the hearing on the proposed amendments were in order. There being no response to his request, the Board approved the recommendations as presented.

(Considered by Finance Committee, July 7, 1971.)

The Finance Committee, at its July 7 meeting, considered proposed procedures to be followed, in the event of Board adoption of the proposed amendments to the Administrative Rules relating to investment, as shown in the preceding item.

The procedure is expected to involve notification to all firms and individuals known or believed to be interested and qualified to manage the portfolio, inviting them to submit formal requests for consideration. The general rules will specify the major factors to be considered. After preliminary screening by the Board’s staff, five firms will be invited to interviews by the Finance Committee. The Committee will recommend one or more firms for Board approval.

Concurrently, a proposed contract or agreement will be developed and reviewed with the Committee, the Board and the selected firm or firms.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Following these introductory comments is a detailed outline of the policy guidelines under which the institutions are proceeding in the preparation of their proposed budgets for 1971-72 and a summary table, revised to reflect the Board's action at the June 9 meeting. The policy guidelines are those required by legislative and Board action, refined to provide administrative guidance in matters of detail.

Following are condensed proposed budget summaries and comparisons, together with a statement of proposed policies to be followed in the detailed budgets for the institutions.
EDUCATION AND GENERAL SERVICES  
Tentative Allocation of Resources by Fiscal Year  
1971-72 and 1972-73

EXPENDITURE PLAN

| Appropriation, State General Fund | $129,019,950 |
| Other Fund Resources               | 63,874,411 |
| **Biennial Total**                 | **192,894,361** |

Tentative allocation to fiscal year 1971-72  
Reserved for allocation to fiscal year 1972-73  

| Increase in year 1972-73 over year 1971-72 | $ 5,131,511 |
| **Detail of amounts reserved for 2nd year increases:** | |
| Academic salary adjustments                  | 2,176,746 |
| OPE rate increase                            | 844,243 |
| Price increases, Services & Supplies          | 428,910 |
| Teaching positions for added workload         | 690,346 |
| Other workload increase, including:           | |
| new building operation and maintenance        | 481,592 |
| Sea Grant, OSU                                | 20,347 |
| Minority and disadvantaged programs           | 31,984 |
| Student wages from other fund resources       | (600,000) |
| Continue special purpose staff at PSU & SOC   | 246,211 |
| Staff transfer from Dental Clinics, UODS      | 25,127 |
| Family Practice programs, UOMS                | 27,846 |
| Summer Session Workload                       | 298,458 |
| **Authorized Increases**                     | 4,671,810 |

Amount Applicable Toward Planned Savings of $1,200,000  
$ 459,701

**NOTE:**  
Classified pay adjustments for 1971-72 have not been allocated to State agencies at this time. A pay increase of approximately 5% for classified staff will require an increased level of expenditure when the Emergency Board allocates funds for July 1971.  
The State appropriation includes $1,364,122 held in a State Emergency Board reserve pending realization of estimated enrollments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>SRO</th>
<th>OTI</th>
<th>UOMS</th>
<th>UDOS</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>Board's Reserves</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislatively Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>22,765,780</td>
<td>23,888,748</td>
<td>14,734,061</td>
<td>4,666,831</td>
<td>5,266,414</td>
<td>2,351,859</td>
<td>2,879,881</td>
<td>5,762,661</td>
<td>2,214,347</td>
<td>141,663</td>
<td>2,763,691</td>
<td>350,700</td>
<td>87,746,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenza Allowance, Supplies</td>
<td>81,127</td>
<td>115,728</td>
<td>62,107</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>20,909</td>
<td>8,658</td>
<td>12,102</td>
<td>31,920</td>
<td>8,981</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>20,813</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>409,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenza Allowance, Books</td>
<td>36,930</td>
<td>50,902</td>
<td>18,813</td>
<td>9,115</td>
<td>9,703</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>113,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Force Allocation</td>
<td>81,278</td>
<td>55,820</td>
<td>72,945</td>
<td>5,157</td>
<td>39,828</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>256,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wage Rate Increase</td>
<td>14,494</td>
<td>18,631</td>
<td>8,894</td>
<td>3,079</td>
<td>2,573</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions in Program</td>
<td>(21,250)</td>
<td>(75,000)</td>
<td>250,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Cost Adjustment, PSU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKLOAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Staff</td>
<td>(29,008)</td>
<td>109,315</td>
<td>(190,500)</td>
<td>185,201</td>
<td>271,404</td>
<td>90,468</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>307,850</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>769,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session Academic Wages</td>
<td>46,198</td>
<td>69,869</td>
<td>69,488</td>
<td>56,668</td>
<td>29,104</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65,594</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>211,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Categories</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>15,768</td>
<td>(10,649)</td>
<td>21,285</td>
<td>26,445</td>
<td>7,962</td>
<td>9,587</td>
<td>44,065</td>
<td>42,432</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,805</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>189,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Grant, OSU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority &amp; Disadv. Program</td>
<td>134,833</td>
<td>37,399</td>
<td>37,457</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,319</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Books</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Clinics Staff Transfer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wage Allocation</td>
<td>133,140</td>
<td>184,436</td>
<td>114,556</td>
<td>47,787</td>
<td>58,952</td>
<td>22,043</td>
<td>19,098</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's Office of Admin.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Practice, UOMS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Program, OTI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATION OF NEW FACILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building Oper. &amp; Maint.</td>
<td>48,143</td>
<td>268,901</td>
<td>339,618</td>
<td>72,391</td>
<td>95,365</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68,611</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,649</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47,947</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>884,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARY ADJUSTMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session Academic Wages</td>
<td>60,451</td>
<td>42,125</td>
<td>58,375</td>
<td>19,657</td>
<td>15,347</td>
<td>7,918</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>203,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% on First $10,000</td>
<td>417,301</td>
<td>428,600</td>
<td>254,196</td>
<td>93,601</td>
<td>94,497</td>
<td>43,416</td>
<td>51,989</td>
<td>81,183</td>
<td>32,869</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>12,152</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,513,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7% Discretionary</td>
<td>125,309</td>
<td>124,911</td>
<td>83,606</td>
<td>26,152</td>
<td>28,332</td>
<td>12,797</td>
<td>17,103</td>
<td>36,763</td>
<td>16,714</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>5,263</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>476,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Gap Closure, PSU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Phys. &amp; Interns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE on Salary Adjustments</td>
<td>48,230</td>
<td>47,640</td>
<td>34,718</td>
<td>11,153</td>
<td>11,034</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td>5,327</td>
<td>12,914</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>181,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller's Transfer</td>
<td>18,269</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>13,229</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>10,718</td>
<td>6,542</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>82,212</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU, Music Lesson Adjust.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings to be Identified</td>
<td>(239,657)</td>
<td>(251,299)</td>
<td>(156,878)</td>
<td>(52,227)</td>
<td>(59,570)</td>
<td>(21,664)</td>
<td>(30,706)</td>
<td>(65,940)</td>
<td>(23,482)</td>
<td>(1,675)</td>
<td>(27,856)</td>
<td>5,123</td>
<td>(931,537)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENTATIVE ALLOCATION</td>
<td>$23,760,384</td>
<td>$25,162,053</td>
<td>$15,866,836</td>
<td>$5,180,400</td>
<td>$5,956,364</td>
<td>$2,563,173</td>
<td>$3,059,032</td>
<td>$6,688,482</td>
<td>$2,324,752</td>
<td>$160,407</td>
<td>$2,785,742</td>
<td>$608,160</td>
<td>$93,891,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Proposed Expenditure Budgets

