STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN
FACULTY DINING ROOM, COMMONS BUILDING, OREGON TECHNICAL
INSTITUTE, KLAMATH FALLS, OREGON

October 25, 1971

MEETING #399-1 A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Faculty Dining Room, Commons Building, Oregon Technical Institute, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

ROLL CALL The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. Monday, October 25, 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. Hosser
Mr. Robert D. Holmes Mr. John W. Snider
Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson Mr. Loran L. Stewart
Mr. Philip A. Joss Mr. George H. Layman

Absent: Mr. Edward G. Westerdahl II was absent for business reasons.

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. D. R. Larson, Assistant Chancellor; Mr. John E. Leahy, Assistant Attorney General; Dr. Carl G. Paetz, Director of Campus and Building Planning; Mr. Richard Zita, Director of Publications; Mrs. Hazel Judd, Information Officer.

Oregon State University—President R. W. MacVicar; Dr. Charles F. Warnath, Director of Counseling Center.

University of Oregon—Dr. Ray Hawk, Vice President for Administration and Finance.

University of Oregon Medical School—Dean C. N. Holman.

Portland State University—President Gregory B. Wolfe.

Oregon College of Education—President L. W. Rice.

Southern Oregon College—President James K. Sours.

Eastern Oregon College—President A. M. Rempel.

Oregon Technical Institute—President W. D. Purvine; Mr. W. Douglass, Dean of Administration; Mr. John Davenport, Director of Residence Hall; Mr. Delbert Folk, Assistant Professor, Curriculum Chairman, Welding.
Others—Mrs. Maxine Warnath, Assistant Professor of Psychology at Oregon College of Education, representing the American Association of University Professors Federation; Mr. Gilbert Polanski, Field Representative, Oregon State Employees Association; Dr. Floyd Stearns, Executive Director, Educational Coordinating Council; Representative Carrol B. Hove, Oregon State Legislature; Mr. Thomas Giulbert, Acting Director, OSPIRG Professional Staff.

Student Representatives—Mr. George D'Angelantonio, Chairman, Inter-institutional Union of Students of Oregon State System of Higher Education; Mr. Raymond Holloway, Portland State University Student and Director of Martin Luther King, Jr., Scholarship Fund of Oregon; Mr. Roy Sowers, Executive Committee member and delegate to Inter-institutional Union of Students of Oregon State System of Higher Education, Associated Students of Portland State University; Mr. Jim Nye, Student Senator and Delegate to the Interinstitutional Union of Students, Oregon College of Education; Representatives of Students for an Informed Republic—Norma Wonser, Verda Sanders, James F. Sanders, Patricia Goings, Pat Justice; Mr. Ron Wilkinson, President, Associated Students, Oregon State University; and Oregon State University students—Stephen F. Anderson, Lucy Mannan, and Betty Waletich.

In addition to the above, several interested citizens were present from Klamath Falls and the surrounding area.

The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting of the Board, held on September 7, 1971, and approved them as previously distributed.

The Chancellor reported that the National Science Foundation will be conducting a major experiment in Oregon to see how science and mathematics education might be improved in the entire state. The National Science Foundation has the broad assignment of improving public school, college and university education in mathematics and science, and previously this assignment has been carried out primarily through institutes for teachers and other individual projects. Since the evidence does not indicate that these individual projects have had sufficient impact on the improvement of science and mathematics education, the National Science Foundation now contemplates the development of a systematic approach involving a program for an entire state. The funds available will permit projects in only one or two states, and the Foundation has therefore sought proposals from the states where it is believed the greatest impact might be made. Oregon has been invited to submit a proposal for a major attack on the improvement of mathematics and science education. The Foundation has indicated to Governor McCall that Oregon was selected because the state has a more consistent plan for education from kindergarten through the university than any of the other states about which the Foundation has information. Consequently, in response to this invitation, there is being developed in Oregon a proposal to the National Science Foundation requesting funding in the amount of $5 million to $10 million to be expended over a period of...
several years in accordance with a systematic state plan for the improvement of science and mathematics education. If the Oregon proposal is selected, the funding for the project would be through the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry which now has a small planning grant to develop the proposal.

The Chancellor indicated that no Board action was required, although if the Board chose to indicate its support of the development of this project, the impact of the proposal on the National Science Foundation would be enhanced.

Mrs. Johnson said that this begins a new approach to attack the problem of getting research in education into the classrooms and into the teacher education institutions that are educating the teachers.

The Board approved a motion by Mrs. Johnson that the Board support vigorously the efforts that are being made to have this kind of program instituted in Oregon.

The Chancellor said that it had been hoped that some general institutional aid would be available from the proposed higher education bill. He said that this is still a possibility but that progress through Congress has been slower than originally anticipated. A bill has been passed in the Senate and a companion bill is soon to be considered in the House.

Even if both bills are passed, there will be a number of other possible impediments to be overcome before funds for general aid to colleges and universities would actually be received. Therefore, the prospect of the bill’s actually having much impact on the operating budget problem for the current biennium is somewhat remote.

The Chancellor indicated that the Senate bill did not provide general institutional aid because it called for full funding of the financial aid to students before any general aid is provided for the institutions. Full funding of student support under the Senate bill is unlikely. The House bill contains provisions for both student aid and institutional aid, and this bill would provide the best hope for financial assistance either in this biennium or the next.

Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon Technical Institute and the project architects, the work performed by the construction contractor for the Lecture Hall-Commons Addition was accepted as of August 27, 1971, subject to the completion of a few minor items. The Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning inspected the work on behalf of the Board on September 28 and acknowledged the acceptance immediately thereafter. A revised semifinal budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on October 26, 1970:
### Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 8/27/71</th>
<th>Original Budget 10/25/70</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Vik Construction Co., Eugene</td>
<td>$783,370</td>
<td>$754,067</td>
<td>$29,303 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional service fees</td>
<td>49,859</td>
<td>47,410</td>
<td>2,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>3,241</td>
<td>11,280</td>
<td>(8,039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>8,530</td>
<td>9,621</td>
<td>(1,091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,722</td>
<td>(22,622)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
<td>$845,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes modifications required by Fire Marshal; relocation of water valve; the reinstatement of a deductive alternate for fixed seating in the auditorium/lecture room; modifications to flooring; revisions to millwork and glazing and other changes incorporated within seven approved change orders.

(2) With approval from the Board's Office, the institution transferred funds from "furnishings and equipment" to the "contingencies" to permit the installation of fixed seating within the auditorium/lecture room.

Plans and specifications for the Lecture Hall/Auditorium/Demonstration Facilities -- Commons Addition were prepared by Architects Skidmore, Owings & Merrill of Portland. The two-story addition was constructed on the north side of the initial unit of the Library-Commons Building, thus expanding the area of the Commons on the upper level and adding a small auditorium (seating approximately 374 persons) for multi-purpose functions at Oregon Technical Institute. Provision was made for a movable sound-attenuated partition to divide the auditorium into two equal-size rooms for large classes, special instructional demonstration programs, conferences, faculty meetings, etc. However, because the bids exceeded the estimates, it was necessary to defer the purchase and installation of the partition in order to stay within the project expenditure limitation approved by the Board and the State Emergency Board. A stage has been provided at the north end of the auditorium with service access to a loading dock and service driveway. The wide foyer will also provide a display area and passageway through the building, particularly for occupants of the residence hall. The gross area of the main floor level of the addition is approximately 9,060 square feet.

The Commons Addition on the upper floor of the building enables the institution to provide additional and improved food service facilities for the occupants of the residence hall and also to provide some informal lounge space for small group gatherings. Cafeteria serving lines have been relocated and revised to provide a "scramble-type" system of service to all students living on campus or boarding at the Commons. The area of the former cafeteria is being converted to a snack bar to serve commuting students and for off-hours food service operation. Most of the equipment being installed in this remodeled area was used in the snack bar operation located previously in the basement of the Physical Education Building. The gross area of the Commons Addition is approximately 9,425 square feet.
Assuming that the 3,335 square feet within the remodeled food service area is equivalent to two-thirds of new area, the adjusted gross area for the project would be 20,709 square feet (9,060 square feet + 9,425 square feet + 2,224 square feet). For this adjusted area, the direct construction costs of $783,370 would average about $37.83 per square foot.

Approximately $530,000 of the project budget of $845,000 was provided from self-liquidating bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises to cover construction costs and other budget requirements related to the Commons Addition. The remainder of $315,000 was provided from the General Fund appropriation in Section 1 of Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969, and from bond borrowings under Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OTI Lecture Hall/Auditorium/Demonstration Facilities -- Commons Addition

Architects - Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Portland

Legislative authorization - Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969

Board's priorities in 1969-1971 - No. 2 (Educational and General Plant)
No. 2 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Approximate gross area (adjusted to include remodeling) - 20,709 square feet

Total project costs $845,000

Direct construction costs:
Total $783,370
Average (per square foot) - $37.83

Financing plan:
General Fund appropriation in Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969 $157,500
Bond borrowings under the provision of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution $157,500
Self-liquidating bond borrowings under Article XI-F(1) and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $530,000
Total $845,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Vice Chancellor Romney reported that federal legislation is currently under consideration which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to any state wanting to participate in a program to establish a mining research institute at one college or university within the state designated for that purpose.

At Chancellor Lieuallen's request, Governor McCall has designated Oregon State University as the locale for the establishment of a state mining institute, to receive such federal funds for this purpose as may subsequently be made available.

Senate Bill S 635 has been passed by the Senate, and a similar House Bill (HR 6788) is shortly to be under consideration in the House. The provisions of S 635 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide financial assistance to any state wanting to participate in a program to establish a mining research institute. Authorizations for the program would be sums adequate to provide $100,000 to each state for the first year, $150,000 for the second year, $200,000 for the third year, and $250,000 for each year thereafter.

The proposed institutes would be authorized to plan and conduct research, investigations, and experiments in relation to mining, mineral resources, metallurgy, ceramics, fuels, scrap recycling, mineral economics, and related environmental research. They would also have the duty to train scientists, engineers, and technicians in these fields.

Grants would be awarded to the institutes to pay 75 percent of the cost of purchasing equipment, facilities, and library materials. No portion of a grant could be used to purchase or lease land or to rent, purchase, construct, or repair any building.

Oregon State's resources make it a logical institution to give leadership to the development of this phase of instruction and research in the State System. Specifically, it has major programs in engineering (chemical, civil, mechanical, metallurgical, and industrial), atmospheric sciences, geology, oceanography, agriculture (agricultural economics, fisheries and wildlife, range management, soils), forestry, and a wide range of research centers and institutes, including: engineering experiment station, forest research laboratory, sea grant program, air resources center, computer center, environmental health sciences center, marine science center, radiation center, nuclear science and engineering institute, water resources research institute.

The final shape of the federal legislation is not yet known. When it is, and before any commitments are entered into pursuant to the federal legislation, further information will be brought to the Academic Affairs Committee and to the Board concerning any possible program or financial implications of Oregon State University's participation in the federal funding provided.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Academic Affairs Committee recommended that the Board accept the report as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Upon the recommendation of Oregon State University officials, the work performed by the construction contractor for Forestry Building Renovation was accepted as of September 17, 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 26, 1971:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Revised Budget 9/17/71</th>
<th>Original Budget 7/26/71</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation work - Tee &amp; Jay Constructors, Corvallis</td>
<td>$ 72,589</td>
<td>$ 69,898</td>
<td>$ 2,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire sprinkler system (to be bid and contracted separately)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant costs (planning, construction supervision, moving, etc.)</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>(3,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 82,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 82,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes additional wiring, plumbing, plastering and painting work authorized by two approved change orders.

Generally, the work was related to the installation of some new partitions, the revamping of lighting and heating systems, changes in exiting and other modifications needed to accommodate the staffs of the English and Psychology Departments. As a result of the renovation work, several general purpose classrooms were provided and there was an increase of about 25 office stations over those available when the building was occupied by the School of Forestry.

Of the total project cost ($82,000), $18,000 was provided from the 1970-71 operating budget of the institution, $60,000 came from the 1971 General Fund capital outlay appropriation for various rehabilitation and remodeling projects and the remaining $4,000 came from the Board's reserve for minor capital outlay and plant rehabilitation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
On December 8, 1970, the Board was informed of arrangements with the Center for Environmental Structure, a nonprofit corporation with principal offices in Berkeley, California, for the professional assistance of Christopher Alexander and others affiliated with the Center in the preparation of a long-range development plan for the University of Oregon. In anticipation of interest of members of the Board in the formulation and review of the basic assumptions and objectives upon which the planning will evolve, the Consultants were advised that recommendations were to be submitted in sufficient time to allow appropriate reviews by the staffs of the institution and the Board's Office for referral to the Board before decisions were reached which would have a major impact upon the development of the master campus plan for the University.

Attached as Supplement A is a summary document submitted to the Board's Office by the Consultants and the staff of the University's Planning Office which summarizes the process of planning and the major points of the study to date with particular emphasis upon the planning assumptions and objectives. Mr. Alexander and officials from the University will be in attendance at the Building Committee meeting to make a more detailed presentation and to respond to questions and comments from Board members.

It was recommended that the planning assumptions and objectives of the long-range campus plan for the University of Oregon, as embodied within Supplement A, be accepted as a basis for further planning and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to instruct the Consultants to proceed with their study, describing and illustrating the plan and its components. It should be understood that the recommendation for the acceptance of the planning assumptions and objectives does not imply concurrence of the University administration or the Board's Office with the various "patterns" and "diagnosis policies" proposed by the Consultant because these are still in draft form and are subject to further analysis and modification.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Hunderup supplemented the above statement and recommendation with the following background information:

"In July 1962, the Board received and placed on file a report prepared by Lawrence Lackey, AIA, Urban Design Consultant, San Francisco, for the development of the UO campus to accommodate a projected enrollment of 16,550 FTE by 1972. Simultaneously, the Board extended the campus boundaries to include certain areas which Mr. Lackey and UO officials recommended for future development of the campus."
"Subsequently, a great amount of planning has been accomplished by the staff of the institution under the direction of Dr. John Lallas, former Director of Institutional Research and Planning and now Executive Dean, and Mr. Larry Bissett, University Planner, working with the Campus Planning Committee, and others. Several major projects have been constructed since 1962 (not as many as would have been desired and, in fact, urgently needed) and planning is now being completed for two projects authorized by the 1971 Oregon Legislature—the Administrative Services Building and the Erb Memorial Union Addition.

"In order to get the fresh perspective of outside consultants in the development of a long-range plan for the University, which would recognize existing conditions and projected future programs or conditions, the Campus Planning Committee and the institutional administration requested assistance in appointing professional consultants to undertake the task of preparing a new long-range development plan in 1970 and 1971. After considering the interest and qualifications of a number of firms, they recommended the appointment of Mr. Christopher Alexander and his associates in the Center for Environmental Structure, Berkeley, California. A report of the arrangements with this non-profit corporation was made to the Board on December 8, 1970. It was noted that the consultants' work would include the preparation of interim and final reports, drawings and such other material as may be necessary (a) to determine cooperatively the basic assumptions and objectives upon which the plan is to be based and (b) to describe and illustrate the plan and its components. In view of the interest of members of the Board in the formulation and review of the basic assumptions and objectives upon which the planning would evolve, the consultants' contract provided that their recommendations were to be submitted in sufficient time to allow appropriate reviews by the staffs of the institution and the Board's Office for referral to the Board before decisions are reached which would have a major impact upon the development of the master campus plan for the University. The contract stipulates that not more than half of the maximum compensation and expense reimbursement shall be payable prior to the formal acceptance of the basic assumptions and objectives upon which the long-range general development plan is to be based.

"Our purpose today is to give Mr. Alexander an opportunity to review with the Building Committee and other members of the Board the progress of his efforts, and those of his associates within the Center for Environmental Structure, to date, and to identify the basic assumptions and objectives of the plan at this intermediate stage. We are hopeful to obtain the reactions of the Board members to the planning process underway and to get as much input as possible, consistent with the expressed desire of the Board to participate in this planning. Our recommendations for Committee action are outlined in the agenda."
"Before asking Mr. Alexander to make his presentation, I would like to cite a bit of the background of the Center for Environmental Structure. The Center was created in 1967 to serve community groups, corporate clients, planners and designers in programming and designing environments which support people's lives, giving careful attention to every detail of the social and psychological subtleties that underlie ordinary situations. They have undertaken basic research on various environmental problems and have tested their ideas in pilot professional projects such as a 1500-unit housing project for a low income community in Lima, Peru (sponsored by the United Nations), a Multi-Service Center in the Bronx, New York (for the City of New York), a joint project with Architects Skidmore, Owings & Merrill to design an educational research facility for the Southwest Regional Laboratories in Los Angeles. Other clients served include the University of California in Los Angeles, the University of Washington and the City of Berkeley. Much of their basic research has been sponsored and financed by the Bureau of Standards and the U. S. Public Health Service. The Center has also been assisting the City of San Francisco in determining station requirements and design criteria for the BART System.

"Mr. Alexander is a graduate of Cambridge University, having earned the Master of Arts in Mathematics Degree in 1956 and a Bachelor of Architecture Degree in 1958. Subsequently, he earned a Doctor of Philosophy from Harvard University in 1963 and has been on the faculty of the University of California since that time."

Mr. Hunderup then asked Mr. Alexander to proceed with his presentation.

Before Mr. Alexander began his remarks, Mr. Joss commented that the concepts presented in the report may be applicable to all of the institutions, even though the presentation pertained primarily to the University of Oregon.

Mr. Alexander indicated that the general research for his report was financed under a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health and that the specific application for the University of Oregon would be financed from the $35,000 fee payment authorized for the long-range development study of the University of Oregon. He then reviewed the essential features of the preliminary study as summarized in the report by Mr. Larry Bissett, University Planner. Mr. Bissett's summary is shown as Supplement A to this docket.

Mr. Alexander said there are three central ideas upon which the planning is based: (1) User participation; (2) balanced use; and (3) piecemeal growth. Mr. Alexander explained that piecemeal growth requires some means of assuring coordination of the whole. In the proposed long-range plan this would be accomplished through criteria or patterns described in the preliminary report.
President Clark said that with the development of some of the concepts stated in the plan the University of Oregon would be moving in the right direction. He said the plan is usable now and that the underlying principles would be helpful over a period of time, although they would be subject to modification. President Clark said that there have been differences of opinion over particular aspects of the plan, but that these differences have been beneficial. He recommended approval of the continuation of the project.

Mr. Hunderup said that the recommendations in the agenda were related particularly to the supplement prepared by Mr. Bissett and did not reflect a recommendation for the adoption of the detailed introductory presentation included in the notebook subsequently distributed by Mr. Alexander to Board members. Mr. Hunderup said his office had been pleased by the enthusiasm of the consultants for the planning project at the University of Oregon and that comments and criticisms have been accepted and given consideration by Mr. Alexander.

Mr. Hunderup stated that it should be understood, however, that the recommendation for acceptance of the planning assumptions and objectives does not imply concurrence of the University administration or of the Board's Office with the various patterns and diagnosis policies proposed by the consultants because they are still in draft form and are subject to further analysis and modification.

Mr. Hunderup indicated that the draft of the study still has many sections which are incomplete and that the consultants have stated clearly that other sections are subject to substantial revision. Nevertheless, the draft constitutes the framework of the master plan. It is expected to get intensive review and criticism by the University planning staff, campus planning committee, students, and other interested persons or groups, prior to its referral in completed form to the Board's Office and the Board.

Mr. Hunderup said there are many features of the study which could be endorsed. He said he concurred in the enrollment data and the involvement of a greater number of users of the space in the planning process, short of the design process. He said that, in his opinion, the project architects and engineers should participate in the early planning stages along with the users of the space. Mr. Hunderup agreed there was a need to repair many existing places but said that many of the items criticized by the consultants are due to circumstances beyond the control of the University or the Board, such as the shortage of funds or decisions made by those outside of the State System of Higher Education.

Mr. Hunderup said that at this stage in the development of the University of Oregon campus, the concept of piecemeal growth is worthy of general support, with the understanding, however, that exceptions may need to occur in the construction of large units for certain specialized facilities. He noted that several piecemeal projects have already been undertaken.
He indicated that the recommendation to acquire properties west of Kincaid Street might be feasible if satisfactory purchase arrangements could be made. However, under Board policy funds appropriated for land acquisition are restricted to properties within the approved campus boundaries (or within the area of development at Portland State University).

Mr. Hunderup said that there did not appear to be any real basis for modifying the Board's present standards for space utilization and planning. Therefore, it would be expected that the development of the long-range plan for the University of Oregon would be based on the present standards rather than upon standards or other ideas proposed by the consultant. He indicated that financial considerations would seem to preclude the suggestion that a work station be provided for each student in or near his departmental home, and also would preclude endorsement of the concept of additional departmental libraries.

With respect to student housing, he said that the integration of housing within the academic programs would be worthy of consideration but that the suggestion to construct married student housing adjacent to academic buildings within the central core of the campus would probably not be given serious consideration.

Mr. Joss emphasized the need to involve students in the planning in such a manner that they would have a responsibility in the decision-making process. President Clark responded that students were members of the campus planning committee.

In response to a question about the feasibility of providing flexibility for change in the structures which are to be built, Mr. Alexander responded that it was very difficult to provide flexibility in construction and also to meet the other criteria proposed in the development plan. He said the requirement for flexibility often takes precedence over many other requirements which may be extremely important.

With respect to the application of the suggested approach to other campuses in the State system, Mr. Hunderup said that the basic research used in the report by Mr. Alexander will ultimately be available on a nation-wide basis under the grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. However, he said he did not believe it was appropriate to involve the other institutions in the discussion of particulars which are not yet determined satisfactorily for the University of Oregon.

Mr. Hunderup indicated that there was a basic difference of opinion about delegating to the users of a particular space the complete design of their particular space. Mr. Hunderup said, in his opinion, this would be catastrophic and that he believed it was important to involve the architects early in the planning of necessary facilities. However, this is one of the basic principles of the planning being done for the University of Oregon by the staff of the Center for Environmental Structure.
Mr. Hunderup said that, in his opinion, the user should prepare a very complete set of educational specifications and an indication of the relationships of the spaces. The architects should take this program and convert it into the physical environment which would meet code and zoning requirements, give consideration to the price and qualities of various building materials, and ultimately convert the ideas of the user into a workable design.

President Clark said that there is a responsibility to consider both the practical and the idealistic aspects of planning. He said ultimately it will probably be possible as a result of changes in the economy, the availability of funds, or modifications in the educational program, to accomplish things which could not be done at the present time; and that the principles in the long-range plan would be helpful in making decisions.

Mrs. Johnson commented that all of the physical planning is based on the needs which result from academic planning. She indicated that academic planning is at a point where it must be re-evaluated in terms of the mission and objectives of the University. Mr. Alexander responded that changes in academic planning should be integrated with physical planning. However, he said the patterns included in the development plan would make it possible to revise those entities which were in conflict with academic changes and yet retain the remainder of the concepts.

Mr. Alexander indicated that he would welcome the opportunity to discuss the long-range development plan with members of the Board on an informal basis.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve the Board's Office recommendations as presented by Mr. Hunderup.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Joss moved that the Board approve the Board's Office recommendation as presented by Mr. Hunderup and recommended by the Committee.

Mr. Mosser stated that he would support the motion provided that the University and the Board's Office have a serious commitment to the report as a basis for further planning. He said consideration should be given to the policies recommended in the report in the planning of buildings.

