MEETING #401-1

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Room 338, Michael J. Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A.M. Monday, January 24, 1972, by the President of the Board, Mr. George H. Layman, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. George H. Corey
Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson
Mr. Philip A. Joss
Mr. John D. Mosser
Mr. Edward G. Westerdahl II
Mr. George H. Layman

Absent: Mr. Robert D. Holmes was absent due to an injury, Mr. John W. Snider was absent due to illness, and Mr. Loran L. Stewart was out of the state.

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. H. A. Bork, Consultant; Mr. Keith L. Jackson, Budget Director; Dr. George Diel, Director of Communications Development; Dr. Carl Paetz, Director of Campus and Building Planning; Mr. John B. Leahy, Assistant Attorney General; Mr. John Richardson, Assistant to the Chancellor; Mr. Richard Zita, Director of Publications.

Oregon State University—President R. W. MacVicar.

University of Oregon—President Robert D. Clark.

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

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

Portland State University—President Gregory B. Wolfe; Mr. W. T. Lemman, Vice President for Business and Finance; Mr. Robert Low, Vice President for Administration.

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

Southern Oregon College—President James K. Sours.
MINUTES APPROVED

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Activities of Educational Coordinating Council

Eastern Oregon College—President A. N. Rempel.

Oregon Technical Institute—President W. D. Purvine.

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; Mrs. Lois McGill, Chairman, Inter-institutional Faculty Senate; Mr. James Sexson, Fiscal Analyst, Executive Department; Mr. Richard Burke, Fiscal Analyst, Legislative Fiscal Officer; Dr. Floyd Stearns, Executive Director, Educational Coordinating Council; Mr. Ronald Thaheild, Executive Secretary, Legislative Interim Committee on Education; Mr. Stephen McCarthy, Attorney for OSPIRG; Mrs. Jeanne Hughes, Executive Secretary, Foundation for Oregon Research and Education.

Student Representatives—Mr. Rod Chandler, State Vice Chairman, and Miss Joan Eggleston, University of Oregon Delegate, Interinstitutional Union of Students; Mr. Ben Merrill, Chairman, OSPIRG.

The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on December 14, 1971, and approved them as printed in the preliminary minutes previously issued.

The Chancellor reported that at its December meeting the Educational Coordinating Council adopted a statement that the joint meetings of the State Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education with the Educational Coordinating Council should be limited to an annual meeting, with any other meetings to be called as a result of special problems that might develop.

The Chancellor also said that the Educational Coordinating Council elected the following officers: Mrs. John Cotton, Chairman; Mr. Lloyd Anderson, Vice Chairman; and Dr. Dale Parnell as alternate Vice Chairman. He indicated that Mr. Rosenberg and Mrs. Moore have submitted their resignations and replacements have not yet been selected. The Governor has also stated his intention of appointing a student member to the Coordinating Council, and this member also has not yet been selected.

The Chancellor reported that the Council had indicated its intention of seeking at the next meeting of the Emergency Board the release of $375,000 to fund the present program for the improvement of undergraduate instruction during the second year of the biennium.

Mr. Layman indicated that the one annual meeting of the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education would necessarily be the September joint meeting which is required by statute. Therefore, no action would be needed on this proposal unless special meetings were desired. He asked if there were other recommendations which required action in the additional material distributed to Board members as a result of the Educational Coordinating Council meeting. The Chancellor said he would review this material again to determine whether any further recommendations should be brought to the board.
Mrs. Johnson mentioned the need for close coordination in the planning for all segments of education and that members of both boards and the Coordinating Council should be kept informed of the activities of the other groups.

Mr. Layman said that Mr. Mosser was a member of the steering committee of three representing the two Boards and the Council. Mr. Mosser said the steering committee would have a meeting in the near future and that it was probable there would be a proposal for a joint meeting on the revised teacher education program which is being developed by the Board of Education.

Inasmuch as the construction documents for the proposed Parking Structure No. 2 at the University of Oregon Medical and Dental Schools were in substantial agreement with the design development phase of planning reported to the Board on September 7, 1971, they were accepted and arrangements were made to receive bids for the project at 7:30 P.M. on December 28, 1971, in Portland. (Authorization to proceed with the construction of the facilities within the 1971 statutory expenditure limitation of $2,540,000 had been obtained previously from the State Emergency Board.)

Although Rose & Breedlove, Inc., and Stevens, Thompson & Runyan, Inc., project engineers, had estimated that the direct construction costs would be approximately $2,126,800, and the final pre-bid budget prepared by institutional officials had contemplated this amount as the maximum available for a contract award, the bids received on December 28 were considerably higher. The basic bids submitted by seven general work contractors ranged from a low of $2,392,500 to a high of $2,620,120. By giving effect to deductions applicable to four bid alternates, these quotations could be reduced to $2,306,000 and $2,533,820, respectively. But the lowest figure is substantially above the budgeted allowance for direct construction costs and cannot be accommodated within the project expenditure limitation of $2,540,000. A budget increase of approximately $195,000 would be required if a contract award were to be made to the low bidder, Teeples & Thatcher, Inc., Portland.

Based upon an analysis of the bids in comparison with their estimates, the project engineers have indicated that "the problems of excavation and construction of the tie-back retaining wall at the north side of the structure with the related problems of traffic on Campus Drive and ready access to the work were greater than anticipated." Furthermore, the investigations "indicated a larger price escalation than assumed under the present government controlled wage-price freeze."

A review of the plans is being made to determine what modifications would be required if the bids received on December 28 were rejected and new bids were solicited following redesign. Some reductions in the size of the structure would appear likely, eliminating a portion of the initial capacity of 787 vehicles contemplated by the design and possibly deleting the structural capacity for future vertical expansion. More complete information and a recommendation is expected to be available by the time of the Board meeting on January 24. Meanwhile, efforts are being made to furnish the Department of Environmental Quality with various data requested concerning the project.
Supplemental Report Presented at Board Meeting

Inasmuch as the bids received on December 28, 1971, for the proposed Parking Structure No. 2 at the University of Oregon Medical and Dental Schools, even after deducting all alternates, were considerably above the estimated requirements for direct construction, there appear to be three practical alternatives for review and discussion with the Board:

1. Authorize an increase of $195,000 in the project budget;

2. Negotiate change order modifications with the low bidder to achieve reductions of approximately $180,000 in the direct construction costs;

3. Reject all bids, issue revised plans and specifications to effect reductions of at least $180,000 in the direct construction costs upon a re-bid invitation.

(Because of the time and expense involved in making a complete redesign to eliminate the potential for future vertical expansion of the structure, such a procedure would not appear to be a practical alternative.)

Each of the three choices noted above has some advantages and disadvantages which may be summarized as follows:

1. Authorize an increase of $195,000 in the project budget:

   Advantages:
   a. Lowest average investment per vehicle space, thus permitting the lowest charge for parking. Based upon the rated capacity of 787 vehicles, a project budget of $2,735,000, when adjusted to exclude the commitments of $149,791 already made for the elevator modifications within the teaching hospital financed as part of this project, would average $3,285 per space. Tentatively, it is estimated that the monthly parking charges would need to be increased about $1 above the level contemplated for the budget of $2,540,000.
   b. The integrity of the design would be preserved.
   c. The number of spaces would come closest to meeting City of Portland code requirements.
   d. Time would be saved and no additional costs would be incurred for design modifications, re-bidding, etc.

   Disadvantages:
   a. The statutory expenditure limitation of $2,540,000 for the project would have to be raised.
   b. Additional self-liquidating bond proceeds would need to be allocated for the project. (They are currently available, however, and no additional bond sale would be necessary.)
2. **Negotiate change order modifications with the low bidder to achieve reductions of approximately $180,000 in the direct construction costs:**

**Advantages:**

a. Save time and some expense, as compared with re-bidding.

b. Minimize the reductions in the scope of the project required to stay within the present budget limitation, and thus minimize increases in parking charges upon completion of the structure. Tentatively, it is projected that the savings could be achieved by eliminating no more than one floor level, decreasing the capacity from 787 to not less than 655 spaces. Based upon a project budget of $2,390,209, which excludes the commitments for the elevator modifications in the teaching hospital, and the capacity of 655 spaces, the investment would average about $3,649 per space, or $364 more than the average of $3,285 if Alternative No. 1 were selected. (The 132 spaces lost by the removal of a floor would have a price tag of about $1,477 each.)

c. This approach is recommended by the project engineers and is favored by several of the bidders, including the second low bidder and the current president of the Oregon-Columbia Chapter of the Associated General Contractors, both of whom have written letters to this effect.

**Disadvantages:**

a. Change order modifications equal to approximately $180,000 would constitute about 8 percent of the lowest bid (net of all deductive alternates). Although such a procedure would not be in conflict with any written policies of the Board, the extent of such change order modifications would exceed the limitations normally considered feasible without re-bidding.

b. There can be no certainty that the contract amount, as adjusted for the proposed change order reductions, would be as low or less than a contract resulting from a new bid invitation.

c. There would be some sacrifice in the integrity of the design concept of the structure.

d. The monthly rates of charge would likely be about $2 above the level contemplated originally for the project budget of $2,540,000.
3. Reject all bids, issue revised plans and specifications to effect reductions of at least $180,000 in the direct construction costs upon a re-bid invitation:

Advantages:

a. Contractors interested in submitting bids for the project would have an equal opportunity to do so.

b. Though a remote possibility, the amount of the contract award based upon new competitive bid figures might be lower than an amount resulting from change order negotiations with the contractor who submitted the lowest bid on December 28, 1971.

Disadvantages:

a. Loss of time and the expense required by the engineers, the Board and contractors because of re-bidding.

b. Particularly in view of trends for price escalation, there can be no assurance that the reductions to be accomplished in order to stay within the budget will not be considerably more extensive than those that could be arrived at by Alternative No. 2. For example, if it were necessary to delete one and a half levels, and thus reduce the capacity of the structure from 787 down to 584 spaces, the average investment per space would be approximately $4,093. (Based upon the assumption of budget "savings" of $195,000, the 203 spaces lost would have a price tag of $961 each.) Under such conditions, the increase in the monthly parking rates would likely be $3 to $4, or more, above those contemplated initially.

c. There would be some sacrifice in the integrity of the design concept of the structure.

Board Discussion and Action

In response to a question concerning the situation with respect to the Department of Environmental Quality, Mr. Hunderup said he had met with Mr. L. B. Day and requested a further interpretation of Mr. Day's earlier letter. Mr. Hunderup said the Department of Environmental Quality must be provided with a new letter from the Portland Planning Commission together with data concerning alternatives that were reviewed and are still under consideration at the Medical School to help solve the parking problem. These include discussions with mass transit authorities in the City of Portland and private carriers in terms of shuttle bus operation and mass transit operation. Mr. Day has indicated that if the additional information is provided, he will recommend to the Commission that it withdraw the moratorium which is currently imposed on proceeding with the parking structure. Mr. Hunderup said there would be no difference in the three proposed alternatives submitted for Board consideration as far as the environmental question is concerned.
Mr. Hunderup emphasized that the first alternative would result in the least cost per unit of space and that alternatives two and three would be more expensive procedures, with no assurance whatever of the construction price if new bids were sought.

Mr. Hunderup indicated that preliminary investigations had been started with the engineers and the low bidder and that it appeared that it would be possible to reduce the project cost by slightly more than the necessary $180,000 by eliminating an entire floor. It has not yet been determined whether sufficient savings could be achieved by deleting less than a full floor. He said the contractors have indicated that the most practical change without involving a complete redesign would be to eliminate the next to the top floor and drop the top floor level down, thus leaving a total of five levels. If this were done, it might not be possible to bridge across directly from the street to the top level of the parking structure, but the potential would remain for restoring the floor and adding the two additional floors that had been planned for the ultimate project. The possibility of a ramp does not appear feasible without substantial redesign.

Mr. Westerdahl said that the first option would have the advantage of allowing a legislative body to speak to the environmental question. In option two there is the disadvantage of possible objections from unsuccessful bidders who may feel that they might have been able to submit a lower bid on the design after it is revised to come within the available funds. He asked whether there had been any discussion with the unsuccessful bidders as to their attitude if change order modifications were negotiated with the low bidder to achieve reductions of approximately $180,000.

Mr. Hunderup said that the second low bidder had indicated he is not interested in the project at the bid price, that the bid received from the low bidder was exceptionally good, and that public interest would be served best by negotiating modifications with the low bidder. The third low bidder has indicated that if Mr. Hunderup believes it would be in the best interests of the Board to negotiate with the low bidder, he would have no objection to this procedure. However, he would be likely to rebid the project if it were again offered for bid. The third low bidder has also stated that there should be negotiation with the low bidder.

Mr. Hunderup said that, in addition, the following letter had been received from Mr. Paul E. Emerick, president of the Oregon-Columbia Chapter of the Associated General Contractors of America:
January 14, 1972

Mr. Elden E. Breedlove
ROSE & BREEDLOVE, INC.
615 Oregon Pioneer Building
Portland, Oregon

Dear Elden:

This is to confirm our conversation of this date, wherein I stated the Paul B. Emerick Co. recommends the following awarding procedure when the low bid exceeds funds available:

That the low bidder be given the opportunity to negotiate with the owner and/or his consultant, in an attempt to arrive at a contract scope and amount satisfactory to both, within the funds available.

If, in the process or at the end of negotiation, mutual satisfaction is not achieved, either party should be at liberty to withdraw. Then the project should be re-designed to bring it within the funds available, with a recall for bids in the same manner as the original bid call.

It is not uncommon for the construction industry to expend $40,000 - $60,000 for the sole purpose of providing a potential owner with competitive bids. When bids have been received, the value of the project has been accurately determined. And, if the low bids exceed the budget, it becomes apparent that the budget estimate is insufficient for the given design and specifications.

In such situations, we believe the professions and owners have an obligation to try to consummate a contract by negotiation to preclude the industry's suffering a like amount on the next bid round.

It goes without saying that the industry cannot absorb such a cost without considering it a part of the expense of doing business and, therefore, reflecting such unnecessary costs in pricing, which merely causes the owners to eventually assume costs which otherwise could be avoided.

In that competitive bidding is an exercise in free enterprise at its best, predicated upon the incentive that, if qualified, the low bidder would be entitled to receive the contract, it is only prudent and ethical that the negotiation—when such is necessary, involves only the low bidder. And that if they cannot successfully consummate a contract, then and only then would the industry be called upon again to bid the same project; but, certainly of a re-design.
Although I have expressed our company's policy and philosophy, I believe that it is the consensus of the general contracting industry, in general and in this area in particular.

Sincerely,

PAUL B. EMERICK CO.

/s/ Paul E. Emerick

Paul E. Emerick

cc: Mr. Ed. Lynch

In response to a question concerning the procedure if the Board decided to negotiate with the low bidder, Mr. Hunderup said that the time element would preclude presenting a report of the negotiations to the next Board meeting on March 28, 1972. He said that he would hope that the authorization would be for the staff to negotiate the changes within the total expenditure limitation. He said that if the Board chose to approve the first instead of the second alternative, there would be no negotiations involved. It was indicated that the next Committee meetings on February 22-23, 1972, would be held before the bids would expire.

Mr. Mosser moved that the Board approve alternative 2, but that before a contract is awarded, it be referred to the next meeting of the Building Committee for approval. He indicated that it was his personal feeling that if the portion of the top level can be retained so that the three entrances are preserved, the contract should be awarded. If not, consideration should be given to abandoning the project until the complete structure can be built.

Mr. Hunderup pointed out that it is extremely urgent to save even the 655 parking spaces in the reduced project, rather than delaying the project. However, Mr. Mosser said that the immediate effect would probably be a loss of about 200 spaces during the construction period. Mr. Mosser said that he did not intend his opinion to be made a requirement for Building Committee approval of the project, but asked that it be given consideration in making a decision.

Mr. Westerdahl asked if the engineers or architects could speak to the question of the possibility of preserving the third entrance.

Mr. Gordon Trapp responded that his firm had provided the State System with a letter indicating changes that could be made to save approximately $180,000, and that the initial approach which was proposed would eliminate half a floor, thus preserving the third entrance. However, that approach would also require other substantial cuts, mainly with regard to eliminating elevator service. The project called for one elevator initially and a second one to be provided at a later date. The second elevator was bid as a deductive alternate and has already been eliminated, but it would appear necessary to eliminate the other elevator in order to save the $180,000 and still preserve the third...
Mr. Hunderup was asked whether the staff has a specific recommendation. He replied that personally he would favor the rebidding, but the pressure is very substantial from the construction industry, from the engineers who designed the project, and from institutional officials to negotiate with the low bidder. He said that he could see nothing particularly wrong with negotiating with the low bidder, particularly since the industry has supported the concept. Consequently, based upon a consideration of all of the factors involved, he would favor alternate No. 2.

Dean Holman concurred in Mr. Hunderup's comments and stressed the urgent need for the structure.

The Board approved Mr. Mosser's motion to authorize the negotiation of change order modifications with the low bidder to achieve reductions of approximately $180,000 in the direct construction costs, subject to approval of the Building Committee at its next meeting. It was understood that the Building Committee at that point would have the power to approve a contract award for the construction of the facilities within the expenditure limitation of $2,540,000 previously authorized by the Board, the 1971 Legislature and the State Emergency Board.

In accordance with Board regulations, Mr. Robert D. Holmes represented the Board at the 1971 Summer Commencement exercises of Portland State University and acted for the Board in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas. The signed copies of the list of approved candidates are on file in the Board's Office.

The Board confirmed the action of Mr. Holmes in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas.

Subsequent to the action of the Oregon Legislature in 1955 in establishing Portland State within the area of the former Lincoln High School property, the original building has been designated informally and unofficially as "Old Main." Similarly, the classroom and office building constructed immediately south of the Smith Memorial College Center has been identified as "South Park Hall" pending the selection of a more appropriate name. This structure houses the Registrar and Business Office as well as the major facilities for the Arts and Letters programs.
Staff Recommendation:

It was recommended that "Old Main" be re-named "Lincoln Hall" and that "South Park Hall" be designated hereafter as the "Richard L. Neuberger Hall" in recognition of the late Senator's contributions as a professional writer and as an effective advocate and supporter of Portland State.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Hunderup outlined some of the contributions of Mr. Neuberger as a legislator to the State of Oregon and to the development of higher education and Portland State University.

In response to a suggestion that similar activities of Mrs. Neuberger be recognized by including her name in the designation of the building, it was indicated that Board policy stipulated that buildings would not be named for living persons unless they had contributed a substantial portion of the construction cost.

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

Pursuant to the disposition agreement for land entered into with the Portland Development Commission, as reported at the December 9, 1968, meeting of the Board, a seventeenth acquisition of land has been consummated. The transaction (No. 3-71) consisted of the following:

1. One parcel in Block 239 involving 6,500 square feet at a total price of $30,090.

2. One parcel in Block 229 involving 36,400 square feet at a total price of $168,500.

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the Board's Office has accepted the construction documents phase of planning which Robert J. Keeney, and Balzhiser, Rhodes, Smith & Morgan, Associated Architects, have completed for the proposed remodeling of the Britt Center at Southern Oregon College. This project was authorized by the 1971 Legislature within an expenditure limitation of $565,000. Now that the new College Union Building is nearing completion, the work involved in altering and refurbishing the Britt Center is to be undertaken.

The construction documents conform substantially with the preliminary plans approved by the Board at the July 27, 1970, meeting. However, a few modifications have been made. The scope of work for landscape development south and east of the building has been expanded and the earlier proposal to convert a portion of the covered terrace, located at the north end of the first floor, into offices, a conference room and lounge for bookstore employees has been abandoned.

The remodeled building is expected to provide additional areas for the college bookstore with related sales, office, service and storage spaces; a post office; ceramics laboratories; offices for the student newspaper and yearbook; the College's placement office with related interview rooms; and offices for the dean of students, dean of women and dean of men. Most of the remodeling work is to occur on the two lower floor levels of the three-story building.

As part of the work to be done, fluorescent light fixtures would be installed, and new ventilation and temperature control systems would be provided. An extension of the tunnel from the southwest corner of Churchill Hall would provide utility services, including steam and chilled water lines, from the central heating and cooling plant. New floor coverings would be installed, and much of the building interior would be redecorated. The ballroom on the third level would be air conditioned, unless it becomes necessary to exercise a bid alternate to omit this portion of the work. A new entryway, including stairways and a balcony, would be provided on the south side of the building for more direct access to the bookstore and for a second exit from the ballroom. A new outside entrance to the lobby of the post office on the ground floor also would be provided.

It is anticipated that bids for the remodeling would be received in mid-February. The direct construction costs are estimated to be $438,057, including sitework, outside utilities, and the air conditioning of the ballroom. For the gross area of approximately 36,838 square feet on the two floors to be remodeled, the direct construction costs of $357,968, excluding these three items, would average about $9.72 per square foot.