**Fiscal Year 1971-72**

**Meeting #397-93**

**July 26, 1971**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions or Divisions</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure Accounts</th>
<th>Operating &amp; Service Accounts</th>
<th>Auxiliary Activities</th>
<th>Gifts, Grants &amp; Contracts</th>
<th>1971-72 All Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational and General Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Oregon</td>
<td>$23,760,384</td>
<td>$2,327,958</td>
<td>$7,418,888</td>
<td>$17,000,000</td>
<td>$50,507,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreg. State Univ.</td>
<td>25,162,053</td>
<td>3,528,932</td>
<td>8,266,126</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>48,957,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State U.</td>
<td>15,866,836</td>
<td>317,769</td>
<td>2,454,953</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
<td>21,889,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreg. Coll. Educ.</td>
<td>5,180,400</td>
<td>51,200</td>
<td>1,756,493</td>
<td>658,000</td>
<td>7,646,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So. Oreg. College</td>
<td>5,956,364</td>
<td>36,544</td>
<td>2,568,204</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>8,783,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East. Oreg. Coll.</td>
<td>2,543,173</td>
<td>24,292</td>
<td>1,022,571</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>3,755,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oreg. Tech. Inst.</td>
<td>3,059,032</td>
<td>63,336</td>
<td>866,964</td>
<td>106,346</td>
<td>4,095,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Medical Sch.</td>
<td>6,488,482</td>
<td>5,540,897</td>
<td>740,500</td>
<td>5,670,000</td>
<td>18,439,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Dental Sch.</td>
<td>2,324,752</td>
<td>127,640</td>
<td>351,677</td>
<td>791,856</td>
<td>3,595,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Resch.</td>
<td>146,047</td>
<td>74,633</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,420,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE Instr.</td>
<td>131,755</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ Broadcasting</td>
<td>743,431</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>783,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Act.</td>
<td>2,653,987</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,653,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board’s Reserves</td>
<td>608,160</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>608,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$94,624,856</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,595,201</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,446,372</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,601,202</strong></td>
<td><strong>$173,267,631</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| State-Wide Public Services | | | | | |
| Div. Contin. Ed. | 3,248,697 | 37,056 | 75,054 | 500,000 | 3,860,807 |
| Teach. Hosp. & Cl. | 11,198,066 | - | - | - | 11,198,066 |
| Dental Clinics | 388,378 | - | - | - | 388,378 |
| Coop. Ext. Serv. | 6,238,480 | - | - | - | 6,238,480 |
| Agric. Exp. Sta. | 6,900,752 | - | - | - | 6,900,752 |
| Forest Resch. Lab. | 1,239,274 | - | - | - | 1,239,274 |
| **TOTAL** | **$31,628,533** | **$37,056** | **$75,054** | **$500,000** | **$32,240,643** |

**Total, All Proposed Budgets**

| | | | | | |
| **$126,253,399** | **$12,632,257** | **$25,521,426** | **$41,101,202** | **$205,503,274** |
### Meeting #397-94

**Department of Higher Education**

**Planned Use of Resources**

**Biennium 1971-1973**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and General Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balances carried forward from prior fiscal periods</td>
<td>$1,621,263</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,621,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student fees at approved tuition rates</td>
<td>27,676,357</td>
<td>29,418,256</td>
<td>57,094,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal funds</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment funds</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>34,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and service fees</td>
<td>372,200</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>762,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, other fund income</strong></td>
<td>$28,240,757</td>
<td>$30,000,456</td>
<td>$58,241,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>$64,019,405</td>
<td>$63,636,423</td>
<td>$127,655,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation, reserved in Emergency Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,364,122</td>
<td>1,364,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for expenditure, estimated on current fee rates</td>
<td>$93,881,425</td>
<td>$95,001,001</td>
<td>$188,882,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Broadcasting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee income</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>733,431</td>
<td>757,458</td>
<td>1,490,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for expenditure</td>
<td>$743,431</td>
<td>$767,458</td>
<td>$1,510,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balances</td>
<td>$1,621,263</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,621,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and other income</td>
<td>28,250,757</td>
<td>30,010,456</td>
<td>58,261,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>64,752,836</td>
<td>64,393,881</td>
<td>128,146,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation, reserved</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,364,122</td>
<td>1,364,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available for expenditure at current fee and other income rates</td>
<td>$94,624,856</td>
<td>$95,768,459</td>
<td>$190,393,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure Limitation 1971-1973</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$194,405,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure authority not funded</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,011,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned savings (net)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net deficiency in resources necessary to fund year 1972-73 at authorized level</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,811,935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

July 26, 1971
### Planned Use of Resources Biennium 1971-1973

#### Education and General Services

##### Instruction Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balances carried forward from prior fiscal periods</td>
<td>$1,621,263</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,621,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student fees at approved tuition rates</td>
<td>27,676,357</td>
<td>29,418,256</td>
<td>57,094,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal funds</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment funds</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>34,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and service fees</td>
<td>372,200</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>762,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL, other fund income</strong></td>
<td>$28,240,757</td>
<td>$30,000,456</td>
<td>$58,241,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>$64,019,405</td>
<td>$63,636,423</td>
<td>$127,655,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation, reserved in Emergency Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,364,122</td>
<td>1,364,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available for expenditure, estimated on current fee rates</strong></td>
<td>$93,881,425</td>
<td>$95,001,001</td>
<td>$188,882,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Educational Broadcasting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fee income</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>733,431</td>
<td>757,458</td>
<td>1,490,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available for expenditure</strong></td>
<td>$743,431</td>
<td>$767,458</td>
<td>$1,310,889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balances</td>
<td>$1,621,263</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,621,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and other income</td>
<td>28,250,757</td>
<td>30,010,456</td>
<td>58,261,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation</td>
<td>64,752,836</td>
<td>64,393,881</td>
<td>129,146,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriation, reserved</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,364,122</td>
<td>1,364,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available for expenditure at current fee and other income rates</strong></td>
<td>$94,624,856</td>
<td>$95,768,459</td>
<td>$190,393,315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Expenditure Limitation 1971-1973: $194,405,250
- Expenditure authority not funded: 4,011,935
- Planned savings (net): 1,200,000
- Net deficiency in resources necessary to fund year 1972-73 at authorized level: $2,811,935
### Agricultural Experiment Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation</td>
<td>$4,162,640</td>
<td>$4,208,021</td>
<td>$8,370,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>994,567</td>
<td>1,025,000</td>
<td>2,019,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service Fees</td>
<td>728,920</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>1,478,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts &amp; Grants</td>
<td>1,014,625</td>
<td>1,186,754</td>
<td>2,201,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$6,900,752</td>
<td>$7,169,775</td>
<td>$14,070,527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forest Research Laboratory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation</td>
<td>$375,190</td>
<td>$417,307</td>
<td>$792,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>169,666</td>
<td>157,666</td>
<td>327,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Products Harvest Tax</td>
<td>514,976</td>
<td>585,024</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service Fees</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts &amp; Grants</td>
<td>139,942</td>
<td>114,627</td>
<td>254,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,239,274</td>
<td>$1,314,124</td>
<td>$2,553,398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dental Clinics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient Fees</td>
<td>$388,378</td>
<td>$411,144</td>
<td>$799,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$388,378</td>
<td>$411,144</td>
<td>$799,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NDEA & Health Professions Student Loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation (match funds)</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$242,723</td>
<td>$482,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>2,160,000</td>
<td>2,184,507</td>
<td>4,344,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$2,427,230</td>
<td>$4,827,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OPERATING BUDGET PLAN
Fiscal Year 1971-72

Education and General Services

1. Enrollment Estimates:
   1.1 Three Term FTE:
      
      | Institution | FTE Students 1971-72 |
      |-------------|----------------------|
      | Six Institutions | 48,566               |
      | OTI           | 1,358                |
      | UOMS          | 910                  |
      | UODS          | 410                  |
      | **FTE students 1971-72** | **51,244** |

   1.2 Graduate student enrollment targets conform to the Governor's budget recommendation of 5,133 FTE.

   1.3 Nonresident enrollment estimates include an additional 300 FTE students above the Governor's budget.

   1.4 Enrollment estimates include 417 FTE students to be transferred from DCE's Portland Extension Center to PSU.

   1.5 Resident undergraduate students will be accepted in the numbers that apply, based on current admissions requirements.

   1.6 UODS enrollments are to conform to Legislative direction concerning numbers of students and priorities for residents.

   1.7 OTI enrollment estimates include lower division transfer and nursing students in addition to anticipated technology students.

2. Tuition and Fees

   2.1 Tuition levels for resident undergraduates are recommended at $130 per term ($390 per academic year) which is $24 per year higher than the Governor's budget and $90 higher than 1970-71 tuition level. Of that amount, $6 covers a transfer from auxiliary activities incidental fee for gym suit service.

   2.2 Tuition for nonresident undergraduates is set at the full cost of instruction. Total tuition and fees will exceed the $1,500 per year minimum designated by the 1971 Ways and Means Committee Budget Report.

   2.3 Tuition for graduate students is increased by a dollar amount no less than the increase for resident undergraduates.
3. Resources:

3.1 Estimated tuition and fees, including balances carried forward from 1969-1971, amount to approximately $29,862,000 for fiscal year 1971-72.