Mr. Hunderup responded that the broad principles involving user participation, piecemeal growth and balanced use are endorsed by both the University administration and the Board's Office. However, some of the specifics included in the report are not endorsed and several of these were cited during the Committee discussion. He commented that the proposed use of Straub Hall and the plans approved for the Administrative Services Building at the University of Oregon were consistent with some of the recommendations in the earlier preliminary report presented to the Building Committee by Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Hunderup said that the principle of user involvement in the planning was endorsed up to the point of not involving outside consultants. Mrs. Johnson said that the planning report contained many statements which would conflict with some of the assumptions on which the institutions are now operating. She also said that academic planning is at a crossroads and changes in the academic program would affect planning. She said the report might be valuable as background for the campus planning committee. However, if approving the report as recommended meant a full endorsement of it as the basis for campus planning, she would have so many reservations that she would be unable to support the motion.

Mr. Hunderup agreed that there were many reservations about the recommendations in the report but that it had been valuable in terms of stimulation in the development of campus planning. He said it was planned to utilize major sections of the report but that other parts would not be acceptable. In response to a question, Mr. Hunderup indicated that the additional investment for completion of the planning study by Mr. Alexander and associates would be the $17,500 remainder of the original $35,000 fee.

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

(Considered by Building Committee, October 5, 1971.)

At the University of Oregon, it is proposed that the John Straub Memorial Hall, a debt-free residence hall located at 15th Avenue and Onyx Street, be converted to educational and general use. This concrete and steel building, with brick veneer, was constructed in 1929 and contains a gross area of approximately 72,448 square feet. The conversion is being proposed for the following reasons:

1. The critical shortage of classroom, laboratory and office spaces at the University, partially due to the deferral of the Behavioral Sciences facilities which had been authorized by the 1969 Legislature but not re-authorized by the 1971 Legislature.

2. The ability to accommodate most of the human research activities (general, experimental, social and child) for the Psychology Department ultimately within Straub Hall.

3. The new space would be preferable to the former married student apartments on Agate and Columbia Streets now being used to meet a portion of the space requirements of the department, provided certain rehabilitation is accomplished.

4. It would provide needed expansion space for the present staff and release space in other buildings, such as Condon Hall, needed by other departments.

5. The location of the Psychology Department within Straub Hall would be much superior, since it would be closer to the facilities for the Biology Department and the Science Library.
6. The space could be made available for academic use because of changing student interest in dormitory housing.

(The conversion of older buildings from former residential use to educational and general use is not without precedent in the State System. Examples include Todd Hall at Oregon College of Education, Waldo Hall and the first Snell Hall at Oregon State University, Hendricks Hall, Susan Campbell Hall and Friendly Hall at the University of Oregon.)

With the assistance of Architects Lutes and Amundson, the same architectural firm which had been commissioned to prepare plans for the proposed Behavioral Sciences Complex, University of Oregon officials have filed with the Board's Office a copy of preliminary plans for several phases of remodeling within Straub Hall.

It is estimated that an initial phase involving minimal alterations to four floors of one section, Unit II, containing a net assignable area of about 4,135 square feet, can be accomplished within a budget of approximately $135,000. Most of the funding would be provided from the 1971 capital outlay authorization for various alteration and rehabilitation projects, supplemented to the extent necessary by building use credits from research and other grant-supported projects available to the institution and by allocations from the Board's reserve for plant rehabilitation.

The plans reflect the basic assumption that since no appreciable physical changes are proposed in the dormitory space arrangement, the conversion to educational and general use can be accomplished rather simply with certain mechanical revisions. The work proposed to be undertaken in this initial phase would include the following:

1. Piping would be installed in the building and connected to the chilled water mains from the central source in the campus heating, power and cooling plant.

2. Radiators would be removed from the rooms and new individual fan coil units would be installed and connected to existing steam lines and new chilled water lines. (Some of the rooms to be remodeled are presently sleeping porches and have only minimal lighting and no provision for heating.)

3. On the first floor, an existing lounge would be converted to a conference room.

4. On two floors, prefabricated sound rooms would be installed and provision would be made for the installation of two existing computers (a PDP-9 and PDP-15).

5. Some of the rooms would be provided with sound walls, lights with dimmers and hook-ups with the computers.
6. Hallways would be carpeted.

7. Wiring and lighting levels would be upgraded.

Generally, the work to be done in another phase of the alterations work for Units F and G, containing 4,394 and 4,448 net assignable square feet respectively, to be deferred until additional resources of approximately $100,000 become available, may be described as follows:

1. Most of the rooms would have fan coil units installed for improved heating and cooling.

2. Some of the rooms would be converted for control/observation techniques with either one-way or two-way windows.

3. Some of the rooms would be used as testing rooms and others would be used as graduate student or staff offices.

4. Carpeting would be installed in the hallways.

Later phases of rehabilitation and capital improvements for the Psychology Department would include the general renovation of the exterior of Straub Hall, general, mechanical and electrical work throughout the remainder of the interior spaces, the development of specialized clinical facilities and, separately, the expansion of animal quarters.

It was recommended that John Straub Memorial Hall at the University of Oregon be rededicated from use as a student residence hall to educational and general plant purposes (office, classroom, research and related service spaces), that the preliminary plans for the initial phases of remodeling be approved, and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to arrange for the preparation of final plans and specifications, bidding and contracting for the alterations contemplated within a budget of approximately $135,000, with the understanding that the construction work would be financed, if possible, from capital outlay funds authorized by the 1971 Legislature, the Board's reserve for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay, and building use credits available to the institution. It was recognized that authorization to proceed with the project is subject to favorable action by the State Emergency Board.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Hunderup reviewed the circumstances which had resulted in the recommendation for the proposed conversion of Straub Hall to educational and general use. In the discussion of the financial implications of the conversion, it was indicted that debt-free dormitories such as Straub Hall had helped in the past to reduce the board and room charges to students living in residence halls. It was also pointed out that if the Board decided to reduce the required dormitory earnings to 100 percent of the debt service on bonds, this action
would reduce the charges to dormitory occupants and would offset the increase in the charges which would be necessitated by the loss of rental income through the conversion of Straub Hall to general use. The loss of rental revenue is estimated at approximately $50,000 per year.

In response to a question from Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Hunderup said that it was his recollection that Board policy did recognize the reimbursement between funds when buildings were converted from one purpose to another, but this would need to be verified. Straub Hall is available and appropriate for academic use and is not needed as a residence hall. However, resources are not available to reimburse auxiliary enterprise funds for the conversion to educational and general use, and it would appear practical to use available facilities rather than to let them stand idle.

It was indicated that the financial aspects of the conversion of buildings between auxiliary enterprises and educational and general use were currently under study by the Finance Committee. The recommendation for consideration by the Building Committee at this time relates only to approval of the conversion of Straub Hall for educational and general use and to the remodeling of the building at the estimated cost for the indicated purposes.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Joss referred to Mr. Mosser's comment that University of Oregon projects should be consistent with the planning principles presented in the Alexander report. He said that, in his opinion, the proposed conversion of Straub Hall was consistent with the report in terms of making more efficient use of existing space rather than building a large new structure.

Mr. Joss indicated that the Building Committee had no reservations concerning the proposed conversion from the standpoint of building utilization. However, the question of financing was discussed during the Committee meeting, particularly with reference to reimbursement of the auxiliary enterprise fund for the transfer of the building to educational and general use. Mr. Joss moved approval of the proposed conversion as recommended by the Building Committee. He indicated further discussion and consideration by the Finance Committee of reimbursement of auxiliary enterprises would be welcome.

Mr. Mosser noted that the recommendation was for the conversion of only two units of the building and questioned the need to transfer the entire building from one category to the other at this time. He referred to the suggestion in the Alexander planning study that dormitory housing and academic spaces be adjacent and suggested that this might be the first opportunity to implement that recommendation by utilizing part of Straub Hall for housing and part for academic and office use. He commented that, in his opinion, there were some questions related to the building itself which apparently had not been examined in terms of the new planning concept.
Mr. Mosser said that this building was originally paid for by the
general taxpayer and not by students so that it did present a different
problem than it would if the building had been purchased through a
student fee arrangement or was still subject to bonded indebtedness.
However, he said that the maintenance of this dormitory in the dormi-
tory pool has, in effect, subsidized to some extent the other dormi-
tories. He said it would appear that removing Straub Hall from the
pool would necessitate an additional charge of approximately $4 per
double room occupant to compensate for the loss of revenue. He said
the amount necessary might be reduced by maintaining part of the
building for dormitory use, phasing in the use for office and academic
space over a period of years.

Mr. Hunderup said it was his understanding that the original financing
of the building was from revenue bonds. He indicated that phasing in
the academic use could be accomplished, particularly since the re-
sources are not available to convert the entire building at one time.

Mr. Layman indicated that Mr. Iain More, President of the Associated
Students of the University of Oregon, was present for the purpose of
commenting upon the proposed conversion.

In his statement, Mr. More presented the following points:

1. The possibility of other uses for the building should
   receive further consideration.

2. The entire building should not be rededicated at this time.

3. The question of the legality of the conversion as presented
   needs further study.

4. It is important to consider reimbursement to the dormitory
   funds for any academic use of the building even though Straub
   Hall was not financed through the same source of funding as the
   other dormitory buildings within the pool.

Mr. More commented that the removal from the pool of this building
would set a precedent for the removal of other dormitories in the
State System. Mr. More also said it was his understanding that
remodeling in a building of this age has about the same cost per
square foot regardless of the use to which the space will be put.

Mrs. Johnson said that her primary concern was with the Board's
housing principles calling for reimbursement between funds if build-
ings were converted to different use. She also expressed concern
about the necessity to increase dormitory rates if the conversion were
approved and questioned the policy of having dormitory students pay
this additional amount to provide academic space.

Mr. Hunderup explained that students living in all residence halls
in the State System have benefitted from having this and other debt-free
dormitories in the dormitory pool. They have paid lower rates than
would have been required if income were received only from projects
built recently at high cost. The conversion of Straub Hall removes
some of this advantage but it does not penalize the present students.
Mr. Hunderup said the Board's attorney had indicated informally that there is no legal impediment to this conversion. The buildings are the property of the State and the Board can determine the highest and best use of the facilities.

Mrs. Johnson asked if building fees or building use credits from research projects could be used to offset some of the loss of income. Mr. Hunderup responded that student building fees could be used but that the building use credits would not be an appropriate source of funds. Mr. Hunderup also indicated that no specific policy statement had yet been found in the Board minutes with reference to the repayment between funds with the exception of a reference to seeking statutory authority to reimburse between funds in connection with a property purchase at the University of Oregon.

Mr. Hossler presented a substitute motion that the Board approve the rededication of Unit H of Straub Hall to academic and general space; authorize planning for Units F, G, and H; authorize submission of plans to the Emergency Board; and defer for further study the rededication of the remainder of Straub Hall and the question of financing if the building is rededicated.

Dr. Ray Hawk, Vice President for Administration and Finance at the University of Oregon, said that approval of Mr. Hossler's motion would create several problems. The University is faced with the necessity of relocating the Department of Psychology because the Behavioral Sciences Building, authorized by the 1969 Legislature and deferred, was not re-authorized by the 1971 Legislature. In addition, he said, Mr. Alexander was very critical in his report of the construction of such a large building at the edge of the campus. Since there appeared to be little likelihood that the building will be constructed, the Psychology Department sought other alternatives. At the same time, the dormitory occupancy was lower and Straub Hall seemed to be a logical solution to the needs of the Psychology Department; and its conversion would make use of dormitory space which might otherwise remain vacant. The rededication of all space in Straub Hall to educational and general use by the Department of Psychology would mean that the University would abandon the request for the Behavioral Sciences Building.

Dr. Hawk said that he could see the logic on both sides of the financing question and that it is a difficult proposal with long-range implications for the entire building program. He said it was the firm intention of the University of Oregon administration to convert all of Straub Hall to psychology, but that if the Board did not wish to approve that plan, it would probably be necessary to continue to seek construction of the new Behavioral Sciences Building.

Dr. Hawk also stated that the VISTA program will not be renewed and this will reduce income in Straub Hall. Project Newgate is also facing financial uncertainties. (Both of these projects have been paying rent for space used in Straub Hall.)
During the discussion, it was indicated that Straub Hall had previously provided a unique living experience which many students liked, but from a dormitory management standpoint, it was the least desirable residence hall to continue. This was the primary reason Straub Hall was removed from dormitory use rather than the fact that it was debt free and other residence halls were not. In addition, its proximity to the science complex was an important factor which made the building a desirable location for the Department of Psychology, because programs in psychology are closely related to the fields of science.

Mr. Snider asked if it could be assumed that there would be no additional requests for dormitory housing construction at the University of Oregon in the foreseeable future and also that there would be no further request for a building to house the Psychology Department.

Mr. Hunderup responded that if Straub Hall were used for psychology, it would meet the needs of that department and a request for a new building for psychology would be unnecessary; also that there are no plans in the foreseeable future to request building construction for single student housing at the University of Oregon. In response to a question, Mr. Hunderup said that the University administration has examined thoroughly other potential uses and has concluded that the best use of the building is for the Department of Psychology.

Mrs. Johnson said there were good and sufficient reasons for converting the building to office and general use but questioned whether there was any possibility of securing state matching funds. She said there was also a great deal of merit in considering the use of the general student building fee to reimburse auxiliary enterprise funds, rather than having dormitory students absorb the loss of income through an increase in dormitory rates. Mr. Hunderup indicated that the present proposal is only the first increment of the conversion and that requests for capital outlay funds for additional phases of remodelling will be recommended for presentation to the 1973 Legislature. Such requests would be substantially less than the amount required to build the new Behavioral Sciences Building.

President MacVicar said that an important principle to consider in the conversion of a building from one type of use to another is that the highest and best use should be made of the building. However, financing from the dormitory pool is very important in terms of the larger group of students. He asked whether the need any longer exists for the pooling of these funds so that the students on one campus are responsible for the activities on another campus. President MacVicar said that originally the commingling of funds was necessary in order to obtain the facilities. If the pooling principle is maintained, he said it was just as valid for buildings constructed in 1929 as for those built in 1969. He said he would urge the Board to approve the plan because there are very urgent academic space needs on all the campuses. However, eventually the financial principle must be solved.

The Board then voted against Mr. Mosser's substitute motion as stated above. Mr. Mosser voted in favor of the motion.
The Board next discussed the intent of the main motion presented by Mr. Joss and asked him for further clarification.

Mrs. Johnson indicated that she could not support the main motion unless it involved a reexamination of the financing. She said she believed a very important principle was involved and that the Board was accountable for it to the legislature and to the public.

Mr. Joss said that it was his intention to leave open for the Finance Committee the matter of reimbursement between the State's general operating fund and the auxiliary enterprises fund and the extent of any reimbursement to auxiliary funds for the conversion. Approval of the rededication of the building would be included in the intent of the motion, together with authorization to proceed with final planning and to seek Emergency Board approval for remodelling in the amount of $135,000.

Mr. Mosser commented that the project should not be referred to the Emergency Board until a fiscal plan was also available for submission.

The Chancellor said that the policy issue on financing involves the compensation of the dormitory reserves from the state general fund for the value of the building. Such compensation would be consistent with the assumed intent of the statute which permits transfers by the Board from the general fund to auxiliary enterprise projects. However, the resources for such compensation are not available at this time, and if it were decided not to proceed with the project without such compensation, the effect would be to halt the project. He suggested a possible course of action might be to approve this particular project and then to review the financial policy with the anticipation that compensation might be requested from the 1973 Legislature.

Mr. Holmer indicated that the possible use of the general building fee was being considered and a recommendation would be presented to the November meeting of the Finance Committee. Both the November Finance Committee meeting and the December Board meeting precede the December Emergency Board meeting so that there would be an opportunity to take any additional appropriate action with respect to the project prior to the Emergency Board meeting. It was pointed out that an actual repurchase of Straub Hall for general use would require legislative action, but an annual payment from student building fees could be authorized by the Board.

The Board then approved the original motion as presented by Mr. Joss, together with the understanding that the Board’s Finance Committee would consider further the matter of reimbursement to auxiliary activity funds in connection with the withdrawal of Straub Hall from dormitory operation as stated in the above discussion. Mr. Mosser voted against the motion.

Upon the recommendation of University of Oregon officials and the project architects, the work performed by the principal construction contractor for the Men's Physical Education Building Restoration was inspected and accepted by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning as of August 26, 1971, subject to the completion of a few minor items. The work performed by two other contractors for minor phases of the Restoration, UO project had been accepted previously.
A revised semifinal budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on January 25, 1971:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition work - Lorentz Bruun, Portland</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
<td>$9,900</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of flooring in apparatus room - Acme Hardwood Floor Co., Portland</td>
<td>$8,533</td>
<td>$8,533</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration and rehabilitation work - John T. Moody &amp; Sons Construction Co., Junction City</td>
<td>$250,941</td>
<td>$238,783</td>
<td>$12,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total direct construction costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$269,374</strong></td>
<td><strong>$257,215</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,159</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees (including preliminary report and cost estimates)</td>
<td>$31,461</td>
<td>$30,246</td>
<td>$1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>$9,165</td>
<td>$10,600</td>
<td>$(-1,435)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$11,939</td>
<td>$(-11,939)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$310,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$310,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes modifications to electrical fusing, chilled water supply and return; the relocation of pipe rooms and a steam line; modifications to the fire sprinkler system; the relocation of certain duct work; and other changes incorporated within six approved change orders.

Plans and specifications for the restoration of areas within the Men's Physical Education Building, which had been destroyed by fire on February 16, 1970, were prepared by Architects Morin-Longwood-Edlund of Eugene. Generally, the remodeling work consisted of the restoration of spaces to their original use but with such modifications in finishes as were necessary to conform to current building code requirements. Remodeling within the basement was limited to the expansion of locker and storage spaces into the areas formerly occupied by the ROTC and included the installation of an automatic fire sprinkling system to conform to present code requirements.

Inasmuch as the fire totally destroyed the floor, interior partitions and roof of the northwest section of the building, the space was cleared and it was possible for the restoration thereof to provide for more functional space arrangement on the main floor than had existed within the original building. For example, the two classrooms formerly located on the west side near University Street traffic were placed on the east side of the corridor with windows opening to the interior court side of this wing. Departmental offices were arranged for more efficient use principally along the front of the building (west side). The former penthouse space used by Health Education, also totally destroyed by the fire, was restored, but in a slightly different manner. A more efficient structural system was designed to provide the potential of future additions which would complete the second floor levels at this northwest section of the building.
In addition to the remodeling work required to restore the fire-damaged areas, minor modifications were made within the northeast wing of the building to provide proper corridor exiting and more efficient utilization of the space. (As part of Phase II of the Central Cooling project authorized by the 1967 Legislature, the existing ventilating system in this wing was modified to provide cooling within the classrooms.)

For the approximate area of 22,624 square feet remodeled, the direct construction costs of $250,941 averaged about $11.09 per square foot. These costs excluded the demolition work and the installation of new flooring in the apparatus room, both of which were contracted separately.

Of the total budget requirements of $310,000, $262,580 was claimed against the State Restoration Fund, $6,800 was allocated from the budget of the Phase II Central Cooling project and the remaining $40,620 was allocated from the Board’s reserve for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay. Minor adjustments may be required in these resources.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UO Men’s Physical Education Building Restoration

Architects - Morin-Longwood-Edlund, Eugene

Legislative authorization - State Emergency Board (January 9, 1971)

Approximate net area remodeled - 22,624 square feet

Total Project Costs $ 310,000

Estimated direct construction costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$ 269,374</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (excluding demolition and new flooring in apparatus room)</td>
<td>$ 250,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (per square foot) - $11.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative financing plan:

| State Restoration Fund | $ 262,580 |
| Article XI-G bonds (for portion applicable to Phase II of Central Cooling) | 6,800 |
| Board’s reserve for plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay | 40,620 |
| Total | $ 310,000 |

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Sale of Small Portion of Animal Farm Property, UOMS

(Considered by Building Committee, October 5, 1971.)

Mr. and Mrs. Roger Bailey, whose home is located contiguous to the University of Oregon Medical School's Animal Farm property in Washington County, near Hillsboro, have expressed interest in purchasing a small strip of this farm for the purpose of constructing a garage for their use. The parcel contains an area of approximately 0.12 acres, with dimensions of approximately 20 feet in width and 258.75 feet in length on the west line. An appraisal by an independent professional appraiser commissioned by institutional officials indicates a value of $500 "due to the increase of value to the purchasers' property by addition of this parcel." This price is satisfactory to the Baileys.

As reported to the Board in April 1964, when the donation of the Animal Farm was received from the Medical Research Foundation of Oregon, Inc., the total property includes approximately 174.19 acres. Institutional officials have indicated that the small portion requested by the Baileys can be declared surplus to the needs of the State and the sale can be consummated in accordance with the provisions of ORS 271.310 and 273.201. (Inasmuch as the estimated value is less than $1,000, competitive bids are not required.)

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officers be authorized to deed to Mr. and Mrs. Roger Bailey that minor portion of the University of Oregon Medical School's Animal Farm property which is described above for a cash consideration of $500.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Snider moved that the Committee recommend approval of the sale by the Board, with the understanding that the cost of the appraisal would be added to the recommended sale price of $500.

It was indicated that the proposed purchase price included the title insurance cost which is normally provided by the seller. Since the appraisal cost is nominal and the amount of $500 had previously been discussed, it was stated that Medical School officials would prefer not to have the appraisal cost added to the purchase price. Furthermore, the price is quite large in relation to the value of the land.

Mr. Joss moved to amend the motion to delete the addition of the appraisal costs to the purchase price. The motion to amend was defeated.

The Building Committee then approved the original motion to recommend that the Board approve the sale at the price of $500 plus the appraisal costs.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Joss indicated that payment of the appraisal cost was satisfactory to the purchaser.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.
Meeting #399-25

Use of Principal of Alex Robb Estate, Contingent Authorization, UOMS

(Considered by Finance Committee, October 5, 1971.)

The last will and testament of Alex Robb contains the following language:

"I give, devise and bequeath all the rest, residue and remainder of my estate and property, real and personal, to the FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF OREGON, Portland, Oregon; in trust, on the terms and conditions and for the uses and purposes as follows, to-wit:

"(1) I direct my trustee to pay to my wife, KATHERINE G. ROBB, all of the income from my trust estate for so long as she may live.

"(2) Upon the death of my said wife, KATHERINE G. ROBB, I give, devise and bequeath the then remainder of said trust estate to THE CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL, said funds to be used by the said recipient in the State of Oregon."

Mrs. Robb has survived Mr. Robb and has access only to the income from the estate. She is, however, concerned about the costs of a possible prolonged illness. It seems highly probable that Mr. Robb would have included a proviso to permit such costs to be paid from the estate had he anticipated such a contingency.

An officer of the trustee bank has urged that the Board of Higher Education take some action to relieve Mrs. Robb's concern on this score.

In consultation with John Leahy, the following language was developed and recommended to the Committee for its approval:

"It is the Board's conclusion that the provisions of the will of Alex Robb, quoted above, probably did not state fully the intentions of the Testator, in that provision was not made for invasion of the principal of the trust, if necessary, to meet the medical or other emergency expenses of Katherine G. Robb.

"To remedy that oversight, the Board authorizes the trustee bank to make invasions of the principal of the trust to a maximum of $25,000 for payment of the medical or emergency expenses of Katherine G. Robb, taking into account other assets, income or insurance benefits available to her."

Concurrently with such action, the bank would be requested to agree to the following commitment:

"The 1st National Bank of Oregon in recognition of the action of the Board of Higher Education in authorizing the invasion of the principal of the trust estate of Alex Robb to pay the
medical or other emergency expenses of Katherine G. Robb, agrees to review such expenses with the Vice Chancellor for Administration before approving requests for the payment of such expenses."

We have considered the fact that this action would represent conditional and partial abandonment of the rights of the Board to the remainder of the estate. However, it is an action which will contribute to the peace of mind of the donor's widow, minimize the possibility of litigation, and remedy the probable oversight of Mr. Robb. Further, there is no certainty that this gesture will, in fact, result in any reduction of the estate, since Mrs. Robb is reportedly in good health.

