STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN
ROOM 338, MICHAEL J. SMITH MEMORIAL CENTER,
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, PORTLAND, OREGON AND
THE BALLROOM, BRITT STUDENT CENTER, S.O.C., ASHLAND, OREGON

May 21 and June 26, 1974

MEETING #416-1 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. (P.D.T.), May 21, 1974, by the President of the Board, Mr. George H. Layman, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. George H. Corey
Mr. Robert D. Holmes
Mrs. Elizabeth H. Johnson
Mr. Philip A. Joss
Miss Valerie McIntyre
Mr. Marc F. Maden
Mr. John D. Mosser
Mr. John W. Snider
Mr. Lorin L. Stewart
Mr. George H. Layman

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

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary D. R. Larson; Mr. Freeman Holmer, Vice Chancellor for Administration; Mr. J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Dr. Miles C. Ramsey, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Mr. W. T. Leman, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration; Mr. H. A. Bork, Consultant; Mr. K. L. Jackson, Budget Director; Mr. Edward Branchfield, Assistant Attorney General; Mr. John Richardson, Assistant to the Chancellor; Dr. George Dier, Director of Communications Development; Mr. Richard Zita, Director of Publications; Mr. Davis Quenzer, Assistant Budget Director.

Oregon State University--President R. W. MacVicar; Dean M. Popovich, Dean of Administration; Mr. Miles Hatzer, Associate Director of Facilities Planning; Dr. Stefan Bloomfield, Assistant Director of Institutional Research; Dr. E. E. Neuman, Head of the Department of Veterinary Medicine.

University of Oregon--President Robert D. Clark; Dr. Ray Hawk, Vice President for Administration and Finance; Dr. Gerald Bogen, Vice President for Student Services; Mr. Richard Reynolds, Student Union Director; Miss Judy Lazarus, Assistant Teacher.

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

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

Portland State University--Acting President E. Dean Anderson; Dr. Joseph Blumel, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Mr. Robert J. Low, Vice President for Administration; Mr. W. C. Neland, Administration, Business and Finance; Mrs. Dawn Dyessler, Chairman, Advisory Council; Mr. David Piskun, Information Officer; Mrs. Betty Leonard, Coordinator, Continuing Education for Social Work; Dr. Summer Shorpe, Coordinator, Urban Studies Undergraduate Program; Dr. Keith Evans, Director of Planning and Institutional Research; Dr. Karl Ditmer, Dean of the College of Science; Dr. Nobed Toulan, Director of Urban Studies; Dr. Whitney Bates, Vice President of the Portland State University chapter of AUP; Dr. Shirley Kennedy, Associate Professor of Anthropology.

Oregon College of Education--President L. W. Rice; Dr. Bert Kersh, Dean of Faculty.

Southern Oregon College--President James K. Sours.

Eastern Oregon State College--President R. A. Briggs.

Oregon Institute of Technology--President W. D. Purvine.
Others--Mrs. Maxine Warmath, Assistant Professor of Psychology at Oregon College of Education, representing the American Association of University Professors Federation; Mr. James Soxson, Budget Supervisor, Executive Department; Mr. Edmond Gnoza, Advisory Council, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate; Mr. Richard Burke, Fiscal Analyst; Dr. Robert McVehon, Chairman, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate; Mr. Bernard Saulfield, Budget Analyst, Executive Department; Mrs. Louise Neiditch, President, Mothers for Children; Mr. Joe Dignan, Member of Bakers Local 114.

Student Representatives--Mr. Robert Liberty, President of Associated Students University of Oregon; Mr. Peter Glazer, Vice Chairman of Associated Students University of Oregon Incidental Fee Committee; Miss Karen Sandonato, member of the University of Oregon chapter of Kappa Kappa Gamma sorority; Mr. Paul M. Nelson, member of the University of Oregon chapter of Chi Psi fraternity; Miss Rosa Solano, MechA Director, University of Oregon; Mr. Herb Everett, University of Oregon organizer of the United Farmworkers Solidarity Committee; Miss Karen Petersen, Acting President of Local #1893 of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.

The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on March 26 and April 24, 1974, and approved them as previously distributed.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

The Chancellor said that staffing plans had been received from several of the institutions but that there would be a delay before the remaining three were received and the report completed. He suggested that the Board begin the review of the staffing plans at the June Committee meetings.