3.2 The biennial State General Fund appropriation is $129,019,950, exclusive of Educational Broadcasting, of which $64,019,405 is recommended for use in year 1971-72. Of the amount reserved for 1972-73, $1,364,122 resides in the State Emergency Board for release if enrollment estimates are realized.

3.3 The biennial appropriation for Educational Broadcasting is $1,490,889. In addition, $20,000 of fee income is anticipated. An amount of $743,431 is recommended for allocation in year 1971-72.

3.4 The Division of Continuing Education is provided an appropriation of $500,000 and a biennial expenditure limitation on other fund resources of $8,624,765. The Division recommends use of $350,000 and $3,098,697 estimated fee income, to fund operations and phase out programs in year 1971-72. State appropriated funds of $150,000 will be reserved to continue programs in year 1972-73 which may be highly desirable but not fully self-sustaining.

4. Expenditure Budgets

4.1 Funds have been allocated to institutions in accordance with guidelines from the Ways and Means Committee.

4.2 New program funds have been allocated for Nursing (OTI), Family Practice (UOMS), Disadvantaged Youth (SOC).

4.3 Student wage allocations of $600,000 provide a supplement to federal work study funds. It is recommended that the appropriated funds be administered under the certification of eligibility rules now operative for federal funds.

4.4 Teaching staff allocations to the colleges and universities are by ratio, adjusted to reduce the first year impact of staff reductions at the UO and PSU. Teaching staff at OTI conforms to the higher ratio established by Ways and Means, supplemented by funds for two FTE staff members on a nonrecurring basis. The Medical School teaching staff additions build toward a faculty to care for expanded enrollments by 1974-75. Dental School staffing continues the transfer of Dental Clinics academic staff to the institution faculty.

4.5 New building operation and maintenance funds are provided for buildings authorized and constructed in 1969-1971.
4.6 Security staff additions approved by the State Emergency Board in year 1970-71 are continued at a reduced level in 1971-72 in the initial budget allocation. Funds are to be requested from the Emergency Board to continue a level of service more consistent with the 1970-71 action, since funding was apparently omitted from the budget through an oversight.

4.7 Disadvantaged student programs are provided for the three universities and SOC. Amounts for the programs are allocated as provided by the Legislature.

4.8 A savings factor of 1% of the annual budget is recommended for each institution. Savings are to be identified and reported periodically to the Board during year 1971-72. Budget savings so derived apply toward student wage allocations and net savings to reduce tuition rate adjustments in 1972-73.

4.9 Summer Session, including amounts for workload increases are provided for year 1971-72 at the colleges and universities. Each institution has recommended a summer session budget, commensurate with estimated enrollments, within the total fiscal year funds available to the institution.

5. Salary Adjustments

5.1 Academic staff, including graduate assistants, are provided 4% of the first $10,000 of salary as a cost of living adjustment. Further adjustments from a 1% discretionary fund provide for promotion, meritorious increases, etc. Institutions have been instructed to allocate discretionary funds among all ranks and salary levels.

5.2 Target salary goals for nine months teaching staff are applied at the colleges and universities and OTI. Institutions have been instructed to make an effort toward reaching that target.

5.3 Supplemental funds provided to PSU for salary adjustments are intended to move that institution approximately 10% of the way toward equality of salary averages with the University of Oregon.

5.4 Resident Physicians and Interns at the Medical School are provided annual increases of $1,000, the amount recommended by the Governor and funded by the Legislature.

5.5 Classified staff are budgeted at 1970-71 rates since agency allocations for pay rate increases were not available in time to incorporate into budgets. Increases will be effective July 1, 1971, and payrolls will be prepared on 1971-72 rates. Budget allocations of state appropriated funds for classified staff pay rate increases will be made early in 1971-72.
5.6 Student wage rate increases funded in the Governor's budget provide less than a 2% increase for year 1971-72 for the six colleges and universities. No student wage rate increases were funded at other institutions.

6. General Information:

6.1 Joint Cost agreements between PSU and DCE have been reviewed to adapt to the impact on PSU of legislative decisions on DCE.

Joint costs of $713,000 per year are recommended for restructuring in year 1971-72 pending study of a more permanent arrangement. For year 1971-72 it is proposed that the Board:

(1) Allocate Board funds to PSU $250,200
(2) Continue DCE payments for services 326,550
(3) Require PSU to absorb a net reduction in level of service 136,250
Total accounted for $713,000

The amount of $326,550 for DCE is contingent upon realization of fee income of $2,798,697. As a protection to PSU it is proposed that the Board guarantee the final $100,000 of DCE's liability to PSU, and allocate that amount from reserves if DCE income is underrealized.

6.2 Oregon Educational Broadcasting is recommended as a part of Centralized Activities with budgets totaling $743,431 for year 1971-72 and administrative control by the Assistant Chancellor.

6.3 Policies used in preparation of institutional budgets apply to all classifications regardless of fund source.

6.4 Special purpose teaching staff funded by the Legislature as supplements to student teacher ratio staff include:

(1) 10.98 FTE, Portland State University, for continued development of the Graduate Program
(2) 4.00 FTE, Southern Oregon College, for the Nursing Program
(3) 4.08 FTE, Oregon Technical Institute, for Dental Hygiene and Nursing Programs.

6.5 The Renal Transplantation Program at the Medical School is continued under a separate appropriation of $165,399 for the biennium. Patient fee income, estimated at $53,049, provides the additional amount to cover a biennial expenditure limitation of $218,448.
STATE-WIDE PUBLIC SERVICE DIVISIONS

7. Dental Clinics, UODS
   7.1 Operations are funded by patient fee income
   7.2 Budgeted expenditures continue the present level of services adjusted for price increases and salary adjustments.
   7.3 Funds not required for operations are to be expended to replace obsolete equipment and dental chairs to the extent funds are available within the expenditure limitation.

8. Teaching Hospital and Clinics, UOMS
   8.1 Patient fee income for the Teaching Hospital currently funds approximately 40% of the operating budget. Legislative action requires that 47% of operations be funded from patient fees in biennium 1971-1973. Modified admissions policies were recognized as necessary to achieve this level of fee support.
   8.2 Operating expenses include phasing into operation of the new Teaching Hospital addition scheduled to commence in March 1972.
   8.3 Outpatient Clinic income estimates were adjusted in the Governor's budget and accepted by the Legislature to anticipate Public Welfare payments for clinic visits. These actions were consistent with provisions in the Welfare Budget.
   8.4 A Family Practice Clinic is included in the budget relative to approval of the Family Practice Program in the Medical School budget.
   8.5 The budget for the Tuberculosis Hospital reflects a continuing workload near the 1970-71 level, adjusted for inflationary costs and salary adjustments. Biennial amounts are as approved by the Governor and the Legislature.
   8.6 All funds for operation of the Tuberculosis Hospital came from State General Fund appropriation.

9. Crippled Children's Division, UOMS
   9.1 Support for the program is derived from State appropriation, federal funds (HEW-Children's Bureau) and anticipated increases in receipts from federal Title XIX money through Public Welfare.
9.2 State appropriation support is provided for physical plant operation and maintenance of the Child Development and Rehabilitation Center. Expenditures for this purpose are to be separately identified. If other fund resources become available, the general fund balance will revert.

9.3 Expenditures for diagnosis, rehabilitation and care of traumatic injury patients continue to increase. The Legislature provided expenditure authority to care for these patients but directed the Division to search out other possible nonstate support of $100,000 for the biennium.

10. Cooperative Extension Service, OSU

10.1 Budget adjustments by the Legislature reflect the intent to emphasize Agricultural Production, Agricultural Marketing, and 4-H Programs in state appropriations support.

10.2 Expanded federal support for Nutrition Education Programs for low income families has been approved by the Legislature and incorporated into other fund expenditure limitations.

10.3 Program levels financed for 1971-72 are somewhat below the level of service provided in year 1970-71 except for nutrition education.

11. Agricultural Experiment Station, OSU

11.1 Program limitations by the Ways and Means Committee hold expansion of staffing in each program to a maximum of 106% of 1969-1971 levels. Programs which had growth in year 1970-71 are reduced in 1971-72 to conform to the 1969-1971 biennial average.

11.2 Two branch stations are to be phased out in biennium 1971-1973 at a savings of $141,335. A plan for further station phase out is to be presented to the 1973 Legislature.

11.3 Field burning research is continued in amount of $24,500 to be expended prior to January 1, 1972. A report to the Emergency Board on progress of the research is required to determine whether supplemental funding will be supplied after January 1.