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 Bids & Contract Award for Todd Hall Remodeling, OCE

In accordance with the program authorized by the Board on April 30, 1971, and by the State Emergency Board on September 24, the final plans and specifications for the conversion of Jessica Todd Hall to educational and general use were completed by Architects Payne-Settecase-Smith of Salem and bids for the project were received at Oregon College of Education on October 6. The quotations received from three contractors ranged from a low of $44,504 to a high of $62,324. A contract award was made to the lowest bidder and the following budget was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs:
Demolition work and minor renovation by OCE Physical Plant Department $ 5,768
Contract work - L. D. Mattson, General Contractor, Salem 44,504
Professional services, including feasibility study 5,900
Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs 268
Contingencies 3,560
Total $ 60,000

Of the total requirements, $10,000 is being provided from the institutional operating budget and the remainder is to be financed equally between the General Fund appropriation for capital outlay in 1971-1973 and bond borrowings under Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution.

Within the area of approximately 18,687 square feet to be remodeled on the first and second floor levels, it is expected that about 79 office stations will be provided, together with conference rooms and related service spaces, principally for use by the Division of Teaching Research.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Report of Inspection & Acceptance of Physical Education Building, Phase I, OCE

Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon College of Education and Payne-Settecase-Smith, project architects, the work performed by the three principal construction contractors for the Physical Education Building, Phase I, was accepted as of September 8, 1971, subject to the completion of a few minor items. 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 budget reported to the Board on September 8, 1970:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Revised Budget 9/8/71</th>
<th>Original Budget 9/8/70</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General work- Morrow-Contractors, Inc., a joint venture, Salem and Portland</td>
<td>$884,273</td>
<td>$868,200</td>
<td>$16,073 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work - Raco, Inc., dba Valley Plumbing and Heating, Salem</td>
<td>201,193</td>
<td>201,950</td>
<td>(757)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work - RMB, Inc., dba Marion Electric, Salem</td>
<td>- 92,140</td>
<td>92,140</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct construction costs</td>
<td>$1,177,606</td>
<td>$1,162,290</td>
<td>$15,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees, including consultants' charges</td>
<td>74,301</td>
<td>69,813</td>
<td>4,488 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>70,428</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>5,428 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>12,665</td>
<td>14,651</td>
<td>(1,986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>23,246</td>
<td>(23,246)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$1,335,000</td>
<td>$1,335,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes the removal of extra material and the provision of impacted gravel fill under footings; the provision of asphalt paving and gravel base for tennis courts; the furnishing and installing of 4" concrete for locker bases; the furnishing and installation of two pairs of doors in upper gymnasium; and other revisions incorporated within thirteen approved change orders.

(2) The increase was caused principally by the consultants' fees for the balancing of mechanical systems following completion of the project.

(3) Reflects reinstatement of certain equipment which had been omitted from initial post-bid budget.

Plans and specifications for the project were prepared by Architects Payne-Settecase-Smith (formerly Payne and Settecase) of Salem. These plans identified three elements functionally integrated into a single structure using reinforced concrete columns, tilt-up concrete walls and a combination of sandblasted textured finish and some brick surfaces. The central element contains the main gymnasium which has been
designed to be free of interior columns so that it can be used alternately as two full-size basketball courts, six volleyball courts, ten badminton courts, or combinations thereof. When needed for inter-collegiate athletic events, convocations, commencement, etc., the use of folding bleachers on the south side of the main floor and in the balcony permits the seating of approximately 2,200 persons. South of the main gymnasium, the first level of this central two-story portion of the building contains locker and shower rooms, varsity and visiting team rooms. The second floor area, which is the balcony to the main gymnasium, would be used for instructional purposes in physical education and health activities when the bleachers are folded.

The second element of the building, which includes the principal entrance to the building, is located on the east side of the gymnasium and contains a large lobby, classrooms and offices. The offices for the faculty, except the department chairman, are on the second floor level immediately above the classrooms.

The third area, which is constructed on the west side of the building, provides an enclosed multipurpose area of approximately 12,000 square feet for tennis, etc.

The total gross area of all three elements is approximately 58,527 square feet. A total of 98 classroom student stations and 18 office stations is provided within the facility. The direct construction costs of $1,132,754 for the building and fixed equipment average about $19.35 per square foot. Excluded from these amounts are direct construction costs of approximately $44,852 which are attributable to outside utilities, site development work, etc.

Approximately $145,000 of the project budget of $1,335,000 was provided from self-liquidating bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises to cover items intended for recreational use of gymnasium, athletic team rooms, etc. The remainder of about $1,190,000 was provided from the General Fund appropriation in Section 1 of Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969, and from bond borrowings under Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OCE Physical Education Building (Phase I)
Architects - Payne-Settecase-Smith (formerly Payne and Settecase), Salem
Legislative authorization - Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969
Board's priority - No. 13 in 1969-1971 (Educational and General Plant)
No. 6 in 1969-1971 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Approximate gross area - 58,527 square feet
Total project cost $1,335,000
Report of Allocation for Physical Plant Rehabilitation and Minor Capital Outlay, PSU

Direct construction costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,177,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and fixed equipment only</td>
<td>$1,132,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- average (per square foot)</td>
<td>$19.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financing plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund appropriation in Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969</td>
<td>$595,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution</td>
<td>595,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-liquidating bond borrowings under Article XI-F(1) and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,335,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board on December 8, 1970, the Chancellor allocated $10,000 from the Board's reserve for physical plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay to cover approximately one-half of the cost of re-keying the educational and general buildings at Portland State University to avoid or at least reduce the risk of loss resulting from the theft of a large number of keys on or about July 31, 1971. Costs applicable to Shattuck School are to be charged against the capital outlay authorization approved by the 1971 Legislature for furnishing and remodeling of that building. The remainder of the cost is to be financed from the operating budget of the institution.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented. President Wolfe explained the circumstances which required the change.

Report of Land Acquisition, SOC

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board, arrangements have been made for the acquisition of the Squire property located at 343 South Mountain Avenue, Ashland. The option price of $6,100 was in line with appraisals obtained by Southern Oregon College. The property consists of a lot containing approximately 9,013 square feet. There are no improvements of value inasmuch as the small house that had occupied the property was destroyed by fire several months ago.

The property is within the area designated for future parking. Consequently, funds to finance the acquisition are being provided from proceeds from the sale of Article XI-F(1) bonds previously authorized.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Confirmation of Institutional Degree Lists In accordance with Board regulations, the following members represented the Board at the June 1971 Commencement exercises of the several institutions and acted for the Board in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas:

- Oregon State University
- University of Oregon
- University of Oregon Dental School
- University of Oregon Medical School
- University of Oregon Nursing School
- Portland State University
- Oregon College of Education
- Southern Oregon College
- Eastern Oregon College
- Oregon Technical Institute

George H. Layman
Elizabeth H. Johnson
Chas. R. Holloway, Jr.
George H. Layman
John D. Mosser
George H. Corey
Loran L. Stewart
Robert D. Holmes
John W. Snider

The signed copies of the degree lists are on file in the Board's Office.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board confirmed the action of the above-listed Board members in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas.

Report of Meeting of Academic Affairs Committee

The Academic Affairs Committee met for a regular meeting at 9:00 A.M., October 4, 1971, in Room 327, Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University. The Committee considered the following matters:


2. Coordination of marine science developments in the State System.

3. Proposed Board rules governing generation and maintenance of student records.

4. OSU designation as the locale for state mining research institute.

5. Proposed change in Administrative Rules relating to Board meetings.

6. Planning of the Committee's work for 1971-72 with specific reference to (a) schedule of Committee hearings on indefinite tenure policies, and (b) schedule of Committee meetings necessary to the review and approval of State System and institutional guidelines for the 1970's.

The Committee adjourned at 4:00 P.M.
A complete report of the Committee's meeting is presented in the document Report of the Meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs, October 4, 1971, which is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of these minutes.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by the Academic Affairs Committee, October 4, 1971.)

At its meeting on September 7, 1971, the Board approved a plan for visits to the institutions by groups of Board members and also approved a change in the schedule for regular Board meetings and Board Committee meetings as follows:

1. Members of the Board, in groups of three and four, will plan annual campus visits at times unrelated to regular Board or Board Committee meetings.

2. The frequency of regular Board meetings will be changed, effective with the beginning of 1972 from a meeting each six weeks to a meeting each two months. It was understood that the two-day Board Committee meetings will be held mid-way between regular Board meetings, once each two months.

3. All Board meetings and Board committee meetings will be held in Portland in order to reduce the travel distance and travel cost for Board members and executives attending the meetings.

In connection with the change in the schedule of Board meetings for 1972, it is necessary to amend the Board’s Administrative Rules. The Board’s rule on the holding of regular meetings now reads as follows:

10.205 Regular Meetings

ORS 351.050 . . . meetings.
... The Board shall meet regularly once every three months at such times and places as the president may determine . . .

In addition to the regular meetings required by ORS 351.050, which are scheduled in January, April, July, and October of each year, the Board will hold additional regular meetings in March, June, September, and December of each year.

It was recommended that Section 10.205 of the Board’s Administrative Rules be amended to read as follows:

10.205 Regular Meetings (wording as amended by Mr. Mosser’s motion referred to in a subsequent paragraph)

Effective January 1, 1972, in addition to the four regular meetings per year required by ORS 351.050, the Board will hold two additional meetings per year,
or a total of six meetings to be held in January, March, May, July, September, and November of each year.

A hearing on the proposed change in the Board's Administrative Rules will be scheduled during the October 25, 1971, Board meeting to be advertised in the State Administrative Rule Bulletin.

A tentative calendar for 1972 follows.

**Tentative Proposed Schedule for Board Meetings**  
**Remainder of 1971 and Calendar Year 1972**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Meetings</th>
<th>Board Committee Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1971</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>(Mon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mon)</td>
<td>OTI, Klamath Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 14</td>
<td>(Tues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tues)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1972</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24</td>
<td>(Mon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mon)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28</td>
<td>(Tues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tues)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22</td>
<td>(Mon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mon)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24</td>
<td>(Mon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mon)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 26</td>
<td>(Tues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tues)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint meeting of Ed. Boards (date not yet established)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 27</td>
<td>(Mon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mon)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Thanksgiving, Thursday, November 23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4-5</td>
<td>(Mon/Tues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 22-23</td>
<td>(Mon/Tues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1972</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5-6</td>
<td>(Wed/Thurs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(New Year's Day, Saturday, January 1)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22-23</td>
<td>(Tues-Wed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20-21/1</td>
<td>(Thurs/Fri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 26-27</td>
<td>(Mon/Tues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 28-29</td>
<td>(Mon/Tues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 24-25</td>
<td>(Tues/Wed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18-19</td>
<td>(Mon/Tues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Christmas, Monday, December 25)</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#April 20-21 dates proposed to avoid conflict with AGB meeting scheduled for Boston on April 23-25, 1972.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

The Committee recommended that the proposed change in Section 10.205 of the Administrative Rules regarding Board meetings be approved by the Board following a public hearing at the Board meeting scheduled for October 25, 1971.
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Mosser moved that the proposed amended rule 10.205 be introduced with the words "Effective January 1, 1972,". The motion was approved and the effective date was included in the amended rule.

President Layman then indicated that further presentations in connection with the hearing on the proposed amendments were in order. There being no oral or written response to his request, the Board approved the Committee recommendation as amended by Mr. Mosser.

(Considered by the Academic Affairs Committee, October 4, 1971.)

The Board at its January and July 1970 meetings authorized three of its institutions (SOC, OSU, UO) to modify institutional English composition requirements for graduation effective during year 1970-71. It requested, however, that reports be made to the Board following the close of the year as to (1) institutional experience with the modified requirements in English composition, and (2) institutional views as to the importance of students' acquiring skill in written communication and what approach to encouraging the acquisition of this skill the institutions felt would be most promising over the long run.

- Oregon State University was authorized to change its English composition requirements from three terms of English composition, one term to be completed in each of the freshman, sophomore, and junior years, to the following:
  
  Wr 121 English Composition, 3 hours, or its equivalent.
  
  Wr 121 is graded on a Satisfactory- Unsatisfactory (S-U) basis (Pass-No Pass effective 1971-72). Students are required to continue in the course until they receive a Satisfactory (S) or Pass (P) grade.

- University of Oregon was authorized to change its English composition requirements from three terms of English composition, one term to be completed in each of the freshman, sophomore, and junior years, to the following:
  
  Two terms of English Composition (6 credit hours),
  Wr 121 to be completed during the freshman year and Wr 323 during the junior year.

The complete reports of Oregon State University and the University of Oregon and the discussion of these reports by the Board's Office of Academic Affairs are presented in the document Reports of the Oregon State University and the University of Oregon on Experience During 1970-71 with Changes in Institutional Requirements in English Composition, prepared for the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs for its October 4, 1971, meeting. The document referred to is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of these minutes.
Board's Office Discussion

1. Efforts of OSU and UO to modify their long-standing English composition requirements grow out of a feeling on the part of the English Department staffs - and the institutions - that the traditional English composition requirements have not been as effective as they ought to have been to warrant their continuation.

2. In these modifications of English composition requirements, the two institutions are in the company of a great many other colleges and universities which are modifying traditional requirements in a variety of ways as they search for an approach to meeting the problems that the English composition requirement was devised to deal with.

The reductions in the English requirements at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon are modest compared with those at a number of other state universities. The institutional requirement in English composition has been dropped from three terms at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon to one term at OSU and two terms at the UO. In a number of other state universities across the country, the requirement has been altogether eliminated. It is assumed in these latter instances that students who lack the necessary communications skills will either seek out voluntarily the help they need to rectify this short-coming, or they will drop out or be eliminated.

Moreover, the Oregon State University and University of Oregon modifications of the institutions' English composition requirements are more modest in their impact than they at first appear to be.

At Oregon State University, two extenuating factors must be reckoned with if one is fully to understand the impact of reducing the institutional English composition requirement from three to one term.

- The one term presently required by Oregon State University under the modified requirement must be completed satisfactorily by the student (at the level of "C" or higher) whether it takes him one or several terms in the course to attain that level of proficiency.

This one-term required course (Wr 121) represents a proficiency standard, which under the new requirements has been set at a higher level than formerly, according to Oregon State University. During the fall and winter terms 1970-71, of the 2,078 students who completed Wr 121, 203 (9.8 percent) received the grade of U (unsatisfactory).

These students must continue in the course for one or more additional terms until they achieve the required level of proficiency. (The foregoing rate of failure in Wr 121 is higher than in 1969-70, before the new institutional requirements became operative. In that year, 6.7 percent of the students completing the course received grades of D or F.)
School and departmental as well as institutional English composition requirements at Oregon State University must be examined if one is fully to understand the extent of Oregon State University's efforts to foster the development of effective communications skills in its students.

These requirements range from 12-18 hours of communications in the schools of agriculture, forestry, and home economics through 9 hours for students majoring in business and technology, science, pharmacy, humanities and social sciences, and nine departments in engineering to a minimum of 3-6 hours in education, physical education, and the remaining departments in engineering.

In addition to the foregoing requirements, six of Oregon State University's professional schools and the division of health and physical education have proficiency standards in communications which must be met by graduates at a satisfactory level of competence.

At the University of Oregon, students achieving 650 or higher on the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) English achievement test are exempted from taking Wr 121, the requirement for them being completion of Wr 323, English Composition (3 credit hours).

But for those students who fall below 370 on the foregoing English achievement test, the English composition requirement is 9 credit hours. For they are required to complete a remedial course, Wr 120, Preparatory English, before enrollment in Wr 121. Moreover, students enrolled in Wr 121 and Wr 323 who have difficulties with spelling, punctuation, and other matters of mechanics are referred to the composition office for individual instruction which is provided without charge and without credit by a remedial instructor who has special competence in working with such students.

The percentage of University of Oregon students scoring below 370 on the test increased sharply in 1969, going from 7.3 percent of 2,314 students to 10.8 percent of 1,926 students. This sudden increase appears to be the result of the special linguistic problems of minority group and disadvantaged students who have been brought in increasing numbers to the campus in more recent years.

The percentage of new freshmen scoring above the cutting score of 650, and therefore exempted from Wr 121, has increased in the period from 1967 to 1970. In 1967, 5.7 percent of a total of 2,274 were exempted; in 1970, 8.2 percent of a total of 1,714.

University of Oregon data also indicate that average score on the English achievement test has gone up during the past five years from 484 in 1967 to 505 in 1970.
The average high school grade-point average of entering freshmen has also increased slightly, from an average of 2.9 in 1961 to 3.10 in 1970. As an expression of any real difference in the average scholastic achievement of students, these latter figures are probably not significant, given the fact that there is evidence to suggest that marking standards in high schools appear to have become less exacting in recent years.

The Oregon State University and University of Oregon modifications in institutional English composition requirements have resulted in a significant decrease in the number of students enrolling in the composition courses which are no longer included in the institutional requirements.

- At Oregon State University, the number of sections of required English composition courses (WR 121) has dropped from 252 sections in 1969-70 to 194 in 1970-71, a reduction of 58 sections.

- At the University of Oregon there were 21 fewer sections of English composition taught in 1970-71 (162 sections) than in 1969-70 (183 sections).

The reduction in the faculty FTE necessary to handle the enrollments in the required English composition courses has resulted in personnel adjustments which the institutions consider to have been beneficial to the overall quality of their undergraduate teaching.

- Oregon State University reports that, relieved of the heavy work load required by the English composition requirements of earlier years, it has been able to staff the remaining sections with more uniformly able and interested faculty.

- The English department at the University of Oregon has reduced its teaching fellows from 74 positions (composition and literature) in the fall term 1970 to 54 for fall term 1971. Funds from the 20 positions eliminated have been used to provide 6 full-time positions which will be committed to undergraduate instruction in literature.

This will permit an increase in the number of lower-division literature courses staffed by professors from 12 sections fall term 1970 (29 percent of a total of 41 positions) to 19 sections (46 percent of 41 scheduled) fall term 1971.

Oregon State University and the University of Oregon are of the firm belief that the modified English composition requirements are a significant improvement, although they acknowledge that continuing efforts must be made to improve their application.

- Oregon State University has sought to examine systematically the working of the new requirements, to identify weaknesses and to shore up those found. This examination has involved
a wide spectrum of faculty. Among the matters that have surfaced that Oregon State University feels require further attention are the following:

- There exists among departments at Oregon State University, including the Department of English, a feeling that ways must be developed to ensure greater uniformity in student experiences in the basic required composition course, Wr 121. The English department and the Wr 121 instructors are acutely aware of this need, and are committed to working on this problem during 1971-72.

- The writing clinic was not used in 1970-71 to the extent that Oregon State University had anticipated. Between October 5, 1970, when the clinic opened, and May 5, 1971, 131 persons sought assistance at the clinic. A total of 467 hours of individual and group instruction was given.

Oregon State University notes, however, that the number of students seeking clinic assistance increased noticeably as the year progressed, and that by the end of the year several departments were seriously considering how they might set up procedures which would encourage referral of students needing clinic help.

- A third problem in the field of instruction in written communication on which Oregon State University is currently working relates to meeting the special needs of disadvantaged students for remedial help in developing their written communication skills. The Oregon State University office of education opportunities and the Department of English are working jointly on the problem.

The University of Oregon continues to work on the problems that it has identified in the field of English composition.

- It has instituted a new course (Wr 120) designed to meet the special needs of students (principally those enrolled in the programs for the disadvantaged) who require special remedial help in composition before undertaking the basic freshman English composition course (Wr 121).

- It has incorporated in the basic freshman course in composition (Wr 121) some work in the writing of research papers, the aspect of composition that claimed a major share of the attention in Wr 222, the course which has been dropped as a requirement for graduation.

- It has sought and continues to seek to encourage the acceptance campuswide of the concept that the quality of written composition among students at the University is a campuswide concern and responsibility rather than a concern and responsibility primarily or solely of the Department of English. To this end, it has sought to
meld the efforts of the various subject matter departments of the university with those of the composition section of the English Department in providing more effective instruction in Wr 323.

- It continues to concern itself with efforts to ensure the quality of instruction in composition. It has placed the responsibility for the composition program in the hands of a senior professor who maintains a close supervision over the work of instructors in the field.

Summary, Board's Office Discussion

A professor of English in one of the nation's major state universities comments that: "Freshman English is not only the largest and most expensive course on campus; it is also the least successful, and incidentally, the least popular with its teachers as well as its students." Whether this is an altogether accurate reflection of conditions on all campuses may be open to question.

But it is certainly true that it is the required freshman English courses that make the English Department among the largest in any college or university, whether size is reckoned in terms of enrollments or number of faculty.

It is, therefore, a refreshing experience to find that departments which rule and reign over these very considerable domains are able and willing to stand off and examine the educational soundness of what they are doing in English composition, or have been doing, and in terms of educational values as it is given to them to see these values, propose policies which have the effect of reducing their dominion by considerable. That is in effect what the departments of English in the institutions under consideration have done.

The two institutions share misgivings as to the traditional English composition requirements. They have established, with Board consent, modified requirements that are in some respects similar, in others dissimilar.

1. Both institutions recognize that some students entering college are fully competent in written composition and ought, therefore, not be required to take more in the way of English composition courses than the student's own interests move him to elect. Such students may, at the University of Oregon, "examine out" of English composition requirements. At Oregon State University, waiver is granted on the basis of the Advanced Placement examination.

2. Both institutions recognize the need for a remedial course to bring students needing remedial help in composition to the level of development at which they can benefit from the basic freshman course in English composition. The University of Oregon offers Wr 120, Preparatory English Composition; Oregon State University is in process of developing a course to serve this same need.
3. Both institutions see a need for and both offer a required basic freshman English composition course for all students whose level of competence in English composition will not enable them to "examine out" of the course.

4. Both institutions feel that responsibility for the improvement of the student's ability in English composition above that represented by successful completion of the basic required freshman English composition course, is a campuswide responsibility, not one exclusively or even primarily of the Department of English.

In giving expression to this shared view, the institutions have taken somewhat different courses of action:

- Oregon State University seeks to prompt campuswide assumption of responsibility for improving the composition abilities of Oregon State University students by (1) encouraging the various schools and departments to establish school and departmental composition requirements beyond the basic one-term institutional requirement in English composition (2) establishing a clinic to provide specific individual and group help to those students identified by instructors in all schools and departments at Oregon State University as needing additional assistance in developing their composition abilities.

- The University of Oregon is seeking such campuswide cooperation in the development of composition abilities of students by (1) establishing a junior-year one-term English composition requirement which is designed to bring the composition instructor from the English department into alliance with the subject matter instructors in the various schools and departments of the institution in a course which generally features a team-teaching approach to instruction in composition, and (2) encouraging instructors in the schools and departments to refer students whom they identify as needing additional assistance in composition to the department of English for individual assistance.

Board's Office Recommendation

It is the view of the Board's Office that the reports from Oregon State University and the University of Oregon presented in the document prepared for the Committee ought to be accepted by the Committee on Academic Affairs and by the Board; that the Committee and the Board should encourage the institutions in their efforts to establish defensible approaches to providing both required and optional opportunities for students to secure help in raising the level of their composition abilities; that a further report from the institutions might well be requested by the Board a year hence.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee noted that because of the need to report as completely as possible on a year's experience with the new English composition requirements, the reports of the three institutions experimenting with new requirements had necessarily come to the Board's Committee too late for the Board to take any action affecting the 1971-72 year. However, Mrs. Johnson reminded the Committee that approval of the Oregon State University and University of Oregon changes in English composition in July 1970 had been on a provisional basis, and approval of the Southern Oregon College changes in January 1970 had been for a three-year period. Mrs. Johnson also noted that the problem involved more than the mechanics of accomplishing instruction in composition; it involves, rather, the nature of the institution's responsibility for development of its students' basic competencies in communication. She said there was considerable evidence that students in elementary and high schools do not receive instruction in writing adequate to achieving a basic competency, and that there is also evidence that English teachers in the public schools are educated primarily in literature rather than composition. She said she was unwilling to accept the premise that because instruction in composition is difficult and complex and is not being done well, the institutions ought, therefore, to abandon all responsibility except for such instruction as may be voluntarily requested by the student. In short, Mrs. Johnson said, the question that must be decided is whether improvement of communications skills is a legitimate and obligatory mission of an institution of higher learning. If it is agreed that the institutions have this obligation, she continued, then ways must be found to fulfill this obligation effectively.