A request will be presented to the State Emergency Board on January 27-28, 1972, for authorization to proceed with the project in accordance with the program approved by the 1971 Legislature. Thereafter, if satisfactory bids are received, a contract award will be made for the remodeling work.
Funds for the Britt Center Remodeling are expected to be provided from self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF THE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

Project - SOC Britt Center Remodel

Architects - Robert J. Keeney, Medford, and Balzhiser, Rhodes, Smith & Morgan, Eugene, Associated Architects

Approximate gross area to be remodeled - 36,838 square feet (Excluding ballroom)

Estimated total project costs $ 565,000

Estimated direct construction costs:
Total $ 438,057
Building and fixed equipment excluding sitework, outside utilities and air conditioning the ballroom $ 357,968
Average (per square foot) - $9.72

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - February 1972
Completion - December 1972

Tentative financing plan:
Article XI-F(1) Bond Borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $ 565,000

Board Discussion and Action

In response to a question from Mrs. Johnson, it was indicated that the Britt Center would retain that name since this building had been designated as a semi-permanent structure and Britt funds are being used for the remodeling.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

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

1. Curtis property - 1066 and 1066-1/2 Henry Street, Ashland

The property consists of a lot containing approximately 9,450 square feet improved with a two-bedroom house, a studio-type house and garage. It is in an area designated for future parking and the purchase price of $14,750 was in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. Funds to finance the acquisition were provided from the proceeds of the sale of Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings authorized by the 1971 Legislature.
2. Bushnell property – 632 Roca Street, Ashland

The property consists of a lot containing approximately 19,680 square feet improved with a one-bedroom house. The purchase price of $7,500 was in line with appraisals obtained by the institution. The property is in an area designated for educational and general plant use and the funds to finance the acquisition were provided from the sale of Article XI-G bond borrowings authorized under Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Report of Purchase of St. Joseph Hospital Property, EOC

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board, arrangements have been made to acquire the eight unimproved lots within the block bounded by J and K Avenues and Sixth and Seventh Streets in La Grande. This property was owned by the Sisters of Saint Francis, La Grande, Oregon, and is located within the approved projected campus boundaries of Eastern Oregon College. The lots contain a total of about 77,530 square feet. As indicated in the College's long-range development plan, the property is expected to be used as part of the site of a future classroom building near the main entrance to the campus.

Negotiations for the acquisition of the property have extended over many years, but were finalized recently following the closure of the St. Joseph Hospital. The option price of $20,000 was in line with the appraised value of the property, and the funds required for the purchase were provided from Article XI-G bond borrowings authorized under Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Committee

On December 10, 1969, a report was made to the Board of the appointment of Architects Hewlett, Jamison & Atkinson (formerly Hewlett & Jamison) for the design and construction supervision of the proposed housing at Yaquina Bay Marine Science Center, Newport, which had been authorized by the 1969 Legislature within an expenditure limitation of $165,000. It was noted that consideration would be given to the possible use of prefabricated components or housing units rather than conventional on-site construction.

Subsequently, a copy of the Architects' schematic design for six double units of housing was submitted to the Board's Office for review, but inasmuch as institutional officials were not able to develop a financial program for the proposed units which would not require some support from campus housing – even for operations, they requested that further consideration of those plans be deferred while additional alternatives were explored.
Copies of a new proposal for a smaller initial phase of housing have been submitted to the Board's Office. These plans anticipate the construction of four one-bedroom apartments which could be used for as many as sixteen single students during certain portions of the year, or for four families at other times. The buildings likely would be pre-fabricated at a factory and transported to Newport for placement on a site at the southwest corner of the Marine Science Center in accordance with the long-range development plan for the complex. The plans have been reviewed and approved by Mr. Louis DeMonte, Campus Planning Consultant.

Each apartment would contain a living room, dining area, kitchen, bath, and one bedroom. The gross area of each unit would be approximately 672 square feet, plus an open porch and deck of about 254 square feet. The apartments would be completely furnished. Heating would be provided through electric baseboard heaters. Approval of the installation of a septic tank and drain field has been confirmed with the local sanitarian.

A tentative financing plan has been prepared by University officials on the assumption that the total cost of the project would be approximately $70,800. Of this amount, the Oregon State University Foundation will provide $50,000 as a gift and the remainder will be obtained from balances available to the institution from housing operations.

Staff Recommendation:

It was recommended that the Board approve the schematic design phase of planning for the construction of four one-bedroom apartments at the Oregon State University Marine Science Center at Yaquina Bay and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to instruct the Architects to prepare the design development and construction documents phases of planning, solicit bids and award a contract for construction, contingent upon approval by the State Emergency Board, within a project budget of approximately $70,800.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF SCHEMATIC DESIGNS

- Project - OSU Yaquina Bay Marine Science Center Housing
- Architects - Hewlett, Jamison & Atkinson, Portland
- Legislative authorization - Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1929
- Board's priority - No. 26 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Estimated gross area:
- Four living units - 2,688 square feet
- Porches and wood decks - 1,016 square feet

Estimated total project costs $ 70,800

Estimated direct construction costs:
- Total, including site development $ 55,500
- Four living units and built-in fixtures 46,400
  - Average (per square foot) - $12.53

Tentative schedule:
- Bidding - March 1972
- Completion - June 1972
Tentative financing plan:
Gift from Oregon State University Foundation $ 50,000
Balances available to the institution from housing operations $ 20,800
Total $ 70,800

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

During the Committee discussion, it was stated that there would be no difficulty in earning sufficient revenue from these housing units so that they would be self-liquidating and self-supporting. Mr. Stewart stated that he wanted it publicly known that his firm was involved in this type of housing and would probably bid on the project if it were approved.

President MacVicar indicated that the master plan provided for additional apartment units but that approval of the schematic plans was not intended as a commitment to construct more units than those presently proposed.

Dr. MacVicar said that these plans are compatible with those being prepared for the South Beach area by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill. He said the integration of the development of the Marine Science Center into a master plan for the area is of concern to Oregon State University, the community of Newport, and to the Port Authority. Dr. MacVicar also commented that there is a great difference in the demand for housing between January and July in the Newport area and that an effort is being made to provide highly flexible housing that can be used for different purposes in different seasons of the year.

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

Staff Report to the Committee

On December 8, 1970, the Board reviewed and approved the schematic design phase of planning for a 150-unit married student housing project at Oregon State University. It was indicated that these apartments would be constructed on a tract of approximately 8.96 acres of land located north and west of the intersection of Western Avenue and 35th Avenue which had been purchased for this purpose in 1968. It was also indicated that although legislative authorization was being requested for the project in the amount of $2,200,000, institutional and Board officials would investigate alternative methods of proceeding with construction either by the Board, directly or indirectly, or by others such as Adult Student Housing, Inc.
The project was not authorized by the 1971 Legislature. However, the need for additional units of housing for married students, particularly graduate assistants, is substantial, and it is necessary to replace as soon as possible the 54 remaining units within Campus Court (the temporary wood-frame war surplus units brought to the campus after World War II).

Consistent with the commitments made to the Board on December 8, 1970, institutional officials have explored alternate methods of proceeding with the construction of the 150-unit complex and have concluded that the most appropriate arrangements can be made through the leasing and development of the site by the Oregon State University Foundation, a non-profit Oregon corporation. This Foundation has applied for and has received preliminary assurance of a loan in an amount not to exceed $2,183,000 from the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the provisions of Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and will proceed with the project if terms and conditions mutually satisfactory to the Board and the Foundation can be developed.

It is proposed that property be leased to the Foundation for the period of planning, construction and amortization of the federal loan (a total of approximately 42 years) at a rental rate sufficient to meet the debt service requirements on the Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings relating to the site acquisition, and that the professional services agreement with the project architects be assigned to the Foundation with the understanding that the Board will be reimbursed for fees paid to date for the initial phases of planning. It is also proposed that contract arrangements be made between the Board and the Foundation concerning the operation and maintenance of the facilities by Oregon State University following the completion of construction. Charges for such services would be sufficient to cover all direct and indirect costs provided by or through the institution, such as the assignment of apartments, collection of rentals, management services, utilities furnished, etc. The form of lease and contract arrangements would be subject to the approval of the Board's attorney. It will be acknowledged that when the Foundation has resolved its financial commitments in the project, principally through the repayment of the federal loan, title to the buildings and other improvements on the site will be vested in the State of Oregon acting by and through the State Board of Higher Education on behalf of Oregon State University.

Staff Recommendation:

It was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to lease the state-owned tract of 8.96 acres north and west of the intersection of Western Avenue and 35th Avenue, Corvallis, to the Oregon State University Foundation for the construction of approximately 150 units of married student housing and that the contract arrangements be made with the Foundation for the operation and maintenance of the facilities by the staff of the institution following the completion of construction.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Hunderup said that the docket item had indicated a period of 42 years for the lease but that more recent conversations with the Department of Housing and Urban Development had indicated that it might be necessary to extend the term of the lease to 75 years. This would protect the interests of the federal government in the event there was a default in the repayment of the loan near the end of the original loan term. The Department of Housing and Urban Development officials also said that a final loan agreement could be approved even though the applicant does not own the property but merely has it under lease.

Mr. Hunderup said the possibility of a transfer of title to avoid the question of leasing had been explored with the Board's attorney but that Oregon Statutes would require public sale of the land to the highest bidder rather than a transfer of title to a specific group. He also said that the proposal contemplates that the Oregon State University Foundation would reimburse the Board for its investment in architectural planning to date and that the architects have expressed a willingness to accept an assignment from the Board to the Foundation for the completion of the planning of the project under the direction of the Foundation.

Mr. Hunderup said that the proposal appears to be consistent with the understanding of legislative intent in directing the Board to seek a solution to some of its construction problems by some funding other than the use of Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds. He said that if the Board approved the recommendation, discussions would be held with the Legislative Fiscal Office and the Executive Department as to the appropriateness of making a report to the Emergency Board.

Mr. Hunderup emphasized that the filing of the application had been authorized by the Executive Committee of the Oregon State University Foundation and that the proposal would be presented to the full Board of Trustees of the Foundation for its approval.

In response to a question about the rental rates for these units, Mr. Hunderup indicated that the rates would be in the range of $120-125 per month for two-bedroom units if the property continued to be classified as tax exempt. The project would qualify for tax exempt status under present regulations but subsequent legislative action could change the classification and the rental rates would then be higher. It was stated that for 150 units there would probably be sufficient demand to keep them occupied even if it were necessary to increase the rates to $160 or $165.

The Committee discussed rental policies and charges with respect to apartments rented as family residences and those rented as apartments for groups of single students. It was indicated that it is very difficult to get accurate information on the percentage of apartments rented to students as opposed to those rented to family groups.
Mrs. Johnson said that some members of the Legislature had expressed concern that the Board was recommending this project without referral to the Emergency Board and that they were also concerned with the close relationship between the Foundation and Oregon State University. She said that she questioned the fact that the original bylaws of the Oregon State University Foundation specified certain activities for the Foundation and that the amendments made recently were designed primarily to permit the building of facilities at Yaquina Bay and in Corvallis. Consequently, donations were made to the Foundation by individuals with the expectation that they would be used for one set of purposes and funds would now be used for a different set of purposes.

Mr. Hunderup responded that the amendments to the bylaws were prompted in relation to the housing at Corvallis but this was not a consideration with the Yaquina Bay project.

Mrs. Johnson said that in addition to the factors mentioned above she was uncomfortable with the proposal because of the great imbalance between married student housing at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University and also because the philosophy for building married student housing and the need for apartments for single students needed to be studied in terms of present demands.

Mrs. Johnson said that if the Board approved the recommendation, the proposal should be referred to the Emergency Board together with more detailed analysis of the relationship between the University and the Foundation for the operation of these housing units over a 75-year period.

Mr. Stewart moved that the Committee recommend approval of the recommendations as presented, with the understanding that a report would be made to the Emergency Board. He also indicated that his business firm might be bidding on this project as well as the one at Yaquina Bay.

Mr. Stewart said that the policy of the federal government is to encourage providing adequate housing and funds have been authorized for that purpose. The State of Oregon also is following a policy to improve housing. He pointed out that much of the housing in the University district in Eugene is deteriorating because it has been rented at low rates to students and the owners cannot afford proper maintenance. He said the Corvallis project would prevent the same thing occurring at Corvallis.

He said this proposal represented proper policy and philosophy which he favored, but that the details of the contractual arrangements should be correctly and adequately stated to meet all legal requirements.

In response to a question about the reason this was not authorized by the legislature, Mr. Hunderup said that he was not in a position to say because Board staff members were not present during the discussion of the decisions that were made in connection with the capital outlay program.
Mr. Mosser said that, in his opinion, a number of factors entered into the legislative reluctance to authorize housing. One of these was pressure from private enterprise on the basis that it is unfair competition because this housing would be tax exempt. Mr. Mosser said he believed this would be a legitimate subsidy and the campuses needed housing which should be integrated with the total University program. He said the decline in dormitory occupancy may also have resulted in the fear that these apartments would not be used. Mr. Mosser said that this might be a good reason for not building dormitories but it is not a good reason in the case of apartments.

Mr. Mosser said there also appears to be a feeling that higher education should devote its major attention to education and not to housing and that the problems of being in loco parentis have diverted higher education from its main purpose. Apartment housing would present fewer problems of that type than dormitories.

Mr. Joss said that he intended to support the motion, but that he wanted it clearly understood that the Foundation had a full opportunity to discuss and consider its action and was not coerced by any pressure from either the University or the Board.

Dr. MacVicar emphasized the need for married student housing at Oregon State University, but he indicated that the University was anxious to get out of the operation of low-cost housing, particularly that which does not meet adequate standards. He said it was difficult for him to advocate high standards of housing when the institution itself was not setting a good example in some of its units. He also said that there were no present plans for recommending further married student housing projects to the Board.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board approve Mr. Stewart's motion that the recommendations be approved, with the understanding that a report would be made to the Emergency Board.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Joss moved that the Board approve the recommendation as presented.

Mr. Hunderup said that the Board of Trustees of the Oregon State University Foundation had met following the January 6, 1972, Building Committee meeting and had approved the undertaking of the project by the Foundation.

Mr. Westerdahl observed that the recommendation as stated in the docket included the provision that a report of the proposed project would be made to the State Emergency Board, and he inquired whether the motion by Mr. Joss included that provision. Mr. Joss replied that his motion did include the report to the Emergency Board.

Mrs. Johnson said that she had been concerned about this project and as a result had reviewed Board policy and Board minutes with respect to the proposed housing. She stated that her understanding of Board policy with respect to housing was that it was provided in order to extend educational opportunity to students; and in connection with married student housing, that an additional purpose is to attract
qualified graduate students, particularly teaching assistants and research fellows. She said that in reviewing the present occupancy rate it would appear that the actual occupancy does not conform with Board policy in terms of giving preference to graduate students. In addition, she said, the University of Oregon has changed the criteria for occupancy to include financial need. As a result, the assignment of married housing has become, in effect, an attempt to solve a societal problem. She said the University of Oregon was trying to furnish low-cost housing and thus keep married students from competing for privately-owned housing with the permanently poor, the elderly, or those on fixed incomes.

Mrs. Johnson then referred to six points of policy which were discussed but not resolved as indicated in the minutes of the December 8, 1970, Board meeting, when the project was first discussed. (1) Further study will need to be made in an effort to lower the investment per apartment by reducing the size and number of two-story townhouse apartments and by other alternatives to be explored. In the priority list presented to the 1971 Legislature for married student housing at four campuses, the estimated cost varied from $8,000 to approximately $20,000 per apartment. (2) The site considered for the Oregon State University married housing is a difficult one in that all basic utilities have to be provided and that earth filling was required and provided by Oregon State University. (Mr. Hunderup explained that any cost for bringing utilities to the site would be charged to the project and that the requirement for earth fill provided Oregon State University an opportunity to dispose of earth excavated in connection with other building projects on the campus.) (3) Although the point was made that Oregon State University has a critical need for additional married student housing, Oregon State University proposes at the same time to raze 56 units of so-called temporary World War II housing. It is noted from the Barometer that persons living in the old apartments like them and also the low rental rates. There are numerous instances in Oregon where left-over buildings from World War II have been converted into motels, hotels, apartments, etc., and have been maintained and modernized and are still in use. (4) Mr. T. J. Starker, a member of the Board of the Oregon State University Foundation, wrote to the President of the Board to the effect that the reason for his negative vote on the married student housing project was that apartments have been built in Corvallis recently at the rate of 360 in one year and 400 in another year, with 400 or more units being planned for 1972; and that there are currently vacancies of 11-12% in those apartments. Mrs. Johnson said that as far as she knew, there has been no indication of any kind of a survey of students who would occupy the new married student housing to determine their preferences as to layout or facilities. (5) There is a need for long-range planning of married student housing, the reasons for building it, and the capacity of private enterprise to supply it. Even though the project is expected to be self liquidating through a federal loan and self supporting, it appears at this time especially important to examine every expenditure in higher education with respect to the educational aims and missions of the institutions. (6) Criteria for student
occupancy of the apartments should be developed. Mrs. Johnson said that as far as she knew, this had not been done, and that she did not know whether such decisions would be made by Oregon State University or the Oregon State University Foundation. Also there are other questions, such as who will supervise construction; who will be financially responsible if operating financial problems occur, the Oregon State University Foundation or the Board; does the proposed arrangement represent an arm's-length relationship on the part of the Board; does the proposed subsidized housing provide the student occupants an appropriate experience vis-à-vis the real world; what about inequitable treatment of young persons as between the married and the unmarried, and between college students and those who do not attend college.

Mrs. Johnson noted also that in approving a similar project previously at Southern Oregon College, the Board passed a supplemental resolution absolving it and Southern Oregon College from any responsibility, financial or otherwise, and that neither the Board nor the institution made any representation to Adult Student Housing concerning details of the project ASH planned to build at Southern Oregon College.

Mrs. Johnson concluded by saying that she could not support the proposed project, even though she knew that the Board had allowed a great discrepancy to build up in the matter of married student housing as between the University of Oregon and Oregon State University.

Mr. Hunderup responded that the questions concerning the long-term planning had not been answered because the architects had not been authorized to proceed with further planning. These questions would be answered as planning proceeds under the direction of the group to which the project is eventually assigned. The cost of construction supervision would be a project cost. If the project is built by the Foundation, Oregon State University would be reimbursed for any costs which it may have incurred.

President MacVicar said that if the Board approved the project as presented, it would be intended that a legal document would be prepared that would protect both the Oregon State University Foundation and the Board of Higher Education from future difficulties. He said the basic difference between this project and other similar projects is the close relationship between the Foundation and the institution. Although they are separate corporations which exist independently, the Foundation exists to serve the University. He indicated it would be possible perhaps to bring the project to the Board under a different management arrangement but that the management of student housing on the campus feels there is a real advantage, particularly for the students, in having uniform housing management on the campus. He noted that the plan has been reviewed with Mr. DeMonte, the campus planner, and its location is appropriate in terms of the master campus plan. The size is consistent with present and future expectations for graduate education in Corvallis.
President MacVicar said that Oregon State University is clearly at a disadvantage in terms of married housing with respect to every other institution in the western region.

Mr. Westerdahl asked whether this project had been denied approval at the executive department or legislative level.

Mr. Hunderup responded that the Executive Department made no recommendation with respect to auxiliary enterprise projects, and therefore the decision must have been made at the legislative level. He said he had not been present at the time of legislative discussions concerning the project. He said that at the Building Committee meeting Mr. Mosser had indicated several factors which he believed had an impact on the decision. These comments were noted in the Building Committee discussion reported in the preceding pages. Mr. Mosser said that he was unable to say that any one of these factors was decisive on this particular project but that all of them were in the background of the legislative reluctance to approve housing projects in general.

Mr. Westerdahl said that he was concerned with the approach being used and that he would prefer seeking state and legislative approval directly. He said that, in his opinion, Oregon State University would be doing about everything as though it were actually building the apartments.

Mr. Hunderup responded that it was his understanding that the Legislature did not want the Board to use XI-F(l) bonding capacity for this project, but it was not his understanding that the Legislature objected to achieving this housing through some other means. In fact, he was led to believe that there was an obligation to work out housing projects with organizations such as Portland Student Services, Adult Student Housing, and the Oregon State University Foundation. Mr. Hunderup said he had no hesitancy in reporting this action to the Emergency Board because he believed this proposal was responsive to legislative direction to find a solution to the project other than using XI-F(l) bonding capacity.

Mr. Westerdahl made a motion to amend the recommendation so that Board approval would take effect only after the Emergency Board approves the project. It was indicated that the original motion required a report to the Emergency Board but not its approval.

Mr. Mosser said he would vote against the amendment because he did not think the Emergency Board should be approving projects that have not had legislative approval. He said he would have no objection to referring the project to the Legislature for a policy decision. He said that if the project should not be built without legislative approval, it should have legislative approval. If it can be built with Board approval, it should be built on the basis of Board action and not subject to Emergency Board approval.

Mr. Westerdahl indicated his agreement with the issue as Mr. Mosser stated it and he withdrew his motion to amend the original motion.
The Chancellor said he was hesitant to seek Emergency Board approval where such approval was not required.

In response to a question from Mrs. Johnson as to why Oregon State University did not construct the apartments directly, Mr. Hunderup indicated that the federal money only represented an interest subsidy and the only means by which Oregon State University could obtain the actual construction funds would be through XI-F(1) bonds.

Mrs. Johnson said that if the Board were to approve this, she hoped it was understood that the Board had a policy for building student housing, and particularly for building married student housing, and that it is prepared to stand on that policy.

The Board then voted on the motion as originally presented. The motion was defeated by a tie vote of three to three. Directors Corey, Joss, and Mosser voted in favor of the motion. Directors Johnson, Layman, and Westerdahl opposed the motion. Mr. Layman pointed out that in Board of Higher Education meetings the President may vote on all motions.

Mr. Layman said that only six of the nine Board members were present and this was an important decision. He said that it would be appropriate for a member who voted on the prevailing side to move for reconsideration at a subsequent meeting. He said that since the vote was a tie, the negatives were considered to be the prevailing side and anyone voting against the motion could move for reconsideration. Mr. Mosser then changed his vote to no in order to have the privilege of moving for reconsideration at a future meeting.

Mrs. Johnson said that she understood this project had been discussed with Adult Student Housing. She said that if the need were so great, the Board would be interested in hearing further details concerning the ASH proposal or one from some other organization that would not be so closely related to Oregon State University as the Oregon State University Foundation. She said that she understood one of the questions concerning the ASH proposal was whether the rents might be higher. However, if legislative action were to put the project as presently proposed on the tax rolls, it would be necessary even for the Oregon State University Foundation to charge higher rentals.

Mr. Mosser said he agreed with Mrs. Johnson that the housing policy was not sufficiently defined and suggested that the matter be referred to the Building Committee or such other appropriate committee as the chair desires for further development or reconsideration of that policy.