12. Forest Research Laboratory, OSU

12.1 State General Fund support for 1971-1973 is provided at the dollar level of the 1969-1971 appropriation. Appropriated funds recommended by the Legislature are $72,297 below the Governor's budget.
12.2 Forest Products Harvest Tax collections were expected to fund $1,100,000 in expenditures for 1971-1973, approximately $74,000 below the level for the current biennium. Current projections of collections by Laboratory administrators are even less optimistic. The Legislature held tax rates at the current assessment of 6¢ per thousand board feet after industry resisted further rate increases to support the Laboratory.

12.3 Authority to expend other fund income of $72,297, to replace appropriated fund reductions, was granted by the Ways and Means Committee. No alternate income sources have been identified.

12.4 Based upon the above conditions, research projects for 1971-72 will be conducted at a level below that of the current fiscal year. Specific projects to be deleted are under consideration in budget planning.

13. NDEA and Health Professions Student Loans

13.1 NDEA and Health Profession Student Loan Programs provide $9 in federal funds for each $1 of state match funds. Appropriation of $482,723 for biennium 1971-1973 approximates the level of loan activity for the current biennium.

13.2 Amounts provided to institutions for year 1971-72 will be limited to approximately one half the biennial total, with each institution limited to amounts necessary to match federal allocations. All funds are reserved in Board accounts until notice of federal allocation is provided.

13.3 Federal fund availability may fluctuate from year to year dependent upon federal appropriations and participation of eligible institutions in the region. If state funds are not sufficient to match federal monies, deficiencies will be prorated among the institutions.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

It was indicated that the information presented in the preceding pages had been prepared in order to keep the Committee fully informed during the budget preparation process. It was also indicated that some modifications would be made in the information prior to the July Board meeting.

The Committee discussed specific items in the report and recommended certain changes. The necessary revisions are included in the preceding summaries and policy statements or will be presented to the Board at the July meeting.

The Finance Committee recommended that the Board consider the report at its July meeting, including any further modifications, and take appropriate action at that time.
The Chancellor said that in addition to the budget summaries and the budget plan presented on the preceding pages, three additional documents were available for distribution. These are included as Supplements D, E, and F to these minutes and consist of the following:

Supplement D -- Comparison of 1970-71 and 1971-72 Budget Plans, Education and General Services

Supplement E -- Comparison of Operating Budget Plans, 1970-71 Approved and 1971-72 Proposed (including all activities)

Supplement F -- Personnel Actions and Salary Adjustments for Board Review, Year 1971-72

The Chancellor then discussed the various elements in the proposed budget materials.

In response to a question concerning the comparative status of salaries in the State System, the Chancellor said that it is probable that the State System salaries will be a slightly lower percentage of the salary averages in the 19 institutions used for comparisons. During the review of personnel adjustments, Mr. Stewart pointed out that some of the top administrators in the institutions would be receiving salaries close to those of the presidents of the institutions. He said that this salary differential did not appear to be commensurate with the differences in the responsibilities between the president and the other administrative positions. The Chancellor responded that there was no policy which would require a specific salary differential between categories of personnel. Further, the State System has had a very long tradition in which some of the academic or clinical staff, particularly at the Medical School, did have salaries larger than that of the head of the institution.

Mrs. Johnson asked whether the one-step increases in the salary scale were automatic until a staff member reached the top step on the scale. The Chancellor explained that the State System has not operated on an automatic step increase. The practice has been for the salary adjustment money to be distributed in accordance with certain guidelines or target salaries, and also in accordance with judgments made at the institutions as to the individuals who should receive more or receive less. Consequently, the money has been distributed on a merit basis, using the salary scale as a guide. Salaries above and below the scale are also permitted.

The Chancellor indicated that in distributing the salary improvement funds for 1971-72 all of the staff members with faculty appointments would receive the $400 increase or four percent of their salary up to $10,000, whichever figure is smaller. The remainder of the salary adjustment money would be distributed in accordance with the so-called merit salary plan.

In distributing the discretionary portion of these funds, the institutions were directed to spread them throughout the different academic ranks. It was indicated that the detailed listings were not yet
available for individual staff members to show the extent to which this has been done.

The Board then discussed the gap remaining between the state appropriations and the balances available for expenditure and the proposed expenditures. Mr. Mosser said that it was his intention to vote for the first-year budget but that he was not committing himself to raising the money to close the gap for the second year because he might prefer to consider budget cuts instead.

Mr. Stewart said that he would vote against the budget because, in his opinion, the wrong approach had been taken. He said he would prefer to have deficit financing for the first year of the biennium and then, if necessary, to raise student fees more than the proposed $24 during the second year of the biennium after there had been sufficient opportunity to examine all possible economies.

Mrs. Johnson said that certainly the budget message from the legislature was clear that every possible saving must be made before further tuition increases were assessed. However, she said that commitments had already been made for staff and building operations by the time the budget situation was finalized and that it was very late to make cuts. She said that some kind of tuition increase was necessary and that perhaps it was better to do this in smaller amounts and at the same time to give the institutions an opportunity to identify savings and to accommodate themselves to reductions that were made by the legislature.

Mrs. Johnson then referred to the reductions in the Agricultural Experiment Station budgets and the specific decision made as a result of those reductions to close the Redmond and Moro research experiment stations. Her comments and subsequent motion with respect to this budget reduction appear following the Board action on the budget itself.

Mr. Holmes indicated that he was sympathetic to the problems of the students in connection with the tuition increase but pointed out that many other individuals served by programs in the State System would also be facing substantial cost increases as a result of the difficult financial situation.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented, including budget recommendations incorporated in the supplementary documents. Mr. Stewart voted no.

Mrs. Johnson explained that the reduction in the budget for the Agricultural Experiment Stations included an amount of $141,335 to phase out two agricultural research branch experiment stations. She said that because the total of the budgets for the Redmond and Moro stations was exactly that amount, it had been assumed that it was the legislative intent that those two stations were to be discontinued. However, the budget report and the subsequent action by the legislature did not name the stations to be closed, and since they were not named specifically,
no public hearings were conducted to explore alternatives or possible other means of achieving the budget reductions. She said that agricultural associations and individual farmers in central Oregon, are petitioning Oregon State University for an opportunity to explore alternatives to closing the Redmond station, which is a research-oriented station. The research relates to alfalfa, wheat, mint and potatoes, and is of benefit largely to small operators in the agricultural industry. She also indicated that there is some confusion as to the meaning of the term "phase out" and the timing that was intended, particularly since research is currently in progress.

Mrs. Johnson said that individuals concerned question whether the expenses which would be involved if the research were continued but monitored from a station in Klamath Falls or Corvallis have been compared with present operating expenses.

Mrs. Johnson then made the following motion: That the Board authorize the President of Oregon State University—working with his staff and the staff in the Chancellor's Office, the advisory committees to the agricultural experiment stations, and other people involved in agricultural experiment work—to review the reasoning and the data by which the recommendations to phase out two branch stations at Redmond and Noro were reached; to explore the cost of alternative proposals that the institution will be making to conduct agricultural research in these parts of Oregon and perhaps monitor it from someplace else; to weigh any other alternatives that might be proposed to meet the legislative directive, and then to review these findings with the Emergency Board, giving them the required notice to place it on the agenda. She stated that the motion is not intended as a request for additional funds but a request to explore alternatives and possible ways of achieving the results short of an arbitrary closing of these two particular stations.

During the discussion of the motion, several Board members questioned whether the findings should go to the Emergency Board or be presented to the Board of Higher Education for study and determination.

Mrs. Johnson amended her motion to specify that the findings be brought to the Board of Higher Education which would then decide the ultimate disposition of the report.

President MacVicar said that he had no objection to the motion, but that in view of the legislative mandate, he felt it was necessary to consult with legislative groups, and that this had already been done informally. It was pointed out that in an unofficial manner anyone is free to discuss a problem with legislators. However, the motion would require that the information be brought before the Board of Higher Education for further consideration and disposition.

The Board approved the motion as stated and amended by Mrs. Johnson. Mr. Joss said that he would like to have all options for the saving of an amount equivalent to this, when the material is presented to the Board for consideration.
In accordance with the discussions held at the time of the June 9, 1971, Board meeting and in addition to amounts and principles approved at the January 25, 1971, meeting, it was recommended that the Board conduct a public hearing during the July 26, 1971, Board meeting and adopt the following tuition and fee schedule for year 1971-72.