Dr. Romney cautioned that the changes in requirements in English composition in the institutions of the System appear more drastic than in fact they are. At Oregon State University, for example, he said, the schools and departments have a co-responsibility with the institution in establishing standards for proficiency in communications, with the result that many students complete considerably more course work in this area than the single required course which is the institutional requirement. In respect to preparation of teachers for the public schools, Dr. Romney said major modifications have been made in the pre-service preparation programs for secondary school teachers, in part as a result of studies made some years ago by Dr. Albert R. Kitzhaber, now of the University of Oregon. Courses in linguistics, rhetoric, literary criticism and the history of language have been added to the preparation programs of students preparing to become secondary school teachers of English. In-service programs have been developed for teachers already in the field who have not had benefit of some of the new course work in the foregoing fields, but this is a slow process.

President Clark commented on the long-time concern of the University of Oregon with the teaching of composition. He emphasized that the present reduction in the requirement was not a move to abandon responsibility for teaching composition but rather an effort to reduce what to students seems a meaningless obligation and to make it meaningful.
Mrs. Johnson observed that she did not see how institutions are going to get relevant research on how to improve teaching of composition if any money saved through reduction of the requirement is used to employ teachers of literature. She noted, too, that improvement in writing was most likely to be obtained through practice, and observed that the students most in need of this practice are the students most likely not to elect to seek out opportunities for practice. She suggested further that students exempt from the basic course in composition could benefit from an advanced course in expository writing.

Dr. Lieuallen asked whether the objective is to establish some kind of more precise minimal standard for all graduates which appears consistent with efforts to recognize differences among students by providing means by which a student may accelerate his movement through a program; or is the objective to accommodate individual differences by requiring enrichment courses for the more able students.

Dr. MacVicar said he felt that the objective should be to establish some kind of standard of ability to convey ideas in written form in the English language, and then provide a wide variety of ways to achieve this competency. He suggested programmed learning and courses in journalism as alternatives to the more traditional courses.

Dr. Lieuallen noted that an important factor in improving the teaching of communications skills is the way the task is looked on by the faculty members who are assigned it. He said he had not noted in the reports from Oregon State University and the University of Oregon any significant emphasis on (1) institutional efforts to reward the people who get this kind of job done well, or (2) the things the institutions must do if faculty members themselves are going to view this as an important task. He said there are a variety of ways a person moves up in the faculty hierarchy and it may be that the teaching of English composition well is not one of them.

Mr. Corey urged that the Board develop an objective in written composition which would provide guidance for all the institutions in the System in the improvement of instruction in composition.

Mrs. Johnson concluded by saying it is imperative that the Committee in its recommendation to the Board indicate to the institutions some of its concerns regarding the teaching of oral and written communication skills.

Committee Recommendation. The Committee on Academic Affairs recommended that the reports of Oregon State University and the University of Oregon experience with changes in institutional requirements in English composition during 1970-71 be accepted; that the institutions be commended for their interest in improving the effectiveness of their programs in written communications.
The Committee further recommended: (1) that the Board express in vigorous, unequivocal terms the importance the Board attaches to (a) the development by students in State System institutions of abilities to communicate effectively in written and spoken English, (b) the necessity of each institution's establishing defensible levels of competency in written communication skills as a graduation requirement, (c) the offering by each institution of learning opportunities in the field of written communications that will meet the needs of the wide range of student abilities and interests to be found in the institution, (d) the fixing within the institution of responsibility for the development and effective offering of the requisite learning opportunities in written communications, (e) the institutions' providing for appropriate recognition in meaningful ways of those faculty who are effective in working with students in the improvement of their communications skills; (2) that the Board extend the provisional approval of the changes in graduation requirements in English composition at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon with a report to be made a year hence concerning progress made in improving instruction in written composition.

Board Discussion and Action

During the discussion, Mr. Joss indicated that he had a number of reservations about the programs and that these were similar to the reservations expressed by Mrs. Johnson during the Committee discussion. However, he indicated that there is merit in dealing with oral and written communication in terms of the student's field of interest. Mrs. Johnson also pointed out that it is important for the Board to be aware of changes that occur in terms of requirements at the high school level in reading and writing skills as they are set forth through the Department of Education.

The Board approved the Committee recommendations as presented in the preceding paragraphs.

Hearing on Board Rules Relating to Maintenance of Student Records in the Institutions

The Board's Office presented to the Academic Affairs Committee at its October 4 meeting a draft of a statement entitled, "Board Rules Relating to Maintenance of Student Records." The Committee, after discussion of the draft, modified it by: (1) excluding the definition of "directory information" in Rule 6, thus leaving to institutional regulations the definition of that term, and (2) adding a phrase to Rule 8 providing that confidential student records can be released without the student's consent upon receipt of a subpoena, or other court order or process. The Board's Office has since added the further stipulation that "Institutional regulations may provide for designated institutional officials to appear in court to test the validity of a subpoena or court order or process relating to the release of student records."

In the course of the discussion of the proposed rules some concern was expressed that Chapter 566 of the Oregon Laws of 1971 stipulates that "access to personal records may be limited to designated classes of information or persons, or to stated times and conditions, or to both, but cannot be limited ... for records more than 25 years old." (Emphasis added.)
With the amendments cited above, the draft of the Board's rules relating to the maintenance of student records was approved by the Committee, which now presents the amended draft for adoption by the Board.

Board Rules Relating to Maintenance of Student Records

Personal and academic records of students must be maintained by institutions of the State System of Higher Education if the institutions are to serve the students' and society's interests effectively.

But as custodians of student records the institutions assume an implicit and justifiable trust - a trust involving the recognition that student records, both academic and personal, are confidential to the student and the institution, except under specified conditions as defined by law, Board rules, or by institutional regulations which are consistent with the law and the Board's rules.

The honoring of that trust is a necessary condition to maintaining the confidence of the students in the integrity of the institution. Without such confidence, the institution's educational and counseling processes are made infinitely more difficult, and in some instances, impossible.

In society, control over information about oneself, like control over bodily security or property can only be relative and qualified, and is limited by the rights of others. Consequently, any policies dealing with the keeping of records must deal with the selective disclosure of those records.

As a general principle, it can be said that the consent of the individual is basic to the maintenance of privacy. Thus, it is the obligation of the institution: (1) to require the written consent of the individual student as a condition to disclosing certain kinds of information about the student to others, and (2) to require his consent prior to collection of certain personal materials concerning such matters as his religious preferences and political beliefs.

Consistent with the foregoing views, and in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 566, Oregon Laws of 1971, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education herewith establishes State System rules and provides for the adoption of institutional regulations governing access to student records of the institutions, and the divisions or departments thereof.
Board Rules Governing Institutional Regulations
Relating to Student Records

1. The Board delegates to the chief executive officer of each institution the responsibility for the development for presentation to the Chancellor and the Board of Higher Education institutional regulations governing the form and variety of student records to be maintained in the institution, the nature of the information to be collected, the way in which such student information is to be recorded, maintained and used, and eventually disposed of, such institutional regulations to be consistent with the laws of Oregon and the administrative rules of the Board of Higher Education.

The Board expects that in the development of these institutional regulations the institutional executives will give faculty and students an important voice, consistent with the nature of the academic community.

2. Definitions:

a. "Personal records" means records containing information kept by the institution, division, or department concerning a student and furnished by him or by others about him at his or at the institution's, division's, or department's request, including, but not limited to, record of grades attained, information concerning discipline, counseling, membership activity, employment performance, or other behavioral records of individual persons.

b. For purposes of compliance with Chapter 566, Oregon Laws of 1971, "records of academic achievement" shall mean the record of credits earned toward a degree and/or degree(s) received.

3. Only such records as are demonstrably and substantially relevant to the educational and related purposes of the institution, division, or department shall be generated or maintained.

4. No student shall be required to give — although he may voluntarily provide — information as to his race, religion, political affiliation or preferences, or personal values, except as required by state statute, federal law, or valid federal rules, regulations, or orders.

5. Official student personal records shall be kept in locations central to the institution, division, or department by which they are maintained, with the custody thereof assigned to designated personnel specifically charged with maintaining the confidentiality of the records in accordance with clearly delineated institutional regulations.
6. Appropriate information about the student may be released without the student's consent. Such unrestricted access shall be limited to the following information:

a. Directory information, that is, information generally needed in identifying or locating a named student.

b. Objective evidence of a student's academic achievement, which is interpreted to be limited to information as to the number of credits and degree(s) earned.

7. All other information in the student records apart from directory information as defined in Rule 6 above shall be considered personal and confidential and subject to the restrictions hereinafter set forth in Rules 8 through 14.

8. Personal records designated as confidential pursuant to Chapter 566, Oregon Laws of 1971, shall be available only to institutional personnel who have a demonstrably legitimate need to review them in order to fulfill their official, professional responsibilities as defined in institutional regulations. These records may not be released to any other person or agency without the student's written consent, unless upon receipt of a subpoena or other court order or process. Institutional regulations may provide for designated institutional officials to appear in court to test the validity of a subpoena or court order or process relating to release of student records.

The institutional executive, or his designated representative, may make exception to the foregoing rule when he determines that there is a clear and present danger to the safety of the student or others and/or property and that disclosure of relevant personal information about the student is essential in order to avoid or substantially minimize the danger.

9. The student shall have the right to review with appropriate institutional personnel any information contained in his records and to petition appropriate institutional officials as defined in institutional regulations for additions or deletions to the record where the accuracy of the information in his file is in question, except in the following instances:

a. Medical and psychological reports

b. Letters of recommendation or evaluations that have been submitted under specified conditions of confidentiality.
10. The need for educational institutions to make available information about the student for research purposes shall be acknowledged and provided for, contingent upon the institution's having adequate provisions to conceal the identity of the student whose personal data or information is being included in the research.

If the regulations protecting the confidentiality of student records would seem to be jeopardized in any way by the release of information for research purposes, institutional regulations shall provide that the institution is to obtain the written consent of the student prior to releasing information about him for research purposes.

11. The individual student's record shall be maintained only for the minimum period of time required to serve the basic official functions of the office which generates and maintains it. It should then be disposed of in a manner such as to protect its confidentiality.

12. The permanent retention of student records shall be limited to those which the institutional executive or the state archivist shall determine to be of long-range value to the individual student or the institution.

13. Duplication of permanent student records shall be kept to a minimum. Such duplicate permanent records as are made shall be destroyed in the same manner as temporary records as set forth in Rule 14 below.

14. All duplicate copies of permanent records and all temporary student records shall be destroyed at a time to be determined and set forth in institutional regulations and in a manner such as to protect their confidentiality.

Special note should be taken that specific meanings have been attached to the terms Board "rules" and institutional "regulations," consistent with the following section of Chapter 734, Oregon Laws of 1971 (the Administrative Procedures Act),

"Rule" means any agency directive, regulation, or statement of general applicability that implements, interprets or prescribes law or policy, or describes the procedure or practice requirements of any agency. The term includes the amendment or repeal of a prior rule, but does not include:

(a) Internal management directives, regulations or statements between agencies, or their officers or their employees, or within an agency, between its officers or between employees, unless hearing is required by statute, or action by agencies directed to other agencies or other units of government.

(b) Declaratory rulings issued pursuant to ORS 183.410 or 305.105.
(c) Intra-agency memoranda.

(d) Executive orders of the Governor.

It is the adoption of the Board's rules for which notice of hearing has been given (in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Administrative Procedures Act). When adopted by the Board, these rules will be filed with and published by the Secretary of State. They will become operative upon such publication.

Institutional regulations, on the other hand, being "internal management directives," as defined in the Administrative Procedures Act, need not be filed with the Secretary of State. They become operative upon adoption by the institution.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Layman indicated that in connection with the hearing presentations in connection with the Board rules relating to maintenance of student records were in order. Mr. Iain More, President of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, indicated his concurrence with the proposed amendment. He said he was particularly pleased that departmental records would also be covered by these rules.

Dr. Ray Hawk, Vice President for Administration and Finance at the University of Oregon, said the proposed amendment was a very good adaptation of existing regulations to fit a new situation and was a great improvement.

Mr. Layman said that a communication on this subject had been received from Mrs. Louise Weidlich, President of Mothers for Children. Mr. Layman asked Mr. Collins to read the letter as a part of the record. The letter appears below:

"Dear Chancellor Lieuallen, President Layman, and Board Members:

"This letter is written in regard to the public hearing, that is in regard to 'Board Policies Relating to Maintenance of Student Records'; I understand that it will be held at Klamath Falls, at the end of this month, when the full Board meets.

"Our group is very concerned with the 'invasion of privacy', which we feel this oversteps, and we feel that a public hearing... far from the center of greatest population does not allow accessibility to very many concerned parents. Klamath Falls is almost 400 miles away, making it almost impossible for those concerned to respond to such a public hearing without considerable expense and difficulty, including a hardship on their families too!"

"We would like to request that you make such a public hearing available, possibly at Portland State, and possibly two other places, such as the St. Johns area and Gresham. Also what about
one in central Oregon, such as Bend, or in the Eugene-Corvalis area? Parents, citizens, taxpayers, and maybe even students should have an opportunity to 'speak to the issue', before the Oregon State Board of Higher Education members...make their final decision.

"Thank you for your consideration in this matter."

Mr. Mosser said that this matter was discussed at the Academic Affairs Committee meeting in Portland. The proposed section increases privacy from invasion, and if further recommendations for its protection are forthcoming from Mrs. Weidlich, they can be considered at any time.

Mr. Layman commented that Mrs. Weidlich had appeared at the Portland Committee meeting in connection with this and other related topics. It was noted also that commencing January 1, 1972, future Board and Committee meetings regularly will be held in Portland.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation that the Board approve the rules covering institutional regulations related to student records, that the regulations be assigned appropriate rule numbers and be adopted as part of the Administrative Rules of the Board.

Note: On October 29, 1971, the rules relating to student records, as approved by the Board, were assigned Administrative Rule numbers and captions and were forwarded to the Office of the Secretary of State for publication in the Administrative Rule Bulletin.

Establishment of Commission on Marine Science

(Considered by the Academic Affairs Committee, October 4, 1971.)

The two universities presently administering marine facilities (OSU, UO) both have distinguished programs in one or more aspects of marine science, or in programs which are dependent on the marine sciences - programs clearly visible on the national scene.

Oregon State University's national eminence in the field of marine science is attested to by the very substantial federal investment in Oregon State University's program in oceanography over the past decade - including the substantial federal funding of a major campus oceanography building, the marine science center at Newport, the gift to Oregon State University of several oceanographic vessels and other equipment.

Also important are state and federally-supported marine biology training grants and research grants in the departments of botany, microbiology, zoology, and fisheries and wildlife.

The crowning recognition of Oregon State University's stature in the marine sciences is the recent announcement (September 1971) by the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration that Oregon State University has been designated a Sea Grant College - one of only four universities in the United States which have thus far been so designated. This designation is expected to have
implications for continuing federal funding of sea grant activities at Oregon State University reminiscent of the continuing federal funding of agricultural research and service which resulted from OSU's designation in 1868 as a land grant institution.

The University of Oregon's national recognition has come, not in the marine sciences as such, but in the specialized fields of biology which are heavily dependent upon access to rich marine resources (currently available to the University at Charleston). These specialized fields, as we have earlier noted, include: comparative and environmental physiology, neurophysiology, developmental biology, molecular biology, and ecology.

The University of Oregon's national recognition has come in the form of major federal grants for the development of these and other sciences at the University (programs considered to be on the verge of national prominence).

- The University of Oregon was in the first group of three universities in the nation to receive a National Science Foundation (NSF) Development Grant ($4 million plus a supplement of $2.1 million).

- More recently, a Health Sciences Advancement Grant of $2.1 million from the National Institutes of Health was given in recognition of the quality of the University of Oregon programs in neurophysiology, developmental biology, and molecular biology, which have national stature. A sum of $50,000 from this grant was used for building renovation at Charleston.

Both Oregon State University and the University of Oregon are agreed as to the necessity for coordination of development of the six marine facilities presently operated by the State System, and any others that may be added, within the framework of a total design for the development of these sciences in Oregon. In addition to these two institutions, other institutions in the State System and other institutions of higher education in Oregon have a stake in decisions concerning the development of marine science resources.

Alternative approaches to achievement of the desired coordination, together with a review of the development of these resources to date, are presented in the document Coordination of Marine Science Developments in the State System: An Interim Report, prepared by the Board's Office for the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs for its October 4, 1971, meeting. This document is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of these minutes.

Board's Office Discussion

The marine science resources of the State System situated on the coast are varied. They consist of facilities in six locations, five of which are administered by Oregon State University, one by the University of Oregon, as follows:
Oregon State University

1. OSU Seafoods Laboratory - Astoria
2. Netarts Bay Aquaculture Research Area - Netarts
3. OSU Marine Science Center - Newport
4. OSU Study Area: Mineral Resources of the Oregon Continental Margin - Off the southern coast of Oregon
5. Marine Research Station - Port Orford

University of Oregon


Oregon State University and the University of Oregon both offer work in marine biology. Oceanography is offered only at Oregon State University where it is a major program.

The relationship of marine biology to oceanography has been described by an oceanographer as follows:

Marine Biology: A large part of the field of Marine Biology deals with that very important, rich zone of life associated with coastal areas of land masses, emphasizing studies of individual animals, their physiology, morphology, and embryology, but, usually, does not emphasize studies of populations in oceanic masses of water and their deep-sea environment and boundaries.

Biological Oceanography: Biological Oceanography embraces many studies pertaining to the seas, including the physics and chemistry of sea water, the ocean boundaries and bottom bathymetry, the different currents, as well as many phases of biology. Perhaps most important, it attempts to integrate all of these various disciplines insofar as they govern the life cycles, population dynamics, and species composition of oceanic organisms. It deals with the variations in time and space that may be related to divergence and convergence zones of the open ocean, to sea bottom conditions, to "desert" areas associated with the central oceanic gyres found in each major ocean, and to primary production of pelagic plants associated with convection of currents and major upwelling regions of the sea. It is also concerned with productivity and population dynamics of coastal estuaries.

The recent announcement from Washington (September 1971) that Oregon State University has been designated a Sea Grant College, with all of the implications that such a designation has for continuing federal support for Oregon State University's marine science programs is the culmination of culmination OSU's efforts to build in the marine sciences strengths paralleling the strengths developed over a century in the agricultural teaching and research fields, an aspect of education basic to the functions of a land grant institution, such as Oregon State University.

Teaching in the marine sciences at Oregon State University is conducted in four schools and a dozen departments, and cooperatively under the Sea Grant program, with the University of Oregon School of Law and Clatsop Community College Technician-training courses.
Marine biology at the University of Oregon is an integral part of the instructional and research programs of the department of biology, although some interdisciplinary studies are being carried on at the department's station at Charleston. (The station also is available for use by other institutions of the System.)

The importance of the Charleston facility's resources to the department of biology stems in important measure from the specific areas of specialization that the department has focused upon: comparative and environmental physiology, neurophysiology, developmental biology, molecular biology, and ecology. These areas of specialization are dependent upon marine resources, the programs in neurophysiology, developmental biology, and ecology particularly so.

The focus of interdisciplinary activities at Charleston has been environmental problems of the Coos Bay estuary. In these studies, multi-disciplinary groups consisting of students in architecture, psychology, urban geography, political science, economics, and biology have analyzed the factors affecting the environmental status of the Coos Bay estuary. Their studies are being utilized by local and regional planning agencies, including the regional office of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

Newport is the center of Oregon State's expansion into marine science. Built in 1965 on the south shore of Yaquina Bay at Newport, the Oregon State University Marine Science Center houses the Yaquina Marine Biology Laboratory, the Pacific Fisheries Laboratory, and a marine museum-aquarium. The center provides docking facilities for Oregon State University's oceanographic vessels, the largest of which is the 180-foot Yaquina.

The buildings at Charleston are all wood frame construction. Remnants of a former Civilian Conservation Corps center, they were built more than thirty years ago. They are structurally substandard, and lacking the teaching, laboratory, and research facilities for more than a minimal program. For the most part, the existing buildings are beyond renovation.

The University of Oregon has acquired four wooden frame buildings from the U.S. Coast Guard for the Institute, to provide minimal, stop-gap facilities for the instructional-research programs being conducted there. These buildings will be renovated to meet reasonable use standards and will become a part of the permanent facility.

Each biennium for a number of biennia, the Board of Higher Education has had on its buildings priority list replacements for the former CCC buildings at Charleston. Always they have been further down on the priority list than would bring them within the building schedule made possible by the legislative appropriation.

Alternative Approaches to Coordination

Among the alternative approaches that conceivably might be considered for achieving coordination in the planning and development of marine science resources are the following:
1. To place the development of marine science resources on the coast under the jurisdiction of a single State System institution, with the admonition that it is the Board's desire that the other institutions of the State System, and to the extent possible, other post-high school agencies and institutions — be given access to the resources in those instances in which the program of study of an institution requires access to marine science resources.

2. To place the development of marine science resources on the coast under the jurisdiction of an autonomous agency such, for instance, as a marine science institute, independent of any of the State System institutions and reporting directly to the Board’s Office and the Board.

3. To provide for coordination of planning and development of marine science programs and resources through the medium of an interinstitutional council having the authority to develop and to present to the Board’s Office and subsequently to the Board’s Committee on Academic Affairs and the Board, long-range, integrated, comprehensive plans for the development of the marine sciences in the State System.

Board’s Office Recommendation

In a meeting in August, involving the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the presidents of Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University, it was agreed that the Board’s Office should seek Board authorization to establish an inter-university commission or council on marine science consisting of representatives of the Board’s Office, and from each of the three universities in the State System (OSU, UO, PSU).

The commission would be assigned the responsibility: (1) to review existing and proposed programs in marine science and to submit recommendations concerning proposed changes in existing or proposed programs, (2) to review proposals for additions to or modifications of existing marine science physical facilities and to recommend to the Board’s Office and the Board any recommended changes in such proposals needed to bring them into line with the program requirements approved for marine science by the Board, and (3) to develop a coordinated comprehensive plan for the development of marine science in the State System of Higher Education.

The Board’s Office presented to the Committee on Academic Affairs the recommendation that such a commission be established, and stated that if authorization to establish the commission were granted, the Board’s Office would aim to meet the timetable proposed in its June 4, 1971, memorandum to the institutional executives, namely, to provide the Board with a proposed comprehensive plan for the development of marine science by the early spring of 1972.
The Board's Office stated that it would propose that in the review of the proposed plan developed by the inter-university council, the Board's Office seek the counsel of objective, knowledgeable persons from outside the State System as a check against the danger of the plan's being too parochial or against its being essentially a self-serving plan.

The Board's Office also stated that the question as to whether the Board's Office should be represented on the commission is an open one. There are advantages to having Board's Office input in the formative stages, but, on the other hand, since the Board's Office must review the proposed plan and provide the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs an objective evaluation of the plan, there may be good reason for the Board's Office to be entirely independent of the commission's operations so as to preserve the proper objectivity in reviewing the proposed plan.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Mosser stated that he felt that responsibility for the administration and development of marine science resources on the coast should be made a responsibility of Oregon State University, which is a sea-grant institution and which has a major development at Newport together with several other marine centers along the coast. He said that he thought the legislature - and certainly he, himself - would feel that any development proposed for Charleston could only be considered in the light of other developments in the marine science resources on the coast. Moreover, he said, he felt that he could not conscientiously approve any developments at Charleston that had not been put into proper perspective as to priority of development by Oregon State University which presently has the major responsibility for marine science resources on the coast. He said that he did not mean that the marine science resources developed on the coast should be available for use only by Oregon State University. Quite the contrary, he said. They must be open to effective use by the University of Oregon, Portland State University, and other institutions for which access to marine science resources are important.