It was agreed that the review of the staffing plans should begin immediately because budgetary implications may be involved in some of the plans.

C.N. Holman, Continuation as Dean, UOVS

The Chancellor recommended that Dean C. N. Holman continue as Dean of the University of Oregon Medical School beyond the usual retirement age of 65. Dean Holman has agreed to remain until the president of the newly-created University of Oregon Health Sciences Center has been selected and has had an opportunity to obtain a dean for the School of Medicine. It was indicated that the recommendation would be included and approved in the budget unless he was instructed otherwise.

L.G. Terkla, Elective Officer in National Organizations

The Chancellor said that Dean L. G. Terkla of the University of Oregon Dental School has been serving as President of the American College of Dentists during the past year. In addition, he has recently been named President-elect of the American Association of Dental Schools and will become president of that organization in March 1975.

Annual Report of Gifts and Grants

The Chancellor called attention to the annual report of gifts and grants which was distributed. He said the report provided a summary of the sources of gifts in two major categories-- federal and other kinds of gifts and grants. The report indicates the total amounts received for 1973-74 and provides comparisons for previous years within the two previous biennia.

The Chancellor noted that there was some reduction in the federal funds received and some increase in the amount of other funds, but the total gifts and grants to the System did not vary greatly. The report follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PURPOSE OF GIFT</th>
<th>SOURCE OF GIFTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction &amp; Department Research</td>
<td>$9,329,167.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$8,428,314.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Source of Gifts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Gift</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organized Activities Related to Instruction</td>
<td>$253,830.00</td>
<td>$97,509.57</td>
<td>$351,339.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSORED RESEARCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>23,988,918.48</td>
<td>1,963,935.18</td>
<td>25,952,853.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>21,227,075.00</td>
<td>3,125,447.52</td>
<td>24,352,522.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sponsored Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>2,461,425.10</td>
<td>1,147,957.80</td>
<td>3,609,382.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>2,134,744.00</td>
<td>1,240,547.27</td>
<td>3,375,291.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension &amp; Public Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>3,006,486.63</td>
<td>1,567,660.40</td>
<td>4,574,147.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>5,007,765.00</td>
<td>856,279.46</td>
<td>5,864,044.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>78,660.00</td>
<td>850.00</td>
<td>79,510.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>224,342.00</td>
<td>14,073.00</td>
<td>238,415.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>20,485.80</td>
<td>161,248.00</td>
<td>181,733.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>33,716.00</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td>35,416.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Institutional Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>1,739,064.50</td>
<td>948,333.93</td>
<td>2,687,398.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>3,523,218.00</td>
<td>1,233,169.36</td>
<td>4,756,387.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>1,434,915.00</td>
<td>153,771.52</td>
<td>1,588,686.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>1,066,882.56</td>
<td>22,356.47</td>
<td>1,089,239.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Study Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>1,544,143.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,544,143.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>1,358,319.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,358,319.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chancellor said the Educational Coordinating Council had met recently and reviewed the report submitted by the Council on the circumstances in southern Oregon related to educational services in the Grants Pass-Medford-Ashland area. Mr. John Snider, newest member of the Council, was present. The Council referred to the appropriate boards the recommendations of the advisory committee. The Chancellor said recommendations pertaining to higher education would be referred to the appropriate Committee of the Board for consideration and recommendation.
Meeting #416-4

E. Johnson
Designated Chairman-elect of AGB

The Chancellor announced that Mrs. Elizabeth Johnson was named chairman-elect of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges at a recent national meeting. He said this organization has grown significantly in membership during the past several years and the election of Mrs. Johnson as head of this very important national organization was an honor to her and to the Board.

Schematic Design for Dearborn Hall Remodel, OSU

(Considered by Building Committee; April 24, 1974; present--Joss, Snider, Maden, Johnson, McIntyre.)

Staff Report to the Committee

The capital construction program authorized by the 1973 Legislature includes $275,000 for remodeling within Dearborn Hall, the electrical engineering building, at Oregon State University. When this building was constructed in 1947, a power laboratory requiring an overhead crane was included in a two-story high space within the structure. Inasmuch as the Department of Electrical and Electronics Engineering no longer uses this type of heavy equipment and does not require the crane in the high overhead space, it is proposed that an intermediate floor level be installed. The new space created would provide a stepped-floor lecture room and a large area which would be used initially as a multi-purpose space for graduate students but later could be partitioned for faculty and staff offices, a conference room and a self-learning center.