DCE Tuition and Fees for 1971-72

The Division of Continuing Education has formalized its recommendations relating to tuition and fees for the 1971-72 fiscal year:

1. Tuition - Undergraduate Courses: $20 per credit hour, with a minimum of $40 and a maximum of $180.

2. Tuition - Graduate Courses: $20 per credit hour, with a minimum of $40.

The Board included these recommendations in the public hearing held on other tuition and fee matters during the July 26, 1971, Board meeting and adopted them as a part of the tuition and fee schedule for 1971-72.
I. Tuition - Per Academic Year Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Nonresident</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>1970-71 Foreign Stu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. UO, OSU, PSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>$184</td>
<td>$431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time, per hour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime, per hour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. OCE, SOC, EOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time, per hour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime, per hour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. OTI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time, per hour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime, per hour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. UOMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time, Medicine</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time, Medicine,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per hour</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time, Nursing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. Tech.</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time, Nursing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. Tech., per hour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime, Nursing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. Tech., per hour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. UODS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time, Dental</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time, Dental,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per hour</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overtime, Dental,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per hour</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time, Hygiene</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time, Hygiene,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per hour</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Changed by Board action to $20.
II. Building Fees - Per Academic Term

All Institutions

Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Nonresident</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-7 hours</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hours or more</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours or more</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Incidental and Health Service Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidental Fee</th>
<th>Health Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. UO*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Health Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hours or more</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Incidental fee includes an amount for OSPIRG
### B. OSU*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Health Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hours or more</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition, a $1 charge is made to each enrolled student for OSPIRG

### C. PSU*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Health Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 or more</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Incidental Fee includes an amount for OSPIRG

### D. OCR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Health Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hours or more</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. SOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Health Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hours or more</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>$23.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. EOC*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Health Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$21.50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hours or more</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition, a $1 charge is made to each enrolled student for OSPIRG.*

### G. OTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Health Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4 hours</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hours</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$19.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 hours</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 hours</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 hours</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 hours</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 hours</td>
<td>$24.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 hours or more</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H. UOMS

- Full time students: $11.00, $11.00, $33.00

### I. UODS

- Full time students: $11.00, $11.00, $29.00
Meeting #397-112  
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

During the Committee discussion, consideration was given to the total amount of the tuition and fees to be paid by the students and the amount of the increase. The range of the incidental fee established by the Board was also discussed. It was indicated that the 1971 Legislature had postponed until July 1, 1973, the effective date of any revision of the incidental fee structure by that body. It was also stated that the Legislative Interim Committee on Higher Education would be studying the matter of the incidental fees and that the Board should also compile data and make recommendations concerning future student fee rates.

Mr. Eugene Bauer indicated that the Dental School wished to change its fee schedule so that it would be the same as that shown for the Medical School. This change has been incorporated in the fee schedule.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Layman indicated that presentations in connection with the hearing on the proposed tuition increases were in order. He then recognized Mr. George D'Angelantonio, Chairman of the Interinstitutional Union of Students of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, who had requested an opportunity to appear.

Mr. D'Angelantonio asked that the Board consider the following recommendations:

1. That the charge for overtime hours be eliminated in Part I, Sections A, B, C, D, and E so that students can take more than 21 hours without being penalized.

2. That tuition be established at the same level for two-year periods so that students could plan their expenses more realistically.

3. That arrangements be developed so that tuition would be paid on the installment plan. This system could also encompass charges at the libraries, book store, and health services.

Mr. D'Angelantonio also suggested that consideration be given to the following:

1. Utilization of buildings more fully in the late afternoon, in the evening or early morning hours, perhaps scheduling required courses or some of the more popular small class sections at those times to encourage enrollment.

2. Transfer of money from the student building fund for use in the construction of academic buildings, possibly on a loan basis.
3. The possible elimination of the gym suit and towel service with the requirement that students furnish their own clothing and launder it.

4. Submitting certain activities, such as some of the physical plant work, to private contractors on the assumption that bids might be lower than present charges.

5. The assessment of the ability of the professors by students, with the result of their assessment to have an effect on whether the professor receives tenure or is retained on tenure.

Mr. D'Angelantonio said that membership of the tuition and fee committee should be constituted differently than in the past. He indicated that his organization offered its assistance and that the Inter-institutional Union of Faculty had expressed a willingness to participate. He said administrators from the schools should be involved and also an individual from the Chancellor's Office to receive the work of the Committee. He concluded by saying that the rich will always be able to obtain their education; the poor will receive federal money, although the higher the tuition the fewer the students who will be helped. However, the middle class of students will be hurt most because these sources of funds are not available to them. He said the middle income group would perhaps be helped by the installment plan and the opportunity to take extra hours without additional charge.

Mr. Mosser asked whether students would find tuition differentials based on the school terms attended as an acceptable alternative, the object being to spread enrollments more evenly over the fall, winter, spring and summer terms. Mr. D'Angelantonio said that such an arrangement would probably be accepted quite well by students.

Mr. Mosser asked what the decrease in revenue would be from reducing the charge for overtime hours from the recommended $40 and $32 to $20. Mr. Holmer said that he did not have the total number of hours at hand but the amount of revenue would not be substantial. He said the main purpose of the charge was to discourage the excessive enrollment of students for extra hours to an extent which, in some cases, makes the academic validity of the hours questionable. It was indicated that students frequently audit courses and then take them in a subsequent term for credit.

President MacVicar commented that students are extremely inventive with respect to manipulating the registration system. Some are attending classes without registration and payment of fees and then enroll during the following term for a large number of hours. In other instances, they are enrolling for a large number of hours and then dropping to the number they wish to carry. This denies spaces to other students who might have registered for the class at the beginning of the term and it is very difficult to counteract in a large institution.

Mr. Layman invited comments from Mr. Iain More, President of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. Mr. More distributed information concerning the minority student program support and a fact
sheet for the ASUO Budget Proposal, together with a statement on tuition increases, which follows:

Tuition Increases

Oregon Increases

"It will cost more for the average student at state colleges and universities to attend this year than last, but the increase in most student charges is not as dramatic as was the increase between last year and the previous year." This statement from a 1970-71 report on student charges might sound not too depressing, if not encouraging. That is unless one is to look at Oregon where as an in-state undergraduate student, tuition charges in that year increased $13.00 and for 1971-72, $30.00. Four out-of-state undergraduates, tuition went up by $133 and $39 during the same period. For graduates the increase was $119 and $60.

The Register-Guard in March examined these figures in terms of percentage increase over the last ten years:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In state undergraduates</td>
<td>+50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>+80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of state undergraduates</td>
<td>+150%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The National Influence

The local picture then is worse than the national. Why? Oregon is affected by national trends. Significantly, they are:

(1) A slowing down of Federal support. Between 1965 and 1969 Federal help doubled. Then in 1969 there was only a 14% increase and in 1970, 12%.

(2) A general increase in cost of higher education. Due to more students, inflation, a steady increase in faculty salaries (state universities have increased median faculty salaries faster than any other institutions), increased support of minority students (they require 3/4% more financial support than other students).

It doesn't take much thought to understand why Federal support has declined. In order to increase government money, there has to be a change in priorities at the highest level and the United States is still locked into enormous military spending.

On the second problem Kingman Brewster said, "One thing is clear in our combination of feudalism and craft unionism, which is riddled with tenure and custom. You don't do the new at the price of the old. You do the new in addition to the old, particularly if it's experimental--and that is expensive," i.e., we have to examine our
priorities within higher education. Are we to be locked in to the annual raises for tenured faculty and administrators? Are we going to be able to really sit down and evaluate our curriculum and see where there are classes, departments, even schools which no longer fulfill their function? It is no good pointing the knife at the national government unless we are prepared to use it on ourselves too.

Our priorities

Some of our priorities have been declared; for example, we want to see a more pluralistic campus. At the present time with increases in tuition and a cut back in jobs we are tending to move away from this and towards a university full of in state upper and middle class students.

The Legislature first cut back on out of state and graduate enrollment, then raised the tuition charges. Now even with the removal of the enrollment ceiling, the increased cost will reduce the numbers of students in these categories. This year the Legislature agreed to phase out the Foreign Student fee remittance, which amounted to a scholarship. By 1974 it will not exist and Oregon, which is in around the top two dozen universities in terms of numbers of foreign students, will move further into isolation.