Mrs. Johnson stated that she felt that the marine science resources ought to be available to other institutions of the State System - and beyond - where such resources are important to the institution's program.

Mr. Corey expressed the view that the proposed commission would, in the process of developing its recommendations for consideration by the Board, provide information which he felt was essential to the Board's understanding fully the alternatives for achieving the necessary coordination in the development of the marine science sources. He stated that before considering a policy placing Charleston's administration under Oregon State University, he would like to see the report of the proposed commission.
Dr. Lieuallen observed that it was the intention of the Board’s Office, should a commission be authorized, to appoint to the commission representatives from the three universities; that these representatives would not be marine scientists who stood to be affected directly by the decisions made by the commission, but would be, rather, high level administrators from the three universities who are somewhat removed from marine science and can therefore perhaps be more objective than might be professors who are using the facilities. He said that should the report of the commission appear to be providing the kind of coordination necessary, he would envision that the commission might be given a continuing responsibility for coordination of planning of marine science resources.

Dr. Romney said that some question had been raised as to whether the Board’s Office should be represented on such a commission since the Board’s Office would be required to evaluate the recommendations made by the commission in preparing them for presentation to the Board. Mr. Nasser said that he felt that if such a commission were to be authorized, the Board’s Office ought not to be represented on it, for the reason cited above.

President Clark urged that the Board not remove from the University of Oregon responsibility for the administration of the Charleston center. He emphasized the integral relationship between the administration of such a center and its effective use by faculty to whom work access to such a center is indispensable. He said that to remove from an institution such as the University of Oregon, which has programs of national repute in aspects of biology that rely heavily upon access to marine biology sources on the coast, responsibility for the administration of the marine center necessary to the programs would be to deprive the faculty of the kind of vital connection with the center that is indispensable to their fullest use of it. He said that the impact of a decision to remove the administration of Charleston center from the University of Oregon would have a devastating effect upon the general state of morale of key faculty members at the University of Oregon and would, in addition, he felt, militate against the University of Oregon’s fullest use of the marine science resources.

President MacVicar stated that Oregon State University would, as a member of the State System, provide services in respect to marine science as it was directed. He said Oregon State University had refrained from providing undergraduate summer programs at Newport in the past, not because of lack of interest or because the marine resources at Newport were not conducive to this type of study, but because these programs were already being provided adequately at Charleston by the University of Oregon. Indeed, he continued, a large number of undergraduates at Oregon State University in the departments of zoology and botany and other science areas are pursuing programs centered in the marine sciences.

Committee Recommendation. The Board’s Committee on Academic Affairs recommended that an inter-university commission on marine science be formed, consisting of representatives of each of the three universities of the State System (OSU, UO, PSU), but not including in a
voting capacity a representative of the Board's Office. (This would not preclude assignment of a member of the Board's Office staff to provide staff assistance to the commission, should that seem wise.) The commission will be assigned responsibility (1) to review existing and proposed programs in marine science and to submit recommendations concerning proposed changes in existing or proposed programs, (2) to review proposals for additions to or modifications of existing marine science physical facilities and to recommend to the Board's Office and the Board any recommended changes in such proposals needed to bring them into line with the program requirements approved for marine science by the Board, and (3) to develop a coordinated comprehensive plan for the development of marine science in the State System of Higher Education, with opportunities for participation by the institutions of the System, the community colleges, independent colleges and universities, and public schools, to be provided to the Board by the early spring of 1972.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Holmes said that he did not favor combining the two facilities. He said they were serving totally different and dissimilar functions and were being administered properly now. However, when the inter-university commission on marine science has completed its report, he will study the recommendations.

Mr. Mosser referred to his remarks during the Committee discussion in which he indicated that the marine science program should be a responsibility of Oregon State University, and any development of the facilities at Charleston should be considered in that context. On the other hand, he said he would prefer two separate programs rather than to have an autonomous committee or commission administering a single marine science program.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented. Mr. Mosser and Mr. Holmes voted against the motion.

Hearing on Delegation of Authority for Granting Certain Easements

(Considered by Board on September 7, 1971)

Section 60.160 of the Board's Administrative Rules reads as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>60.160 Conveyances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorized conveyances of all real property shall be approved by the Attorney General or his appointee, and executed by the President and Secretary of the Board. (See also ORS 351.150)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORS 351.150, referred to above, provides that all conveyances of real property owned by the State of Oregon for the benefit of institutions under the control of the Board shall be executed by the President and Secretary of the Board.

Inasmuch as easements have been interpreted traditionally as conveyances of interests in real property, individual requests for them have been referred to the Board for approval or other action. The
Board may wish to revise this procedure by granting general authority to the President and Secretary of the Board to execute certain easements.

Accordingly, it was recommended that Section 60.161 be added to the Board's Administrative Rules as follows:

60.161 Easements

The President and the Secretary of the Board are authorized without Board approval to execute easements affecting real property owned by the State of Oregon for the benefit of institutions under the control of the Board in accordance with the following:

1. The easement shall be recommended by the Chancellor or the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning and shall be in a form approved by the Board's attorney.

2. If the property affected is within the approved projected campus boundaries, or the area of development of Portland State University, the easement shall relate only to underground utilities with appropriate access.

3. If the property affected is not within the approved projected campus boundaries, or the area of development of Portland State University, the easement shall relate either to utilities or to rights of way for access to adjacent properties.

4. Easements granting any rights in real property other than those indicated in 2. and 3., above, shall be approved by the Board prior to their execution by the President and the Secretary of the Board.

The Board on September 7, 1971, gave preliminary approval to the recommendation as presented and directed that the Board conduct a public hearing and give final consideration to the addition of Section 60.161, as shown above, to the Board's Administrative Rules at its meeting scheduled for October 25, 1971.

Board Discussion and Action

President Layman indicated that presentations were in order in connection with the hearing on the proposed addition to the Administrative Rules with respect to easements. There was no oral or written response to his request.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.
On October 23, 1967, the Board approved a recommendation to modify its policy statement regarding bid procedures in order to reflect an intent to bid projects of $1,000,000 or less on a lump-sum basis and to anticipate including built-in furniture work, in most instances, as a part of the General Work contract.

Specifically, the wording of the policy statement for "bid procedures" which has been incorporated within the capital construction policies followed by the institutions and the Board's Office is stated as follows:

"Normally, in soliciting bids, the Board will seek separate quotations for at least three major categories of work (general, mechanical and electrical). However, in most instances involving direct construction cost estimates of $1,000,000 or less, or when the project consists principally of alterations to an existing building, a single bid will be sought for the work. Furthermore, when it is estimated that less than $100,000 will be spent for any one of the categories of work, that category will be lumped together with one or more of the other categories.

"These policies shall not preclude the possibility of soliciting separate bids for certain portions of work, such as built-in fixtures or special equipment items involving substantial sums if, in the judgment of the appropriate Board officials, such procedures appear necessary or desirable."

In recognition of price escalation, it was recommended that this policy statement be modified to substitute $1,500,000 in lieu of $1,000,000 for the estimated direct construction cost of projects for which separate bids would be received for the three major categories of work (general, mechanical and electrical).

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.

In authorizing the expenditure of 1971-1973 capital outlay funds for the conversion of Todd Hall at Oregon College of Education to educational and general use and for remodeling within Churchill Hall at Southern Oregon College, the State Emergency Board's action on September 24, 1971, was taken with the understanding that the Executive Department would unschedule a corresponding amount from the current operating budget of the Department of Higher Education. Accordingly, the balance in the Board's reserve for physical plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay has been reduced by $57,500.
Meeting #399-58
October 25, 1971

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Allocation for Membership in Malheur Environmental Field Station Consortium

Public and private colleges and universities in Oregon have established a consortium for the operation of the Malheur Environmental Field Station on the site of a former Job Corps Center. David R. Malcolm, chairman of the Field Station Advisory Council, has written to request payment by the Oregon State System of Higher Education of the annual assessment described in the Consortium Agreement ("$0.30 for each full-time equivalent student enrolled at the end of the second week of registration during the fall term or semester"). The Agreement calls for payment by October 31.

Conversion of second week headcount enrollment to estimated full-time equivalent would call for payment of 30 cents for each of 49,277 FTE students (omitting UOMS and UODS), or $14,783.

It was recommended that the Board authorize the payment from the Board's Reserve to the Malheur Environmental Field Station of $14,783 for year 1971-72.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Mosser moved that the recommendation be approved. Mrs. Johnson said she understood that Mr. Mosser's motion called for an allocation to cover the payment for only the one year 1971-72. She asked that copies of the consortium agreement be made available to Board members.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

CONDITION OF BOARD'S UNAPPROPRIATED FUND AND SPECIAL RESERVES

As of October 25, 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 reported as of September 7, 1971</td>
<td>$ 45,811.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Amount approved by the Chancellor for OSU's participation in the Governor's Task Force to Study Use of Adair Air Force Base</td>
<td>$ 742.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount for OSSHE membership in Malheur Environmental Field Station Consortium per October 25 docket item</td>
<td>$14,783.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance estimated as of October 25, 1971</td>
<td>$ 30,286.00</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 September 7, 1971</td>
<td>$ 394,168.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Amount unscheduled by State Emergency Board action of September 24, 1971, in authorizing expenditure of capital construction funds</td>
<td>$ 57,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount approved by Vice Chancellor Hunderup for PSU, reported in October docket</td>
<td>$ 10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance estimated as of October 25, 1971</td>
<td>$ 326,668.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting #399-59

October 25, 1971

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

$3,000,000 State of Oregon, State Board of Higher Education Building Bonds, Series 1972 A

(Considered by Finance Committee, October 5, 1971.)

The proposed bond issue in the amount of $3,000,000 will provide permanent funding for the planning, construction, and equipping of Arnold Hall and Bloss Hall at Oregon State University. Temporary funding was provided by an earlier bond issue. The refunding has been required to meet regulations of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development as a condition precedent to final approval of a Debt Service Grant.

The release of funds previously provided for the temporary financing of the Arnold and Bloss Halls construction projects, coupled with approximately $1,700,000 of unallocated proceeds from previous XI-F(1) bond issues, is expected to be sufficient to finance all XI-F(1) projects planned between now and July 1, 1972. These include the Medical School parking project, Oregon College of Education student center project, University of Oregon utility extension, and a roofing project at Portland State University.

It was proposed that the Committee recommend Board adoption of the bond resolution at the October 25, 1971, Board meeting, and that the Board’s staff be authorized to advertise the bonds for sale, receive and tabulate bids, and make appropriate recommendation to the Board for sale of the bonds on December 14, 1971.
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION deems it necessary, pursuant to law, including Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, Chapter 709, Oregon Laws 1971, and applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351, to sell general obligation STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION BUILDING BONDS, SERIES 1972 A, of the State of Oregon, in the principal amount of $3,000,000 to provide funds to plan, construct, alter, repair, furnish and equip buildings and other structures for higher education, to purchase and improve sites therefor, and for payment of costs incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds; and

WHEREAS, THE BOARD, as required by ORS 351.160, has determined conservatively that said buildings and other structures will be wholly self-liquidating and self-supporting from revenues to accrue from the operation thereof and from gifts, grants, or building fees, and from unobligated revenues of higher education buildings or projects of like character; and

WHEREAS, THE BOARD is authorized and directed by ORS 351.170 to establish such rates, charges, and fees for use of such buildings, structures or projects, including revenue-producing buildings and structures already constructed, as, in the judgment of the Board, shall provide the required revenues to make the new buildings, structures or projects self-liquidating and self-supporting, and as shall provide the funds with which to amortize the principal of and pay the interest on bonds issued to finance such buildings, structures or projects; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE STATE OF OREGON, that, with the approval of the State Treasurer of the State of Oregon, THREE MILLION DOLLARS ($3,000,000) par value of bonds, authorized by law, including Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, Chapter 709, Oregon Laws 1971, and applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351, be issued and sold; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said bonds totaling THREE MILLION DOLLARS ($3,000,000) par value be issued and the proceeds from the sale of these STATE OF OREGON, STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION BUILDING BONDS, SERIES 1972 A be used to plan, construct, alter, repair, furnish and equip buildings and other structures for higher education, to purchase and improve sites therefor, and for payment of costs incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds, as provided by law, including Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, Chapter 709, Oregon Laws 1971, and applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the principal of and the interest on all of the bonds issued pursuant to this resolution be paid on the due dates thereof at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, and that the said bonds be designated STATE OF OREGON, STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION BUILDING BONDS, SERIES 1972 A, and be numbered consecutively; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said bonds be dated January 15, 1972, and be issued in denominations of $5,000 each, to mature upon the dates and in the principal installments hereinafter in this resolution set forth, subject to redemption in regular numerical order at par value and accrued interest on any interest-paying day or days on and after April 15, 1981, from the moneys and revenues indicated by law, including Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, Chapter 709, Oregon Laws 1971, and applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351, or through refunding; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the maturity dates and principal installments of said bonds be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1974</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1975</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1976</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1977</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1978</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1979</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1980</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1981</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1982</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1983</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1984</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1985</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1986</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1987</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1988</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1989</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1990</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1991</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1992</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1993</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1994</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1995</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1996</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1997</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1998</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 1999</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2001</td>
<td>205,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State Board of Higher Education furnish to the original purchaser of said bonds, without cost to him, the written opinion of accredited bond attorneys certifying to the validity and legality of the said bonds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said bonds be the direct general obligations of the State of Oregon, and that, except as to variations of interest rates and maturities, they be of uniform tenor and be in substantially the following form, prepared by the Attorney General of the State of Oregon:

Number | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | Number
-------|---------------------------|-------
       | STATE OF OREGON          |       
       | STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION | BUILDING BOND |
$5,000 | SERIES 1972 A            | $5,000|

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that the STATE OF OREGON acknowledges itself to owe and for value received hereby promises to pay to bearer the principal sum of ____________________________ FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS ____________________________ ($5,000) on the fifteenth day of April, 19__ , with interest on said sum from the date hereof until paid, at the rate of PERCENT (%) per annum, payable semiannually on the fifteenth day of April and the fifteenth day of October in each year, as evidenced by, and upon the presentation and surrender of, the interest coupons hereto annexed as they severally become due. Both the principal of and the interest on this bond are payable
at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America.

The bonds of the issue of which this bond forms a part, maturing on and after April 15, 1982, may be redeemed at the option of the State of Oregon, on and after April 15, 1981, at par and accrued interest, on any interest-paying day or days in regular numerical order or in the entire amount of the issue outstanding at call date, upon notice given by the Treasurer of the State of Oregon at least thirty (30) days prior to the redemption date specified therein, by publication thereof in one issue of a newspaper or financial journal of general circulation printed and published within the City and State of New York, and one issue of a newspaper of general circulation printed and published within the City of Salem, Oregon. From the date of redemption designated in any such notice, interest on the bonds so called for redemption shall cease.

This bond is issued by the State of Oregon in conformance to its Constitution and under and by virtue of and in all respects in full and strict compliance with its laws, and in particular Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution, Chapter 709, Oregon Laws 1971, and applicable provisions of ORS Chapter 351, for the purpose of financing the cost to plan, construct, alter, repair, furnish and equip buildings and other structures for higher education, to purchase and improve sites therefor, and for payment of costs incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds.

The faith and credit of the State of Oregon hereby are irrevocably pledged to the punctual payment of the interest on and the principal of this bond as the same become due and payable respectively.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, the STATE OF OREGON has caused this bond to be signed by the Governor and by the Secretary of State with their facsimile signatures, and by the State Treasurer, and sealed with the seal of the State of Oregon, and has caused the annexed interest coupons to be executed with the facsimile signatures of its said officers, all as of the fifteenth day of January, 1972.

__________________________
Governor

(SZAL)

__________________________
Secretary of State

__________________________
Treasurer
FORM OF COUPON
(For coupons maturing on April 15, 1972)

No. _______ On the fifteenth day of April, 1972, THE $_______
STATE OF OREGON will pay the bearer

_____________________________ DOLLARS

at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and
State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time
of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and
private debts within the United States of America, for three
months' interest then due on State of Oregon, State Board of
Higher Education Building Bond, Series 1972 A, No. _______.

(facsimile) (facsimile) (facsimile)
State Treasurer Secretary of State Governor

FORM OF COUPON
(For coupons maturing on October 15, 1972, up
to and including April 15, 1981)

No. _______ On the fifteenth day of October, 1972, THE $_______
STATE OF OREGON will pay the bearer

_____________________________ DOLLARS

at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State
of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment,
is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within
the United States of America, for six months' interest then due on
State of Oregon, State Board of Higher Education Building Bond,
Series 1972 A, No. _______.

(facsimile) (facsimile) (facsimile)
State Treasurer Secretary of State Governor
FORM OF COUPON

October 25, 1971

(For coupons maturing after April 15, 1981)

No._______ On the fifteenth day of October, 1981, unless the bond hereinafter designated shall have been called for previous redemption and due provision made for the payment thereof, THE STATE OF OREGON will pay the bearer

$_______ DOLLARS

at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America, for six months' interest then due on State of Oregon, State Board of Higher Education Building Bond, Series 1972 A, No._______.

(facsimile) State Treasurer

(facsimile) Secretary of State

(facsimile) Governor

The foregoing bond and coupon forms hereby are approved as to legal form this day of 1971.

LEE JOHNSON, Attorney General of the State of Oregon

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, as provided by ORS 351.430, the Secretary of the State Board of Higher Education be and he hereby is authorized to advertise the said STATE OF OREGON, STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION BUILDING BONDS, SERIES 1972 A, for public sale thereof on or about December 14, 1971, at a price of not less than $98 for each $100 par value thereof, and the accrued interest thereon, and the notice of sale to specify that the Board reserves the right to reject any or all bids for the bonds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary and Vice Chancellor for Administration of the State Board of Higher Education be authorized to effect the necessary arrangements to deliver the bonds and to receive payment therefor.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Holmer reported that the Attorney General had questioned whether the cost of obtaining the opinion of accredited bond attorneys certifying as to the validity and legality of the bonds should be paid by the purchaser instead of by the Board from the proceeds of the bonds. Consequently, subsequent discussions with the Attorney General may result in the deletion of the paragraph in the resolution which refers to the provision of such an opinion. Further information is expected to be available at the time of the October 25 Board meeting.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Upon motion by Director Mosser, the resolution was duly adopted as read with the following voting in favor of adoption: Directors Holmes, Johnson, Joss, Mosser, Snider, Stewart and Layman. Mr. Corey had left the meeting prior to the roll call vote.

Those voting no: None.

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

(Considered by Finance Committee, October 5, 1971.)

$5,500,000 State of Oregon, Community College and Education Center Bonds, Series 1972

The Board of Education has requested the Board of Higher Education to sell, with the approval of the State Treasurer, $5,500,000 par value general obligation bonds of the State of Oregon, pursuant to Chapter 310, Oregon Laws 1971, and Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution. Proceeds from the bonds will be used for state aid on building projects for community colleges and education centers.

It was proposed that the Committee recommend Board approval of compliance with the request of the Board of Education, adoption of the bond resolution at the October 25, 1971, Board meeting, and that the Board's staff be authorized to advertise the bonds for sale, receive and tabulate bids, and make appropriate recommendation to the Board for sale of the bonds on December 14, 1971.
WHEREAS, THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION has received a certification dated August 26, 1971, from the State Board of Education, pursuant to law, including Chapter 310, Oregon Laws 1971, that the State Board of Education requests the sale of $5,500,000 bonds authorized for issuance for community colleges and education centers under Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution; and

WHEREAS, THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, with the approval of the State Treasurer, shall sell such general obligation bonds of the State of Oregon, of the kind and character prescribed by said Article as the State Board of Education determines is necessary to provide an aggregate amount not exceeding $5,500,000 for state aid on building projects for community colleges and education centers, as authorized by law, including Chapter 310, Oregon Laws 1971; and

WHEREAS, THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION deems it necessary, pursuant to law, including Chapter 310, Oregon Laws 1971, to sell general obligation STATE OF OREGON, COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND EDUCATION CENTER BONDS, SERIES 1972, in the principal amount of $5,500,000 to provide for state aid on building projects for community colleges and education centers; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE STATE OF OREGON that, with the approval of the State Treasurer of the State of Oregon, FIVE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($5,500,000) par value of bonds, authorized by law, including Article XI-G of the Constitution of the State of Oregon and Chapter 310, Oregon Laws 1971, be issued and sold; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said bonds totaling FIVE MILLION FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($5,500,000) par value be issued and the proceeds from the sale of these STATE OF OREGON, COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND EDUCATION CENTER BONDS, SERIES 1972 be used for the purpose of providing for state aid on building projects for community colleges and education centers as provided by law, including Chapter 310, Oregon Laws 1971, and for payment of costs incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the principal of and the interest on all of the bonds issued pursuant to this resolution be paid on the due dates thereof at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, and that the said bonds be designated STATE OF OREGON, COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND EDUCATION CENTER BONDS, SERIES 1972 and be numbered consecutively; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said bonds be dated January 15, 1972, and be issued in denominations of $5,000 each, to mature upon the dates and in the principal installments hereinafter in this resolution set forth, subject to redemption in regular numerical order at par value and accrued interest on any interest-paying day or days on and after January 15, 1982, from the moneys and revenues indicated by law, including Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution, and Chapter 310, Oregon Laws 1971; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the maturity dates and principal installments of said bonds be as follows:

January 15, 1975 $ 95,000 January 15, 1989 $185,000
January 15, 1976 100,000 January 15, 1990 195,000
January 15, 1977 105,000 January 15, 1991 205,000
January 15, 1978 110,000 January 15, 1992 215,000
January 15, 1979 115,000 January 15, 1993 225,000
January 15, 1980 120,000 January 15, 1994 235,000
January 15, 1981 125,000 January 15, 1995 250,000
January 15, 1982 130,000 January 15, 1996 260,000
January 15, 1983 135,000 January 15, 1997 275,000
January 15, 1984 140,000 January 15, 1998 290,000
January 15, 1985 145,000 January 15, 1999 305,000
January 15, 1986 150,000 January 15, 2000 320,000
January 15, 1987 155,000 January 15, 2001 335,000
January 15, 1988 160,000 January 15, 2002 345,000

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the State Board of Higher Education furnish to the original purchaser of said bonds, without cost to him, the written opinion of accredited bond attorneys certifying to the validity and legality of the said bonds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said bonds be the direct general obligations of the State of Oregon, and that, except as to the variations in the interest rates and maturities; they be of uniform tenor, and be in substantially the following form, prepared by the Attorney General of the State of Oregon:

Number $5,000
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
STATE OF OREGON
COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND
EDUCATION CENTER BOND
SERIES 1972

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, that the STATE OF OREGON acknowledges itself to owe and for value received hereby promises to pay to bearer the principal sum of $5,000 on the fifteenth day of January 1975 , with interest on said sum from the date hereof until paid, at the rate of 7 PERCENT ( %) per annum, payable semiannually on the fifteenth day of January and the fifteenth day of July in each year, as evidenced by, and upon the presentation and surrender of, the interest coupons hereto annexed as they severally become due. Both the principal of and the interest on this bond are payable at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America.