Mr. Layman referred the question of the housing policies to the Building Committee for consideration.

Since the Board did not approve the preceding item on the construction of married student housing at Oregon State University by the Oregon State University Foundation, the Board did not consider or vote on a proposed resolution concerning the application from the Foundation for federal loan assistance.
Upon the recommendation of Oregon State University officials and the project architects, the work performed by the principal contractors for Arnold Cafeteria was accepted as of November 15, 1971, and the work for Bloss Hall was accepted as of November 6, 1971, both subject to the completion of a few minor items. The Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning inspected the work for acceptance on behalf of the Board. A revised semifinal budget for both projects is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on June 9, 1970:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Costs</th>
<th>Revised Budget 11/6/71 &amp; 11/15/71</th>
<th>Original Budget 6/9/70</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General work - Willis A. Hill, Inc., Salem</td>
<td>$2,068,971</td>
<td>$1,967,000</td>
<td>$101,971 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical work:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Cafeteria - W. D. Claggett Mechanical Contractors, Inc., Salem</td>
<td>244,216</td>
<td>234,800</td>
<td>9,416 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloss Hall - Temp-Control Corporation, Portland</td>
<td>409,782</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>9,782 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical work - Ross Electric, Inc., Corvallis</td>
<td>236,931</td>
<td>216,815</td>
<td>20,116 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct construction costs</td>
<td>$2,959,900</td>
<td>$2,818,615</td>
<td>$141,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition - Arnold Cafeteria</td>
<td>62,248</td>
<td>62,248</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>232,263</td>
<td>209,771</td>
<td>22,492 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitework (landscaping, paving, walks, etc.)</td>
<td>53,116</td>
<td>146,494</td>
<td>(93,378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable equipment</td>
<td>163,700</td>
<td>167,000</td>
<td>(3,300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical distribution modification</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18,500 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>24,496</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>56,372</td>
<td>(56,372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$3,514,223</td>
<td>$3,485,000</td>
<td>$29,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - Construction costs included above for minor rehabilitation projects accomplished by change order:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit to Industrial Building</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving parking area</td>
<td>8,926</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total deductions for nonproject costs</td>
<td>$10,723</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$10,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net project costs</td>
<td>$3,503,500</td>
<td>$3,485,000</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Before deducting liquidated damages of $2,100 which are being assessed for 60-day delay in completing contract by last adjusted completion date.

#This landscaping work was bid separately and is scheduled for completion on or before May 1, 1972. Other portions of the site work were incorporated into the general construction contract by change orders.
(1) Includes the deletion of certain foundation drainage tile; revisions to hardware schedule; modifications to vinyl tile in dining room, entry and other rooms; the furnishing and installation of meterflow units; the construction work related to excavation, sidewalks and asphalt paving (the funds for which were provided from the amount budgeted as "Sitework [landscaping, paving, walks, etc."]"); the furnishing and installation of extra paneling; the installation of stainless steel back splash; modifications to shower stalls, desks, backs and tops of dressers; the furnishing and installation of fiberglass insulation on concrete surfaces and other revisions incorporated within 17 approved change orders.

(2) Includes the furnishing and installation of fire hose cabinets; the relocation of water meter; the installation of branch shut-offs on steam to kitchen equipment; installation of dryer vent and other revisions incorporated within five approved change orders.

(3) Includes changing water closets to flush valve, and changing shower stalls; the addition of floor drains; the furnishing and installation of 10 additional fire hose cabinets; the furnishing and installation of two pumps for electric manholes; the raising of fire hydrant and lowering of two manhole covers; and other revisions incorporated within five approved change orders.

(4) Includes the rerouting of electrical feeders; the electrical work for site construction including excavation, backfill, poles, luminaires and lamps, etc.; the rerouting of the underground primary electrical service and other revisions incorporated within 13 approved change orders.

(5) Includes additional fees related to approved change orders, landscaping and furnishings.

(6) Includes portion of costs charged against the project budgets for modifications to the primary electrical distribution system on the campus which were approved by the Board on April 30, 1971. The balance of the electrical service revision costs came from the budgets of the new Forestry Building, Library Building Addition, Central Heating Plant Boiler and new Administrative Services Building.

Plans and specifications for Arnold Cafeteria and Bloss Hall were prepared by Architects Bear, McNeil, Bloodworth & Hawes of Portland. Arnold Cafeteria is a one-story structure with partial basement and is constructed of reinforced concrete with exterior finish featuring brick veneer and exposed sand-blasted concrete. It has a gross area of approximately 29,500 square feet. It will provide food service to the 744 students assigned to Finley and Bloss Hall and has the capacity to serve an additional 236 students who may be accommodated in a future residence hall within this complex. The direct construction costs of $912,377 for the building and fixed equipment, exclusive of site costs and landscaping, average about $30.93 per square foot.
Bloss Hall is a seven-story structure, plus basement, constructed and finished like Finley Hall. It has a gross area of approximately 84,755 square feet, including 6,611 square feet of general storage area in the basement, and has a capacity for 372 student residents. The direct construction costs of $1,930,839 for the building and fixed equipment average about $22.78 per square foot.

As noted in the report of bids and contract awards, an application was filed with the Department of Housing and Urban Development for an interest subsidy grant. Although DHUD concurred in the awarding of construction contracts, it did not approve of the funding provided by an earlier bond issue. With the concurrence of the Board, $3,000,005 of Series 1972A XI-F(1) bonds were sold on December 14, 1971, and these bonds meet regulations of the federal agency as a condition precedent to final approval of the debt service grant. Excess dormitory sinking fund reserves are expected to provide the balance of funds required to finance the projects.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Arnold Cafeteria (Incl. land)</th>
<th>Bloss Hall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architects - Bear, McNeil, Bloodworth &amp; Hawes, Portland</td>
<td>Chapter 307</td>
<td>Chapter 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative authorization in 1969</td>
<td>No. 17</td>
<td>No. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's priority in 1969-1971 (Auxiliary enterprises)</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>84,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate gross area (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>$1,247,700</td>
<td>$2,255,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$1,028,561</td>
<td>$1,931,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated direct construction costs:</td>
<td>$912,377</td>
<td>$1,930,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (per square foot)</td>
<td>30.93</td>
<td>22.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financing plan (subject to minor adjustment following final arrangements of DHUD interest-subsidy grant):

Self-liquidating bond borrowings under authority of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution (par value $3,000,050) | $1,046,854 | $1,893,746 |
| Balances available for auxiliary enterprises | 200,846 | 362,054 |
| Total | $1,247,700 | $2,255,800 |
Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Pursuant to authorization granted by the Board on March 10, 1969, the Vice Chancellor for Administration submitted an application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (DHUD) for an interest subsidy grant under the College Housing Program.

DHUD has approved an annual debt service grant in an amount not to exceed $96,800, covering the period bonds are outstanding, or the difference between "(1) the average annual debt service costs on the bonds sold to finance the Approved Government Supported Project Costs as determined by the Government on completion of the Project and (2) the average annual debt service that would have been required during the life of the loan at an interest rate of 3 percent, whichever is the lesser." Because of the lower interest rate, the actual amount of the subsidy will be only about $36,000 per year. The annual debt service grant will be effective as of the date of occupancy through the date the Bonds financing the Project are entirely liquidated.

The two buildings of this project have been constructed and have been utilized since fall term of 1971. State of Oregon general obligation bonds, Article XI-F(l), 1972A Building Bonds of $3,000,000 principal value were sold December 14, 1971, to permanently finance this project.

It was recommended that the Board adopt the following Resolution, authorizing execution of the grant agreement, by roll call vote:

RESOLUTION APPROVING AGREEMENT

WHEREAS, the STATE OF OREGON, acting by and through the State Board of Higher Education, on behalf of Oregon State University, has heretofore filed with the United States of America (hereafter referred to as the "Government") an application for Federal financial assistance designated by the Government as Project No. CH-ORE-78(DS), Contract No. H-992-431-16, and

WHEREAS, the Government, acting by and through the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, has tentatively offered to make available financial assistance and has transmitted for consideration an appropriate proposed Agreement; and

WHEREAS, said Agreement has been duly read and fully considered in open meeting of this governing body, in accordance with all pertinent rules of procedure and legal requirements, and has been made a part of the records of this body; and

WHEREAS, it is deemed advisable that said agreement be approved and its execution authorized;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education that said Agreement be and the same hereby is approved without reservation or qualification;
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Freeman Holmer, the Vice Chancellor for Administration, is hereby authorized to execute said Agreement, and Richard L. Collins, the Secretary of the Board, is hereby authorized to attest the execution of said Agreement, and the execution and attestation by said officers shall constitute the approval of the Agreement by this governing body.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Holmer then read from the Board's file copy the complete text of the agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In response to a question, Mr. Holmer explained that the grant is limited to the difference in interest rates between 3 percent and the rate actually secured on the bond issue sold by the Board on December 14, 1971. The interest saving will amount to approximately $36,000 per year.

Mrs. Johnson asked if an agreement of this type would prevent future conversion of such a dormitory into apartment units at some later date, since the agreement designates the number of single students who will live in the dormitory.

Mr. Hunderup responded that in his opinion the number of people to be accommodated could be altered and that there had been flexibility in making changes in specific numbers in connection with other projects financed in part from similar grants. No student residence facility on a campus has previously been converted to general institutional use while bonded indebtedness on the facility was outstanding.

Mrs. Johnson commented that in addition to examining the possibility of apartment-type housing, the Board should consider the basic question of the purposes in providing any student housing. It was indicated that there would be an agenda item for the February 23, 1972, meeting of the Board's Building Committee on the subject of student housing policy.

Upon motion by Mr. Joss the Board approved the recommendation as presented and adopted the above resolution on roll call vote, with the following voting in favor of adoption: Directors Corey, Johnson, Joss, Mosser, Westerdahl, and Layman.

Those voting no: None.

The President of the Board thereupon declared the resolution duly adopted by a unanimous vote of those present.
Upon the recommendation of Oregon State University officials and the project architects, the work performed by the principal construction contractor for the Library, First Addition, was accepted as of November 19, 1971, subject to the completion of a few minor items. The Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning inspected the work for acceptance on behalf of the Board. A revised semifinal budget for the project is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on October 26, 1970:

<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>Contractors, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>$1,425,611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - Portion of change order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for new water line applicable to Memorial Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(funded separately)</td>
<td>864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees (including plan revisions)</td>
<td>$1,424,747</td>
<td>$1,398,250</td>
<td>$26,497 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical distribution system modifications</td>
<td>115,931</td>
<td>98,526</td>
<td>17,405 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site work and utilities</td>
<td>27,050</td>
<td>27,050</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant costs and miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>36,772</td>
<td>44,226</td>
<td>(7,454)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>41,948</td>
<td>(41,948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$1,881,050</td>
<td>$1,865,000</td>
<td>$16,050 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes the provision of a new office; the furnishing and installation of sound retardant doors; the provision of a lithium bromide detection system for the condensate returns; the relocation of existing electrical conduits; modifications to wall finishes; moving thermostats; the provision of additional rubber floor tiles; the replacement of an obsolete water line on Memorial Place and the installation of fire hydrants bid originally as an alternate; and other revisions incorporated within four approved change orders.

(2) Includes fees related to balancing of mechanical systems.

(3) As noted in the Board minutes of April 30, 1971, a portion of the costs for the modifications of the primary electrical distribution system were charged against the project budget of the Library Addition. Although the total budget was increased $16,000, no action was required of the Legislature or the Emergency Board inasmuch as the post-bid budget was $210,000 less than the expenditure limitation indicated in Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969. The remainder of the electrical service revision costs came from the budgets of the new Forestry Building, Administration Building, Bloss Hall, Arnold Cafeteria, and the Central Heating Plant Boiler.
Plans and specifications for the project were prepared by Architects Hamlin, Martin & Schultz of Eugene. The new fifth and sixth floors, which have a gross area of about 59,857 square feet, have the same general arrangements as the original Library - open stacks and reader stations intermingled to provide student access to the volumes within the Library.

The addition provides about 960 more reader stations, 42 study carrels, a seminar room and approximately 22,046 square feet of open stacks. Service facilities include administrative service areas, microfilm reading room, work room, materials supply room, book and periodical storage and a staff room. The exterior finish of the building is a continuation of the same brick veneer, window wall and sun and weather screen used on the initial unit of the building. The interior materials match those of the existing building and lighting continues with the same system of recessed fluorescent fixtures. The building is air conditioned. All air handling equipment and duct sizes were sized originally to accommodate this expansion.

Some minor remodeling of portions of the existing building were also undertaken as part of the contract work in order to utilize the Library facilities more efficiently upon the completion of the two new floors.

Upon the assumption that approximately $127,821 of the direct construction costs relate to the remodeling work and $9,502 relate to the costs of the new water line, the remaining $1,287,420 for the two new floors would average about $21.51 per square foot.

Of the total project costs of $1,881,000, a federal grant under Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended, provided $82,263, the General Fund appropriation in Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969, provided $907,369, and the remainder of $891,368 was financed from bond borrowings under the provision of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OSU Library, First Addition
Architects - Hamlin, Martin & Schultz, Eugene
Legislative authorization - Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969
Board's priority - No. 8 in 1969-1971 (Education and General Plant)
Approximate gross area of addition - 59,857 square feet (excluding about 12,500 square feet of remodeling)

Estimated total project cost $1,881,000

Estimated direct construction costs:
  Total $1,424,747
  Portion thereof allocated to new addition $1,287,420
  Average (per square foot) - $21.51
Financing plan:
Federal grant under Title I of Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended $ 82,263
General Fund appropriation in Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969 907,369
Bond borrowings under provision of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution 891,368
Total $1,881,000

Board Discussion and Action
The Board accepted the report as presented.

Release of Board's Interest in Invention of Professor Michael Newton, OSU

Staff Report to the Committee
Oregon State University officials report that Professor Michael Newton, Associate Professor of Forestry Ecology, has discovered a process entitled, "Ecosystem Analog Model." The discovery was submitted to Battelle Development Corporation in accordance with the patenting and marketing agreement, but said corporation has declined to accept the process for patenting and developing because of doubtful patentability, due to the fact that successful marketing of this device would require an intensive effort to educate potential users to the benefits of the invention, and the low probability of recovering investment and generating income. The inventor believes that some benefit can be derived from the development of this process by his own effort and expense.

Staff Recommendation
It was recommended that the Board authorize the release to Professor Michael Newton of any interest it might have in the invention, in accordance with Section 64.140, Paragraph 4, of the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

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

Board Discussion and Action
The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Release of Board's Interest in Invention of Dr. Richard W. Boubel, OSU

Staff Report to the Committee
Oregon State University officials report that Dr. Richard W. Boubel, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, has discovered a process entitled "A High Volume Stack Sampler." This discovery was submitted to Battelle Development Corporation in accordance with the patenting and marketing...
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agreement; but said corporation has declined to accept the process for patenting and developing because of doubtful patentability due to prior art. The inventor believes that some benefit can be derived from the development of this process by his own effort and expense.

Staff Recommendation

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

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

(Considered by Finance Committee, January 6, 1972.)

Staff Report to the Committee

Oregon State University reports that R. C. Rockhill, Graduate Research Assistant; Dr. James P. Eldridge, former Graduate Assistant who is currently with the Department of Microbiology at the University of Southern Mississippi; and Dr. Donald A. Klein, former staff member now with Colorado State University, invented a process entitled, "Process for Conversion of Lignin Sulfonates into Single Cell Protein," which has been evaluated by Research Corporation and considered to be suitable for patenting. The invention was developed from research which was funded by a Public Health Service grant.

Oregon State University, through its patent committee, has negotiated with the inventors for Assignment of Invention and Patent Rights in which each inventor is to receive 10 percent of the total net patent income, if any, derived by the Board as royalty from any patent received on the invention. Such a distribution is consistent with the Board's patent policy as defined in Section 64.310 of the Administrative Rules.

As the invention was developed with federal assistance from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it will be required that the maximum paid to the inventors will not exceed the following federal royalty sharing standard:

1. 50 percent of the first $3,000 gross royalty under patent,
2. 25 percent of the gross royalty between $3,000 and $13,000,
3. 15 percent of the gross royalty in excess of $13,000.

Assignment of Patent Rights of Eldridge, Rockhill and Klein, OSU
Staff Recommendation:

Pursuant to Section 64.150 of the Administrative Rules, it was recommended that the Board officials be authorized to enter into an agreement with the inventors for an Assignment of Invention and Patent Rights for the invention and to execute necessary agreements with Research Corporation in regard thereto within the limits described.

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.

The Academic Affairs Committee met in regular session at 9:00 A.M. January 5, 1972, in Room 327, Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, to consider the following matters:

1. Board Rules Relating to Generation and Maintenance of Faculty Records.

   No final action was taken by the Committee on the proposed rules. The Committee asked that there be some slight modifications in the rules, permitting institutions to maintain both open and confidential faculty personal record files but restricting severely what may be placed in the confidential file.


   The Committee approved the recommendation of the Board's Office and presents to the Board elsewhere in this docket the recommendations for Board consideration and adoption.


   The Committee expressed satisfaction at the apparent widespread efforts of institutions to secure student evaluation of instruction. Members of the Board asked whether there would be wisdom in seeking to develop a basic uniform instrument to be used in securing evaluation of instruction by students, but leaving to the departments and institutions the option of adding special items to the basic instrument should they wish to.
A complete report of the meeting, titled Report of the Meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs, January 5, 1972, is submitted to the Board for designation as an integral part of the minutes of the January 24, 1972, meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by the Committee on Academic Affairs, Personnel, and Public Affairs, January 5, 1972.)

The Committee on Academic Affairs, Personnel, and Public Affairs recommended that the Board of Higher Education adopt the following transfer policies covering transfer of community college credits into State System institutions:

1. Effective spring term 1972, State System institutions shall accept for credit all college transfer work completed in an Oregon or other accredited community college by the transferring student in the first 108 quarter hours of work he completes toward baccalaureate degree requirements (an increase of 15 credit hours over the 93 credit hours presently accredited). It should be emphasized, however, that it will be to the advantage of some community college students—those enrolled in subject matter fields in which the course of study is highly specialized, for instance—to transfer into a four-year institution before the completion of two years' work in a community college. To guide community college students in their program planning, the State System will continue to make available to community colleges annually the catalog Recommended Transfer Curricula which sets forth detailed term-by-term courses of study in a wide range of subject fields.

2. State System institutions shall also provide for flexibility in their policies so as to allow for consideration by an appropriate institutional agency or official of petitions from students who, already having completed 108 credit hours of work applicable to baccalaureate degree requirements, find that the baccalaureate program worked out with the State System institution permits additional lower-division work, and who, for defensible reasons, desire to complete some portion of that work in a community college.

The adoption of the 108 credit hour policy will extend to community college students the same privilege currently being extended to freshmen and sophomores in the State System institutions, namely the privilege of earning an average of 18 credits per term of appropriate work for a full six terms during their freshman and sophomore years with the assurance that the full amount will be acceptable toward baccalaureate degree requirements.

The 93 credit hour transfer policy presently in effect limits community college students, however able they may be, to not to exceed an average
of 15-1/2 credit hours per term (assuming six terms or two years) acceptable on transfer into a four-year institution.

Discussion of the proposed policy revision and background information on the transfer situation is presented in the document Transfer Policies Relating to Community College Students Entering State System Institutions, prepared by the Board's Office for the January 5 meeting of the Committee. This document is bound in a separate volume and is considered an integral part of the Board's minutes.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

Mrs. Johnson said that in many cases college students do not have specific goals and as a result take more than the required number of courses for graduation or they change majors one or more times. She said it has been suggested that students be required to pay an additional fee for courses taken beyond a certain number of credit hours required for a degree, or perhaps if they change majors more than once. Additional fees have also been suggested if a student takes a second degree, such as two bachelor's or two master's degrees.

She suggested that the Board undertake a study of the financial implications to the State System of extra hours or second degrees and course changes. She suggested that the Academic Affairs Committee might explore with the institutions their experience along these lines and consider the feasibility of possible additional charges. It was indicated that the Committee could proceed with this study without Board authorization.

(Considered by Building Committee, January 6, 1972.)

Staff Report to the Committee

In response to the Board's request for an annual report of single and married student housing, a study has been prepared for the Fall Term 1971. Data on residence hall capacities and occupancies were obtained from all nine institutions. However, data on family housing were obtained only from Eastern Oregon College, Oregon College of Education, Oregon State University, Southern Oregon College, and the University of Oregon, inasmuch as units of married student housing are not owned or operated by the other institutions within the State System of Higher Education. The form of the report is similar to that used in the past and identifies: (a) dormitory capacities and occupancies; (b) data on other housing for single students; (c) the total number of married students (male and female); (d) the number of graduate teaching assistants and research assistants; (e) the number of graduate (f) typical rental rates for family housing at each of the five institutions.
Some of the main features of the Fall Term 1971 report may be summarized as follows:

Dormitory Capacities and Occupancies

1. For the State System as a whole, the occupancies of all residence halls averaged about 84.9 percent of the rated capacities compared with an occupancy rate of 88.5 percent for the Fall Term 1970. (See Table I.)

2. The nine institutions provided housing accommodations for 11,592 students, or 19.8 percent of the total headcount enrollment of 58,600 students. This 19.8 percent figure was comprised of 16.9 percent within single student housing and 2.9 percent in other housing, principally married student apartments. (See Table II.)

3. Fraternities and sororities housed 2,926 students, or 5.0 percent of the total headcount enrollment. This represented a decrease of 270 students from the data reported last year. (See Table II.)

4. Privately-owned residence halls for single students provided housing for 1,062 students, or 1.8 percent of the total enrollment, as compared with 1,148 students, or 2.1 percent of the enrollment in Fall Term 1970. (See Table II.)

5. Of the total headcount enrollment of 58,600 students in Fall Term 1971, 42,697 students (72.8 percent) were living in private homes, apartments, etc. (See Table II.) In the report for Fall Term 1970, the comparable figures were 38,748 and 70.2 percent.