State Board Action Needed

Somewhere the burden on the student has to stop. Until the 7th of July this year for instance, the hopeful student could at least feel that he knew what was the inevitable for the biennium. But no! The Finance Committee of the State Board suggests a $10-$16 further increase to cover up a gap between the legislative appropriation and the recommended tuition fees. The time has certainly come now for the State Board to take a stand, to refuse to make the increase and to ask the Emergency Board to fund the difference. Further than that the State Board should make a mandate to the universities to initiate a very serious self-evaluation, this should include every department within the institution including the ASUO. Lastly, the State Board should take action itself and impress upon the Interim Committee on Higher Education, that before more tuition increases are levied that some alternate methods of funding higher education in this state are examined. If the state cannot find the taxation to increase funding without the universities appearing increasingly to be a public utility, then let us seriously examine the voucher system, which has a multitude of advantages, deferred tuition, or any other possible method. Changes in priorities, changes in methods of funding are possible at every level, but they need leadership.

In the State of Oregon that leadership should be manifested in a positive, purposeful manner by the State Board of Higher Education. Slapping on a further increase in tuition to fill a gap does not represent that sort of leadership. In the short term it represents an easy way out and in the long term, a penalty on perhaps the most important investment this state has, the student.
Mr. Layman then invited Mr. Ron Wilkinson, President of the Associated Students of Oregon State University, to present his comments.

Mr. Wilkinson said that Oregon State students would not prefer graduated charges by terms because it imposes too heavy a burden during the fall term. He suggested that there are other ways in which enrollments might be distributed more evenly between the terms. He emphasized the need for counselling which would point out that students did not need to enter college immediately after high school graduation, or that perhaps they should be attending a community college or other form of post high school education.

Mr. Wilkinson expressed the opinion that all higher education should be governed by the same board in order to provide closer coordination of all post-high school educational opportunities. He agreed with previous statements that the charge for overtime hours should be eliminated and that there should be two-year periods with the same tuition rate.

Mr. Mosser observed this would necessarily mean that the students would pay a higher cost than they otherwise would during the first year of a biennium. Mr. Wilkinson said that the main problem the student faces now is the inability to project his educational costs.

In commenting upon the presentations, Mrs. Johnson said that they were really referring to mass higher education but that is not the same as saying education for the masses in the universities. Nor does universal exposure to higher education necessarily mean university education. She also noted that the Board has indicated previously its commitment to many of the things mentioned in the statements. Both the Board and the legislature have stated that the institutions must examine their programs for all possible changes which could result in lower expenditures.

Mrs. Johnson also pointed out that community colleges are supported from both state and local tax funds and this has implications for the shifting of students between community colleges and four-year institutions.

Mrs. Johnson said that if the community colleges were to be a part of a higher education system, this really would mean that the available dollars would be split up into smaller amounts because more people would be competing for them.

Mr. Wilkinson said that he was aware of the complexities in the relationship between community colleges and State System schools, but that coordination can only be achieved by a post-high school board for both State System schools and the community colleges.

Mr. Holmes commended the students for their presentations. He said the Board is aware of the problems mentioned and is doing what it can. However, neither the Board nor the legislature can solve all of these difficulties until the people of the State of Oregon are willing to provide more tax dollars to do the job that needs to be done, not only in education but in all areas of state support.
Mr. D'Angelantonio suggested the need for public education as to the programs of the State System institutions and the worthwhile activities in which students are engaged.

Mr. Collins then read the following letter from Mr. David Johnson of Portland as a part of the hearing on the proposed tuition increases:

4740 NE 99, #4
Portland, OR 97220
July 14, 1971

R. L. Collins, Secretary
Oregon State Board of Higher Education
PO Box 3175
Eugene, OR 97403

RE: Public Meeting at Southern Oregon, July 26, 1971, at 11:00

Dear Mr. Collins:

I noted in the Oregonian that the State Board of Higher Education has not yet affirmed the tuition increase for next fall and that it will discuss possible actions at the forthcoming meeting before taking finalizing action.

I have no doubts that the Board will affirm the present increase suggested, but I believe such increases for many students are unfair. Students no longer are able to support a college education cost by working summers, and many are unable to cover costs by working during the academic year. Loans are not as readily available as many suggest. Tax breaks are not allowed to students for education either, so any extra monies from such an alternative are not available, though some people claim so.

It is my feeling that the fairest tuition is one that is assessed on a graduated basis. (Such a system has been employed in the East with success, most notably in Michigan.) Such a system sets a basic tuition floor; money needs over and above that which can be supplied by basic tuition monies are filled by assessing added-tuition on the basis of the ability to pay (similar to the federal income tax system). I feel such a system might well be investigated as to its propriety and utility in the state.

Sincerely,

/s/ David Johnson

David Johnson

Mr. Spencer Alpert, a student at the University of Oregon, called attention to the fact that the incidental fee budget at the University of Oregon this year would not include the entire amount that students pay if they wish to see athletic events. He said athletic tickets would be sold to students this year for approximately $17.50 for a ticket for the entire year.
At the same time the athletic budget is being cut by more than 50 percent and this is contrary to the stipulation in the guidelines for incidental fees which requires a vote of the entire student body to cut a budget by an amount of more than 50 percent. The cut can be made if an alternate method of funding is discovered. However, the alternate method of funding is to charge students. He said that over 12,000 students picked up their free athletic tickets last year and that if even a large majority of them purchase tickets this year, the charge affects quite a few people. Mr. Alpert asked the Board not to approve the budget with the allocation for athletics to be provided in this manner, since, in his opinion, it was contrary to the stated guidelines.

President Clark said that the principle of alternate methods of funding had always been a part of the discussion with respect to cutting of programs financed within the incidental fee budget. The separate student charge for athletics is widely used, both nationally and in the Pacific 8 conference. He said that the recommendation was the result of an effort to provide an acceptable way of giving support to traditional activities and yet introducing some flexibility and choice on the part of some students if they chose not to participate in what is one of the major and most costly factors in the whole budget. He also noted that the charge for the athletic admission has been set at $15.00.

Mr. Holmes moved that the Board approve the tuition and fees as presented. Mr. Mosser moved to amend the motion by reducing the fees for nonresident and foreign undergraduate students as listed in Part I, Sections A, B, and C, from the indicated figures of $40 and $32 to an amount of $20 in each instance. Mr. Holmes accepted the amendment to his motion.

Mrs. Johnson asked if the tuition and fees recommendations could be voted upon separately. Mr. Mosser moved that the tuition schedule and the fee schedule be voted upon separately, and the Board approved the motion.

The Board then approved the tuition schedule as amended by Mr. Mosser.

The Board then approved the Fee Schedule, Parts II and III, shown above.

Mrs. Johnson voted against the motion for the reasons previously stated and also because she said she had continuing concerns about a mandatory fee collected by an institution and then turned over to an outside organization, for what appears to be refunding.

Mr. Layman said that the next meeting of the Board will be on September 7, 1971, on the campus of the University of Oregon. This meeting will be followed by the joint meeting with the Board of Education and the Educational Coordinating Council in Salem on September 8, 1971.
Meeting #397-119

July 26, 1971

Election of Officers

Mr. Layman said that the Board is required by statute to elect officers annually at the July Board meeting. Mr. Joss moved that the incumbent officers be nominated to continue in their present positions for another year. Mr. Layman asked Mrs. Johnson to preside during the election of officers. The Board then elected Mr. George H. Layman as President and Mr. John W. Snider as Vice President.

Mr. Layman expressed his appreciation and that of Mr. Snider. He said that he would be hopeful that during the coming year it would be possible to continue the self-analysis of the Board's operating procedures, policies, and other improvements, taking into account the questions raised during the legislative session.