The bonds of the issue of which this bond forms a part, maturing on and after January 15, 1983, may be redeemed at the option of the State of Oregon, on and after January 15, 1982, at par and accrued interest, on any interest-paying day or days in regular numerical order or in the entire amount of the issue outstanding at call date, upon notice given by the
Treasurer of the State of Oregon at least thirty (30) days prior to the redemption date specified therein, by publication thereof in one issue of a newspaper or financial journal of general circulation printed and published within the City and State of New York, and one issue of a newspaper of general circulation printed and published within the City of Salem, Oregon. From the date of redemption designated in any such notice, interest on the bonds so called for redemption shall cease.

This bond is issued by the State of Oregon in conformance to its Constitution and under and by virtue of and in all respects in full and strict compliance with its laws, and in particular Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution and Chapter 310, Oregon Laws 1971, for the purpose of providing for state aid on building projects for community colleges and education centers, and for payment of costs incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds.

The faith and credit of the State of Oregon hereby are irrevocably pledged to the punctual payment of the interest on and the principal of this bond as the same become due and payable respectively.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, the STATE OF OREGON has caused this bond to be signed by the Governor and by the Secretary of State with their facsimile signatures, and by the State Treasurer, and sealed with the seal of the State of Oregon, and has caused the annexed interest coupons to be executed with the facsimile signatures of its said officers, all as of the fifteenth day of January, 1972.

Governor

(S Seal)

Secretary of State

State Treasurer
FORM OF COUPON

(For coupons maturing on July 15, 1972, up
to and including January 15, 1982)

No. On the day of , 19 , THE $_______
STATE OF OREGON will pay the bearer

__________________________ DOLLARS

at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America, for six months' interest then due on State of Oregon, Community College and Education Center Bond, Series 1972, No.__________.

(facsimile) (facsimile) (facsimile)
State Treasurer Secretary of State Governor

(For coupons maturing after January 15, 1982)

No. On the day of , 19 , $_______
unless the bond hereinafter designated shall have been called for previous redemption and due provision made for the payment thereof, THE STATE OF OREGON will pay the bearer

__________________________ DOLLARS

at the Fiscal Agency of the State of Oregon, in the City and State of New York, in any coin or currency which, at the time of payment, is legal tender for the payment of public and private debts within the United States of America, for six months' interest then due on State of Oregon, Community College and Education Center Bond, Series 1972, No.__________.

(facsimile) (facsimile) (facsimile)
State Treasurer Secretary of State Governor

The foregoing bond and coupon forms hereby are approved as to legal form as of the day of , 1971.

LEE JOHNSON, Attorney General of the State of Oregon
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, as provided by ORS 351.430, the Secretary of the State Board of Higher Education be and he is hereby authorized to advertise the said STATE OF OREGON, COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND EDUCATION CENTER BONDS, SERIES 1972, for public sale thereof on or about December 14, 1971, at a price of not less than $100 for each $100 par value thereof, and the accrued interest thereon, and the notice of sale to specify that the Board reserves the right to reject any or all bids for the bonds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Secretary and Vice Chancellor for Administration of the State Board of Higher Education be authorized to effect the necessary arrangements to deliver the bonds and to receive payment therefor.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

It was indicated that this bond resolution would also be subject to the possible deletion of the paragraph relating to the opinion of an accredited bond attorney with respect to the bonds.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Upon motion by Director Mosser, the resolution was duly adopted as read with the following voting in favor of adoption: Directors Holmes, Johnson, Joss, Mosser, Snider, Stewart, and Layman. Mr. Corey had left the meeting prior to the roll call vote.

Those voting no: None.

The President of the Board thereupon declared said resolution duly adopted by a unanimous vote of those present.
Advance Acquisition of Land Program of Federal Government

(Considered by Finance Committee, October 5, 1971.)

The Department of Housing and Urban Development awarded a grant to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, entitled, "Advance Acquisition of Land Program," which was accepted by the Board on April 29, 1968. A provision of the basic grant provided that fifty-six (56) certain parcels would be acquired under this program located within the authorized land acquisition boundaries of the campuses of the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University, with federal assistance in form of interest reimbursement on the bonds that finance the acquisitions. In order to realize the maximum federal assistance under this program, the number of parcels has been increased from fifty-six (56) to seventy-nine (79) and the said parcels have been specifically identified.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development now requires that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education approve and adopt by a Resolution the First Amendatory of subject grant agreement, Project No. AL-6-38-0001, Contract No. H-602-2610.

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION APPROVING AND PROVIDING FOR THE EXECUTION OF AN AMENDATORY CONTRACT FOR A GRANT FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE UNDER SECTION 704 OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1965 BY AND BETWEEN THE OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BE IT RESOLVED by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education:

1. That the pending proposed amendatory contract for a grant for financial assistance under Section 704 of the Housing Act of 1965 is hereby in all respects approved.

2. That Freeman Holmer, Vice Chancellor for Administration, of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, is hereby authorized and directed to execute Contract No. H-602-2610 in two (2) counterparts on behalf of said Board and the Secretary of the Board, Richard L. Collins, is hereby authorized and directed to impress and attest the official seal of the Applicant on each such counterpart and to forward such counterparts to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, for execution on behalf of the Government together with such other documents relative to the approval and execution of such counterparts as may be required by the Government.

3. That Freeman Holmer is authorized to execute, file and request requisition of funds as may be appropriate.

4. That this Resolution shall take effect immediately.

Discussion and Action by the Committee

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

Upon motion by Director Mosser, the Board approved the recommendation and the above resolution was duly adopted as read, with the following voting in favor of adoption: Directors Holmes, Johnson, Joss, Mosser, Snider, Stewart, and Layman. Mr. Corey had left the meeting prior to the roll call vote.

Those voting no: None.

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

Selection of Investment Managers

(Considered by Finance Committee, October 5, 1971.)

Twenty investment management firms were invited to submit offers for the management of the Endowment and Quasi-Endowment funds under control of the Board of Higher Education. Proposals were received from all of the firms.

The Committee on Finance interviewed representatives of five firms. Additional interviews will be held, after which a recommendation will be made to the Board.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Mosser indicated that a legal opinion was being requested as to the extent to which the endowment and quasi-endowment funds can be pooled.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented. It was indicated that additional interviews were scheduled for November 2 and that further report would be made to the Board.

Report of Finance Committee

The Committee on Finance and Business Affairs received a report from the Vice Chancellor for Administration at its meeting on October 5, 1971. This report summarized developments in connection with various activities in the Office of Administration.

The Committee discussed the following topics in some detail:

1. The University of Oregon comment on the Bardsley & Haslacher Survey on the "Marketing of Dormitory Housing."

2. Administrative data processing.

3. Enrollment report.

Additional information is expected to be available or was requested by the Committee in connection with each of these subjects. Any recommendations with respect to these items will be presented to the Board following further consideration by the Finance Committee.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Presentations Concerning OSPIRG

Mr. Layman stated that arrangements had been made for presentations concerning OSPIRG by Mr. Gerald Swibies, State Director of Public Relations for the Students for an Informed Republic, and by Mr. Bernard H. Merrill, Chairman, OSPIRG State Board of Directors. Mr. Layman indicated that each individual had been allocated ten minutes for his presentation and noted that no item pertaining to OSPIRG was on the agenda for Board action at the October meeting. He then requested Mr. Swibies to make his presentation.

Mr. Swibies said that his organization maintained that voluntary support would sustain any organization which justifies itself and its cause to the students. In his statement, Mr. Swibies presented detailed objections to certain management and fiscal practices of the OSPIRG organization. He said that it is imperative that OSPIRG generate honest financial support from truly concerned and dedicated supporters. He urged that the Board establish controls on the organization which would correct the objections presented in his report.

Mr. Layman asked Mr. Swibies about the extent of membership in his organization and its representation on State System campuses.

Mr. Swibies said several hundred individual students throughout the campuses of Oregon are actual members, and many others do support its activities. A specific chapter, as such, is located at Southern Oregon College.

Mrs. Johnson said that Mr. Swibies was identifying some of the problems which the Board had anticipated in its earlier discussions. She said her concern was with the method by which the funds collected on an individual campus are sent to the state organization of OSPIRG for distribution to the local projects and who makes the decision concerning the distribution.

The Chancellor responded that conferences were being held with the Secretary of State's Office and Controller's Office and with representatives of OSPIRG in order to develop a procedure for the distribution of funds which would meet the requirements of the Audits Division and the Board's Office for adequate accountability.

The Chancellor explained that the money collected locally is deposited to an account in the Controller's Office. A bonded member of the OSPIRG group is assigned a revolving fund from the Board's revolving fund. The expenses of OSPIRG are paid from the assigned revolving fund and periodically a requisition, supported by an expenditure accounting, will be submitted to the Controller for reimbursement of the expenditures of OSPIRG. This list of expenditures will include
a certification that the funds were spent in accordance with the Board's understanding with OSPIRG and with the articles of incorporation of OSPIRG.

If the Controller identifies any expenditures which do not appear to be in accordance with those provisions, the Chancellor will be notified so that appropriate action can be taken. The arrangements referred to are between the Chancellor's Office and the state organization of OSPIRG. The allocations of funds from the state OSPIRG to the local OSPIRG chapters would appear on the list of expenditures for the State OSPIRG. Finances of local OSPIRG chapters will be handled primarily through a relationship between state OSPIRG and the local OSPIRG groups.

Mr. Layman indicated that Mr. Bernard Merrill had also requested the opportunity to appear before the Board in connection with OSPIRG.

Mr. Merrill responded to the statements regarding OSPIRG by Mr. Swibies, and indicated that many of them resulted from misinformation and misinterpretation.

Mr. Merrill then reported in some detail regarding OSPIRG procedures and practices and stated that all of them were in accord with proper accounting and business principles and with the purposes expressed in the articles of incorporation which had been filed for the organization.

Mr. Merrill responded affirmatively to a question from Mr. Layman as to whether the state OSPIRG group had removed from its articles of incorporation the statement concerning litigation. The organization does not have litigative powers except for those that pertain to it as a corporation. He said the OSPIRG organization has an agreement with the Chancellor that no funds, either those voluntarily solicited or those automatically collected, would be used in any capacity for litigation.

During the discussion, it was indicated that the amount of money deposited with the Controller for OSPIRG from student collections exceeds the amount advanced by the Controller to OSPIRG in the assigned revolving fund.

Mrs. Johnson said that it was her understanding at the time OSPIRG was approved that local groups would elect representatives to the State organization and that requests for projects would be transmitted to the state OSPIRG group for review through the elected representative from each campus. The state group would review the projects and institute the research, and pay the necessary expenses to carry out the project.

Mr. Merrill responded that all funds are expended from the state office by the disbursing agent of OSPIRG who is the treasurer for the organization. Some of these expenses may be incurred at the local board level, but they are reviewed prior to payment and then paid by the OSPIRG treasurer from the revolving fund previously outlined. He said also that local groups have the recall power if the state organization is not fulfilling its purpose to their satisfaction.
President Layman announced that the next regular meeting of the Board would be held on December 14, 1971, on the campus of Portland State University.

Regular meetings of the Board's Committees are scheduled for November 22 and 23 at Portland State University and the Division of Continuing Education Building in Portland.

COMMUNICATIONS, Mr. Collins indicated that a communication had been received from Mr. Irwin S. Adams, Executive Vice President for the North Clackamas County Chamber of Commerce on the subject of OSPIRG. He read the following resolution passed by the Chamber of Commerce:

"The North Clackamas County Chamber of Commerce opposes the mandatory method of collecting fees for the OSPIRG group."

Mr. Collins then read the concluding paragraph of the letter which further explains the position of the organization:

"It is the position of the North Clackamas County Chamber of Commerce that our young people should be encouraged to 'work within the system'. However, we respectfully urge the Oregon State Board of Higher Education to rescind the mandatory collection feature as not consonant with the functions reposed in that official body."

Mr. Collins indicated that the letter had been acknowledged.

In response to a question, the Chancellor indicated that he had been in extensive communication with Mr. Adams, and that it was clear that the communication was intended to refer to state-wide activities of OSPIRG, rather than to activities within the area of Clackamas County.
### SUMMARY OF GIFTS AND GRANTS TO DATE
**FOR YEAR 1971-72**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Total</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 26, 1971</td>
<td>$11,089,024.94</td>
<td>$11,089,024.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 1971</td>
<td>10,747,750.43</td>
<td>21,836,775.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26, 1971</td>
<td>10,814,998.92</td>
<td>32,651,774.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 $9,490.32 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Details</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association of University Women,</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos Bay, OR Branch, North Bend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoco Production Foundation Inc. Special,</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 1748, Seaside</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Johnson Research Fellowships</td>
<td>$1,592.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction City High School Student Body</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Union High School</td>
<td>$325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln County School District, Newport</td>
<td>$918.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State Chapter, P.E.O. Sisterhood, Portland</td>
<td>$1,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's High School, Medford</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Pacific College, Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroptimist Club, Brookings</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset High School, Beaverton</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agency for International Development**

Grant of $102,111 from the Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., "to accommodate expenditures for a program of assistance to Turkey for Improvement of Wheat Production," April 1, 1971, through March 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Harry E. Clark, State Extension Specialist.

**Colorado State University**

Grant of $1,000 from Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, for research entitled, "Analysis of Structure and Function on Grassland Ecosystems," September 2 through December 31, 1971, under the direction of Dr. John A. Wiens, Associate Professor of Zoology.

**Environmental Protection Agency**

Grants totaling $172,464 from the Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., for research, training programs, fellowships and other purposes, as follows:

1. $43,962 - "Social and Economic Effects of Change in Air Quality," July 1, 1971, through April 22, 1972, under the direction of Dr. R. G. Mason, Professor of Sociology, and Dr. R. C. Vars, Jr., Associate Professor of Economics.

2. $41,272 - "Tidal Flats in Estuarine Water Quality Analysis," April 1, 1971, through March 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. David A. Bella, Assistant Professor of Civil Engineering.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ford Foundation</td>
<td>Grant of $3,960 from The Ford Foundation, New York City, &quot;for salaries, wages, materials, participant stipends, and other costs under an advanced study fellowship for black Americans,&quot; September 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Henry P. Hansen, Dean of the Graduate School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aeronautics &amp; Space</td>
<td>Grant of $7,000 from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., for research entitled, &quot;Neutron Activation and Analysis,&quot; July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Roman A. Schmitt, Associate Professor of Chemistry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
<td>Grants totaling $188,750 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., for research, fellowships, and other purposes, as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. $1,250 - &quot;To accommodate expenditures under a Science Faculty Fellowship Award in behalf of Mr. Zenas R. Hartvignson,&quot; September 1, 1971, through February 28, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Harry Goheen, Professor of Mathematics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. $28,000 - &quot;Evolution of Competitive Ability,&quot; September 1, 1971, through February 28, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Peter S. Dawson, Associate Professor of Zoology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. $48,100 - &quot;Time Fluctuations in Ocean Currents, September 1, 1971, through February 28, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Douglas R. Caldwell, Assistant Professor of Oceanography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. $1,000 - &quot;Postdoctoral Fellowship from the National Science Foundation,&quot; July 26, 1971, through July 25, 1972, under the direction of Dr. J. Ralph Shay, Chairman, Department of Botany.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. $14,000 - "Biochemistry of Insect Development," August 1, 1971, through February 28, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Victor J. Brookes, Associate Professor of Entomology.

7. $30,000 - "Symbiotic Nitrogen Fixation," September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Harold J. Evans, Professor of Plant Physiology.

8. $20,700 - "Natural and Forced Turbulent Mixing Between Interconnected Adjacent Flow Channels," September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. James G. Knudsen, Professor of Chemical Engineering.

Oregon Arts Commission

Grant of $800 from the Oregon Arts Commission, Salem, for expenses necessary in the preparation and publishing of a catalog for "Contemporary Prints from Norway III," September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Gordon Gilkey, Dean, School of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Oregon State Employment Division

Grant of $57,730 from the Oregon State Employment Division, Salem, "to develop a program to improve training and employment opportunities for rural residents in Wallowa, Gilliam, Sherman, Wheeler, and Morrow Counties," July 1, 1971, through October 1, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Stanley Miles, Extension Economist, Manpower Development.

Oregon State Welfare Division

Grant of $114,622 from the Oregon State Welfare Division, Salem, "to conduct a pre-employment training program for low-income and disadvantaged persons." July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Miss Ann Litchfield, Assistant Director, Home Economist, Extension Service.

U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare

Grants totaling $511,867 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., for training programs, as follows:

1. $306,667 - "To pay school-related expenses for students of low-income families," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Richard E. Pahre, Director, Student Financial Aids.

2. $205,200 - "To pay expenses under the NDEA Title IV Training Program," September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. H. P. Hansen, Dean of the Graduate School.

U. S. Dept. of Justice

Grant of $6,000 from the U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., "for student grants under a Law Enforcement Education Program," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Hugh F. Jeffrey, Jr., Business Manager.
Grants totaling $338,096 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., for research, training programs, fellowships, and other purposes, effective September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, unless otherwise indicated, as follows:

1. $19,059 - "Expenses under an Environmental Health Traineeship Grant," under the direction of Mr. Fred J. Burgess, Dean of Engineering.

2. $159,272 - "Demonstration Grant for the Study of the Utilization of Grass Seed and Cereal Crop Residues," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. David O. Chilcote, Associate Professor of Crop Physiology.

3. $19,211 - "Metabolic Changes Induced by Tumor Virus," under the direction of Dr. V. H. Freed, Head of Agricultural Chemistry.

4. $28,196 - "Biochemical Studies of Spermiogenesis in Drosophila," under the direction of Dr. Robert W. Newburgh, Chairman of Biochemistry and Biophysics.

5. $36,347 - "Inborn Errors and Pyruvate Kinase Isozymes," under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Dyson, Assistant Professor of Biophysics.

6. $1,000 - "Postdoctoral Allowance in behalf of Robert Alvarez, Jr.," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Thomas C. Moore, Associate Professor of Botany.

7. $55,800 - "To accommodate expenditures under a Health Professions Scholarship Program from the U. S. Public Health Service," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Richard F. Pahre, Director of Financial Aids.

8. $19,211 - "To accommodate costs under a development award program," under the direction of Dr. V. H. Freed, Head, Agricultural Chemistry.

Grants to the several Agricultural Experiment Station Departments and Divisions, for research work and other purposes, from various donors, as follows:

Agricultural Research Foundation

$3,934.18 - "Cherry Brine Research," under the direction of Dr. R. F. Cain, Professor of Food Science and Technology.

Coos County

$750 - "Resistance of Port Orford Cedar to Root Rot," under the direction of Dr. Lewis Roth, Professor of Botany.
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Curry County
$3,500 - "In support of lily bulb research," under the direction of Dr. A. N. Roberts, Professor of Horticulture.

Oregon State Game Commission
$5,000 - "In support of Cooperative Fishery Unit," under the direction of Dr. Raymond C. Simon, Professor of Fisheries.

Otter Trawl Commission of Oregon
$3,500 - "Research and Development of a Domestic Market for Dogfish Shark," under the direction of Dr. D. L. Crawford, Assistant Professor of Food Science and Technology.

S. B. Penick & Company
$500 - "Research on insects affecting man and beast," under the direction of Dr. R. L. Goulding, Associate Professor of Entomology.

Stauffer Chemical Company
$250 - "To support research in entomology studies," under the direction of Dr. R. W. Zwick, Associate Professor of Entomology.

$5,000 - "Effects of Climatic Conditions during Growth and Immediately Preceding Harvest on the Storage Life and Market Quality of Pears," under the direction of Mr. W. M. Mellenthin, Professor of Horticulture.

Western Oregon Livestock Association
$500 - "Tansy Ragwort and the Cinnebar Moth Control," under the direction of Dr. W. P. Nagel, Associate Professor of Entomology.

University of Oregon

Scholarships & Fellowships
Gifts totaling $58,376.25 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

Aid Association for Lutherans All-College Scholarship, Appleton, Wisconsin $ 400.00
Alpha Omega Foundation, Inc., Berkeley, California 609.75
American Legion Auxiliary, Hillsboro 150.00
Birthday Scholarship Fund, Wrangell, Alaska 100.00
Boise Cascade Foundation, Inc., Boise, Idaho 2,100.00
BOWLING PROPRIETORS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., Hoffman Estates, Illinois 507.00
Buckbee-Nears Company, St. Paul, Minnesota 500.00
Business & Professional Women's Club, Junction City 366.50
The Carpenter Foundation Scholarship, through School District No. 6, Central Point 370.00
The Carpenter Foundation Scholarship, through Medford Senior High School, Medford 1,185.00
Carpenter Foundation, through Phoenix High School, Phoenix 202.00
Citizens' Scholarship Foundation of Middleborough, Middleboro, Massachusetts 600.00
Cleveland High School, Portland 171.50
The Colonial Dames of America, New York City 300.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonist Knights Scholarship, Anaheim, California</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cook Foundation, Inc., Hamden, Connecticut</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Legal Education Opportunity, Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>$1,010.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Zellerbach Foundation Scholarship, San Francisco, California</td>
<td>$3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Gamma Alumnae, (Agnes Beach Memorial Scholarship Fund), Portland</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demaray Scholarship Fund, through the First National Bank of Oregon, Medford</td>
<td>$166.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain Plywood Co., Drain</td>
<td>$167.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Chapter of Oregon, Order of the Eastern Star Endowment Fund, Pacific City</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 1663, Lebanon</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge No. 1999, St. Helens</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emery Educational Foundation, Inc., Wilton, Connecticut</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Scholarship, Golf, Illinois</td>
<td>$7,256.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epsilon Sigma Alpha, Gamma Nu 2378, Pilot Rock</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Administration Employees Association, Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-Pacific Foundation, Portland</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Hanley Scholarship Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules Incorporated, Wilmington, Delaware</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsch Educational Endowment Fund, through First National Bank, St. Joseph, Missouri</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoerner Waldorf Corp. Charitable Foundation, St. Paul, Minnesota</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Order of Job's Daughters, Portland</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Order of King's Daughters and Sons, Inc., New York City</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Women's Fishing Association, Palm Beach, Florida</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Jackson Foundation, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction City Education Association</td>
<td>$507.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBND Lava Bear Boosters Club of Bend</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Union High School, Lebanon</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettermen's Scholarship, Bend Senior High School</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield Hi-Y Club, Marshfield Senior High School, Coos Bay</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville Rotana Club, McMinnville</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford Rotary Foundation, Medford</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleboro Kiwanis Club (Bourne Wood Scholarship), Lakeville, Massachusetts</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Oregon Scholarship Pageant, Seaside</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss, Adams &amp; Co, Seattle, Washington</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu Phi Epsilon, Eugene</td>
<td>$368.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Association of Secondary School Principals, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, Milford, Ohio</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NCO Wives Club, Dyess Air Force Base, Texas $ 250.00
North Douglas Parent-Teacher Association, Drain 150.00
Oregon Association of Broadcasters, Eugene 500.00
Oregon City Senior High School, Oregon City 200.00
Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs (Virginia Brown Music Scholarship), Portland 150.00
Oregon Golden Gloves, Inc., Portland 250.00
Oregon State Elks Association, Salem 1,200.00
Leslie S. Parker Memorial Scholarship Fund, through the Grand Chapter Order of the Eastern Star, Corvallis 1,000.00
Patch Memorial Scholarship Fund, through the Army Relief Society, New York City 125.00
Phi Beta Patrons, Eugene 1,000.00
Portland Panhellenic Association, Portland 500.00
The Presser Foundation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 200.00
Quill and Scroll Foundation, Iowa City, Iowa 250.00
The Range of the White Buffaloes, Madras 150.00
Ricketts Music Store, Inc., Roseburg 100.00
Rose City Park United Methodist Church, Portland 150.00
Rose Festival Scholarship, Portland 507.00
M. M. Scott Scholarship Committee, Honolulu, Hawaii 250.00
The William Lightfoot Schultz Foundation, Clifton, New Jersey 1,000.00
Springfield Rotary Club, Springfield 200.00
SMCP Scholarship Committee, City of Seattle, Seattle, Washington 171.50
South Santiam Educational and Research Project, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis 167.00
Burt K. Snyder Educational Foundation Scholarship Award, through the First National Bank of Oregon, Portland 270.00
Tektronix, Inc., Beaverton 6,560.00
Texas AFL-CIO, Austin, Texas 500.00
Tozer Foundation, Inc., Stillwater, Minnesota 1,000.00
Max D. Tucker Scholarship Fund, U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 999.00
Turner Educational Trust, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 600.00
Western Conference of Teamsters, Burlingame, California 500.00
Williamette High School Girls' League, Eugene 150.00
Woolley Logging Co., Drain 334.00
Yoncalla Area Scholarship Fund, Yoncalla 507.00

Grant of $65,000 from the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc. (CEMREL, Inc.), St. Ann, Missouri, "for continued support of the Center for Research and Demonstration in the Early Education of Handicapped Children," June 1 through November 30, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Hill Walker, Associate Professor of Early Education.
Grant of $41,671 from the Dayton Board of Education, Dayton, Ohio, "for participation in the University's OSOE-Sponsored Follow-Through Program," July 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Wesley Becker, Professor of Education.