Married Student Housing

1. At the five institutions which provided some units of family housing, approximately 24.0 percent of the male students were married, ranging from a low of 19.0 percent at Southern Oregon College to a high of 32.7 percent at Oregon College of Education. Approximately 16.1 percent of the female students enrolled were married, ranging from a low of 9.4 percent at Oregon State University to a high of 25.3 percent at Eastern Oregon College.

For the total enrollment at these five schools, 20.8 percent of the students were married, ranging from a low of 15.6 percent at Oregon State University to a high of 26.5 percent at Oregon College of Education. (See Table IV.)

2. Of the 916 family housing units constructed or acquired specifically to accommodate married students, 194 were occupied by graduate assistants and research fellows and 437 were occupied by other graduate students. Thus, approximately 70 percent of all of these units were assigned to graduate students. (See Table V.)
3. Of the 254 miscellaneous family housing rental units available during Fall Term 1971, 181 were rented to students. Of these, 85 units were occupied by graduate students, including 34 who were classified as graduate assistants or research fellows. (See Table VI.)

4. For the five institutions, the percentage of married male and female students was highest among graduate students, including graduate assistants, research assistants, etc., and decreased with each lower academic year to the freshman level. With the exception of the seniors at Southern Oregon College, the percentage of married male undergraduate students at the three regional institutions was somewhat higher than at either the University of Oregon or Oregon State University. Similarly, the percentage of married female students at the three smaller institutions was somewhat higher than at either of these two universities. (See Table VII.)

5. The overall percentage of married students living in institutionally-owned housing at the five institutions was 12.7 percent (1,089 out of a total of 8,559). On an institutional basis, this percentage varied from a low of 3.3 percent at Oregon College of Education to a high of nearly 20 percent at Eastern Oregon College. At the two universities, the highest percentage of married male and female students living in institutional housing was in the category of graduate assistants, research assistants, etc., whereas at the other schools, the highest percentage was generally in the senior class level. (See Table VII.)

6. At the five institutions, the number of married male students decreased by 471 (from 6,327 in 1970 to 5,856 in 1971). In terms of percentages, these figures represent a decrease of 2.0 percent (from 26.0 percent in 1970 to 24.0 percent in 1971). (See Table VIII.)

7. Of the grand total of 1,170 family living units at these five institutions, only 518 (44.3 percent) have been completed within the last eleven years. At Oregon State University, 94 apartments in Orchard Court were completed for initial occupancy during Fall Terms 1961 and 1963. At the University of Oregon, 408 apartments were completed in Westmoreland Village for initial occupancy between Fall Terms 1960 and 1964. At Eastern Oregon College, 16 apartments were completed by Fall Term 1962. The remainder of family housing units available consisted primarily of temporary war surplus buildings obtained from the federal government and residences of varying ages and conditions within the campus boundaries of the institutions. (See Table IX.)

8. In accordance with the policies adopted by the Board on February 18, 1969, it is expected that the rates of charge for student housing shall be such that the income will be sufficient to make each of the three categories of housing – married student,
regular residence halls and cooperative living units - self-supporting and self-liquidating. Rental rates for married student housing and miscellaneous properties are established in recognition of this objective. Rates applicable to most units at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University and Eastern Oregon College were approved by the Board on January 25, 1971. Because of the variety of facilities available for miscellaneous housing, rental rates differ markedly. (See Tables IV and IX.)

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Fall Term 1971 report of student housing be accepted. The complete report appears on the following pages.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mrs. Johnson said that the statistics revealed a need to evaluate the philosophy for providing married student housing, because the statistics seem to indicate an inconsistency in following the priorities originally approved for married housing. She referred also the the philosophy that housing was needed to attract superior graduate students but at present it appears that this is no longer necessary because there are many applicants for every graduate spot.

Mr. Mosser mentioned that the report still shows a decline in the students' desire for dormitories and asked if perhaps it is time to consider the possibility of converting one of the most convertible dormitories into apartments. He suggested that Mr. Hunderup select a dormitory that might have possibilities and return to the Board with a proposal for an architectural study of the cost and feasibility of conversion to apartments. It was indicated that these apartments might be considered for the use of single students.

President MacVicar said that West Hall on the campus of Oregon State University would be an excellent possibility for conversion and that Oregon State University would be glad to be a guinea pig for such a study.

Mr. Hunderup said that federal loan funds or interest subsidies are available for this type of project.

It was also stated that occupancy of fraternities and sororities is declining and the possibility of acquiring some of these structures should be considered. Mrs. Johnson said that many of them might be ideal for living purposes, particularly for cooperative living organizations.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board accept the report as presented.
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Joss called the Board’s attention to the comments by Mr. Mosser and Mrs. Johnson during the Committee discussion. Mr. Mosser had asked for a study of the feasibility of converting a dormitory to apartment units, and Mrs. Johnson had suggested that it might be possible to acquire sorority and fraternity houses as they become available.

Dr. Paetz said that some recent news stories had given the impression that there were substantial numbers of vacancies in the campus dormitories. The percentages from the report showing lower rates of occupancy are based on the original rated capacity for multiple occupancy. However, some of the rooms are presently occupied as single occupancy rooms at a higher rental rate.

Mr. Hunderup said that at the time the residence halls were built, they had a certain rated capacity based on multiple occupancy of many of the rooms, but that this may have been an overextension of what their true capacity should be. Perhaps in order to get students to live in the residence halls, it may be necessary to rate even more of the rooms as single occupancy rooms.

Mrs. Johnson pointed out that single occupancy reduces the number of students paying for food service and that this can have an impact on the debt service reserves which are built up primarily through revenue from the food program. She said that it would be helpful to have a report of at least the gross occupancy figures for each quarter because winter and spring occupancy may vary from fall occupancy.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by Public Services Committee, January 6, 1972.)

Staff Report to the Committee

At the request of the Public Service Activities Committee at its meeting on November 23, 1971, there is presented herein a rewording of the recommendation pertaining to Educational and Public Broadcasting Service contained in the Report to the Board - Public Broadcasting in Oregon (Ralph Steetle, January 4, 1971).

Consideration of the revised recommendation by the Committee, with action to propose its approval by the Board, was requested:

Staff Recommendation:

It was recommended that the Board of Higher Education, in consultation with the State Board of Education, the Educational Coordinating Council, the Governor and officials of the Legislature, appoint an advisory committee on educational and public broadcasting
service. The advisory committee should give consideration to the three questions* raised in Report to the Board - Public Broadcasting in Oregon, January 4, 1971, and contained on page 33 of that Report, and to other matters which seem to them to be significant to the furtherance of educational and public broadcasting service in Oregon. The Committee should make necessary recommendations to the Director of Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Service as often as seems useful, and should report to the State Board of Higher Education at least once a year regarding essential and appropriate steps which, if implemented, would improve the service of the state's broadcasting activities for the citizens of Oregon.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

During the discussion, it was indicated that the advisory committee would consist of 20-25 members. However, it was suggested that it might be helpful to have smaller subcommittees to facilitate meaningful discussion and possibly quick recommendations.

The Public Services Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

In response to a question regarding the procedure for selecting the advisory committee, Mr. Larson said that discussions with individual Committee members had indicated that he should confer with state officials to obtain recommendations. The names would then be presented to the Committee and the Board for approval.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

*The three questions referred to above are shown on the reverse of this page.
A number of key questions need attention at this juncture of development of Oregon Educational Broadcasting:

1. **How can the local in-state programs broadcast by radio and television be improved?** The national sources of programs are beginning to provide outstanding contributions to both children (Sesame Street) and adults (Civilization). The special services that Oregonians should expect from Oregon Educational Broadcasting in the way of locally produced programs of all kinds need improvement as well. Improvement will involve the active collaboration of those responsible for in-school and college-level instruction and those responsible for the general cultural programs, working with the media specialists.

2. **How can appropriate access to the broadcast facilities be assured to potential users?** We believe that the agreement between the State Board of Higher Education and the State Board of Education as to the purposes of Oregon Educational Broadcasting and the time to be allocated to in-school and teacher in-service programs is indicative of the effort of the State Board of Higher Education to give the public schools adequate access to the radio and television resources over which the State Board of Higher Education presides. Likewise, the efforts of OEB to solicit from a sampling of residents of Oregon an indication of the general education, public service subjects of interest to the public reflects a concern with serving these needs as they can be identified. But as we shall note on p. 34, we believe that a further step can be taken by providing for an advisory board, representing the various segments of Oregon society with a stake in educational radio and television, to advise concerning the policies governing the OEB.

3. **How can funds be secured and deployed so as to foster the most effective use of television and radio to meet the needs of the people of Oregon?**
The Public Service Activities Committee met in regular session at 10:00 A.M., January 6, 1972, in Room 327, Smith Memorial Center, Portland State University, to consider a report on the University of Oregon Medical School teaching hospitals and clinics, prepared under the direction of Dean Holman at the request of the Academic Affairs Office.

Dean Holman observed that the report was before the Committee on Public Service Activities because the hospital and clinic facilities of the Medical School provided a great deal of public service. However, he noted, the purpose of the facilities is to support the educational programs of the Medical School, and any decisions as to how the facilities should be operated or how extensive they should be must be based on the educational commitment.

In 1967 the Medical School started a program of expansion which would increase the number of students enrolled in medicine from 300 to 450. This program of expansion was based upon plans for expansion of hospitals and basic science facilities involving commitments to the federal government, which provided substantial funds in support of the program, and to the accrediting agency for medical schools, which approved the proposed increase in enrollment in view of plans for expansion of facilities and faculty.

These plans, and commitments for expansion of enrollments, facilities, and staff were formulated with the expectation that Multnomah Hospital would continue to be available to the Medical School at a fully operational level.

Dean Holman said there was no question that if the Medical School is to meet these commitments, toward which money has been accepted and expended, it is essential that Multnomah Hospital be restored to full operation.

In the discussion of this problem by the Committee, several observations were made, both by members of the Committee and by Dean Holman.

1. The teaching hospitals not only serve the teaching function, but provide a great deal of medical care for the indigent. The Medical School and Multnomah County each collect about 50 percent of the costs of operating their respective hospitals from patients. The remainder is the cost of care of medically indigent -- people who are not on Medicare, who are not on welfare, who do not have third-party carriers to pay for their care, and who cannot pay for it themselves. Thus two questions are involved, (1) provision of sufficient numbers of patients to serve the teaching needs of the Medical School and (2) provision of medical care of the indigent.

2. Multnomah County appears to want to get out of the hospital business. In view of the fact that the state is not likely to pick up care of the medically indigent in Multnomah County through the Medical School budget, alternate plans not dependent on a
large medically indigent patient population must be made to provide sufficient patients to carry out teaching responsibilities. These "back-up" plans should include other hospital and clinic facilities in the Portland area, whenever possible or feasible.

3. The Medical School operates year round, with nursing classes using the basic science facilities during the summer term when they are not used by medical students. Fourth year medical clinical programs rotate throughout the entire year. Internship, graduate, and medical technology programs operate year round. Consideration is being given to rotating classes the first three years of the medical program, with three-fourths of the students on campus at any one time. A substantial number of medical students would find it difficult to attend school year round, both because of the rigorous instruction involved and because many medical students have serious problems financing their education and need an opportunity to work one term out of each year. Scholarships and low-interest loan funds are not sufficient to the need.

4. Nationally, for the class of 1970, 46 percent of all applicants to medical schools were admitted to some school. The University of Oregon Medical School had 800 applicants and admitted 96. Oregon students are given first preference, with a second preference to applicants from the four WICHE states which do not have medical schools. For all practical purposes, no one else has a chance for admission.

5. Oregon has no program to prepare physical therapists. This training is available through WICHE, but opportunities are limited because of the difficulty of getting admitted to out-of-state schools. The Board requested from the 1969 Legislature funding to establish a program of preparation for physical therapists but the request was not granted.

6. The baccalaureate program in nursing has been fully accredited by the National League of Nursing through 1977. The master's program has been provisionally approved pending graduation of students from the program as presently organized. The program will be looked at again two years from the time of the first graduates.

Mr. Mosser and Mr. Corey asked that the Medical School draw up a statement of priorities in terms of minimum numbers of beds in the various medical areas necessary for a viable instructional program, with recommendations as to how these could be obtained, for the consideration of the Committee at an early meeting. The Committee will then make a recommendation to the Board for presentation to the 1973 Legislature. Dr. Holman and Dr. Romney noted that the present report included preliminary information that had been developed in respect to the problem, and said a further report on the problem would be brought to the Committee.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented. Mrs. Johnson emphasized the need to consider both the financial and educational aspects of the needs of the Medical School.

(Considered by Finance Committee, January 6, 1972.)

Resource Requirements Prediction Model

Staff Report to the Committee

For three years, Oregon has participated in the activities of WICHE leading to the establishment of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE. The objectives of NCHEMS are to "design, develop, and encourage the implementation of management information systems and data bases including common data elements in institutions and agencies of higher education...."

In pursuit of these objectives, NCHEMS is engaged in a substantial number of coordinated activities related to the goals. One of the activities has been the development of "a long-range planning model designed to aid higher level management in determining the resource implications of alternative policy and planning changes." Portland State University cooperated during the past year as one of the eight institutions that served as pilot tests of this model (identified as RRPM, or the Resource Requirements Prediction Model).

Portland State University has been impressed by the RRPM and in the current fiscal situation, has put the data base required by the model to good use. To be consistently useful over an extended period of time, however, it is necessary that the entries into the data base be mechanized. This has been one of the reasons for Portland State University's joining with the University of Oregon in the development of specifications for an automated student records system. It also accounts for some aspects of developments in connection with the Financial Management System in the Controller's Office.

It had been a part of our long-range expectations that we would implement RRPM for the institutions and for the System as rapidly as student records were automated. We believe that the RRPM is a useful tool in finding the answers to many "what if" questions (e.g., What would be the financial implications if a particular undergraduate major were added or eliminated?).

On December 12-14, 1971, WICHE sponsored a legislative work conference that included a NCHEMS presentation of its activities, with special emphasis on the virtues of RRPM. Officials present, including Oregon legislators, legislative staff, Educational Coordinating Council staff, and Executive Department representatives were favorably impressed and have conveyed to the Chancellor an urgent insistence that the Department of Higher Education undertake the implementation of the model, at least for the instruction function, in time for use by the legislature in 1973.
This is a formidable task, but it can be done if the resources can be made available. The Executive Department has indicated that a legislative staff presentation will be made to the Emergency Board at its January meeting, proposing that the Emergency Board make additional resources available for this purpose.

Some of the associated costs are closely related to other activities already planned (such as the student information and financial management systems) and can be covered from present resources. The accelerated effort required to build a "clean" data base, to prepare computer programs, and the required computer costs are the chief obstacles at the present moment to our proceeding with this projected activity.

As with all predictive models, RRPM is limited by the assumptions on which it is based. It can deal with proportional fiscal impact of changes in number of students, the mix of students, the numbers, salaries and mix of faculties, and changes in course or major requirements. These are important questions and RRPM could provide more precise responses than manual methods permit. RRPM, however, cannot deal with qualitative questions — and was not designed to do so.

Staff Recommendation

In view of the need for precise data for planning and the obvious legislative interest, it is believed that authority should be provided to proceed with the implementation of RRPM, if sufficient resources can be identified. Since the RRPM effort will contribute to other planned information systems development, it is believed that it is appropriate to proceed with the RRPM project.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Holmer identified other planning models which might be of interest to the legislature. He said one of the reasons for studying the ability to provide other planning models is that both of the WICHE models require the induced course load matrix. The induced course load matrix serves at least two objectives — one, determination of the cost per student by each major or field of study, and two, determination of the cost per degree earned. This required a detailed analysis of the departments in which majors are actually taking their courses. Frequently, the major designated by a student early in his college career is not realistic and he may change majors. Consequently, there is a question as to the value of building the course load matrix by hand rather than waiting until it is available with the implementation of the student information system. Furthermore, if it were necessary to build the course load matrix more than once before the student information system is available, much of the work would have to be repeated each time, and this is a fairly expensive investment.

Mr. Holmer indicated that in discussing the virtues and desirability of the Resource Requirements Prediction Model with the Emergency Board there will be a number of questions that need to be explored. It will be necessary to ascertain explicitly the kinds of questions that the legislature wants to ask of the model in order to determine whether the
questions could be answered more simply and more economically by using other available resources. However, if the legislature has an interest in proceeding with the project, recognizing the added cost that would be involved, it has been made clear to the Executive Department and the Legislative Fiscal Office staff that the Board's staff is ready to proceed. The cost factor appears to be at the level of approximately $150,000.

Mr. Mosser said that he had definite reservations about suddenly crashing into one phase of an information program when there is an orderly program to develop a management information system from which this type of data will come. He said that in his opinion the State System should continue its present plans to develop the management information in an orderly sequence. In addition to the dollars, this project would inevitably require the allocation of personnel and their transfer from other projects. He said he would want to know more about the details of the payment of the costs for all of the program before proceeding.

Mr. Mosser also said that the Resource Requirements Prediction Model would represent one of the most sophisticated uses of the management information system, not a fundamental usage. He said he was concerned that it would be discovered that the fundamental data would not be programmed and on the line and thus the questions asked could not be answered and the whole data processing procedure would be discredited again.

Mr. Holmer responded that all of these things had been of concern to the Board's staff, but that it also wanted to be as responsive as possible to the interests of the legislators. Mr. Mosser commented that it would only hurt the Board and the Legislature if the impression were given that $150,000 would be the cost when a careful analysis might reveal a much higher cost.

Mr. Westerdahl asked whether the funds would be expended to develop more software or be expended in the entry of data into a system which would be developed at some particular site.

Mr. Holmer said that there would be some systems development of the software type internally to match certain categories used in the Board's accounting system with the way these categories are arranged in the Resource Requirements Prediction Model. However, two-thirds of the amount probably represents data collection and purification.

Mr. Westerdahl commented that although he agreed with the observations made by Mr. Mosser, he could also envision considerable savings over a period of time and greater utilization if the State System can adopt a uniform system in which the software is being developed elsewhere.

Mr. Mosser said that his concern was the necessity for building a full data base in order to get all of the sophisticated question answering or simulation data, and that he felt this might be building only part of that data base. The entire system might then prove to be inadequate when people start asking questions which require data that are not in
the system. Mr. Mosser indicated that the student records system, the financial information system and an accounting system should be developed first and not attempt to get the questions before the data is available for the answers.

Mr. Westerdahl said the Board had a responsibility to respond to the interest of the Executive Department and the legislature by giving them a realistic picture in a factual, honest and comparative way so that the program can be evaluated clearly.

Mr. Mosser said that if the legislature is trying to determine the impact on other institutions if a program now existing were cut out at one institution, it would require a very elaborate data base to provide meaningful answers. He said, in his opinion, they are trying to get at the end product of a completed data processing system which is less than half developed. Further, he said he thought he was realistic in saying that it would require an expenditure of a couple of years and probably a couple of million dollars to get the information they want.

Mr. Holmer said that it would be necessary to present a factual statement of the difficulties that have been encountered.

Mr. Mosser said that in addition the legislature and the Emergency Board need to be informed of the progress on the development of the management system for the State System and the amount of work required before it would be ready for the implementation of the more sophisticated system which would give them the answers available from the Resource Requirements Prediction Model.

Mr. Westerdahl moved that the Finance Committee recommend to the Board that it authorize the Board's staff to give a factual presentation to the Emergency Board relating to the cost and impact of adopting the RRPM System in the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Mr. Joss asked if Portland State University had sufficient data available so that the program could be implemented to answer the questions for Portland State only.

Mr. Holmer indicated that these data were available for Portland State and that this would be a part of the presentation and positive response to the request. He said it may be possible to put the cost estimation model in a parallel mode at Portland State at a cost substantially less than the $150,000. This would permit the legislature to see that the cost estimation model has some virtues and is not quite as complex as the Resource Requirements Prediction Model. However, it also uses the induced course load matrix which presently exists only at Portland State. This would be one of the alternatives suggested to the Emergency Board. Mr. Holmer said that information would also be provided as to the kinds of reports that are now available.

Mr. James Sexson, Fiscal Analyst, indicated that a number of people have been interested in the implementation of this system and that
Heeling had made a very convincing presentation. He suggested that it might be appropriate to involve all of these various people in the discussions again.

The Finance Committee adopted the motion presented by Mr. Westerdahl as stated above.

Board Discussion and Action

During the Board discussion, Mr. Holmer indicated that there are two basic approaches to the use of the prediction model. In one of these, predictions are based on certain assumptions as to faculty salaries, student teacher ratios, or other factors, and the model can then be used to describe the fiscal impact of various decisions based on the predetermined factors.

The second approach is to use actual costs and actual policies to make predictions on a known base. It is intended to use actual data to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. Holmer indicated that several meetings had been held subsequent to the January 6, 1972, Finance Committee meeting which indicate that it may be possible to simplify implementation of the prediction model from the way in which implementation was originally perceived. Under the revised plan, data collection would begin with spring term, although this would involve a substantial training program with the institutions to assure that the data elements would be collected consistently among the institutions. Only the minimum data required for this particular prediction model would be collected, rather than that required for a full student information system.

The Board approved the recommendation that the Board's Office staff be authorized to give a factual presentation to the Emergency Board relating to the factors involved, the cost, and the impact of implementing a version of the Resource Requirements Prediction Model in the Oregon State System of Higher Education in time for use with the Ways and Means Committee of the 1973 Legislature.

CONDITION OF BOARD'S UNAPPROPRIATED FUND AND SPECIAL RESERVES

As of January 24, 1972, for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Board's Unappropriated Fund</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance reported as of December 14, 1971</td>
<td>$ 30,286.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance reported as of January 24, 1972</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Board's Reserve for Plant Rehabilitation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance reported as of December 14, 1971</td>
<td>$ 299,168.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Amount approved on December 14 to apply to budget reduction for year 1971-72</td>
<td>$ 155,148.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance reported as of January 24, 1972</td>
<td>$ 144,020.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Tuition and Fee Policy

(Considered by Finance Committee, January 6, 1972.)