Mr. Layman said that it was probable a new Board member would be appointed shortly to fill the vacancy created by the death of Mr. Holloway. He indicated that committee appointments would be deferred until after the appointment is made. However, he suggested that many of the committees have been composed of the same personnel for some time and it might be desirable for Board members to serve on other committees to provide them with broader experience and knowledge of all operations of the Board. He asked that Board members indicate their first and second choices for Committee appointments within the next few days.
The following gifts and grants to the institutions have been approved for acceptance and expenditure by the institutions and the Board's Office in accordance with Board action on January 27-28, 1964. It was recommended that the Secretary of the Board be authorized to make suitable acknowledgement to the donors and grantors. The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Oregon State University

Scholarships & Fellowships

Gifts totaling $16,544 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.F. &amp; A.M. Beaverton Lodge No. 100, Beaverton</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Parent-Teacher Association, Albany</td>
<td>$136.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland Senior High School, Ashland</td>
<td>$252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bate Plywood Company, Inc., Merlin</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Atlee Burpee Company, Doyleston, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canby Union High School Student Body, Canby</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter Foundation Scholarships, through Central Point School District No. 6</td>
<td>$299.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crook County High School, Prineville</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Plywood Company, Drain</td>
<td>$166.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East School Parent-Teacher Association, Tillamook</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 1371, Bend</td>
<td>$272.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 2146, Milton-Freewater</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 1814, Prineville</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First National Bank of Oregon</td>
<td>$1,107.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Pass School District No. 7 (Redwood Lions Club Scholarship), Grants Pass</td>
<td>$136.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro Business and Professional Women's Club, Hillsboro</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>$834.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Johnson Trust Fund</td>
<td>$1,659.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPine P.T.C., LaPine</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Club, Mapleton</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Club, McMinnville</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford Senior High School (Carpenter Foundation Scholarships), Medford</td>
<td>$1,183.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>$1,826.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Miss Oregon Pageant of Seaside, Inc., Seaside</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Mother's Club, Ashland</td>
<td>$2,176.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEO Sisterhood, Chapter B.F., The Dalles</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEO Sisterhood, Chapter C.Z., North Bend</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix High School (Carpenter Foundation Scholarships), Phoenix</td>
<td>$264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Portland Rose Festival Association, Portland</td>
<td>$272.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reedsport High Student Body, Reedsport</td>
<td>$216.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club, Gresham</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club, Newberg</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club, Roseburg</td>
<td>$408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton Union High School, Silverton</td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Colorado State University
Grant of $13,173 from Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, for research entitled, "Analysis of Structure and Function on Grassland Ecosystems," January 1 through December 31, 1971, under the direction of Dr. John A. Wiens, Associate Professor of Zoology.

Mrs. C. Holt
Gift of a violin, large silver serving tray, and a scrapbook of Oregon State University activities, from Mrs. Curtis Holt, Portland. The gift is valued at $300.

R. Mengler
Gift of sixteen titles in the fields of law and legal history, valued at $106.95, from Mr. Richard Mengler, Corvallis.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Grant of $9,780 from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., for research entitled, "Effects of Air Force Propellants on Metabolism," September 1, 1970, through August 31, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Roman A. Schmitt, Professor, Radiation Center.

National Endowment for the Humanities
Grants totaling $17,183 from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C., for research and other purposes as follows:

1. $10,116 - "Essays and Correspondence of Edward F. Ricketts," June 15, 1971, through August 15, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Richard B. Astro, Assistant Professor of English.
2. $7,067 - "Coast Tsimshian Language Extinction," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. John A. Dunn, Assistant Professor of Anthropology.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Grant of $36,300 from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U. S. Department of Commerce, Rockville, Maryland, to pay costs for salaries, wages, materials and other expenses for a "Pacific Sea Grant Advisory Program," March 1, 1971, through February 29, 1972, under the direction of Mr. William O. Wick, Head, Marine Advisory Program.

National Science Foundation
Grants totaling $1,496,405 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., for research, traineeships, and other purposes, as follows:

1. $8,600 - "Ergotic Theory," June 15, 1971, through June 14, 1972, under the direction of Dr. James R. Brown, Associate Professor of Mathematics.
2. $140,200 - "Collaborative Research in Paleo-Oceanographic Studies of Late Quaternary Ocean Circulation and Climate in the Northern Atlantic and Pacific Oceans," May 1, 1971, through April 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Theodore C. Moore, Jr., Assistant Professor of Oceanography.
3. $656,700 - "Collaborative Research in an Investigation of the Nasca Lithospheric Plate and Its Interaction with the South American Continental Block," May 1, 1971, through April 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. LaVerne D. Kulm, Associate Professor of Oceanography.

4. $50,000 - "For the construction of a Core Laboratory as authorized by Mr. J. I. Hunderup," May 1, 1971, through April 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. LaVerne D. Kulm, Associate Professor of Oceanography.

5. $367,305 - "Coastal Upwelling Experiment," July 1, 1971, through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Robert L. Smith, Associate Professor of Oceanography.

6. $20,700 - "Catalyst Deactivation," May 15, 1971, through May 14, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Ocrave Levenspiel, Professor of Chemical Engineering.

7. $50,000 - "Graduate Traineeship Program," March 2, 1971, through September 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Carl Bond, Acting Dean of the Graduate School.

8. $60,300 - "Investigation of the Air-Sea Exchange of Carbon Dioxide and Oxygen Off Oregon," June 30, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. John V. Byrne, Chairman, Oceanography, and Dr. Louis Gordon, Instructor in Oceanography.

9. $9,300 - "Provenance of North Pacific Sediments," June 30 through August 31, 1971, under the direction of Dr. G. Ross Heath and Dr. Jack R. Dymond, Assistant Professors of Oceanography.

10. $92,100 - "Nature and Environmental Response of Marine Psychrophilic Bacteria," June 1, 1971, through May 31, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Richard Y. Morita, Professor of Microbiology.

11. $14,500 - "Data Analysis and Reduction of Deep Sea Drilling Program Site Surveys Leg 18," May 15, 1971, through May 14, 1972, under the direction of Dr. LaVerne D. Kulm, Associate Professor of Oceanography.


13. $5,200 - "Division Algebras and Algebraic Number Theory," June 15, 1971, through June 14, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Burton I. Fein, Associate Professor of Mathematics.

Oregon State Board of Education

Grants totaling $83,461 from the Oregon State Board of Education, Salem, for workshops and other purposes, as follows:

1. $15,600 - "To provide costs for the conduct of two workshops for teachers of disadvantaged and handicapped persons," April 27 through June 30, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Henry A. Ten Pas, Director of Vocational Education.

2. $64,200 - "For Special Vocational Education Projects for Vocational Teacher Education," May 3 through June 30, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Henry A. Ten Pas.

3. $3,661 - "Adult Basic Education Program for the Development of Functional Literacy," May 1 through September 15, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Ten Pas.

Mrs. D. A. Paterson

Gift of a collection of historic clothing and textiles to the Home Economics Department, from Mrs. Delia A. Paterson, Portland. The gift is valued at $103.

U.S. Dept. of Agriculture

Grants totaling $35,609 from the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., for research and other purposes, as follows:

1. $34,109 - "To Determine Feed Use Suitability of Decontaminated Cottonseed Meals," June 4, 1971, through June 3, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Russell O. Sinnhuber, Professor of Food Science and Technology.

2. $1,500 - "To code, process and summarize physical and economic data on ranching operations obtained in the original survey supported by this contract," April 15 through November 27, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Wilbur A. Davis, Associate Professor of Anthropology.

U.S. Dept. of the Air Force

Grant of $67,536 from the U. S. Department of the Air Force, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, for research entitled, "Research Investigation on Effects of Air Force Propellants on Metabolism Using Ratiomegriometry," April 15, 1971, through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. C. H. Wang, Head of the Radiation Center.

U.S. Dept. of the Army

Grant of $10,000 from the U. S. Department of the Army, Sacramento, California, for research entitled, "Field Studies of Reservoir Currents," June 1, 1971, through May 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Larry S. Slotta, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering.

U. S. Atomic Energy Commission

Grants totaling $44,000 from the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington, for research, as follows:

1. $20,000 - "Studies of Low Energy Induced Nuclear Fission," June 15, 1971, through June 14, 1972, under the direction
of Dr. Walter D. Loveland, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Radiation Center.

2. $24,000 - "Properties of Enzymes from Thermomorphs and Halophiles," April 1, 1971, through March 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Robert R. Becker, Professor of Biochemistry.

U.S. Forest Service
Grant of $1,212,68 from the U. S. Forest Service, Washington, D.C. for a study related to the "Need for Information on Alternative Procedures for Appraising and Selling Public Timber," under the direction of Dr. John Beuter, Associate Professor, Forest Research Laboratory.

U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare
Grants totaling $689,466 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., for training programs and other purposes, as follows:

1. $101,273 - "Training Program for Approximately 100 Teachers of Spanish-Surnamed Adults," June 1 through December 31, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Keith Goldhammer, Dean of the School of Education.

2. $106,308 - "Upward Bound Program," May 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Clausen, Director, Upward Bound.


4. $124,932 - "Career-Oriented Relevant Education," June 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Cas Heilman, Assistant Professor of Vocational Education.

U.S. Dept. of the Interior
Grants totaling $78,226 from the U. S. Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., for training programs, July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, as follows:

1. $39,974 - "Training Program in Freshwater and Marine Pollution Biology," under the direction of Dr. Charles E. Warren, Professor of Fisheries.