Grant of $3,780 from the Joint Committee for the Humanities in Oregon, Corvallis, for a project entitled, "A Documentation of Some Folk Arts in Oregon," September 1, 1971, through February 1, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Marvin Janzen, Assistant Professor of Education, on behalf of Mrs. Sachiyé Jones.

Grants totaling $50,106 from the Lane County 4-C Council, Eugene, for child care services at the ASUO Child Care and Development Center ($25,872) and the Illahe Child Care Center ($24,234), September 7, 1971, through September 6, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Richard C. Reynolds, Director, Erb Memorial Union.

Grant of $38,292 from the Linn-Benton Intermediate Education District, Albany, for a project entitled, "System Approach to Behavior in Reading Education," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Carl Wallen, Associate Professor of Education.

Grant of $10,000 from the Mott Foundation, Flint, Michigan, for continued support of the Northwest Community Education Development Center, July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Larry Horyna, Assistant Professor of Education.

Grants totaling $273,000 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., for research, fellowships, and other purposes, as follows:


2. $45,400 - "Research at Pine Mountain Observatory," May 1, 1971, through February 28, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Edwin G. Ebbighausen, Professor of Physics, and Dr. Russell J. Donnelly, Professor and Head of the Department of Physics.

3. $40,000 - "Behavioral Functions of the Mammalian Hippocampus," September 15, 1971, through February 28, 1974, under the direction of Dr. Daniel P. Kimble, Professor of Psychology.

4. $6,000 - "Reflection of Protein Structural Change in the Value of the Partial Specific Volume," September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. F. J. Reithel, Professor of Chemistry.

5. $55,000 - "Migration and Differentiation of Neural Crest Cells," September 1, 1971, through February 28, 1974, under the direction of Dr. James A. Weston, Associate Professor of Biology.

7. $80,200 - "Molecular Electronic Spectra: Assignments and Interpretation," September 1, 1971, through February 28, 1974, under the direction of Dr. William T. Simpson, Professor of Chemistry.

Oregon Arts Commission Grants totaling $9,278 from the Oregon Arts Commission, Salem, for various projects, July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, as follows:

1. $1,100 - "Endowment for the Oregon Artist Series," under the direction of Mr. Antonio Diez, Director, Statewide Services, Museum of Art.

2. $3,500 - "Artist Day-in-Residence (A Continuation of Artist Workshop Demonstrations)," under the direction of Mr. Antonio Diez, Director.

3. $4,678 - "Traveling Exhibits Awards, 3rd Annual Statewide Services Competition," under the direction of Mr. Antonio Diez, Director.

Oregon Museum of Science & Industry Grant of $2,102 from Oregon Museum of Science and Industry, Portland, "for the services of Dr. Eugene Maier in connection with OMSI's Systems Approach Grant," August 16 through September 16, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Eugene Maier, Professor of Mathematics.

Oregon State University Subgrant of $32,104 from the U. S. Department of Commerce, through Oregon State University, Corvallis, as an allocation for participation in the Sea Grant Program at Oregon State University, July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Jon L. Jacobson, Assistant Professor of Law.

Reader's Digest Foundation Gift of $500 from the Reader's Digest Foundation, Pleasantville, New York, to the "Reader's Digest Student Travel-Research Fund," under the direction of Mr. W. N. McLaughlin, Director of Business Affairs.

Rockefeller Foundation Grant of $1,500 from the Rockefeller Foundation, New York City, for the unrestricted use of the University of Oregon under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Clark, President.

Rosebud Sioux Tribe Grant of $12,939 from the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Rosebud, South Dakota, "for participation in the University's OSOE-Sponsored Follow-Through Program," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Wesley Becker, Professor, Special Education.

Mrs. F. Titus Gift of the deed to lot 300 in the Pioneer Memorial Park Association Cemetery, from Mrs. Frank Titus, Eugene. The gift is valued at $300.
Grant of $14,540 from Tupelo Public Schools, Tupelo, Mississippi, "for participation in the University's USOE-Sponsored Follow-Through Program," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Wesley Becker, Professor of Special Education.

Grants totaling $45,574 from the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington, for research and other purposes, as follows:

1. $25,574 - "Diffusion Controlled Reactions and Exchange Reactions in Solution," September 15, 1971, through September 16, 1972, under the direction of Dr. R. Noyes, Professor of Chemistry.

2. $20,000 - "Nucleo-Cortical Interactions in Amphibian Development," August 1, 1971, through July 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Philip Grant, Professor of Biology.

Grants totaling $807,971 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., for training programs and other purposes, as follows:

1. $60,300 - "Summer program of employment and training experience for economically disadvantaged and disabled youths," March 1, 1971, through February 29, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Andrew Halpern, Associate Professor of Education.

2. $234,797 - "Teaching Grant and Traineeships in Rehabilitation Counseling," September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Harold W. James, Assistant Professor of Education.

3. $101,092 - "In-service fifth cycle second year Teacher Corps grant," September 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Stanley Cohen, Associate Professor of Education.

4. $467,335 - "Supplemental funds for College Work-Study Program," January 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Larry Large, Director of Financial Aids.

5. $55,553 - Reduction in amount of grant reported in June 9, 1971, minutes to reflect the deletion of a portion of the project for East St. Louis. The grant as previously reported was in the amount of $137,516 for continued support of the Head Start Program, July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Wesley Becker, Professor of Education. The revised grant amount is $81,963.

Grant of $37,440 from the U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., "for continued support of the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP)," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Larry Large, Director of Financial Aids.
Grants totaling $3,723,688 from the U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., for the following purposes:

1. $3,657,997 - "For continuation of the operations at Tongue Point Job Corps Center, Astoria, Oregon," August 1, 1971, through July 31, 1973, under the direction of Mr. W. Snyder, Acting Director.

2. $65,691 - "For continuation of the operation at Portland Job Corps Office - Helene Kennedy Contract," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. W. Snyder.

Grants totaling $382,354 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., for research, fellowships, and other purposes, September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, unless otherwise indicated, as follows:

1. $25,755 - "Genetic and Fine Structure Basis of Disjunction," under the direction of Dr. Andrew S. Bajer and Dr. Edward Novitski, Professors of Biology.

2. $30,928 - "Chromosomal Structure and Genetic Redundancy," under the direction of Dr. Donald E. Wimber, Professor of Biology.

3. $195,179 - "Molecular Basis of Control Mechanisms," under the direction of Dr. Aaron Novick, Professor of Biology.

4. $28,235 - "Research Scientist Development Award, on behalf of Dr. Gerald Patterson," under the direction of Dr. Herbert J. Prehm, Chairman, Special Education.

5. $26,921 - "Studies on Spatial Representation," under the direction of Dr. Fred Attneave, Professor of Psychology.

6. $5,300 - "Predoctoral research fellowship award on behalf of Kenneth C. Hunter," under the direction of Dr. Paul P. Rudy, Director, Institute of Molecular Biology.

7. $31,936 - "Racemic Tetrodotoxin Derivatives -- Neurological Probes," under the direction of Dr. John J. Keana, Assistant Professor of Chemistry.

8. $31,200 - "Enzyme Catalytic Mechanism Studies," under the direction of Dr. Raymond G. Wolfe, Professor of Chemistry.

9. $5,900 - "Predoctoral fellowship award on behalf of Richard A. Block," September 15, 1971, through September 15, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Douglas L. Hintzman, Assistant Professor of Psychology, and Dr. Aaron Novick, Dean of the Graduate School.

10. $1,000 - "Postdoctoral supply allowance on behalf of Shelby A. Sherrod," July 16, 1971, through July 15, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Virgil Boekelheide, Head, Department of Chemistry.
Grant of $20,902 from the Uvalde Independent School District, Uvalde, Texas, "for participation in the University's USOE-Sponsored Follow-Through Program," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Wesley Becker, Professor, Special Education.

Grant of $28,950 from the Williamsburg County Schools, Kingstree, South Carolina, "for participation in the University's USOE-Sponsored Follow-Through Program," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Wesley Becker, Professor of Special Education.

Gifts to the University of Oregon Library from various donors as follows:

**Erickson Estate**
Collection of manuscripts, correspondence, clippings, etc., concerning the activities of Miss Ruth Erickson and Miss Eleanor Stevenson, from Miss Stevenson, New Milford Connecticut. The material relates to their activities in the first half of the century as they worked with the liberal political groups, civil rights organizations, and Socialist political parties of this period. The gift is valued at $300.

**Mrs. Janet Stevenson**
Correspondence, manuscripts and related files, valued at $600, from Mrs. Janet Stevenson, Astoria. She is an author of books for young people.

**T. Thompson**
Additional book and short story manuscripts, valued at $275, from Mr. Thomas Thompson, Newbury Park, California. He is a western pulp author and television scriptwriter.

**K. Werth**
Original artwork for the illustration of six books, including original drawings, color separations and overlays, from Mr. Kurt Werth, Bronx, New York. The gift is valued at $3,000.

**C. M. Wilson**
Additional manuscripts of nonfiction and history, from Mr. Charles Morrow Wilson, Putney, Vermont. The gift is valued at $295.

**W. L. Worden**
Correspondence files, manuscripts of articles, and tearsheets, valued at $540, from Mr. William L. Worden, Fox Island, Washington. Mr. Worden is a reporter-correspondent for the Associated Press and free-lance author.

**H. Wyckoff**
Four linear feet of labor and management arbitration files from Mr. Hubert Wyckoff, Watsonville, California. The gift is valued at $510.

**W. L. Wunsch**
Gift of acrylic painting entitled, "Figure in Black," by Mark Clarke, from Mr. William L. Wunsch, Sylmar, California. The painting is valued at $250.
University of Oregon Medical School

Scholarships & Fellowships
Gifts totaling $10,073.25 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

- American Legion Auxiliary, Department of Oregon, Hillsboro: $125.00
- Baptist Life Association, Buffalo, New York: $200.00
- Benton County Medical Auxiliary, Corvallis: $150.00
- Donald W. Blanche, M.D. South Pasadena, California: $100.00
- The Britt Memorial Scholarship Fund, Modford: $200.00
- The Carpenter Foundation Scholarship, through School District No. 6, Central Point: $134.00
- Clackamas County Tuberculosis and Health Association, Oregon City: $600.00
- Daughters of the American Revolution, Oregon State Society, Portland: $165.00
- Drain Plywood Co., Drain: $334.00
- Leukemia Association of Oregon, Inc., Portland: $745.25
- Marion County Health Department, Salem: $3,600.00
- Leslie S. Parker Memorial Scholarship, through Order of Eastern Star, Corvallis: $2,500.00
- Rogue Valley Physicians' Service, Medford: $750.00
- Silverton Hospital Auxiliary, Silverton: $200.00
- Burt K. Snyder Educational Foundation, Portland: $270.00

Mrs. C. W. Easter
Gift of $1,000 from Mrs. Charles W. Easter, Seattle, Washington, "for use in connection with the cardiovascular program," under the direction of Dr. Herbert E. Griswold, Professor and Head of the Division of Cardiology.

Mrs. Beatrice Gerlinger
Gift of 452 shares of Willamette Industries, Inc., stock, from Mrs. Beatrice Lee Gerlinger, Portland. Proceeds from the sale of the stock in the amount of $12,025.44 are to be used as follows: DMSO Research, 25 percent ($3,006.36); establishment of Gerlinger Research Fund, 35 percent ($4,208.90); and establishment of Gerlinger Student Loan Fund, 40 percent ($4,810.18).

U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare
Grant of $13,563 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. "in further support of a training program in Rehabilitation Medicine," September 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Kenneth D. Swan, Associate Professor and Head, Division of Physical Medicine.

U.S. Public Health Service
Grants totaling $715,459 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., for research, training programs, fellowships, and other purposes, September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, unless otherwise indicated, as follows:

1. $28,230 - "Pharmacology of Polycycloalkane Anesthesiology," under the direction of Dr. Elton L. McCawley, Professor of Pharmacology.
2. $71,466 - "Structure and Function of the Inner Ear," under the direction of Dr. Catherine A. Smith, Professor of Otolaryngology.

3. $35,289 - "Prenatal Hemodynamics," under the direction of Dr. J. Job Faber, Associate Professor of Physiology.

4. $73,078 - "Neural Mechanisms of Postural Control," under the direction of Dr. John M. Brookhart, Professor and Chairman, Department of Physiology.

5. $307,225 - "Malignant and Genetic Alterations in Human Cells," under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Koler, Professor and Head of the Division of Medical Genetics, and Dr. Richard T. Jones, Professor and Chairman, Department of Biochemistry.

6. $24,880 - "In further support of an undergraduate clinical training program in cardiology," under the direction of Dr. Herbert E. Griswold, Professor and Head of the Division of Cardiology.

7. $32,261 - "Viral Induced Control of Host Biosynthesis," under the direction of Dr. Wallace J. Iglewski, Assistant Professor of Microbiology.

8. $35,146 - "Pharmacologic Analysis of Transmission in Ganglia," under the direction of Dr. William K. Riker, Professor and Chairman, Department of Pharmacology.

9. $75,668 - "Eccrine Sweat Gland Function," under the direction of Dr. Richard L. Dobson, Professor of Dermatology.

10. $9,776 - "The Development of the Nervous System in Man," October 1, 1971, through September 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Howard W. Davis, Assistant Professor of Anatomy.

11. $1,000 - "In support of a postdoctoral fellowship supply for Larry F. Rich," July 19, 1971, through July 19, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Robert P. Burns, Professor of Ophthalmology.

12. $19,440 - "In support of a training program in Psychiatry - GP Special Training," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. George Saslow, Professor and Chairman, Department of Psychiatry.

13. $1,000 - "In support of a special fellowship supply allowance for Dr. David W. Blackmore," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Benjamin Ross, Professor of Physiology.

14. $1,000 - "In support of a postdoctoral fellowship supply allowance for Dr. Jeffrey Pinto," June 1, 1971, through May 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. J. Peter Bentley, Associate Professor of Biochemistry.
Portland State University

Alaska State Dept. of Education

Grant of $5,300 from the State of Alaska, Department of Education, Juneau, Alaska, "for a special education masters fellowship for Doris Hoagland," June 7, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Keith H. Larson, Associate Professor of Education.

City of Portland

Grant of $1,240 from the City of Portland, Portland, as a supplemental grant to Summer "71" Puppet, Black, and People's Theatres, June 7 through September 30, 1971, "to take dramatic productions to the streets, parks and community centers of people who seldom, if ever, see live actors in a theatrical production," under the direction of Mr. Kermit Shafer, Associate Professor of Theatre Arts.

College of Wooster

Grant of $11,740 from the College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio, "to provide field placements and interdisciplinary urban studies seminars for Wooster College students during the 1971-72, academic year," under the direction of Mr. Sumner Sharpe, Research Associate.

Oregon State Program on Aging

Grant of $8,418 from the Oregon State Program on Aging, Salem, for support of "The Areawide Project for Aging Services -- Multnomah County," August 23 through October 31, 1971, under the direction of Mr. John O'Brien, Assistant Professor of Sociology.

Portland Public Schools

Grant of $19,010 from the Portland Public Schools, School District No. 1, Multnomah County, to conduct a project in Environmental Education entitled, "Environmental Clearinghouse," August 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Harold Jorgensen, Associate Professor of Education.

Supplementary Training Associates

Grant of $13,570 from the Supplementary Training Associates, Washington, D.C., "to provide necessary professionally qualified personnel, facilities, supplies, equipment, and all related instructional support to develop and implement a Supplementary Training Program of the type and character which enables nonprofessional persons on full-year Follow-Through staffs to function more effectively in their career development role," September 1, 1971, through June 20, 1972, under the direction of Mrs. Marilyn Peters, Program Manager, Follow-Through Supplementary Training.

U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare

Grants totaling $1,277,143 from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., for training programs, library materials, and other purposes, July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, unless otherwise designated, as follows:

1. $649,850 - "Participation in the College Work-Study Program for the period January 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Bonner Robinson, Director of Financial Aids."
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2. $27,000 - "Supplement to original allocation for the 1972 fiscal year for Educational Opportunity Grants," under the direction of Mr. Bonner Robinson.

3. $305,961 - "Federal allocation for the National Defense Student Loan Fund for the 1972 fiscal year," under the direction of Mr. Bonner Robinson.

4. $77,555 - To support the cost of books and library materials incurred under a grant entitled, "College Library Resources Program," Title II-A, Higher Education Act of 1965, P.L. 89-329, as amended, June 28, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Frank Rodgers, Librarian.

5. $9,268 - "To provide a foreign curriculum consultant who will assist in improving the Middle East language and area studies programs at Portland State University and Woodrow Wilson High School," August 1, 1970, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Frederick J. Cox, Director, Middle East Studies Center.

6. $11,954 - To support an Institute entitled, "Desegregation Conference," for the purpose of informing school superintendents, school board members, mayors of major cities, and other selected persons in Region X of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Supreme Court Decisions of April 1971, regarding the desegregation of schools," July 1 through October 15, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Robert Hughley, Project Director.

7. $73,551 - "Training Complex (PAGE) Portland Area Complex for Education," June 15, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. William A. Jenkins, Dean, School of Education.

8. $115,000 - "In-Service Institute in Reading in the Language Arts (Operational Phase)," July 1, 1970, through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. William A. Jenkins.


Oregon College of Education

Subgrant of $9,000 through the Oregon State Board of Education, Salem, to provide traineeships for fifteen students attending the Summer School in Special Education, and to develop the special education program, under the direction of Dr. Dennis J. Fahey, Professor of Education.
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U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development

Grant of $4,587 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C., as a "fellowship to Lester Sandoval for the 1971-72 year in the Urban Fellowship Program under Title III of P.L. 88-560, as amended," September 15, 1971, through June 15, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Paul Griffin, Chairman Social Science Department.

U.S. Dept. of Justice

Grant of $800 from the U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, for a "Law Enforcement Education Internship Program," under the direction of Mr. Jean S. Long, Assistant Professor of Social Science.

U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare

Grants totaling $445,978 from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., for the following purposes, July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Jack D. Morton, Dean of Students:

1. $176,390 - "Educational Opportunity Grants to Needy Students."
2. $269,588 - "Student loans under the National Defense Student Loan Program."

Southern Oregon College

Gifts totaling $10,218 from the following donors for scholarships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise Cascade Corporation Foundation, Inc., Boise, Idaho</td>
<td>$ 650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Pacific Utilities Company, San Francisco, California</td>
<td>1,038.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Clayton Fund, Houston, Texas</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Zellerbach Foundation, San Francisco, California</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cummins Engine Foundation, Columbus, Indiana</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Kappa Gamma - Epsilon Chapter, Ashland</td>
<td>173.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Chapter of Oregon, Order of the Eastern Star, Corvallis</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Lodge, Ashland</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Education Association, Eugene</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-Pacific Foundation, Portland</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Order of Job's Daughters, Grand Council of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEO Sisterhood, Oregon State Chapter, Portland</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Mariana Islands</td>
<td>919.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>1,038.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gifts totaling $1,850 from the following donors to be used for student loans:

- Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War, 1861-1865, Portland: $100.00
- The S. S. Johnson Foundation, Redmond: $500.00
- Tuttle Memorial Fund, through the Rogue Valley Memorial Hospital Auxiliary, Medford: $1,250.00

Grants totaling $267,591 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., for training programs and student loans, as follows:

1. $261,921 - "For National Defense Student Loan Program," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Stephen Flynn, Director of Financial Aids.

2. $5,670 - "Adjustment in allocation for Educational Opportunity Grants," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Stephen Flynn.

Grants totaling $85,000 from the U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., for the following purposes:

1. $1,000 - "Law Enforcement Education Internship Program," June 1 through September 1, 1971, under the direction of Mr. Stephen Flynn, Director of Financial Aids.

2. $84,000 - "Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP)," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Stephen Flynn.

Gifts totaling $54,916.33 from the following donors, for scholarships and fellowships:

- Boise Cascade Foundation, Inc., Boise, Idaho: $3,025.00
- Bureau of Indian Affairs, Colville Indian Agency, Coulee Dam, Washington: $750.00
- Colville Indian Agency, Hespelem, Washington: $750.00
- Bureau of Indian Affairs, Juneau Area Office, Juneau, Alaska: $9,958.00
- Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Area Office, Window Rock, Arizona: $1,508.00
- Bureau of Indian Affairs, Northern Idaho Agency, Lapwai, Idaho: $3,400.00
- Bureau of Indian Affairs, Umatilla Agency, Pendleton: $6,673.00
- Bureau of Indian Affairs, Warm Springs Agency, Warm Springs: $7,037.00
- Burns Mothers Club, Burns: $200.00
- Central Point School District No. 6, Central Point: $100.00
Gifts totaling $5,776.15 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

**Oregon Technical Institute**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous Donor</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid Association for Lutherans, Appleton, Wisconsin</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Business Womens' Association, Klamath Falls</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legion Auxiliary, Brookings Harbor, Unit No. 195,</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise Cascade Corporation, Boise, Idaho</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boisde Cascade Corporation, Boise, Idaho</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes and Bands, Yakima Indian Nation, Toppenish, Washington</td>
<td>$233.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, Warm Springs</td>
<td>$2,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Kappa Gamma, Iota Chapter, Pendleton</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Chapter of Oregon, Order of the Eastern Star, Corvallis</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-Pacific Foundation, Portland</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna Ladies, Riddle</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood River Valley High School, Hood River</td>
<td>$220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauilani Home for Girls Trust, Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Fossil Lodge, No. 110, Fossil</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masonic Lodge No. 41, La Grande</td>
<td>$519.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton-Yamhill Lions Club, Yamhill</td>
<td>$519.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton-Freewater Education Association, Milton-Freewater</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy Relief Society, Arlington, Virginia</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, Lapwai, Idaho</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Congress of Parents and Teachers, Portland</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State Elks Association, Salem</td>
<td>$475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State Chapter, P.E.O., Portland</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Rock High School, Pilot Rock</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potlatch Forests Foundation, Inc., Lewiston, Idaho</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie City Parent-Teacher Association, Prairie City</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club, Brookings</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroptimist Club of La Grande</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiner American Foundation, Inc., Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertrude Straub Trust, through Hawaiian Trust Company Limited, Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiller-Drew P.T.O., Tiller</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla Tribal Scholarship Committee, Pendleton</td>
<td>$8,112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Junior Women's Club, Union</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union-Wallowa County Legal Secretaries Association, La Grande</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. National Bank (Clara Hanley Scholarship Fund), Portland</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. National Bank of Oregon (Jackson Foundation), Portland</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>$519.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarships & Fellowships
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California-Pacific Utilities Company, Klamath Falls $ 528.00
Gerlach Empire Parent-Teacher Association, Empire, Nevada 100.00
The Jackson Foundation, through the U.S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 1,000.00
Madras Senior High School, Madras 150.00
Mt. Hood Community College Associated Student Body Fund, Gresham 215.15
Oregon Nurses Association, District No. 8, Klamath Falls 100.00
Oregon State Chapter, P.E.O. Sisterhood, Portland 275.00
Mrs. Ruth M. Powers, Oregon City 250.00
Sierra-Cascade Logging Conference, Inc., Redding, California 500.00
Smith Memorial Presbyterian Church, Fairview 115.00
Soroptimist Club, Brookings 100.00
Southern Oregon Plywood, Grants Pass 168.00
Standard Oil Company of California, San Francisco, California 250.00

Gift of one used AC 2900 Diesel Engine, Serial No. 2D-11486, valued at $700, from the Allis-Chalmers Company, Denver, Colorado, for use in the Auto-Diesel Department.