Staff Report to the Committee

The Interinstitutional Fee Committee has held its first meeting, identifying the concerns which need consideration by the Board of Higher Education. The second meeting will be held on January 13, 1972. Representatives of the Interinstitutional Union of Students have been invited to participate.

The issues on the agenda of the Fee Committee include:

1. Graduate student tuition, including resident-nonresident differentials.
2. Foreign student tuition.
3. Senior citizen tuition.
4. Medical-Dental student tuition.
5. Staff fees.
6. Incidental fee recommendations.
7. Health service fee recommendation.
8. Board and room charges.
9. Distribution of summer term tuition and fees among building, incidental, health service and Board's tuition income.
10. OSPIRG participation.
11. Other fee recommendations.

Staff Recommendation:

Recommendations are not being made to the Committee on Finance at this time, pending the outcome of the cigarette tax referendum and the deliberation of the Fee Committee. However, informal discussion by the Finance Committee of the foregoing agenda items will be helpful to the staff and the Fee Committee.

Discussion and Recommendation of the Committee

Mr. Holmer stated that board and room charges were directly related to Board policy with respect to debt service coverage and should be treated concurrently. Consequently, these two topics would be discussed at the time the follow-up report on debt service coverage is available. In response to a question from Mr. Mosser with respect to the plans for an increase in graduate student tuition, Mr. Holmer said that consideration was being given to an across-the-board increase in graduate student tuition.
tuition with the exception of the amounts for medical and dental school students. The legislature stipulated the amount of the tuition for out-of-state students in medicine and dentistry.

Mr. Holmer said that information available from other states suggests that the present level for graduate tuition is lower than that of neighboring states. There has been discussion also of whether the University of Oregon Law School should be subject to professional fees and an increased fee level for graduate students in all professional schools.

Mrs. Johnson said that it is necessary to take a realistic look at tuition for all graduate students and to have some comparisons with other institutions.

Mr. Westerdahl said that it would be helpful to consider the categories listed in the form of a comparability table with the other institutions that would show the amount and date of the last increase.

It would also be helpful to have data concerning the number of applicants in the professional schools and the date by which a definite commitment to enroll is obtained.

Mr. Mosser commented that a range for incidental fees had been set last year and that he would be very reluctant to increase incidental fee activities at a time when it is necessary to cut back on instruction and basic programs.

Mr. Holmer said that a proposal had been approved last year to permit foreign students to remain at the same tuition level at which they entered a program until they have completed that program. Significant problems have occurred in the administration of this, primarily in terms of equity. Other nonresident students feel that their problems are as severe as those of foreign students in many instances. In addition, foreign students transferring to a different institution become subject to new and usually higher rates because they are changing their programs.

The various trends and experimental methods being proposed or inaugurated elsewhere to help meet the high cost of tuition were discussed. It was indicated that the Board should be kept aware of these new developments. Mr. Holmer said that there are some really significant things in the way of an entirely new departure in tuition and loan developments but that he was reluctant to suggest them without encouragement initiated by the Board. He said perhaps these alternatives should be presented to the Board for discussion and consideration.

Mr. Mosser said that the state-wide scholarship and student aid program should not be considered as State System aid next year but that the Board should decide what it wishes to present to the next legislature. The Board's proposal should be coordinated with the community college decisions and the state program of student financial aid.
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The Chancellor said that he would hope that any bold modifications in the present tuition and financial aid program would be preceded by a careful review to determine what should be the responsibility of the student and the responsibility of the public. It would then be possible to implement a tuition policy that would be consistent with that philosophy. The present policy indicates that it is a shared responsibility and some of the proposals in other places appear to emphasize the fact that tuition is the ultimate responsibility of the student.

It was agreed that tuition policy decisions would be discussed for next year but that no major innovative changes would be instituted without thorough study.

The Finance Committee recommended that the Board accept the report as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Holmer indicated that recommendations would be presented to the Finance Committee and the Board after information is received from three subcommittees of the interinstitutional fee committee. This information will be sent to the Board well in advance of the Committee meetings. It was also indicated that comparative data on tuition and fees from other institutions would be provided as soon as possible.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by Finance Committee, January 6, 1972.)

Staff Report to the Committee

Members of the Committee on Finance have expressed an interest in devising appropriate means of permitting students to pay as they learn, with fees to be collected in full during each term. At least four patterns of action appear possible:

1. An institutionally-operated billing system (which assumes at least a one-third payment of tuition and fees at the time of registration).

2. A pre-payment system, operated either by a private agency or by the institutions. Numerous public and private colleges use such systems (using monthly payments, beginning three months before registration).

3. Bank credit cards (which require a discount of the tuition and fees due).

4. A bank credit card cash advance system (which charges the credit card holder an advance fee of 1-1/4 percent).

The first alternative involves a substantial direct cost to the state (and, indirectly, to cash-paying students).
The second, if operated by a private organization, costs the student (or his parents) some interest on the money. The System and its institutions probably could not pay for the operation out of interest earnings.

The banks issuing credit cards have internal operating rules requiring a discount. It would appear to require legislation authorizing payment of a discount of fees set pursuant to statute, if there were no substantial down payment.

The cash advance has several administrative problems, since it normally requires use of parents' cards and it requires substantial advertising to make it effective.

It seems to be possible to combine one and three, on the legal theory that billing and collection are permissible System operations (if there has been a down payment) and the bank credit card discount then becomes an economical alternative to the billing and collection procedure.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Committee provide staff with further guidelines as to the directions of future exploration it deems to be appropriate.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Holmer described the advantages and disadvantages of the various deferred payment plans.

Mr. Mosser said that a monthly system should be set up that is not prohibitively expensive by having an administrative structure that was not complex. He said the community colleges have always had a policy which would permit the student to defer payment until the end of the term. The student could not register for the next term or receive credit until payment was made for the current term. He said that in many instances the need for deferred payment is only for a few days until a check is received.

Mr. Westerdahl said he was convinced the deferred payment plan was needed and that it should have a minimum of administrative overhead. He suggested that it might be beneficial to start such a program on an experimental basis during the spring term when the student population is relatively stable.

Mr. Joss pointed out that the administration of an institution faces a philosophical problem in having to deny grades or registration to students who default.

Institutional executives indicated that minor adjustments were currently being made in emergency situations to defer payment until the student receives his expected check or other source of funds. They were receptive to proposals to implement a deferred payment plan.
The Finance Committee recommended that deferred payment plans involving a minimum of administrative procedures be authorized on an experimental basis at each institution during spring term 1972, provided that further investigation does not reveal any legal restrictions against deferred tuition payments.

**Board Discussion and Action**

In response to a question concerning any legal restrictions with respect to the deferred payment plan, Mr. Holmer indicated that a preliminary investigation had not shown any restriction in the statutes or in the Administrative Rules. However, the question has not yet been referred to the Board's attorney. Mr. Holmer said the estimate of total state revenue included interest on state income and the deferred payment plan would reduce some of this interest. However, if an additional 75 students were enrolled through the deferred payment plan, it would appear that enough additional revenue would be obtained to offset any loss of interest during the period of time involved.

It was pointed out that some nominal charge may be assessed those students taking advantage of the plan and that this would help to offset the loss of income.

The Board discussed minor changes in the original wording of the recommendation and approved the recommendation as stated above.

*(Considered by Finance Committee, January 6, 1972.)*

**Staff Report to the Committee**

Underrealized enrollments for year 1971-72 resulted in a reduction of estimated income of $983,000 reported to the Finance Committee on November 23, 1971. Pursuant to the Committee's request, each institution has provided a detailed report of the budget adjustments planned to reduce expenditures by an equal amount. The adjustments are summarized as follows:

**University of Oregon**

- Position freeze savings $20,969
- Remodeling and rehabilitation projects deferred 21,000
- Equipment replacement reserve eliminated 140,000
- Total assigned to UO $181,969

**Oregon State University**

- New teaching positions unallocated and unfilled $110,000
- Position freeze on all vacant positions, academic and classified 108,855
- Total assigned to OSU $218,855
### Portland State University

- Staff reductions in Placement Service, Personnel Service and Physical Plant Operations
  - Equipment replacement reserve eliminated: $78,160
  - Library book purchases deferred: $77,718
  - Total assigned to PSU: $155,918

### Oregon College of Education

- Unfilled academic positions: $23,914

### Southern Oregon College

- Undistributed and unfilled teaching positions: $67,167
- Sabbatical leave replacements not appointed: $10,002
- Physical Plant operating economies: $7,831
  - Total assigned to SOC: $85,000

### Eastern Oregon College

- Art and business classes discontinued or consolidated with other staff loads: $5,254
- Library staff reduction spring term: 2,250
- Placement services curtailed: 2,300
- General administration staff reduction and workload redistribution: 2,850
- Sabbatical leave replacements not appointed: 5,758
- English Department FTE reduction spring term: 1,512
- Other payroll expense related to reduced staff: 1,708
- Library book purchases deferred: 20,000
- Services and supplies, including travel, and equipment reductions in selected departments: $23,368
  - Total assigned to EOC: $65,000

### Oregon Technical Institute

- Allocation for overrealized enrollment reduced by share of underrealized Board income to net increase (increase): $13,000
  - Total assigned to OTI: $13,000

### University of Oregon Medical School

- Academic position held vacant: $16,221
  - Total assigned to UOMS: $16,221

### University of Oregon Dental School

- Reduction of Dean's emergency reserve: $5,812
  - Total assigned to UODS: $5,812
Teaching Research Division

Reduction of services and supplies in general administration $ 730
Total assigned to TR $730

Centralized Activities

Savings on vacant positions in Chancellor's Office $957
Reorganization of Office of Administration to begin elimination of positions 6,960
Reduced FTE of classified staff in financial management systems development 2,596
Savings in Controller's Office by use of microfiche and deferred installation of computer terminals 5,276
Student wages and classified FTE reductions in Facilities Planning 978
Duplicating service adjustments 148
Total assigned to Centralized Activities $16,915

Board's Reserves

Rehabilitation project reserve reduced $155,148
Board's funds available from OCE correction 50,000
Total assigned to Board's Reserves $205,148

TOTAL NET REDUCTIONS $983,000

Discussion and Recommendation of the Committee

Mr. Mosser commented that the report described the things that had been done to meet the necessary budget reductions, but it did not provide sufficient detail to determine whether the actions were wise ones.

Mr. Holmer said that additional narrative to give more complete information had been included for 1972-73 reductions. However, detailed analyses had not been shown for 1971-72. He said some of this information was available in some of the institutional reports. Mr. Holmer stated that when an academic position is held vacant it is obvious that there has been an increase in the workload of other teachers at some loss to the students.

Mr. Mosser said that this is a part of the fundamental task of determining whether the institutions are seeking long-range productivity improvements in higher education or merely trying to adapt the funds available.
He said if a program has been restructured so that one less faculty member is necessary, this is a positive improvement, but if you have sacrificed the quality of the program, it is not increased productivity in the long run. The same thing is true in other areas where possible savings can be made.

Mr. Westerdahl commented that these data have been provided for 1972-73. He then asked how Oregon State University had been able to absorb the cut with unfilled positions.

It was indicated that Oregon State had anticipated the cuts and held a number of positions vacant. This was also done partially at other institutions.

The Finance Committee recommended that the Board accept the report as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

It was indicated that it was difficult for the Board to understand and consider budget reductions with the limited information available, and it was pointed out that for the remainder of this year and to some extent for next year, the time element had made it necessary for the Board to rely on the institutions for the decisions with respect to the budget reductions. Mr. Mosser said that, therefore, the Board had instructed the institutions and the Board's Office to make the cuts with the following policy guidelines: (1) that some mitigation of the severe cuts to two of the smaller schools be provided from the Board's reserves; and (2) that the institutions be encouraged not to make temporary cuts that would create further problems for next year.

Mr. Mosser said that there would be an opportunity for policy decisions to be considered in connection with the next biennial budget and that data concerning institutional priorities should be assembled now to assist the Board in making its evaluations.

There was general discussion as to whether the reduction of staff or the dropping of courses and programs within a school or department necessarily resulted in an increased workload or a reduction of quality in education.

Mrs. Johnson mentioned the need to consider the availability of the various educational programs on an overall basis in terms of duplication of academic majors and of providing for the state the broadest educational program in the most economical way.

Mr. Lernman commented that elimination of courses may merely reduce the number of students and tuition income. He said that in order to have a genuine cut, the same number of full student credit hours must be maintained with fewer staff members teaching those students. This would then result in an increased workload.
Mr. Mosser said that there may also be an increase in workload over what would have prevailed if the full staff had been employed for the reduced number of students. However, this would not necessarily mean a cut in the legislatively authorized and contemplated level of service because fewer staff members are serving a smaller number of students than budgeted. Therefore, the workload may be at the level which was contemplated initially.

Mrs. Johnson said the Board needed to consider goals and objectives that might have a major impact on the budget and to be certain that the available funds are being spent to achieve the goals and objectives which have been approved.

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by Finance Committee, January 6, 1972.)

Staff Report to the Committee

A one percent savings factor was applied to each institution's budget at the beginning of fiscal year 1971-72. Institutions are to identify savings as they are produced by program adjustments and revised expenditure plans throughout the year.

Savings identified through October 25, 1971, are summarized on the attached report. For the Education and General Services Program, $398,232 has been recorded as savings from a fiscal year requirement of $936,352. The remaining savings will be identified as subsequent reports are obtained from the institutions.

After the one percent program was initiated, underrealized enrollment for year 1971-72 required that additional budget savings be generated. Elements of the total savings requirement will appear in either the budget adjustments reported to the Finance Committee as a separate agenda item on January 6, 1972, or as a part of this report. To assess the total impact of budget adjustments on operating expenditures, it is necessary to review the two reports jointly.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Finance Committee recommended that the Board accept the report as presented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Savings Required</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>To Be Identified By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Oregon College</strong></td>
<td>$29,364</td>
<td>0.45 FTE faculty filled by graduate student and part-time instructor</td>
<td>$1,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educ. &amp; Psych. 1.55 FTE faculty not filled</td>
<td>$22,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total savings reported</strong></td>
<td>$23,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To be identified by June 30, 1972</strong></td>
<td>$5,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Technical Institute</strong></td>
<td>$30,706</td>
<td>Hiring at lower rate than budgeted</td>
<td>$1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant positions not filled</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total savings reported</strong></td>
<td>$2,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To be identified by June 30, 1972</strong></td>
<td>$28,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Research Division</strong></td>
<td>$1,475</td>
<td>Teaching Research, Unallocated Operating Reserve (Reduction of funds available for matching)</td>
<td>$701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total savings reported</strong></td>
<td>$701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To be identified by June 30, 1972</strong></td>
<td>$774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon College of Education</strong></td>
<td>$52,327</td>
<td>Business Office, Sec. 1 position unfilled</td>
<td>$4,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security Patrolman 2 position not filled</td>
<td>$7,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total savings reported</strong></td>
<td>$11,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>To be identified by June 30, 1972</strong></td>
<td>$40,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon State University</strong></td>
<td>$252,299</td>
<td>Dept. of Art, 1.00 FTE faculty not filled, fewer sections Introduction Art offered</td>
<td>$17,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Econ., 0.33 FTE faculty not filled, some upper division courses not offered</td>
<td>13,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Psych. 1 graduate TA position not filled, fewer recitation sections, Basic Psychology</td>
<td>3,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY (continued)

Dean of Students, eliminating welcome letter to new students, not filling academic position $ 3,220

Division of Health and P. E., 10,284

Financial Aid Office, cut-back of work force during vacation 949

School of Home Ec., .14 FTE faculty position not filled, cut-back of faculty resources for upper division 2,647

Home Management, filling graduate TA with a first year inexperienced TA 461

Dean’s Office, .41 FTE faculty position not filled, cut of resources for enrollment overload 3,887

School of Science, faculty turnover 6,000

Resignation unfilled 6,442

Cancellation of instruction budget for Atmospheric Science 12,012

Reduction of 1.29 FTE faculty in Physics Department 20,140

Sabbatical leave positions not filled 11,133

School of Forestry, increase of number of courses taught per faculty member 4,936

School of Engineering, salary savings on unfilled position, consolidated Mfg. Engineering Tech. with Mechanical Engineering 19,983

School of Agriculture, TBA positions filled at lower level than budgeted 12,582

Physical Plant, reduction of service 29,256

School of Pharmacy, FTE faculty resignation filled by part-time personnel 4,625

School of Business, underfilling 2 asst. prof. positions with 2 instructors 10,355

Library, consolidation of reference desks and eliminating 1.00 FTE faculty position in serial section 21,640

Total savings reported $213,988

To be identified by June 30, 1972 $ 38,311
**Southern Oregon College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Savings Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undistributed teaching staff, 4.75 FTE</td>
<td>$59,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total savings reported</strong></td>
<td>$59,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be identified by June 30, 1972</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University of Oregon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Savings Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abolishment of Admin. Asst. position in Business Office</td>
<td>$12,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abolishment of position in Institutional Research and Planning</td>
<td>$8,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced FTE faculty in Student Services</td>
<td>$819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total savings reported</strong></td>
<td>$21,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be identified by June 30, 1972</strong></td>
<td>$216,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University of Oregon Dental School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Savings Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Operating Reserve (proposed equipment purchase will probably be postponed)</td>
<td>$5,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total savings reported</strong></td>
<td>$5,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be identified by June 30, 1972</strong></td>
<td>$17,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University of Oregon Medical School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Savings Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of FTE faculty in undistributed teaching staff and corresponding OPE</td>
<td>$16,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total savings reported</strong></td>
<td>$16,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be identified by June 30, 1972</strong></td>
<td>$49,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Centralized Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Savings Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discontinue funding of Condon Lectures</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total savings reported</strong></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be identified by June 30, 1972</strong></td>
<td>$25,354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary savings, positions filled at lower rate than budgeted in Library and Instructional TV; wage savings on positions filled at lower rate than budgeted in Physical Plant; .75 FTE faculty from undistributed teaching staff</td>
<td>$39,713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total savings reported:** $39,713

**To be identified by June 30, 1972:** $115,165

---

**TOTAL SAVINGS REPORTED:** $398,232

**TOTAL REMAINING TO BE REALIZED:** $538,120

**TOTAL IDENTIFIABLE SAVINGS REQUIRED:** $936,352

---

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Mosser said that it was important to emphasize the problems that the institutions and the State System faced in allocating these cuts on a tentative basis within a very short period of time. He said that while he had been critical with respect to where some of the cuts were made, that the institutions had responded well in getting the job done on a rational basis within the very limited time available.

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Staff Report to the Committee

Attached is a summary of the staffing and expenditure levels, comparing the initial budget for year 1971-72 with the tentative proposal for year 1972-73. Following the summary is a set of three exhibits for each institution to show:

1. Institution comparison of staff and expenditure plan for 1971-72 and 1972-73.
2. Analysis of workload and program reduction recommendations for 1972-73.
3. Functional display of budget adjustments to reflect a tentative budget summary for 1972-73.

All data relates to the Education and General Services Program which is supported by general fund appropriation and student fees.

Also distributed was a report on the information gathering process and the guidelines being used by the University of Oregon which is representative of the analytical processes being employed by each institution to make budget and program adjustments. It is expected that these efforts will continue throughout the biennium. Adjustments to the tentative plan are to be anticipated as each institution refines the data through which program adjustment decisions are reached.
### SUMMARY, EDUCATION AND GENERAL SERVICES

**TENTATIVE BUDGET PLAN 1972-73**
**COMPAARED WITH INITIAL BUDGET FOR 1971-72**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>1971-72 INITIAL BUDGET</th>
<th>1972-73 TENTATIVE BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic FTE</td>
<td>Classified FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>3,261.66</td>
<td>613.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized Activities Related to Instr.</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Public Service</td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>47.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries &amp; Museums</td>
<td>168.94</td>
<td>267.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>122.49</td>
<td>270.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant Operation</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>791.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen'l Admin.</td>
<td>137.81</td>
<td>542.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen'l Institutional Expense</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>89.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Reserves</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,767.68</td>
<td>2,628.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## THREE TERM FTE ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS

**YEAR 1972-73**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Nov. 1971</th>
<th>Jan. 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fin. Comm. Review</td>
<td>Revised Estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>13,890</td>
<td>13,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>14,936</td>
<td>14,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>9,333</td>
<td>9,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>3,639</td>
<td>3,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>4,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOG</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIX INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>47,639</td>
<td>47,337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Lower Division**
  - 24,075
- **Upper Division**
  - 18,664
- **Graduate**
  - 4,900

- **SIX INSTITUTIONS**
  - 47,639

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Nov. 1971</th>
<th>Jan. 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOMS</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UODS</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTI</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FTE ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>50,518</td>
<td>50,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Revisions result from improved data provided by institutions for fall term, 1971, and a correction of graduate enrollments to include that portion of the DCE transfer to PSU which includes graduate students not contemplated in the initial limitation of 4,900.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In response to a question, Mr. Holmer indicated that a further report would be made giving additional details at the next meeting of the Committee. Mr. Holmer also referred to the tentative schedule for the development and approval of the 1972-73 budget plan. He said that the purpose of the presentation to the Committee was to secure such reactions and guidance as the Committee might wish to give for the formulation of specific instructions to the institutions for the preparation and submission of a budget request to the February Committee meeting. He noted that a special Committee meeting might be necessary if the Committee wished to review the tentative program further. Mr. Holmer then asked for comments and questions on the elements of the overall budget plan.

Mr. Mosser said that at this point it is necessary to rely very heavily on the institutions because they have the most knowledge of the situation within the institutions. He said that, although his information is limited, he believed that perhaps other cuts might have been better. He stated that he was not suggesting that any of the proposals had to be changed but wished to express some areas of disappointment and perhaps get some reactions.