2. $38,252 - "Training Program in the Economics of Water Quality and Supply," under the direction of Dr. Herbert H. Stoever, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics.

U.S. Public Health Service
Grants totaling $1,496,916 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., for research, training programs, and other purposes, June 1, 1971, through May 31, 1972, unless otherwise indicated, as follows:

1. $27,683 - "Sedimentation Analysis of Associating Systems," under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Dyson, Assistant Professor of Biophysics.
2. $70,995 - "Biomedical Sciences Support Grant," under the direction of Dr. Roy A. Young, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.

3. $31,247 - "Photolysis of Pesticides," under the direction of Dr. Donald D. Bills, Associate Professor of Food Science and Technology.

4. $21,228 - "Lactose Utilization by Lactic Streptococci," under the direction of Dr. William E. Sandine, Professor of Microbiology.

5. $40,966 - "Environmental Cadmium - Its Effects and Interactions," under the direction of Dr. Philip D. Whanger, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Chemistry.

6. $21,711 - "Neural Detection of Ionizing Radiations," under the direction of Dr. Donald J. Kimeldorf, Professor of Radiation Biology.

7. $37,442 - "Mycotoxin Toxicity and Carcinogenesis," under the direction of Dr. Russell O. Sinnhuber, Professor of Food Science and Technology.


9. $9,000 - "Toxicology and Biological Effects of a Variety of Chemical Agents in the Environment," under the direction of Dr. Lyle Calvin, Head of Statistics.

10. $475,765 - "Toxicology and Biological Effects of a Variety of Chemical Agents in the Environment," under the direction of Dr. Virgil H. Freed, Head of Agricultural Chemistry.

11. $45,531 - "Metabolism of Hexachlorophene, A Potential Intoxicant," under the direction of Dr. Donald R. Buhler, Associate Professor of Agricultural Chemistry.

12. $36,105 - "Training Program in Microbiology," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Paul R. Elliker, Head of Microbiology.

13. $88,186 - "Training Program in Environmental Toxicology," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Ian J. Tinsley, Associate Professor of Chemistry.

14. $15,934 - "Development Award in Behalf of Sonia R. Anderson," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. R. W. Newburgh, Chairman, Biochemistry and Biophysics.

15. $46,770 - "Training Program in Toxicology," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Charles E. Warren, Professor of Fisheries.
16. $46,414 - "Training Program in Food Protection and Toxicology," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Harold W. Schultz, Head of Food Science and Technology.

17. $181,763 - "Health Professions Educational Improvement Training Grant," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Charles O. Wilson, Dean of the School of Pharmacy.

18. $50,417 - "Training Program in Biometry," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Lyle D. Calvin, Head of Statistics.

19. $2,900 - "Predoctoral Fellowship in Behalf of Mr. Leroy H. Heaton, "June 1 through November 30, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Donald R. Buhler, Associate Professor of Agricultural Chemistry.

20. $39,807 - "Biochemistry of Procarbazine and Related Hydrazines," May 1, 1971, through April 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Donald J. Reed, Associate Professor of Biochemistry.

21. $66,037 - "Metabolism and Cocarcinogenicity of Cyclopropenes," April 1, 1971, through March 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Russell O. Sinnhuber, Professor of Food Science and Technology.

22. $26,287 - "Metabolism and Carcinogenicity of Aflatoxins," April 1, 1971, through March 31, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Donald J. Lee, Research Associate, Food Science and Technology.

23. $10,237 - "Basic Improvement Grant from the Public Health Service," April 1, 1971, through March 31, 1972, under the direction of Miss Virginia F. Harger, Head of Institutional Management.

24. $41,120 - "Histone-Nucleic Acid Interaction," April 1, 1971, through March 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Irving Isenberg, Professor of Biophysics.

University of Washington

Grants to
Agric. Exper. Stations:

Agricultural Engineering Research Foundation

Grants to the several Agricultural Experiment Station Departments and divisions for research work and other purposes from various donors, as follows:

$6,200 - "Research on Drainage, Irrigation and Structures," under the direction of Mr. Dale E. Kirk, Professor of Agricultural Engineering.

Grant of $15,631 from the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, for research entitled, "Dynamics and Thermodynamics of Arctic Sea Ice," May 1, 1971, through April 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Clayton A. Paulson, Assistant Professor of Oceanography.
$3,564 - "Dairy Sanitation," under the direction of Dr. P. E. Elliker, Professor of Microbiology.

$2,966 - "Seed Technology," under the direction of Dr. D. F. Grabe, Professor of Agronomy, Farm Crops.

$2,375 - "Forage Breeding Studies," under the direction of Dr. R. V. Frakes, Professor of Plant Breeding, Farm Crops.

$18,440.55 - "Weed Research," under the direction of Dr. A. P. Appleby, Associate Professor of Agronomy.

$4,275 - "Soil Fertility Studies," under the direction of Dr. T. L. Jackson, Professor of Soils.

$4,750 - "Forest Soil Fertility Studies," under the direction of Dr. C. T. Youngberg, Professor of Forest Soils.

$1,900 - "Potato Fertility Studies," under the direction of Dr. T. L. Jackson, Professor of Soils.

$11,704 - "Soil Temperature Studies," under the direction of Dr. L. Boersma, Associate Professor of Soils.

$9,444.19 - "Hop Research," under the direction of Dr. C. E. Horner, Professor of Plant Pathology.

$2,375 - "Varietal Testing of Small Grain," under the direction of Dr. W. E. Kronstad, Associate Professor of Agronomy.

$3,971 - "Activity and Flavor Production of Lactic Cultures," under the direction of Dr. W. E. Sandine, Professor of Microbiology.

$6,555.25 - "Research on Drainage and Irrigation," under the direction of Dr. R. H. Brooks, Associate Professor of Agricultural Engineering.

$6,661.50 - "Experimental Hop Lines Research," under the direction of Mr. S. T. Likens, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Agricultural Chemistry.

$781.15 - "Integrated Control of Pests Attacking Horticultural Crops in Southern Oregon," under the direction of Dr. P. H. Westigard, Associate Professor of Entomology.

$15,000 - "Effects of Heavy Metals on Three Species of Forage Fishes and on Steelhead Trout," under the direction of Dr. R. C. Simon, Professor of Fisheries.

$1,200 - "Control of Mint Diseases," under the direction of Dr. C. E. Horner, Professor of Plant Pathology.
$400 - "To support potato variety evaluation," under the direction of Mr. A. E. Gross, Professor of Agronomy.

$5,000 - "Genetics of Quality and Flavor Conditioning Substances in Blue Lake Beans," under the direction of Dr. W. A. Frazier, Professor of Horticulture.

$500 - "Control of Soil Pests," under the direction of Dr. R. F. Berry, Assistant Professor of Entomology.

$3,000 - "Plant Toxicity of Zirconium-Hafnium Rich Solid Wastes," under the direction of Dr. V. VanVolk, Assistant Professor of Soils.

$1,000 - "Fungicide Testing on Fruit and Ornamental Trees," under the direction of Mr. Iain C. MacSwan, Extension Plant Pathology Specialist.

$15,488 - "Irrigation Feasibility," under the direction of Dr. Frank J. Conklin, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, and Dr. J. E. Vomocil, Extension Soil Specialist.

$1,200 - "Effect of Bacitracin, Roxarsone and Aprol Hi-E on Growth and Feed Efficiency of Broilers," under the direction of Dr. G. H. Arscott, Professor of Poultry Nutrition.

$7,500 - "Research on Effects of the Paper Industry on Streams," under the direction of Dr. C. E. Warren, Professor of Fisheries.

$11,919 - "Support of Food Processor Industry to Applied Research Work in Agriculture," under the direction of staff members in the Agricultural Experiment Station.

$8,270 - "Filbert Research Program," under the direction of Dr. M. M. Thompson, Assistant Professor of Horticulture.

$6,250 - "Oregon Field Burning Research and Field Sanitation," under the direction of Dr. D. O. Chilcote, Professor of Crop Physiology.

$5,000 - "The Genetic Heritability of Characteristics of Coho Salmon," under the direction of Dr. R. C. Simon, Professor of Fisheries.

$31,500 - "Research and Programs To Benefit the Oregon Strawberry Industry," under the direction of staff members in the Agricultural Experiment Station.

$3,053 - "The Effects of Two Synthetic Mammalian Sex Hormones on Naturally Acquired Gastro-Intestinal Nematode Populations in Lambs," under the direction of Dr. S. E. Knapp, Professor of Veterinary Parasitology.