Grants totaling $190,174 from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., for various programs, as follows:

1. $44,160 - "Matching funds for grants to low-income students under special program for disadvantaged," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Terrance R. Brown, Director of Financial Aids.

2. $71,712 - "National Student Defense Loan Program," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Terrance R. Brown.


Grant of $5,000 from the Office of International Education, Oregon State University, Corvallis, "to provide administrative services necessary for the effective management of the educational program known as English Language Institute," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Gordon Sitton, Director, International Education.
Oregon Economic Development Division
Grant of $6,200 from the Economic Development Division, Office of the Governor of Oregon, Salem, "to conduct the Governor's Conference on Consumer Protection," August 17 through October 31, 1971, under the direction of Mr. Kenneth Waldroff, Chairman of the Conference and Institute.

State Law Enforcement Planning Agency
Subgrant of $18,411 through the State Law Enforcement Planning Agency, Portland, "to train and educate peace officers on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Civil Disorders, and Violence," August 16 through September 10, 1971, under the direction of Mr. Robert Gridley. This grant is under the provisions of Part C of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, P.L. 90-351.

Supplementary Training Associates
Grant of $61,426 from Supplementary Training Associates, Berkeley, California, "to provide professionally qualified personnel, facilities, supplies, equipment and all related instructional support necessary to develop and implement a Supplementary Training Program of the type and character which enables professional and non-professional persons on full-year Head Start Center staffs to function more effectively in their career development roles," September 1, 1971, through June 20, 1972, under the direction of Mrs. Marilyn Peters, Project Director.

Teaching Research Division
Corvallis School Dist. No. 509J

Douglas County School District No. 19
Grant of $375 from Douglas County School District No. 19, Myrtle Creek, "for development of a proposal for serving handicapped children ages birth to six years," under the direction of Dr. Harold D. Fredericks, Associate Research Professor.

Educational Coordinating Council & Oregon Board of Education
Grant of $2,982 from the Educational Coordinating Council and the Oregon State Board of Education, Salem, "to conduct a study to determine the educational programs available in Oregon's adult correctional institutions," March 15 through May 1, 1971, under the direction of Dr. F. Leon Paulson, Project Director.

Fairview Hospital and Training Center
Subgrant of $3,000 through Fairview Hospital and Training Center, Salem, "to conduct an educational accomplishment audit of Fairview Hospital and Training Center's ESEA, Title I Project," August 10, 1971, through October 29, 1972, under the direction of Mr. John Quanbeck, Project Director.

Grand Prairie School District No. 14
Grant of $800 from Grand Prairie School District No. 14, Albany, "to provide professional services in the District's Title I Remedial Reading Project," March 1 through June 12, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Harold D. Fredericks, Associate Research Professor.
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Grant of $600 from the Jackson County Intermediate Education District, "to provide in-service training and evaluation in mental retardation to the Jackson County IED staff during fiscal year 1972," August 10, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. H. D. Fredericks, Project Director.

Grant of $4,000 from the Marion County Intermediate Education District, Salem, "to conduct an evaluation of the 1972 Speech Tele-Van Project and prepare a written report," September 15, 1971, through June 1, 1972, under the direction of Mr. John Quanbeck, Project Director.

Subgrant of $102,342, through Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, "to conduct planning for a behavioral science institute," December 31, 1970, through June 30, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Jack V. Edling, Research Professor.

Subgrant of $67,725 from the Mid-Willamette Valley Community Coordinated Child Care Council, "to operate a child care center in Monmouth during fiscal year 1972," September 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Paul Dawson, Assistant Professor, Teaching Research.

Grant of $800 from the Oregon State Board of Education, Salem, "to plan and conduct a two-day workshop for practical nursing faculty and provide a workshop evaluation and follow-up," April 1 through June 30, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Michael Saslow, Assistant Research Professor.

Subgrant of $4,061, through Portland School District No. 1, Portland, to prepare and reproduce the documents which remain from the District Project entitled, "A Plan for Combining the Proposals of the Portland and Corvallis Schools To Test Procedures for Managing by Objectives," November 23, 1970, through January 15, 1971, under the direction of Dr. H. Del Schalock, Research Professor. The project is funded under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Grant of $12,000 from the State Textbook Commission, Oregon Board of Education, Salem, "to design and conduct a study which will collect and analyze data relative to information requested by the State Textbook Commission, Oregon Board of Education," May 1, 1971, through February 1, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Casper F. Paulson, Project Director.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 2:10 P.M.

George H. Layman, President

R. L. Collins, Secretary
The Center for Environmental Structure was retained for the University of Oregon (through the offices of the State Board of Higher Education) to conduct a comprehensive audit of the University's entire planning process and "to recommend a development program which reflects the current and emerging educational policy and is responsive to student, faculty and staff input."

The following assumptions were built into the program prepared by the University and annexed to the Consultant's contract:

1. Enrollment would be expected to increase at very gradual rate up to a maximum of somewhere between 17,000 and 19,000 FTE students.

2. The proportion of graduate to undergraduate enrollment would continue as at present, to be approximately 20 percent of the total FTE enrollment. (It should be noted that because of the difference in average course loads for graduate students (9-12 hours) as opposed to undergraduate students (15 hours), graduate students represent approximately 26 to 28 percent of the total number of students while their FTE represents approximately 20 percent of the total.)

3. Approximately 60 percent of the students are males, and 40 percent are females. Approximately 25 percent of all students are married, and of those that are married, approximately 70 percent are males and 30 percent are females.

4. All student housing must be self-supporting and self-liquidating. In view of changing student attitudes, it is not possible to establish a realistic basis for planning additional single student housing of the traditional dormitory type. Married student housing continues to be in very great demand and could be expanded up to a point where there were sufficient units to house approximately 50 percent of the married graduate students without fear of vacancies.

5. All parking facilities must be self-supporting and self-liquidating.

6. Under current campus planning guidelines, ground coverage for new buildings has been limited to 25 percent; total building density has been based on an average ratio of floor area to ground area of 1:1. While these standards may be revised in accordance with the Consultant's recommendations, any new standards would have to meet the following requirements:

   a. That academic buildings be located within a 10-15 minute walking distance of each other;

   b. That within this area there be sufficient building capacity to accommodate ultimate enrollment requirements.
The Center for Environmental Structure was selected from a nationwide field of consulting firms, largely on the basis of their response to certain questions concerning the difficulties of accommodating changing conditions within the framework of conventional planning techniques. They indicated that in their view these difficulties were generic to current planning practices and that if hired they would present an alternative approach.

In their first draft proposal, the Center for Environmental Structure presented a comprehensive "planning process" as an alternative to the traditional "master plan" concept usually employed by most planning consultants. It involved a number of new and sometimes controversial proposals. It has now been reviewed and refined to the point where the fundamental concepts have received broad support from the Campus Planning Committee and the University community generally. It is being presented to the State Board of Higher Education at this time so that they might participate in the formulation of the basic assumptions and objectives upon which future planning will evolve. What follows is intended to summarize the major points of the study to date, with particular emphasis upon basic planning assumptions and objectives; immediately following is an extremely short "overview" of the proposed planning process; following that, is a chapter by chapter review of the study organization and its content.

Overview

CES recommends that emphasis be given to the development of a "planning process" instead of simply relying on the traditional "master plan." The proposed planning process is based on the fundamental assertion that the environment really counts; that if it is not "working" properly, resources are literally being wasted. Places that do not work can be identified by chronic over-use or under-use. The primary objective of the planning process is to "repair" those places which are not working, thus restoring them to balanced use.

For a place to be in balanced use, certain relationships between that place and others, and within the place itself, must be present. These relationships are defined by patterns. To achieve and maintain balanced use, it is necessary (and at the same time less expensive) to follow a policy of piecemeal growth which provides for adaption to changing conditions through continuous repair of the total environment wherever under-use or over-use occurs.

Every biennium the University's Planning Office conducts a diagnosis of the campus to determine which of its "parts" are "working" and which are not; those areas which are out of balance, are analyzed to determine specifically which patterns are missing in each case. The planning process relies on a high degree of user participation to assure responsiveness to users' real needs. User participation also provides a continuous monitoring of the environment and feedback on the effectiveness of planning decisions. Thus, user groups both initiate and control the design of their own projects, in accordance with the patterns adopted by the Campus Planning Committee.
Adherence to the diagnosis and patterns assures that the projects are properly related to one another and to the campus as a whole. As the patterns are "built-in" to project after project, a comprehensive global order will gradually emerge, because the projects, although developed by different groups at different times, are guided by a common set of principles (patterns).

Study Organization and Content

The CES study is divided into two parts. Part 1 (Chapters 1-6) describes the theoretical framework which replaces the conventional master plan approach. In Part 2 (Chapters 7-9) the theory is applied to the University of Oregon, to construct a full scale "master plan" but of a new and different type. Chapter Seven contains a detailed set of planning principles or "patterns;" Chapter Eight contains the diagnosis and proposed policies for development of the University campus; Chapter Nine includes a series of some twenty example projects and a "simulation" of the entire campus as it might appear some 15-20 years hence as the result of continuous development under the proposed planning process.

Chapter One analyzes the functions and deficiencies of the conventional master plan approach. The central planning problem is to "...coordinate a large number of design acts, carried out by hundreds of different people over a period of many years in such a way that they create a living and coherent whole, with balanced relationships between its parts..." People have tried to solve this problem by creating "master plans." But the difficulties of the master plan are that it tends to impose a rigid, totalitarian order on those whom it is intended to serve. Being inflexible and unable to accommodate changing conditions, people are forced to circumvent it, and the master plan soon falls into total disuse.

Chapter Two explains the need for participation on the part of the "users" of University facilities. Participation is inherently good because it allows people to become involved in shaping their own environment; as they are able to become involved they take a personal interest in their surroundings. They develop a sense of responsibility and even "ownership" towards them. User participation is also important to the planning and design process because it is precisely the users who know most about their own needs. It is only the actual user who really knows whether his facilities are working properly or not.

Chapter Three introduces the concepts of balanced use and patterns. Places which do not work exhibit specific symptoms. They are either over-used or under-used. In either case, facilities which are out of balanced use cannot be used properly, and are wasting University resources. The fundamental axiom for the university planning process is that every place be brought up to balanced use. No place should be doing too little or too much. Nineteen types of places are identified as the major parts of a university. These nineteen place-types are: CAMPUS, DEPARTMENT, STUDENT HOUSING, ADMINISTRATION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, PARKING, LOCAL ROADS, OUTDOOR PLACES, PEDESTRIAN PATHS, BIKE PATHS, STUDENT GATHERING, CAFES AND SHOPS, SPORTS, LIBRARIES, CLASSROOMS, FACULTY OFFICES, STUDENT WORKPLACES, ENTRANCES, CORRIDORS. Each kind of place, being associated with certain activities and social processes, is susceptible to certain characteristic problems.
So long as these problems remain unsolved, in any given place, there is little chance that this place will support the activities which go on there. To solve these problems, each place must have certain specific properties. These properties are called patterns. The university environment can be said to be balanced only when each of the places in it has the specific patterns which are appropriate in each case.

Chapter Four discusses piecemeal growth as contrasted with "large lump development." Any living organism must repair itself constantly in order to maintain health. Failure to replace cells or to heal damaged tissues ultimately results in a complete breakdown of the system. The same is true of the environment. Good environments are the ones that have grown slowly, merging the new with the old, modifying existing buildings to adapt to new needs. The projects that contribute most to the creation of good university environments are projects which add small increments to improve places in a cumulative manner. Small projects continually being introduced into the environment are referred to as "piecemeal growth." Large complexes and high rise buildings are referred to as "large lump development." The current approach to capital construction has tended to favor large lump development, but it can be demonstrated that piecemeal growth is to be preferred on important counts.

Small increments can take better care of the needs of the entire university community. Small increments allow for meeting urgent needs within a shorter period of time. Fewer mistakes are made in the design and construction of small projects, and those that are made can be corrected more easily. Economic studies indicate that small increments cost no more, and usually less, per net square foot of space. Small increments make it possible for people to participate in the initiation and design of projects. Small projects allow people to develop a sense of place, and to take care of their territory. Piecemeal growth will make it more likely that existing buildings are properly maintained.

Chapter Five deals with the problem of coordinating many small projects in such a way that an integrated whole finally emerges. Continuing the biological analogy — how is it, that when an organism grows, millions of different cells all growing at various places throughout the organism, manage to form a unified whole? It is clear that the organism creates a unified whole in some way that is not analogous to the "master plan" approach. Actually the problem is solved in the organism in two steps: first, the organism constantly monitors its own internal state. At any given moment, there is, within the organism, some representation of the current difficulties: in particular, those parts of the organism, where critical variables have gone beyond their allowable limits, are identified. We may call this the diagnosis. In response to the diagnosis, the organism sets in motion growth processes to repair the damage. It is fairly certain that the broad framework of this growth is governed by the endocrine system, which creates a variety of chemical growth fields throughout the organism. The growth fields create the context for growth, and determine the locations where growth shall occur. Then the genetic code carried by the cells controls the local configurations which grow at those locations — modified always, by interaction.
with the growth fields themselves. The problem of morphological integration in the University is proposed to be solved by means of two very similar steps:

1. Diagnosis, and the creation of repair fields.

2. Local repair, carried out within these repair fields, in the form of individual projects.

The diagnosis would be conducted every two years by the University's planning office. Places which are out of balance and the specific patterns which are lacking in each instance, would be identified throughout the entire campus. This would be shown on a series of maps, corresponding to the nineteen place-types described in Chapter Three. Each map would be supplemented by a series of temporary policies, prescribing the administrative steps which must be taken to make possible the growth and repair which the map defines. Each map with its supplementary policies, defines a crude repair field, which does for the University, what the endocrine fields do for an organism. The nineteen maps, acting together, will control all growth and repair within the University. Superficially, these maps may seem to be like a conventional master plan. There is, however, a great difference. The master plan describes some future state of the campus. The repair maps tell us what is out of balance now, and what must be done to correct it — and they change constantly, as the University changes.

Chapter Six outlines the administrative procedures necessary to implement the proposed planning process. It is proposed that the Campus Planning Committee recommend the adoption of patterns on behalf of the University community; the University Planning Office prepares the biennial diagnosis of the current state of the campus, and assists the user groups in the initiation and formulation of project proposals; the Campus Planning Committee reviews proposed projects and makes recommendations to the President for submission to the State Board of Higher Education as the University's Capital Construction Program; project teams, composed of various users and the Planning Office, prepare schematic designs for the high priority projects, and architects are hired to develop detailed plans in consultation with the project teams.

Chapter Seven presents, in detail, some seventy patterns arranged in accordance with the place-types to which they apply. These are listed below as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place-Type</th>
<th>Applicable Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS</td>
<td>University size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University shape and diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town integrated with university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University as a marketplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>Department size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department space standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fabric of departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living woven into learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University as a marketplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department hearth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT HOUSING</td>
<td>Students close to campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living woven into learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student household mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student community size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private access to each apartment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>Administration decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small services without red tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC BUILDINGS</td>
<td>Human scale in public buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings shaped for light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal office communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling of shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social spaces define structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>University parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nine percent parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cars surround pedestrian islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiny parking lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL ROADS</td>
<td>Looped local roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cars surround pedestrian islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cruising loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T-junctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paths interrupt roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTDOOR PLACES</td>
<td>Access to a green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convex connected spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South facing open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small open spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patios which live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trees must stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Places at the edge of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDESTRIAN PATHS</td>
<td>Cars surround pedestrian islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Territorial ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University as a marketplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paths interrupt roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centripetal pedestrian paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ample street lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIKE PATHS</td>
<td>Bike paths and racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT GATHERING</td>
<td>Activity nuclei No isolated student union Realms between departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFES AND SHOPS</td>
<td>Town integrated with university Real learning in cafes Activity nuclei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTS</td>
<td>Relax: Leisure is part of learning Activity nuclei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARIES</td>
<td>Campus library decentralized Activity nuclei Stacks and carrels integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>Classroom size and distribution University as a marketplace Seats outside meeting rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY OFFICES</td>
<td>Students near faculty offices University as a marketplace Primary groups among students and faculty Light on two sides of every room Thick walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT WORKPLACES</td>
<td>A workplace for every student Primary groups among students and faculty Students near faculty offices Light on two sides of every room Thick walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTRANCES</td>
<td>Entrance location Circulation realms Territorial ambiguity Bike paths and racks Entrance shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRIDORS</td>
<td>Short corridors Circulation realms Territorial ambiguity Corridors which live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter Eight presents a preliminary version of the Consultant's diagnosis of the campus and tentative policy recommendations. There are some 59 policies in all. A condensed summary of the major aspects of the diagnosis and policy proposals follows:

1. **Enrollment Growth**

   Future enrollment increases should be held below two percent per year; planning should be based on an ultimate enrollment limitation between 17,000 and 19,000 FTE; however, building density should be established in such a manner that enrollment could be increased if need be, by making additional land purchases within appropriate walking distances from the center of the campus.
2. Campus Shape and Diameter

Future development of the campus should maintain all classroom facilities within 1,500 feet of the center of campus; all other University facilities (except student housing) should be within 2,500 feet of the center of campus. The future campus should not have a "hard" edge; it should blend into the surrounding community. Functionally, there is no necessity for all University land to be contiguous, and there are substantial advantages to interspersing University facilities into the surrounding community wherever the two are compatible. Land purchase policies should be revised to permit the acquisition of property outside the official campus boundary, subject only to the maximum walking distances referred to above.

3. Campus Expansion

The area for future classroom development should extend from Franklin Boulevard on the north to approximately 18th Street on the south and from the middle of the block between Alder and Hilliard Streets on the west, to Walton Hall on the east, excluding Sacred Heart Hospital and Northwest Christian College. This places the center of the classroom area just north of Gerlinger Hall, approximately midway between the Student Union and the Library. In this location the walking circle for classrooms would include all existing classrooms and would encompass a large area directly west of the existing campus in which the largest number of fraternities and sororities are located. As more and more of the fraternal organizations are apparently having to disband, the houses which are coming onto the market provide ideal opportunities to acquire buildings which are extremely well suited for a great number of University purposes.

4. Automobile Circulation

The University should, first and foremost, be considered as a pedestrian precinct — automobile traffic should be clearly subordinated; roads should be limited to providing access to the principal areas of the campus and through traffic should be eliminated entirely. At the same time, the road system should not appear so private that it would discourage townpeople and visitors from driving into and around the campus. To accomplish this, roads should be organized as a system of narrow one-way loop roads laid out so that the loops penetrate deep into the campus and come close to all major buildings. Campus entrances should be clearly identified, but no road on campus should be more than 17 feet wide.

(An agreement has been concluded between the State Board of Higher Education and the City of Eugene, which will provide for the eventual vacation of almost all city streets through the present campus. This, of course, does not necessarily mean that all roads will be eliminated from the campus, but it gives the University the power to develop an automobile circulation system that is more compatible with pedestrian circulation and campus development in general.)
5. Parking

Diagnosis and policies for parking are still in the process of formulation; however, three major objectives will guide the development of parking policies. These are:

a. It is imperative to restrict the total amount of land covered by parking, so that parking does not threaten the environment.

b. All users of parking will have to pay for it, whether they are given space in parking garages or in lots.

c. Parking which is provided for commuters must be close, in time-distance, to the workplaces served.

6. Open Space

One of the great dangers for campus development is the temptation to fill in the open spaces with new buildings as the University expands. Fortunately, the principal open spaces at the University of Oregon have, for the most part, been preserved. It is essential that these areas should continue to be respected. This is not to say that future buildings should not be located in the central campus area, but that when they are, great care should be exercised so that the integrity of these areas is not destroyed. (Actually, there is considerable space in the central campus area in which additional building would actually strengthen the principal open areas by providing more of a sense of enclosure, better scale, etc.)

7. Building Character

Except for Prince Lucien Campbell Hall and Carson Hall, all University buildings have been kept at four stories or less. This has contributed a great deal toward maintaining a more human scale for the entire campus. This quality has been entirely lost at universities (such as Berkeley and U.C.L.A.) which have gone in for high rise construction. (Attempts are often made to justify high rise construction on the basis that it preserves open space. Actually, the reverse is true, because high rise construction tends to destroy most of the valuable character of the open space that is left.) Preliminary studies indicate that there is enough room to provide building space for substantially more than 19,000 students within appropriate walking distance without resorting to high rise construction.

Considering the high investment in the University’s existing campus and buildings, most of which are less than four stories, it is essential that no further high rise construction should take place on the Oregon campus. Buildings should be kept at three stories or less and only exceptionally should four story buildings be permitted. Four stories should be considered maximum. Wherever feasible, buildings should be organized in small increments, linked together with arcades, covered walks,
etc.; circulation should be organized to provide numerous ground floor entrances leading directly to the floors above; ground floor space should be devoted primarily to classrooms, departmental hearths, student lounges, exhibit space, etc., opening directly onto covered walks.

8. Pedestrian Circulation

Pedestrian circulation takes on special significance in a University since both students and faculty must be constantly moving from one building to another. The circulation system should form the basic organizational network for the entire campus; it should begin to develop a network of "pedestrian streets" connecting the major sectors of campus with covered walks, arcades, etc. New buildings should be located along these pedestrian streets. Future classrooms, student union facilities, etc., should be built along arcades and on the ground floor of new buildings, opening off of the pedestrian streets.

9. Departments

The "optimum" size for any university department is bound to vary from discipline to discipline and will depend on a number of factors such as the mix between graduate and undergraduate students, teaching loads generated by other majors, aspirations and goals of the department, etc. Each department should be asked to review this question for itself and to make recommendations concerning its optimum size. Those departments which propose to maintain an enrollment in excess of 400 FTE students should be asked to indicate the special reasons which require that the department be that large, and to look for ways and means of providing better departmental scale by creating subdivisions within the department, or through departmental reorganization, etc.

Every department should have a well-defined social hearth which serves as a focus for interchange between the faculty and the students in that department. Each departmental hearth should be central to the department offices and should provide space for picking up mail, secretarial pool, student information, etc. Not all department faculty need be housed in the same building. They should, however, be located within 500 feet of the department hearth and their offices should be clustered in groups of no less than five faculty offices.

10. Housing

The University should encourage the development of student housing in close proximity to the campus. Consideration should be given to the leasing of University land to student cooperatives or developers who agree to provide low cost housing to students. Housing should be treated as generalized housing suitable for both married and single students, or for
any mixed distribution of the two kinds of household. Wherever feasible, dormitories should be converted so that they become apartment houses but retaining certain communal facilities, such as lounges, etc.

Chapter Nine, when completed, will include some twenty example projects worked out according to the patterns, diagnosis, and policies previously described. It will also include a "simulation" of the campus as it might appear after 15-20 years of development under the proposed planning process. One example project has been completed: a proposal for the College of Education.

Larry Bissett
University Planning
September 15, 1971
Revised: September 22, 1971