Mr. Mosser referred to the following specific points:

1. The cut of approximately $1,750,000 in instruction while increasing administration by approximately $7,000. He said he would prefer to see instruction favored over administration although he recognized that there had been cuts in personnel and equipment for administration.

2. The large increase in the physical plant operation indicates that new buildings are expensive and that construction in the next biennium should emphasize the improvement of efficiency in the present plant rather than building expensive new plants.

3. At Oregon State University many of the developing programs appeared to take a larger proportion of the reduction. He said these were the kinds of programs which he would like to see developed and expanded.

4. More specific information is needed regarding the cuts at Southern Oregon College.

5. A positive focus is needed to the program at Eastern Oregon College in order to attract students to that institution.

6. Recruitment is being reduced and cuts are being made in vital areas at a time when enrollments are declining.
Mr. Mosser said he was wary of telling the institutions exactly where cuts should be made because frequently a statement or a computer report of these planned cuts does not reveal the full impact of a certain reduction. He cited an example at Portland State University of a reduction of one staff member which actually affected five other persons and their educational programs.

Mr. Westerdahl said his concern was with the entire approach to making these reductions. He said that previous discussions had indicated that quantity should be sacrificed before quality but that it did not appear the budget cutting philosophy was based on priorities which ranked programs in order of importance. He said he was referring to priorities by institutions at a minimum, and preferably on a system-wide basis in view of the magnitude of the cuts required.

President MacVicar said that reductions which were to be used for the three percent salary increase had been spread pretty evenly throughout the budgets on the basis that the reduction should come from the departments whose staff members would be receiving the salary increases. President MacVicar also said that the suggested budget plan represented a first response to meet a deadline and was not necessarily the final recommendation. He said the institutional staff had done a magnificent job in preparing some realistic and reasonable statements within a very short time.

Mr. Mosser said that he did not necessarily accept the philosophy that the three percent should be applied evenly unless the institution is prepared to say that everything is of equal importance. He said this is a long-term process, not merely an interim adjustment, and the entire program needs to be considered in a priority way.

It was indicated that the entire 1972-73 budget, including salary increases, was in the hands of the Emergency Board.

Mrs. Johnson indicated that she had many of the same questions as those raised by Mr. Mosser. She also commented that it was very difficult to know the exact impact of any of these reductions. She referred specifically to the elimination at Eastern Oregon College of four part-time people in business at a time when there is a sharp increase in enrollment in the new business-economics degree program initiated in the fall of 1971. She asked what impact this would have on the ability of the institution to offer alternatives to students who are not interested in education.

President Rempel responded that part-time staff were teaching business law and that these were attorneys and businessmen. He said the institution was absorbing this load by using administrative staff to teach some of these courses and it was not a cut in the business offerings.

Mr. Westerdahl said that regardless of the decisions made to approve or reject the tentative curtailment program, it could not be done on the basis of specific data. He then moved that the Finance Committee recommend Board approval of the tentative program for budget curtailment.
However, he said if other cuts become necessary, it was his opinion that the Chancellor's staff and the Board have a responsibility to establish some guidelines that affect the entire System, rather than cuts being made on a sharing basis without a definite statement of priorities.

The Finance Committee approved the motion that the Board adopt the tentative program of budget curtailment for year 1972-73, recognizing that modifications will be made if the institutions get further information and have an opportunity for a more thorough study of the problem.

Following the motion, there was a general discussion of the philosophy and implications of the budget curtailment problems. The following points were made:

1. Although increases are indicated in administration, the administrative function has been understaffed for some time, and in some instances additional responsibilities, including classroom duty, have been assigned to administrative staff.

2. Almost any college or university could operate with less money if every operation were analyzed completely.

3. If Board regulations or requests result in higher costs for little benefit, these things should be brought to the attention of the Board.

4. Only two states, Texas and Mississippi, are operating at a lower expenditure level per student than Oregon, as indicated in a report printed in the December 13, 1971, issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education.

5. The cost of education per student in Oregon has not increased very much during the entire decade of the 1960's, much less rapidly than general inflation. Consequently, the kinds of cuts indicated by the budget create a real concern about the erosion of quality.

6. Many of the suggested economies, such as those in physical plant improvement and libraries, may result in serious future problems, particularly if funding continues to be limited.

7. Future additional cuts are probable. It is also likely that budgets will be very limited for a long period of time. However, the restricted financial situation should not be permitted to continue indefinitely and it is the Board's responsibility to fight energetically for the necessary funds to prevent the deterioration of educational quality in Oregon.
8. Institutional executives, in commenting upon the fiscal situation, urged that institutional flexibility be maintained in dealing with the budgets, especially if the Board sets System-wide priorities. They also advocated the use of innovative approaches where necessary to meet changing needs and to lower costs.

9. Smaller institutions have less flexibility in making budgetary adjustments than do larger institutions.

10. Costs for educating a student in a particular program of study should be evaluated in terms of the need for a person with that particular type of training.

11. Some of the services and courses which the public wants may not be provided because of lack of funds.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Mosser said that the total for the Board's budgeted reserves includes the salary increase funds for 1972-73 which have not yet been allocated. He said he assumed the institutions and the Board's staff would have recommendations with respect to the allocation of the salary reserve and that a policy concerning it would be considered in connection with the approval of the final budget.

It was indicated that the budget plan must be presented to the Emergency Board for review and release of the funds being held by that Board for year 1972-73. The presentation to the Emergency Board would include sources of income, level of tuition, and the proposed expenditures by function, but not the detailed institutional operating budgets. However, the institutional budgets would be presented to the Board of Higher Education for approval. In discussing the possibility of recommending the rescinding of a previous decrease in tuition of $4 per term for year 1972-73, it was indicated that this could be done after the report of the Interinstitutional Fee Committee was received.

It was also indicated that the auxiliary enterprise budgets would be presented to the Board for approval and to the Emergency Board for review and release of funds for year 1972-73. A special Finance Committee meeting has been tentatively scheduled for February 29, 1972, in order to meet the deadlines in connection with the Emergency Board meeting dates.

The Board approved the tentative budget plan for use in preparing the institutional operating budgets for year 1972-73 and for presentation to the Emergency Board as recommended.
In connection with recent consideration by the Finance Committee and
the Board's Office of Administration of investment management and
procedures, it is recommended that changes be made in the Board's
Administrative Rules:

1. It is recommended that changes be made in Section 66.230
as follows:

At present the first paragraph provides for four investment
pools as shown below:

1. A corporate stock pool for Endowment Fund accounts
2. A bond-mortgage pool for accounts in either the
   Endowment or Quasi-Endowment Fund
3. A corporate stock pool for the Quasi-Endowment Fund
   accounts
4. A dollar-obligation pool for the Current Donation Fund

It is recommended that the number of pools be reduced from
four to three with other changes, so that the list would
read as follows:

1. For Endowment Fund accounts
2. For Quasi-Endowment Fund accounts
3. For Current Donation Fund accounts.

As changed the entire revised section 66.230 would read;

66.230 Investment Pools and Participation Units

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

1. For Endowment Fund accounts
2. For Quasi-Endowment Fund accounts
3. For Current Donation Fund accounts.

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

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

Recommendations will be made annually to the Board of
detailed standards of security holdings for all funds,
such as minimum required ratings of bonds, ranges of
maturities for dollar obligations, and similar factors.
2. Section 66.231 contains the following statement in the first two sentences:

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

It is recommended that the two sentences shown above be deleted from Section 66.231.

As changed Section 66.231 would then read;

66.231 Endowment Fund Investments

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

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

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

Periodically, the Vice Chancellor for Administration is to distribute to the Endowment accounts the appropriate portion of estimated dividend and interest income for the current fiscal year. The estimates of income shall be adjusted at the end of each year to give effect to over- or under-realization.

It is expected that each institution will administer the expenditures of endowments in such a way as to assure the existence of a balance in each endowment operating account at the end of a fiscal year, and will recognize that with investment in corporate stocks, related dividend income will fluctuate and may be less or more than originally estimated.

Some gifts or bequests are subject to investment conditions stipulated by the donor which prevent the investment of moneys in security pools. The investment program for said gifts and bequests shall be as directed by the terms of the gift or will, and pursuant to law and Board policy.
3. Section 66.232 contains the following statement in the first two sentences:

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

It is recommended that the two sentences shown above be deleted from Section 66.232.

As changed, Section 66.232 would read:

66.232 Quasi-Endowment Funds

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

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

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

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

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

The effect of the proposed changes 2. and 3., preceding, is to leave discretion concerning proportions of funds to be invested in the corporate stock pool and the bond-mortgage pool to the investment manager(s), subject to such conditions as the Board may desire to authorize for incorporation in the contract or agreement with the manager(s).
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Layman indicated that presentations were in order in connection with the hearing on changes in the Administrative Rules on investment management. There was no oral or written response to his request.

Mrs. Johnson referred to a suit being brought against an investment firm by an eastern college charging that the investment policies of the firm had lost money for the college, and that it had invested too heavily in speculative stocks. She asked if the experience of the eastern institution had implications for the Board in entering into a contract for investment management.

Mr. Mosser said that it pointed out the need for care in selecting the investment counsel and for providing them with objectives as to the results which the Board wished to obtain. Performance of the firm in meeting those objectives should be monitored on a regular basis by the Board's staff and the Finance Committee.

Upon motion by Director Mosser, the Board adopted the proposed changes in the Administrative Rules by a unanimous vote of all present.

President Layman announced that the next Board Committee meetings are scheduled for February 22-23, 1972, on the campus of Portland State University. The next regular Board meeting is scheduled for March 28, 1972, also on the campus of Portland State University.

Mr. Layman said that at the time the Board approved the 1972 Board meeting schedule, it had been agreed that a plan for campus visitations by Board members would be arranged. He said a tentative plan had been prepared and presented the following schedule:

It was suggested that the members of the Board be divided into groups as follows:

**Group A**

Mr. Layman, President; Member, Finance Committee
Mr. Holmes, Member, Academic Affairs Committee; Chairman, Public Service Committee
Mr. Stewart, Member, Building Committee

**Group B**

Mr. Corey, Member, Academic Affairs Committee, Public Service Committee, and Executive Committee
Mr. Joss, Chairman, Building Committee
Mr. Westerdahl, Member, Finance Committee
Mr. Layman indicated that if the above assignments were approved, it
would mean that each group would have representation from each Com­
mittee, that the lawyers on the Board would be divided among the
groups, and that each group would have a representative from the
Executive Committee. He said this latter point takes on added
significance when one considers the selection of a chairman to
head each group. If the group chairman were also a Committee
chairman, there would be the risk of the discussion focusing too
much on the subject area of the chairman. He suggested, therefore,
that the Executive Committee member assigned to each group be
appointed its chairman.

Mr. Layman said the institution might be divided into "sets" as
follows: (Note: Travel has been taken into consideration in
developing the sets. As recommended, each group would visit two
valley institutions and on in the outlying regions.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set 1</th>
<th>Set 2</th>
<th>Set 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>PSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>EOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTI</td>
<td>UODS</td>
<td>UOMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was recommended that the groups and sets be assigned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Layman said that in the absence of any objection the indicated
schedule would be followed and he designated the specified
groups of Board members as special committees for the visitations.
The details relating to the visitations will be provided to Board
members at a later time.

Mr. Collins reported that a letter addressed to Board members under
date of December 10, 1971, had been received from Mr. John M.
Morgenthaler, President of the Board of Directors of the Lake Oswego
Chamber of Commerce, and that copies of the letter had been mailed to
Board members. The letter indicated the opposition of that organiza­
tion to the mandatory collection of fees from students in State System
institutions to finance OSPIRG.
# 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>10,641,543.43</td>
<td>21,730,568.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26, 1971</td>
<td>10,814,998.92</td>
<td>32,545,567.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 14, 1971</td>
<td>5,541,878.37</td>
<td>38,687,445.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 24, 1972</td>
<td>4,454,246.35</td>
<td>42,541,692.01</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

American Cancer Society

Grant of $77,547 from the American Cancer Society, Inc., New York City, for research entitled, "Adenovirus: A Model for Eukaryotic Replication Units," January 1, 1972, through December 31, 1973, under the direction of Dr. George D. Pearson, Assistant Professor of Biochemistry.

American Chemical Society

Grant of $3,000 from the American Chemical Society, Washington, D.C., for research entitled, "Separation and Quantitative Analysis of Inorganic and Organomercury Compounds," September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. James D. Ingle, Jr., Assistant Professor of Chemistry.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Grant of $20,510 from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., for research entitled, "Physiological Ecology of Cryophillic Algae and Their Responses to Simulated Martian Environment," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Herbert Curl, Jr., Professor of Oceanography.

National Science Foundation

Grants totaling $887,984 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., for research, institutes, training programs, and other purposes, as follows:

1. $137,187 - "For an Academic Year Institute in Basic Sciences," November 18, 1971, through January 31, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Stanley E. Williamson, Chairman of Science Education.


3. $10,600 - "Phylogeny and Distribution of Nearctic and Palearctic Leafhoppers," April 1, 1971, through September 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Paul W. Oman, Professor of Entomology.

4. $72,911 - "To accommodate expenditures for Scientific Purposes under an Institutional Grant for Science," December 3, 1971, through December 2, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Roy A. Young, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.
5. $83,328 - "Experiment in the Transportability of Computer-Based Curriculum Materials," November 1, 1971, through April 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Lawrence C. Hunter, Director, Computer Center.

6. $29,200 - "Granitic Rocks in the Mesozoic Evolution of the Pacific Northwest," January 1, 1972, through June 30, 1974, under the direction of Dr. William H. Taubeneck, Professor of Geology.

7. $56,479 - "Summer Institute in Multiple Fields for Secondary School Teachers," December 6, 1971, through September 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Fred W. Fox, Professor of Science Education.


9. $40,000 - "A Standard Biostratigraphic Sequence for the Lower and Middle Devonian in Western North America," February 1, 1970, through July 31, 1974, under the direction of Dr. J. Granville Jensen, Associate Professor of Geology.

10. $411,600 - "Salaries, wages, materials and other expenses for vessel operation," December 1, 1971, through May 31, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Wayne V. Burt, Associate Dean of Research, and Captain Ellis B. Rittenhouse, Associate Professor of Oceanography.

Oregon State Department of Agriculture

Grant of $12,480 from the Oregon State Department of Agriculture, Milk Stabilization Division, Salem, for "A Study of the Economics of Dairy Management Systems and Cost of Producing Grade A Fluid Milk in Market Area One," November 15, 1971, through October 1, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Gene Nelson, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics.

Oregon State Board of Education

Grants totaling $21,663.30 from the Oregon State Board of Education, Salem, for training programs, as follows:

1. $19,497 - "Vocational Teacher Education Pre-Service Program To Provide for Special Need Students," October 31, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Henry Ten Pas, Director, Vocational and Adult Education.

2. $2,166.30 - Federal subgrant for "Planning and Preparing Programs for a Special Adult Education Project and Intern Program," November 15, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Henry Ten Pas.

Oregon State Highway Commission

Grant of $76,200 from the Oregon State Highway Commission, Salem, for "An Economics Analysis Required for Optimum Allocation of Resources within the State Highway Department," October 19, 1971, through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Gary W. Sorenson.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Grant Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon PUD Directors' Association</td>
<td>Grant of $44,500 from the Oregon PUD Directors' Association, Tillamook, for a study of &quot;The Wind Power Potential in Selected Areas of Oregon,&quot; November 1, 1971, through October 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. E. Wendell Hewson, Chairman, Atmospheric Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodgers Organ Company</td>
<td>Grant of $3,800 from the Rodgers Organ Company, Hillsboro, for research &quot;To Develop an Integrated RC Oscillator Suitable for Organ Tone Generator Application,&quot; November 15, 1971, through January 15, 1972, under the direction of Mr. J. C. Looney, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan Power Company</td>
<td>Grant of $20,160 from the Taiwan Power Company, Taipei, Taiwan, for &quot;A Reactor Operations Training Program for Fourteen Trainees from Taiwan,&quot; January 1 through May 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. C. H. Wang, Director of the Radiation Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Atomic Energy Commission</td>
<td>Grants totaling $20,700 from the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Richland Operations Office, Richland, Washington, for research as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. $9,200 - &quot;Radionuclide Cycling in Natural Populations of Amphibians,&quot; September 15, 1971, through September 14, 1972, under the direction of Dr. David L. Willis, Chairman, General Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. $11,500 - &quot;Gaseous Metal Halide Molecular Symmetries,&quot; January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Carroll W. DeKock, Assistant Professor of Chemistry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Dept. of Commerce</td>
<td>Grants totaling $12,750 from the U. S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, for research and other purposes, as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. $2,750 - &quot;Extended Application and Improvement of Methodology for the Cryo-Preservation of Viable Salmonid Sperm,&quot; September 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Howard F. Horton, Professor of Fisheries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. $10,000 - &quot;Estuarine Monitoring Program,&quot; November 1, 1971, through October 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Richard S. Caldwell, Assistant Professor of Fisheries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Forest Service</td>
<td>Grants totaling $35,826.65 from the U. S. Forest Service, Washington, D.C., for research and other purposes, as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. $30,933 - &quot;Biochemical Oxygen Demand of Finely Divided Logging Debris,&quot; December 7, 1971, through December 7, 1972, under the direction of Dr. G. W. Brown, Assistant Professor of Forest Hydrology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. $1,193.65 - "Study related to the Need for Information on Alternative Procedures for Appraising and Selling Public Timber," 1971-72, under the direction of Dr. John Beuter, Associate Professor, Forest Research Laboratory.


U.S. Department of Labor Grant of $177,750 from the U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., for expenses under a "National Youth Corps In-School Program," June 30 through August 31, 1971, under the direction of Dr. Harry E. Clark, Community Development Specialist.

U.S. Dept. of the Navy Grant of $211,000 from the U. S. Navy Department, Washington, D.C., "to provide for payment of tuition and fees for students participating in the NROTC Program," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Lieutenant Commander L. J. Carpenter, Professor of Naval Science.

U.S. Public Health Service Grants totaling $577,896 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C, for research, training grants, and other purposes, as follows:

1. $21,614 - "Ontogeny of Osmotic and Ionic Regulation," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Ronald H. Alvarado, Associate Professor of Zoology.

2. $15,944 - "Development Award No. 5 KO4 GM 32784-03 in behalf of Dr. Curtis W. Johnson, Jr.," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. R. W. Newburgh, Head of Biochemistry and Biophysics.

3. $1,000 - "Postdoctoral Allowance in behalf of Randolph L. Rill," November 1, 1971, through October 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Kensal E. Van Holde, Professor of Biophysics.

4. $32,292 - "The Role of Cation Salts in Nutrition," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Harold J. Evans, Professor of Plant Physiology.

5. $507,046 - "Environmental Toxicology of Pesticides," November 1, 1971, through October 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Virgil H. Freed, Head of Agricultural Chemistry.
University of Oregon

Subgrant of $9,096 through the University of Oregon from the U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., for "A Study of the Labor Force Participation Behavior in Females," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Gary W. Sorenson, Chairman, Department of Economics.

University of Washington

Subgrant of $60,694 through the University of Washington from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., for research entitled, "Site Characterization, Biological and Environmental Monitoring and Mapping under a Coniferous Forest Biome Program," September 15, 1971, through February 28, 1972, under the direction of staff members in Forest Management, Botany, Forestry, Biology, Forest Physiology, Nematology, Entomology, and Forest Wildlife Ecology.

Grants to Agric. Exper. Stations:

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

Agricultural Research Foundation

$7,800 - "Control of Soil Temperature with Reactor Cooling Water," under the direction of Dr. L. L. Boersma, Professor of Soils.

$1,175 - "Microbiology of Processing Fruits and Vegetables," under the direction of Dr. Paul Krumperman, Associate Professor.

$500 - "Formulation of New Commercial Food Products," under the direction of Dr. Lois McGill, Associate Professor of Food Science and Technology.

$1,000 - "Methodology of Flavor Evaluations," under the direction of Dr. Lois McGill, Associate Professor of Food Science and Technology.

$1,500 - "Mycotoxin Toxicity and Carcinogenesis in Trout," under the direction of Dr. R. O. Sinnhuber, Professor of Food Science and Technology.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries & Wildlife

$11,928 - "Study of Otter Population on the Oregon Coast at Port Orford," under the direction of Mr. H. M. Wight, Professor of Wildlife Ecology.

Cornell, Howland, Hayes & Merryfield, Inc.

$1,000 - "Laser Mediated Lignin Solid Waste Fermentation," under the direction of Dr. A. W. Anderson, Professor of Microbiology.

Malheur Onion Growers

$4,500 - "Research on Pink Root Rot of Onion," under the direction of Dr. E. K. Vaughan, Professor of Plant Pathology.

Mink Farmers Research Foundation, Inc.

$15,000 - "Support of Mink Research Program," under the direction of Dr. Floyd M. Stout, Associate Professor of Animal Nutrition.

Oregon Fish Commission

$6,625 - "Infectious Disease of Salmonid Fishes," under the direction of Dr. J. L. Fryer, Associate Professor of Microbiology.
Oregon State Game Commission: $6,500 - "Inventory of Vibriosis in Salmon," under the direction of Dr. J. L. Fryer, Associate Professor of Microbiology. 

$5,000 - "Biology of the Protozoan Parasite Ceratomyxa Shasta," under the direction of Dr. J. L. Fryer, Associate Professor of Microbiology. 

$4,000 - "Diagnosis of Fish," under the direction of Dr. J. L. Fryer. 

Pacific Bulb Growers Research Committee: $1,300 - "Growth and Development of Ornamental Plants as Related to Environmental Factors and Their Control," under the direction of Dr. A. N. Roberts, Professor of Horticulture. 


$7,000 - "Ringspot Virus Study," under the direction of Dr. K. G. Swenson, Professor of Entomology. 

West Coast Beet Seed Company: $940 - "Soil Fertility," under the direction of Dr. T. L. Jackson, Professor of Soils. 

Western Oregon Livestock Association: $559 - "Tansy Control," under the direction of Dr. W. P. Nagel, Associate Professor of Entomology. 

University of Oregon: Gifts totaling $10,667.91 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

Alpha Omega Foundation, Inc., Berkeley, California: $452.25 
Associated Student Body of Union High School Scholarship Fund, Silverton: $500.00 
The Business and Professional Women's Club, Astoria: $200.00 
Business and Professional Women's Club, Junction City: $136.00 
The Carpenter Foundation, through School District No. 6, Central Point: $299.00 
Cockerline Memorial Trust Fund, through the U.S. National Bank, Salem: $166.66 
Elks Lodge No. 1680, Burns: $150.00 
Elks Lodge No. 1845, Hermiston: $100.00 
Elks National Foundation, Chicago, Illinois: $600.00 
Emery Educational Foundation, Inc., Wilton, Connecticut: $150.00 
Eugene Symphony Association, Eugene: $2,050.00 
Filipino Scholarship Foundation of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii: $100.00 
First National Bank of Oregon, Medford: $167.00 
First Presbyterian Church, Astoria: $100.00
Georgia-Pacific Foundation, Portland  $250.00
Mamaroneck-Larchmont Student Aid Fund, Inc., Larchmont, New York  400.00
Medford Senior High School, Medford (including $1,067 through the Carpenter Foundation)  1,284.00
Meier & Frank Co., Portland  100.00
Moss, Adams & Co., Seattle, Washington  500.00
P.E.O., Portland  250.00
The Professional Baseball College Scholarship Plan, New York City  233.00
Rotary Club, Florence  125.00
C. M. Schauer Enterprises, Vancouver, Washington  500.00
The S&H Foundation, Inc., New York City  1,350.00
Seattle Model City Project Scholarship Committee, Seattle, Washington  171.00
South Santiam Educational and Research Project, through Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis  334.00

Bethlehem Steel Corporation
Grant of $2,500 from Bethlehem Steel Corporation, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, to the General Gift Fund, for the unrestricted use of the University of Oregon, under the direction of Mr. W. N. McLaughlin, Director of Business Affairs.

Eastman Kodak Company
Grant of $1,000 from Eastman Kodak Company, Rochester, New York, for the unrestricted use of the University, under the direction of President Clark.

Lane Community College
Grant of $5,525 from Lane Community College, Eugene, for the services of Mr. Frank Salerni in connection with "Children's Repertory Theatre," September 16, 1971, through June 15, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Charles A. Leistner, Head of the Speech Department.

National Science Foundation
Grants totaling $261,180 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., for research, training programs, and other purposes, as follows:

1. $68,680 - "Administration of Institutional Grants for Science (G-1)," December 3, 1971, until expended, under the direction of Dr. Aaron Novick, Dean of the Graduate School.

2. $143,000 - "Neutron Physics and Electromagnetic Transitions in Nuclei," December 15, 1971, through May 31, 1973, under the direction of Dr. D. C. McDaniel, Professor of Physics, and Dr H. W. Lefevere and Dr. J. C. Overley, Associate Professors of Physics.

3. $38,000 - "Spectroscopy of Oriented Biological Systems," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. John A. Schellman, Professor of Chemistry.

4. $11,500 - "For support of the 1972 Summer Institute in Mathematics for Secondary School Teachers," December 6, 1971, through September 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. A. F. Moursund, Professor of Mathematics.
Oregon State Board of Education: Grant of $1,200 from the Oregon State Board of Education, Salem, for a "Mini-grant Applied Research Proposal for Career Exploration Guidance," December 1, 1971, through February 1, 1972, under the direction of Dr. John Loughary, Head, Counseling Department.

Oregon Career Information Center: Grant of $162,770 from the Oregon Career Information Center, Lane Community College, Eugene, "for the conduct of the Career Information Center," October 1, 1971, to March 1973, under the direction of Dr. Bruce McKinley, Research Associate, School of Community Service and Public Affairs.

Tektronix Foundation: Gift of $100 from Tektronix Foundation, Beaverton, for the unrestricted use of the University of Oregon, under the direction of Mr. W. N. McLaughlin, Director of Business Affairs.

Todd County Independent School Dist.: Grant of $22,975 from Todd County Independent School District, Mission, South Dakota, "for participation in the University's Follow-Through Program," July 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Wesley Becker, Professor of Education.

U.S. Dept. of Justice: Grants totaling $218,374 from the U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., for training programs, as follows:

1. $8,356 - "Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP)," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Larry Large, Director of Financial Aids.

2. $210,018 - "Oregon Project NewGate," November 1, 1971, through October 31, 1972, under the direction of Mr. V. Lee Layman, Director, Oregon Project NewGate.

National Park Service: Grant of $1,000 from the National Park Service, U. S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., "to conduct an Archaeological Reconnaissance (Report) in the Corps of Engineers; Catherine Creek Reservoir, Oregon," December 1, 1971, through December 1, 1972, under the direction of Mr. David Cole, Acting Director, Museum of Natural History.

U.S. Public Health Service: Grants totaling $209,037 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., for research, fellowships, and other purposes, as follows:

1. $2,550 - "Predoctoral fellowship in behalf of Mary K. Bullard," July 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Philip D. Young, Associate Professor of Anthropology.

2. $1,000 - "Postdoctoral supply allowance on behalf of Charles W. Pratt," October 18, 1971, through October 17, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Peter H. von Hippel, Director, Institute of Molecular Biology.

3. $33,586 - "Photoionization as A Probe of Biological Membranes," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. O. Hayes Griffith, Research Associate, Institute of Molecular Biology.
4. $92,574 - "Structure and Relations of Proteins and Nucleic Acids," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Peter von Hippel, Director, Institute of Marine Biology.

5. $77,327 - "Generalizability of Behavioral Assessment," January 1, 1972, through December 31, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Stephen Johnson, Assistant Professor of Psychology.

6. $1,000 - "Postdoctoral supply allowance on behalf of Richard A. Frankel," September 7, 1971, through September 6, 1972, under the direction of Dr. John A. Schellman, Professor of Chemistry.

7. $1,000 - "Postdoctoral supply allowance on behalf of Peter J. Dehlinger," September 23, 1971, through September 22, 1972, under the direction of Dr. O. Hayes Griffith, Research Associate, Institute of Molecular Biology.

Subrant of $5,186 through the University of Washington, from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., for research entitled, "Coniferous Forest Biome," September 15, 1971, through February 28, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Jane Gray, Curator of Paleobotany, Museum of Natural History.

Gift of $150 from the Women's Choral Society, Eugene, to the Music School Gifts account, under the direction of Mr. W. N. McLaughlin, Business Manager.

Gifts to the Library:

B. Huberman
Collection of books, pamphlets, brochures, from Dr. Edward Huberman, Maplewood, New Jersey, and also the library and files of his late brother, Leo Huberman. The gift is valued at $470.80.

J. Gange
Approximately 80 volumes and assorted pamphlets and brochures on the subject of international politics, sociology, economics, etc., from Dr. John Gange, Eugene. The gift is valued at $227.10.

H. Goehler
Selection of approximately 185 volumes, including many books on law and economics, from Mr. Herman Goehler, Portland. The gift is valued at $261.57.

J. Hedgpeth
Collection of significant runs of six periodicals and journals from the field of oceanography and marine biology, from Dr. Joel Hedgpeth, Newport. The gift is valued at $1,660.

Mrs. A. C. McDonald
A set of Tolstoi (24 volumes) and a set of Robert Lewis Stevenson's works (27 volumes), and the Heritage Press edition of "Treasure Island," from Mrs. A. C. McDonald, Eugene. The gift is valued at $195.
Mrs. C. McKinley

The working files and correspondence of Charles McKinley, from Mrs. McKinley, Portland. Mr. McKinley was a historian and political scientist and specialist in the fields of public administration and planning with particular emphasis on the Pacific Northwest. The gift is valued at $4,820.

Mrs. V. Werner

Additional manuscripts, correspondence, and research material for six book-length publications for adults and children, from Mrs. Vivian Werner, Paris, France. The gift is valued at $975.

F. L. Stetson

Approximately 180 volumes covering politics, history, horticulture, crafts and other areas, from Mr. Fred L. Stetson, Eugene. The gift is valued at $201.20.

Mr. & Mrs. G. Gilkey

Gift of one black and white woodblock print, entitled "Stone Image of Bishunnu, Yang-Kang Temple," from Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Gilkey, Corvallis. The gift to the Museum of Art is valued at $500.

University of Oregon Dental School

Oregon Foundation for Dental Research and Development

Grant of $11,000 from the Oregon Foundation for Dental Research and Development, Portland, in the form of a guarantee toward the purchase of an Electron Microscope. Arrangements for transfer of funds to the proper account will be made when the purchase is completed. The equipment will be used by the entire research community of the Dental School, under the direction of Dr. R. Quinton-Cox, Anatomy Department.

U. S. Public Health Service

Grants totaling $76,959 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D. C., for research and student loans, as follows:

1. $50,804 - "General Research Support Program," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. William B. Wescott, Associate Dean.

2. $26,155 - "Loan Funds for undergraduate dental students," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Ernest A. Hurley, Director of Student Affairs.

University of Oregon Medical School

Scholarships & Fellowships

Gifts totaling $1,140 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

The Allstate Foundation, Seattle, Washington $ 300.00
Clackamas County Medical Education Foundation, Oregon City 690.00
Coeur d'Alene Rotary Club, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 150.00
Rogue Valley Physicians' Service, Medford 300.00

Abbott Laboratories

Grant of $150 from Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, Illinois, "In support of a clinical study to report on complete cases of bacterial otitis media (payment to be $150 per each completed report)," under the direction of Dr. Alexander J. Schleuninger, Associate Professor of Otolaryngology.
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C. V. Allen

Gift of a Whirlpool air conditioner, Model #ASMO8020, valued at $125, from Dr. C. V. Allen, Portland, for use in the Department of Radiation Therapy, under the direction of Dr. C. N. Holman, Dean.

American Cancer Society, Oregon Division, Inc.

Grant of $16,675 from the American Cancer Society, Oregon Division, Inc., Portland, for research entitled, "To Investigate the Role of Estrogen Receptor Macromolecules in Tissue Differentiation of the Mammary Gland and in the Etiology of Breast Cancer," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Benjamin S. Leung, Assistant Professor of Surgery.

Mrs. G. C. Bellinger

Gift of $100 from Mrs. Grover C. Bellinger, Salem, to the Grover C. Bellinger Pulmonary Laboratory Research Fund, under the direction of Dr. Miles Edwards, Professor and Head of Chest Diseases.

The Deafness Research Foundation

Grant of $4,645 from The Deafness Research Foundation, New York City, for research entitled, "Determination of Temperature Effects Upon the Electrical Activity of the Cochlea," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Mary B. Meikle, Research Associate, Otolaryngology.

Mr. & Mrs. C. E. Ford

Gift of $100 from Mr. and Mrs. Carl E. Ford, Glendale, for "DMSO Research," under the direction of Dr. Stanley Jacob, Associate Professor of Surgery.

Hendrickson Estate

Bequest of $300 from the estate of Esther Ada Knapp Hendrickson, Portland, to be distributed as follows: Unrestricted use of Doernbecher Hospital, $100; and Diabetes Research, $200. The funds will be used under the direction of Dean Holman.

J. Hervin

Gift of $900 from Mr. Jason Hervin, Tualatin, for animal care research, under the direction of Mr. Allan Rogers, Director of Animal Care.

Mr. & Mrs. Ira C. Keller

Gift of a tract of land representing that portion of tax lots 105 and 129 lying in Section 9 Township 1 South, Range 1 East of the Willamette Meridian, Multnomah County, from Mr. and Mrs. Ira C. Keller, Portland. The tract consists of approximately 8.4 acres and is valued at $29,700. The land is to be used for Medical School purposes, and if it is not used for such purposes, the title will revert to the Kellers or to their heirs. The deed to the property was received on December 20, 1971.

National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation

Grant of $496 from the Oregon Chapter of the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation, Portland, for the Barbara Burdick Project, to be used toward the purchase of a protein separator to assist in research, under the direction of Dr. Robert A. Campbell, Associate Professor of Pediatrics.

The National Foundation

Grant of $32,880 from The National Foundation, White Plains, New York, "in further support of the Birth Defects Research Center," January 1 through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Neil R. M. Buist, Associate Professor of Pediatrics.

Oregon Medical Association

Grant of $5,418 from the Oregon Medical Association, Portland, for the Library Fund, under the direction of Miss Margaret Hughes, Professor and Librarian.
Noren Estate: Bequest of $2,600 from the Myrtle Noren Estate through The Oregon Bank, Portland, for the unrestricted use of Doernbecher Hospital, under the direction of Dr. Michael Baird, Medical Director.

Oregon State Division of Mental Health: Subgrant of $21,000 from the Oregon State Division of Mental Health, Alcohol and Drug Section, Portland, "to provide an expert witness for the City of Portland prosecutor who will be prosecuting Driving While Under the Influence of Intoxicating Liquor cases," June 17, 1971, through June 30, 1973, under the direction of Dr. Tyra T. Hutchens, Professor and Chairman, Department of Clinical Pathology.

Oregon State Elks Association: Grant of $13,650 from the Oregon State Elks Association, McMinnville, "in support of the Elks' Program for Visually Handicapped Children through March 30, 1972," under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Swan, Professor and Chairman of Ophthalmology.

Portland Academy of Medicine: Gift of $1,000 from the Portland Academy of Medicine, Portland, for the purchase of books, supplies and special equipment, under the direction of Miss Margaret Hughes, Professor and Librarian.

Schering Corporation: Grant of $1,750 from the Schering Corporation, Bloomfield, New Jersey, for "Drug Study for Berlin Laboratories," under the direction of Dr. Clarence V. Hodges, Head of the Department of Urology.

The Max & Rose Tucker Foundation: Grant of $500 from The Max and Rose Tucker Foundation, Portland, for the unrestricted use of Doernbecher Hospital, under the direction of Dr. Michael Baird, Medical Director.

U. S. Public Health Service: Grants totaling $518,195 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Washington, D.C., for research, student loans, and other purposes, January 1 through December 31, 1972, unless otherwise indicated, as follows:

1. $163,811 - "Studies in Breeding Large Animals for Medical Research," under the direction of Dr. William S. Fletcher, Professor of Surgery.
2. $19,060 - "Absorption and Transport of Dietary Lipids," under the direction of Dr. Alfred J. Rampone, Professor of Physiology.
3. $37,220 - "EEG Studies in Newborn and Young Infants," under the direction of Dr. Rudolph C. H. Engel, Professor of Pediatrics.
4. $56,736 - "Studies in Cryobiology," under the direction of Dr. Stanley W. Jacob, Associate Professor of Surgery.
5. $37,179 - "Health Professions Student Loans," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Dick B. Speight, Student Financial Aid Officer.
6. $19,028 - "Nursing Student Loans," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Dick B. Speight, Student Financial Aid Officer.

7. $75,000 - "In further support of a Regional Service Center in the Eugene area to provide services to crippled children," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Richard L. Sleeter, Director Crippled Children's Division.

8. $110,161 - "Genetics Study Program," September 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. Richard L. Sleeter, Director, Crippled Children's Division.

Portland State University

Scholarships & Fellowships Gifts totaling $2,153.15 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation March of Dimes, Tri-County Chapter, Portland</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland Embassy, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>$553.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Turner Educational Trust, through the U. S. National Bank, Portland</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heirs of E. Bloch Gift of $500 from the Heirs of Ernest Bloch, Bend, "for salaries and supplies for research on Ernest Bloch's music and photography," effective during 1971, under the direction of Mr. Thomas T. Taylor III, Film Consultant.

Burlingame Fred Meyer Store Gift of a swing set, valued at $150, from the Burlingame Fred Meyer Store, for use in the Child Care Center, under the direction of Miss Diane Duveneck, Director of the Center.

Coast Gordon Business Forms Gift of computer tab stock, valued at $251.10, from Coast Gordon Business Forms, Portland, for use in the computer center under the direction of Mr. Craig Magwire, Director of the Center.

A. R. Gassaway Gift of $113.05 from Mr. A. R. Gassaway, Portland, to employ a College Work Study Project student in social science, under the direction of Mr. R. Edward Grosswiler, College of Social Science.

M. Heinrich Gift of spectrographic laboratory equipment, valued at $5,865, from Mr. Mortimer Heinrich, Honolulu, Hawaii. The equipment is to be called the Heinrich Spectrographic Laboratory, and will be under the direction of Mr. John E. Allen, Head of the Department of Earth Sciences.

M. S. Isseks Gift of books and federal documents in the area of economics, government and public administration, and issues of Public Administration Review, valued at $120, from Mr. Morris S. Isseks, Portland. The gift is to be used in the library under the direction of Dr. Frank Rodgers, Director of the Library.
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Multnomah County Alcohol Recovery Center
Grant of $5,000 from Multnomah County Alcoholic Recovery Center, Portland, "To conduct an evaluation of the feasibility of a Detoxification Center," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Lyndon Musolf, Head, Urban Studies. This is a partial funding of an overall project to evaluate a group of programs funded with Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funds.

National Science Foundation
Grant of $9,444 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., to be used for the support of departmental research and the purposes set forth in "Administration of Institutional Grants for Science," beginning December 5, 1971, under the direction of Dr. David T. Clark, Dean of Graduate Studies.

Oregon Council on Economic Education
Grant of $500 from the Oregon Council on Economic Education, Portland, to replenish funds in the Economic Education Gifts account, under the direction of Mr. Hugh G. Lovell, Director, Center of Economic Education.

PSU Foundation
Gift of $1,455.99 from the Portland State University Foundation, "to support research studies of the Middle East," October 1 to December 31, 1971, under the direction of Mr. Robert Moody, Research Associate.

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

U.S. Dept. of Justice
Grant of $6,000 from the U. S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Washington, D.C., "for support of the Internship Program," September 1 through December 31, 1971, under the direction of Mr. Bonner Robinson, Director of Financial Aids.

Oregon College of Education

Amity School District #4J
Grant of $1,536 from Amity School District #4J, Amity, "to accommodate costs for speech therapy services provided to the Amity School District," October 23, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. John Sparks, Director of Business Affairs.

Lorene Sails Higgins Charitable Trust
Gift of $4,000 from the Lorene Sails Higgins Charitable Trust, through the Bank of California, Portland, "to aid in the establishment of the John C. Higgins Memorial Collection of books and other materials related to the History and Culture of the Greater Northwest," under the direction of Mr. John N. Sparks.

Independence School Dist. 13J
Grant of $855 from School District 13J, Independence, for the establishment of an evening course, "Mathematics-In-Service," to be conducted during the period October 6, 1971, through March 8, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Vern D. Hiebert, Assistant Professor of Mathematics.
Grant of $2,296 from Marion County School District 24J, Salem, "to provide a supervisor for Career Opportunities Program (COP)," during Fall Term 1971, under the direction of Mr. Roger P. Kershner, Associate Professor of Education.

Grants totaling $134,469 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., for institutes, as follows:

1. $71,626 - "Summer Institute in Geography for Secondary School Teachers," December 6, 1971, through September 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. James W. Gallagher, Professor of Geography.


Grant of $92,245 from the U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., for loans and grants to students enrolled in the Law Enforcement Education Program, July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Jean S. Long, Assistant Professor of Social Science.

Gifts totaling $2,919.03 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

- Elks Lodge No. 1680, Burns $ 150.00
- Elks Lodge No. 326, Roseburg 300.00
- Kiwanis Club, Newport 125.00
- McKay's Market, Coos Bay 125.00
- National Merit Scholarship Corporation, Evanston, Illinois 250.00
- Oregon Council of the Blind, Woodburn 400.00
- Oregon State Bowling Proprietors Association, Inc., Portland 100.00
- Oregon Shakespearean Festival, Ashland 117.00
- Pacific High School Student Body, Port Orford 200.00
- Roseburg Senior High School, Roseburg 479.53
- M.M. Snider Scholarship Fund, White City 172.50
- Taft Union High School Parent-Teacher Association, Taft, California 100.00
- U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Warm Springs Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Warm Springs, Oregon 400.00

Grants totaling $66,657 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C., for institutes, as follows:

1. $55,157 - "Summer Institute in Biological and Earth Sciences for Secondary School Teachers," Summer 1972, under the direction of Mr. William B. Purdom, Associate Professor of Science.

2. $11,500 - "Summer Institute in Mathematics for Secondary School Teachers," Summer 1972, under the direction of Mr. Robert A. McCoy, Assistant Professor of Mathematics.
Grant of $28,000 from the U. S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Washington, D.C., "for loans in the Law Enforcement Program at Southern Oregon College," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. Ivan Polk, Assistant Professor and Chairman, Law Enforcement.

**Eastern Oregon College**

**Scholarships & Fellowships**

Gifts totaling $13,510 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

- Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., New York City, $175.00
- Bureau of Indian Affairs, Juneau Area Office, Juneau, Alaska, 8,902.00
- Bureau of Indian Affairs, Umatilla Agency, Pendleton
- Georgia-Pacific Foundation, Portland, 1,750.00
- Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Fossil Lodge No. 110, Fossil
- Nevada Indian Agency, Stewart, Nevada, 1,365.00
- Oregon Congress of Parents and Teachers, Portland, 166.00
- Oregon State P.E.O. Sisterhood, Portland, 125.00
- Soroptimist Club of La Grande, 170.00
- U.S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland, 507.00

Grant of $400 from the Oregon Council on Economic Education, Portland, "to conduct a study on Economic Education in Higher Education," December 10, 1971, through December 31, 1972, under the direction of Dr. John Jambura, Professor of Social Science.

**Oregon Technical Institute**

**Scholarships & Fellowships**

Gifts totaling $3,642 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

- Corvallis High School Parent-Teacher Association, Corvallis, $150.00
- Faculty of Gresham Union High School, Gresham
- Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan, 200.00
- Klamath Saddle Club, Inc., Klamath Falls, 767.00
- Klamath Union High School (GRA) Scholarship, Klamath Falls, 250.00
- Rotary Club, Hood River, 100.00
- Miss Sarah F. Wolverton, Pasadena, California, 2,000.00
Gift of air equipment, valued at $1,045.50, from Mr. Charles Glover, Klamath Falls, Oregon, for use in the Auto-Diesel Department.

Gift of materials and equipment, valued at $500, to be purchased for the Electro-Mechanical Computer Center, from Mr. T. J. Orr, Klamath Falls.

Gift of a new Ford Model 9000 tractor Chassis, Tractor No. C303445, from the Tractor and Implement Division of Ford Motor Company, Eugene, for use in the Auto-Diesel Department. The gift is valued at $10,935.

Grant of $11,858 to provide instructional equipment from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., for use in the instructional program, under the direction of Mr. Ray G. Prevost, Dean of Faculty. This equipment is provided under Title VI a. of the Higher Education Act.

Gift of $500 from the Society of Real Estate Appraisers, Portland, as an unrestricted gift for staff professional development, under the direction of Dr. Robert A. Nicholas.

Grant of $1,500 from Medford Public Schools, Medford, to "provide professional consulting services to the District's Child Resource Program during fiscal year 1972," July 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Dr. H. D. Fredericks, Research Professor (Project Director).

Grant of $4,550 from the Rogue Valley Opportunity Center, "to provide professional staff services for the operation of a sheltered workshop for handicapped persons in Medford, Oregon," October 1, 1971, through June 30, 1972, under the direction of Mr. John McDonnell, Instructor, (Project Director).

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 P.M.
SUPPLEMENT A
OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

RESIDENCE HALLS AND MARRIED STUDENT HOUSING
The Oregon State Board of Higher Education recognizes that it is essential for some student housing to be provided if educational opportunity is to be extended to students of all geographic regions in Oregon. A summary analysis of student housing and a summary comparison of dormitory capacities and occupancies appear in Tables I, II, and III and identify principally the regular residence halls for single students.

Data for the Fall Term 1971 study were obtained from the nine institutions within the State System. The data are applicable to the closing of the fourth week of classes during Fall Term 1971.

The rationale of providing housing for single students applies also to the provision of some housing for married students. The Board also believes that housing units for married students are needed at the universities in Corvallis and Eugene and, to a lesser extent, at several of the other institutions to encourage the enrollment of those able graduate students who qualify as teaching and research assistants. The attached exhibits have been prepared in response to the Board's specific request for an annual report of married student housing and temporary housing for single students. The arrangement is similar to the Fall Term 1970 report and identifies the total number of married students (male and female), the number of graduate teaching assistants and research assistants, and the number of graduate assistants occupying institutionally-owned housing units.

Data on married student housing for the Fall Term 1971 study have been obtained from Eastern Oregon College, Oregon College of Education, Oregon State University, Southern Oregon College, and the University of Oregon. No units of married student housing are owned or operated by the other institutions of the State System of Higher Education. The data on married student housing appear in Tables IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII. A summary of family housing appears in the three pages of Table IX.

---

2 Ibid.
TABLE I

COMPARISON OF DORMITORY CAPACITIES AND OCCUPANCIES
(At Close of Fourth Week of Classes)
FALL TERM 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Rated Capacity</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Percent of Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon College</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>4,872*</td>
<td>4,312*</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>2,916!</td>
<td>2,368!</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Technical Institute</td>
<td>558**</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>11,459</td>
<td>9,743</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Medical and Dental Schools</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11,629</td>
<td>9,873</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table I indicates that for the State System as a whole, the number of occupants in the Fall Term 1971 was 84.9 percent of the rated capacities of the dormitories or residence halls.

The occupancy for six institutions (excluding the Dental and Medical Schools) varied from a low of 76.1 percent at Oregon College of Education to a high of 91.1 percent at Southern Oregon College.

Portland State University does not have any institutionally-owned permanent residence halls. It does provide temporary housing for some students in its Operation Plus program within an apartment house acquired under the Urban Renewal project.

NOTES:

* For Oregon State University, the data include a capacity of 378 students and an occupancy of 385 students within institutionally-owned cooperative houses. Approximately 258 students were assigned as single occupants in rooms that had been rated originally for multiple occupancy. If the rated capacity were adjusted to 4,614 (4,872 less 258), the resultant comparison of dormitory occupancy to capacity would be 93.5% instead of 88.5%. In Weatherford Hall, 142 spaces in the west wing are not occupied due to the proposed remodeling which was approved by the 1971 Legislature.

** For Oregon Technical Institute, the data included in the rated capacity reflect 26 spaces, 13 rooms, being used temporarily as faculty offices. If these spaces were omitted from the rated capacity, the percentage of occupancy would be 85.5 rather than 81.5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupancies Fall Term 1971:</th>
<th>EOC</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OTI</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>UODS</th>
<th>UOMS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within institutionally-owned facilities (Totals)</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>4,506</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>3,094</td>
<td>606**</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>11,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In dormitories</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>4,312#</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>9,743</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other housing</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within privately-owned facilities (Totals)</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>11,026</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>12,155</td>
<td>13,891</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>45,783</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>47,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In fraternities and sororities</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperatives</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In private homes, apartments, etc.</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>8,357</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>10,761</td>
<td>13,725</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>41,472</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>42,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In privately financed residence halls near campus</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals (Headcount enrollment)</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>15,532</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>15,249</td>
<td>14,497*</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>57,245</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>937??</td>
<td>58,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage analysis of student housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within institutionally-owned facilities (Totals)</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In dormitories</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In other housing</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within privately-owned facilities (Totals)</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In fraternities and sororities</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In cooperatives</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In private homes, apartments, etc.</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In privately financed residence halls near campus</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II indicates that during the Fall Term 1971 institutions provided housing accommodations for 11,592 students, or 19.8 percent of the 58,600 students who were enrolled when the reports were prepared. This 19.8 percent was comprised of 16.9 percent within single student housing and 2.9 percent within other housing, principally for married students.

Fraternities and sororities housed 2,926 students, or 5.0 percent of the total headcount enrollment within the State System. Most of these accommodations were at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon. (In the Fall Term 1970, this figure was 3,196 students, or 5.8 percent of the enrollment of 55,191 that term.)

Privately-owned residence halls for single students provided housing for 1,062 students, or 1.8 percent of the Fall Term 1971 enrollment, compared with 1,148 or 2.1 percent of the 1970 enrollment.

Of the total enrollment of 58,600 students in the Fall Term 1971, 42,697 (72.8 percent) were living in private homes, apartments, etc. The comparable figure for 1970 was 38,748 or 70.2 percent.

NOTES:
* Due to changes in enrollment procedures, data for PSU this year include both PSU and DCE students at Portland Center now counted as PSU students.
# For OSU, the 4,312 occupancies in the residence halls include 385 students living in cooperative houses owned by the institution.
** For PSU, the 606 occupancies noted represent 46 students housed in the King George Apartment for the Operation Plus Program and 560 students housed in apartments leased to Portland Student Services, Inc.
! For UOMS, the 117 occupancies exclude 13 UODS women students who were housed in UOMS-UODS Women's Residence Hall.
!! The total headcount enrollment of 937 excludes 22 X-ray technologists.
### TABLE III
SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF STUDENT HOUSING CAPACITIES - FALL TERM 1971
(At Close of Fourth Week of Classes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated capacities of institutionally-owned facilities:</th>
<th>EOC</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OTI</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>UODS</th>
<th>UOMS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent dormitories</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>4,494</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>11,081</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>11,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary dormitories</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative houses</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotals</strong></td>
<td>627</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>4,872</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>2,916</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>12,127</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12,297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent housing for married students</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary housing for married students</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1,067</td>
<td>5,079</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>3,676</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>13,297</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>13,467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rated capacities of privately-owned facilities:</th>
<th>EOC</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OTI</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
<th>UODS</th>
<th>UOMS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fraternities and sororities</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative houses</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence halls near campus</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Rated capacities of permanent dormitories and institutionally-owned cooperatives to headcount enrollment, Fall Term 1971

38.5% 25.7% 31.4% 30.7% 19.1% --- 34.9% 20.0%
Table III indicates that during the Fall Term 1971 institutions had a rated capacity of 12,297 students within permanent or temporary dormitories and cooperative houses. Fraternities and sororities had a rated capacity of 3,269, and privately-owned residence halls located near the campuses or area of development had a rated capacity of 1,650.

The percentage of the rated capacities of permanent dormitories and institutionally-owned cooperatives to the Fall Term 1971 headcount enrollment varies from 19.1 percent at the University of Oregon to a high of 38.5 percent at Eastern Oregon College. (Portland State University is using the King George Apartment for its Operation Plus program on a temporary basis.)

NOTES:

Oregon State University - The rated capacities for permanent dormitories include 142 spaces in Weatherford which were not assigned pending future remodeling authorized by the 1971 Legislature.

Oregon Technical Institute - The rated capacities for permanent dormitories include 26 spaces reserved temporarily for offices.

University of Oregon - The rated capacities for permanent dormitories include 51 spaces reserved for Newgate Project in Straub Hall.

Portland State University - The rated capacities for temporary dormitories represent the King George Apartment used for the Operation Plus Program (cap. 60) and other apartment buildings leased from Portland State University by Portland Student Services, Inc. (cap. 608).
### Table IV

OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

ANALYSIS OF MARRIED STUDENT ENROLLMENTS AND RENTAL RATES
FOR INSTITUTIONAL HOUSING UNITS
FALL TERM 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOC</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Student</td>
<td>15,532</td>
<td>15,249</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>4,766</td>
<td>1,628</td>
<td>41,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male Student</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>24,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Married Male</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>5,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percentage of</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Female Student</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>2,165</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>16,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Married Female</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>2,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Percentage of</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Total Single</td>
<td>13,114</td>
<td>11,543</td>
<td>2,921</td>
<td>3,806</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>32,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Married</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>8,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Percentage of</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rental Rates:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$36.50</td>
<td>$39.00</td>
<td>$31.50</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>140.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Typical Housing Units:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No-Bedroom</th>
<th>1-Bedroom</th>
<th>2-Bedroom</th>
<th>3-Bedroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bedroom</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FALL TERM 1971
Table IV has been prepared to indicate the total student enrollments at the five institutions which had some units of married student housing available in the Fall Term 1971 and, in addition, statistics concerning male and married male, female and married female student enrollments and typical rental rates for family housing at each institution.

Table IV indicates that approximately 24.0 percent of the male students enrolled at the five institutions were married. On an institutional basis, the percentage of male students who were married ranged from a low of 19.0 percent at Southern Oregon College to a high of 32.7 percent at Oregon College of Education.

Table IV also indicates that approximately 16.1 percent of the female students enrolled at the five institutions were married. On an institutional basis, the percentage of female students who were married ranged from a low of 9.4 percent at Oregon State University to a high of 25.3 percent at Eastern Oregon College. About 20.8 percent of all students in the five institutions were married. On an institutional basis, this percentage varied from a low of 15.6 percent at Oregon State University to a high of 26.5 percent at Oregon College of Education.

The Board's policy on capacity to finance auxiliary enterprises projects states, in part:

"At the February 18, 1969 meeting of the Board, action was taken to confirm the previously adopted policy in principle that the rates of charge for student housing shall be such that the income will be sufficient to make each category of housing - married student, regular residence halls, and cooperative living units - self-supporting and self-liquidating.

...The self-liquidating concept, as applied to married family housing and cooperative housing, anticipates that separately for each category of housing at each institution the rates of charge to students shall be such as to produce sufficient net operating income, increased by interest income on investments, to meet bond debt service requirements on the bonds outstanding in each category."

Table IV indicates the minimum and maximum rates as well as the typical rental rate ranges for various types of units available during the Fall Term 1971. Some revisions were made in the rentals prior to the beginning of this academic year. It is possible that further revisions will be required prior to the beginning of the next academic year.

---

TABLE V
OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
ANALYSIS OF OCCUPANCY OF INSTITUTIONALLY-OWNED FAMILY HOUSING UNITS CONSTRUCTED OR ACQUIRED SPECIFICALLY TO ACCOMMODATE MARRIED STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPANT CLASSIFICATIONS</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOC</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate assistants and research fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Married male students</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Married female students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Married male students</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Married female students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total graduate students</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Undergraduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Married male students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Married female students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total undergraduate and graduate students</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty and staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other occupancies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vacancies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total of units (Items 1-8)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table V has been prepared to indicate the classification and numbers of students renting institutionally-owned family housing units which were constructed or acquired specifically to accommodate married students.

Of the 916 units identified in Table V, over 800 were located at the two universities.

Of the 894 students who occupied these units, 631 (or 71%) were graduate students. Of these 631 occupants, 194 (or about 27%) were graduate assistants and research fellows, and the remainder of 437 were classified as other graduate students.
### TABLE VI
OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
ANALYSIS OF OCCUPANCY OF INSTITUTIONALLY-OWNED
MISCELLANEOUS FAMILY HOUSING RENTAL UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPANT CLASSIFICATIONS</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOC</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate assistants and research fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Married male students</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Married female students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Married male students</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Married female students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total graduate students</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Undergraduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Married male students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Married female students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Single students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total undergraduate and graduate students</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty and staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other occupancies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vacancies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total miscellaneous family housing rental units (Items 1-8)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VI indicates that there were 254 miscellaneous family housing rental units available during the Fall Term 1971. The total of 105 units at the University of Oregon does not include 20 miscellaneous housing units and the 58 wood-frame World War II surplus apartments on Columbia Street and Agate Street, formerly used as married student housing units, which are now assigned for office use.

Of the 181 units rented to students, 85 were occupied by graduate students, including 34 who were classified as graduate assistants or research fellows.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Female Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Married Male &amp; Female Students Living in Institutionally-Owned Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc.</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Graduates</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>7,923</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>9,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc.</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Graduates</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>2,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>1,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6,664</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>9,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Graduates</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Page 107 was left blank in order that the text on page 108, accompanying Table VII, could appear opposite the concluding part of Table VII.
### TABLE VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent Married</th>
<th>Female Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Percent Married</th>
<th>Married Male &amp; Female Students Living in Institutionally-Owned Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Enroll</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN OREGON COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Graduates</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTERN OREGON COLLEGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Graduates</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL - 5 INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants, Research Assistants, etc.</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Graduates</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>4,473</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>2,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>3,657</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>2,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>3,693</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>4,224</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>3,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>5,789</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>6,195</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>18,548</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>24,404</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>14,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VII, which is on two pages, has been prepared to analyze, for the five institutions, the male and female student enrollment in each class (year of academic standing) and the percentage of those male and female students who were married. In addition, the numbers and percentages of those married male and female students who were living in institutionally-owned property have been indicated.

For the five institutions, the percentage of married male students was highest in the graduate assistants (59.8%) category and other graduates category (59.1%) and decreased with each lower academic year to the freshman level (6.6%). With the exception of the seniors at Southern Oregon College, the percentage of married male undergraduate students at the three regional institutions was somewhat higher than at either of the two universities.

The percentage of married female students was highest in the other graduates category (50.7%), decreased to 33.9 percent for graduate assistants and research assistants and then decreased with each lower academic year to the freshman level (5.2%). The percentage of married female students at the three smaller institutions was somewhat higher than at either of the two universities.

A further analysis of married male and female students has been made in the last two columns of Table VII. Here the numbers and percentages of married male and female students who lived in institutionally-owned housing during the Fall Term 1971 have been listed for each of the five institutions. The overall percentage of such students was 12.7 percent (1,089 out of 8,559). On an institutional basis, this percentage varied from a low of 3.3 percent at Oregon College of Education to a high of nearly 20 percent at Eastern Oregon College. At the two universities, the highest percentage of married male and female students living in institutional housing was in the graduate and research assistants category, whereas at the other schools the percentage was generally in the senior class level.
### TABLE VIII

OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

COMPARISON OF MARRIED MALE STUDENT ENROLLMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease) in Percent of Male Students Married</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>9,805</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>9,692</td>
<td>2,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>9,320</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>9,387</td>
<td>2,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>2,513</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOC</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>24,404</td>
<td>5,856</td>
<td>24,335</td>
<td>6,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table VIII is an analysis and comparison of data contained in line 2 (Male Student Enrollment) and line 3 (Married Male Student Enrollment) on Table IV for the five institutions during Fall Terms 1969, 1970 and 1971. As indicated previously, 24.0 percent of the male students in the Fall Term 1971 were married. This percentage represents a decrease of 1.8 percent from Fall Term 1969 and a decrease of 2.0 percent from Fall Term 1970. Eastern Oregon College reported the largest increase (1.3%) and Oregon College of Education reported a decrease of 4.9 percent.

Table VIII also indicates that the number of married male students increased from 6,152 in 1969 to 6,327 in 1970 then decreased to 5,856 students in 1971. In the five institutions, this represents an increase of 175 students from 1969 to 1970, a decrease of 471 students from 1970 to 1971 and a decrease of 296 from 1969 to 1971. Individual institutions showing decreases were: University of Oregon (277), Oregon College of Education (74), Oregon State University (136) and Eastern Oregon College (15). Southern Oregon College had an increase of 31 married male students.
### Table IX

**OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

**SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF FAMILY HOUSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>No. of Stories</th>
<th>Life Expectancy</th>
<th>0-1-2-3-more</th>
<th>Charges Per Month</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Court</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Indef.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22, 62, 10</td>
<td>$85.00-$110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Court</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19, 27, 8</td>
<td>45.00-$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Houses &amp; Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5, 10, 23, 21</td>
<td>#Used as offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
<td>5, 51, 112, 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY OF OREGON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland Village</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>0, 76, 332, 0</td>
<td>$81.00-$91.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon Apartments</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0, 2, 244, 1</td>
<td>$36.50-$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Housing Units</td>
<td>Fair to Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1, 28, 41, 35</td>
<td>$55.00-$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>760 *</td>
<td>1, 106, 617, 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include 20 miscellaneous housing units, 27 units on Columbia Street and 31 units on Agate Street used for educational purposes.*
Of the grand total of 1,170 family living units available on the five campuses during the Fall Term 1971, only 518 (44.3%) have been completed within the last eleven years. At Oregon State University 94 new apartments in Orchard Court were completed for initial occupancy during the Fall Terms 1961 and 1963. At the University of Oregon a total of 408 new apartments was completed in Westmoreland Village for initial occupancy between the Fall Terms 1960 and 1964. At Eastern Oregon College 16 new apartments were completed by the Fall Term 1962. Otherwise, the present housing facilities for married students on all campuses consist primarily of temporary war surplus buildings obtained from the federal government. In general, these war surplus buildings are deteriorating rapidly and are expected to be removed within the next few years. Other properties have been acquired within the campus boundaries of the institutions, including residences of varying ages and conditions. These units are listed as miscellaneous houses, apartments or housing units and are generally in fair to good condition.

Oregon State University and the University of Oregon consider the temporary housing units to be safeguarded adequately against fire hazards with satisfactory repair and maintenance. The University of Oregon has installed automatic fire alarm systems and fire escapes in all two-story buildings within the Amazon Project. Oregon State University lists the Campus Court Project as "poor" with a life expectancy of only one year.

Institutional officials have advised the Board's office of the following policies concerning priorities of assignment within the family housing units described in this study.

Oregon State University. Orchard Court is reserved for graduate assistants and graduate students with a minimum of seven credit hours. Campus Court is assigned to students on a priority basis of first, graduate students; second, seniors; third, juniors; fourth, sophomores; and fifth, freshmen. These students must carry a minimum of eight credit hours. Miscellaneous housing is assigned by date of application.

University of Oregon. All applicants are required to submit a financial statement as part of the married housing application. Applicants with financial means priority are assigned first, starting with graduate assistants, the graduate students next and on down to freshmen last. The date of application determines the priority within each classification. Miscellaneous housing is assigned by date of application.
### SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF FAMILY HOUSING (CONT'D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Life Expectancy</th>
<th>No. of Stories</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Charges Per Month</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-1-2-3-more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Houses</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Court Housing</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Housing</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oregon College of Education and Eastern Oregon College consider the temporary housing units to be safeguarded adequately against fire hazards with satisfactory repair and maintenance. A few of the miscellaneous houses at Southern Oregon College are in poor condition, and the institution plans the sale and removal of these units within the near future. Southern Oregon College lists the College Court housing as being in poor condition. It is scheduled to be replaced soon.

The following policies are used in assignment to the family housing units described:

**Oregon College of Education.** Units are available to students on a first-come, first-served basis.

**Southern Oregon College.** All applications are kept by date of application. Each applicant is asked how many bedrooms would be required and the maximum rent that could be paid. As units become available (all tenants are required to give at least 30-day written notice of intent to vacate), they are offered to those applicants who are at the "head" of the file and who would fit the particular unit that is available. Because the units vary so much in size, rent amount, and condition, the College attempts to "fit the tenant to the unit."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Life Expectancy</th>
<th>No. of Stories</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>Charges Per Month</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0- Bedrm</td>
<td>1- Bedrm</td>
<td>2- Bedrm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EASTERN OREGON COLLEGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eocene Court</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Permanent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eocene Court</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Temporary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Housing</td>
<td>Poor to Good</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL - 5 INSTITUTIONS**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>254 are miscellaneous housing units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IX
Eastern Oregon College. The Eocene Court apartments are available to married students only on a first-come, first-served basis; institution will accept divorcees with children for assignment in married student housing.

NOTE: Of the grand total of 1,170 family living units available on the five campuses, 254 were miscellaneous housing units. These were summarized in Table VI.