Institutional officials and the project architects have provided a copy of the schematic design phase of planning for this project. The plans correspond with the program requirements outlined above and incorporate also the proposed conversion of the long, narrow level-floor classroom on the third floor into a 26-station Vocational Education electronics laboratory. The remodeling of existing spaces on the ground floor and the third floor would involve a total gross area of approximately 7,603 square feet, and the new construction would add approximately 4,817 square feet.

The lecture hall floor would be of reinforced concrete flat plate construction with formed risers. The floor of the future office space would be of steel beams with a column-free span across the existing power laboratory. A concrete floor slab would be poured on a metal form. The lecture room would have vinyl asbestos floor covering, and some acoustical treatment would be provided on a portion of the ceiling. Seating for approximately 175 persons would be provided in fixed-tablet arm chairs secured to the face of the risers. A projection booth would be provided with the capability to handle a wide range of audio-visual equipment. The graduate student area would have a concrete floor and would use the existing overhead lighting. Provision would be made for heating on a temporary basis pending the final partitioning of the space for faculty and staff offices. Within the Vocational Education laboratory, floors would be covered with vinyl asbestos tile and room partitions would have metal studs with plaster. The ceiling would be covered with acoustical tile. A folding partition would be provided to create a separate demonstration area from the laboratory. Modifications to the mechanical and electrical systems would be made as required.

Based upon the estimated gross area of approximately 12,420 square feet and the price level expected to prevail when bids are solicited later this year, the direct construction costs are estimated to be about $216,840, or $17.46 per square foot. The total project budget of $275,000 would be financed from state funds (General Fund appropriation and Article XI-G bonds).

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the schematic design phase of planning for the proposed remodeling of Dearborn Hall be approved and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to instruct the architects to complete planning, solicit bids and award a contract for construction within the expenditure limitation of $275,000 authorized by the 1973 Legislature, subject to prior approval by the State Emergency Board.
RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OSU Dearborn Hall Remodel

Architects - Architects Etcetera, Portland

Legislative authorization - Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973

Board's priority - No. 4 in 1973-1975 (educational and general plant)

Approximate gross area of remodeling and new construction - 12,420 square feet

Total project costs - $275,000

Estimated direct construction costs:
Total
Average (per square foot) - $17.46

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - August 1974
Completion - March 1975

Tentative financing plan:
General Fund appropriation within Chapter 592,
Oregon Laws 1973 - $137,500
Proceeds from bond borrowings under Article XI-G
of the Oregon Constitution - 137,500
Total - $275,000

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.

Site Change (Considered by Building Committee; April 24, 1974; present--Joss, Maden, Snider, Johnson, McIntyre.)

Staff Report to the Committee

On December 18, 1973, the Building Committee reviewed and recommended approval of the schematic design phase of planning which Architects Balzhiser, Longwood, Smith, Paul & Anderson had prepared for the proposed Animal Care Facilities at Oregon State University. It was indicated that this project had been authorized by the 1973 Legislature with an expenditure limitation of $415,000 and that the facilities would be located west of 35th Street, immediately west of the Wave Tank, south of the site leased to the federal government for the Environmental Protection Agency Laboratory.

Subsequent to the approval of these preliminary plans by the Board on January 22, institutional officials and the project architects have given further consideration to the site and the implications of possible relationships with future facilities for Veterinary Medicine. These factors had been considered initially, but as a result of additional study with Mr. Louis DeMonte, the campus planner, particularly with respect to the tentative identification of the probable site of new buildings for Veterinary Medicine in the southwest portion of the campus, between 30th and 35th Streets south of Washington Way and the Southern Pacific Railroad tracks, they have concluded that it would be more appropriate to construct the Animal Care Facilities on the north side of Washington Way, approximately 350 feet west of the intersection with 30th Street, near the existing Veterinary Diagnostic Clinic.
Only minor adjustments in the plans would be required to adapt them to the new site, and space is available for the future additions described when the schematic design was presented initially. The outline specifications for the building remain substantially the same as those reported earlier except that it is now proposed that precast, prestressed concrete core slabs be used for the roof in lieu of steel. The estimated gross area of the building has been re-calculated at 8,315 square feet, slightly more than the total of 8,016 square feet mentioned at the December meeting. In spite of the increase in area and the rapid escalation of construction prices, but with some savings in utility connection costs at the new site, the architects have confirmed their estimate of direct construction costs within the allowance of $323,590 indicated previously.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the siting of the proposed Animal Care Facilities at Oregon State University be changed to the area immediately west of the existing Veterinary Diagnostic Clinic, north of Washington Way between 30th and 35th Streets, and that the revised schematic design phase of planning for the project be approved so that the appropriate Board officials can authorize Architects Balzhiser, Longwood, Smith, Paul & Anderson to complete the plans and specifications, solicit bids and award a construction contract within the total project budget of $415,000, subject to the approval of the State Emergency Board.

RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF REVISED SCHEMATIC DESIGN PHASE OF PLANNING

Project - OSU Animal Care Facilities

Architects - Balzhiser, Longwood, Smith, Paul & Anderson, Eugene

Legislative authorization - Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973

Board's priority - No. 3 in 1973-1975 (Educational and General Plant)

Estimated gross area - 8,315 square feet

Estimated total project costs $415,000

Estimated direct construction costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building and fixed equipment only - Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (per square foot) - $38.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tentative schedule:

Bidding - June 1974
Completion - November 1974

Tentative financing plan:

General Fund appropriation within Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973 $207,500
General obligation bonding under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution 207,500

Total $415,000

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendations as presented.
Rate Increase for Cooperatives, OSU

Staff Report to the Board

A report relating to the proposed rate increase of the cooperatives at Oregon State University, as well as the residence hall operations, applicable to academic year 1974-75 was presented to the Finance Committee and Board meetings of January 21 and 22, and again February 26, and March 26, 1974. At the request of Oregon State University, the recommendation relating to the cooperatives was deferred at the March 26, 1974 meeting in order to further analyze the financial operation. The additional review revealed that the initial proposed rate increase of $24 annually (from $338 to $362) for Heckart, Reed, Azalea, Coed Cottage and Oxford and $25 (from $365 to $390) annually for Avery and Dixon was fiscally sound. These proposed rates for "room only" contracts reflect an increase of approximately 7 percent.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the cooperative "room only" rates be set as follows:

- Heckart, Reed, Azalea, Coed Cottage, Oxford: $362 annually
- Avery, Dixon: $390 annually

Board Discussion and Action

A public hearing having been held on January 22, 1974, the Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Reserve Base and Timber Harvest Tax for Forest Research, OSU

Staff Report to the Committee

The Forest Research Laboratory at Oregon State University receives financial support from a forest products harvest tax, authorized by State law on merchantable forest lands, at the rate of five cents per thousand feet, board measure. ORS 321.037 requires the Board of Higher Education to determine as of February 16 of each year the unexpended balance of funds in the "Forest Research and Experiment Account" and also the amount budgeted for expenditures for the remainder of the current fiscal year and for the following fiscal year. If the projected balance at the end of the following fiscal year remaining from the unexpended balance as of February 16 is not estimated to equal or exceed $400,000 then the tax during the following fiscal year shall continue at the maximum statutory rate. A two-cent surcharge, imposed by Chapter 112, Oregon Laws 1973, for the 1973-1975 biennium, is included in the calculations. If the estimated balance exceeds $400,000, then there is to be a fifty percent reduction in the tax rate.

An examination of the financial condition of the Forest Research Laboratory account as of February 16, 1974, and projection of expenditures to June 30, 1975, using the formula prescribed by the statute, shows the following:

| Actual Unexpended Balance as of February 16, 1974 | $166,999 |
| Loss - Budgeted Expenditures: |
| February 16, 1974 to June 30, 1974 | $240,677 |
| July 1, 1974 to June 30, 1975 | 630,000 |
| Statutory Reserve Base as of February 16, 1974 |
| Negative | ($703,678) |

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that, pursuant to law, the Department of Revenue be notified that the Reserve Base as of February 16, 1974, has a projected negative balance of $703,678.
Based on provisions of ORS 321.037, it follows that the Forest Products Harvest Tax will continue to June 30, 1975, on merchantable forest lands at the rate of five cents per thousand feet, board measure, plus the two-cent surcharge. It is expected that the income from the tax during the entire period of February 16, 1974, to June 30, 1975, will total about $710,000.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report and approved the recommendation as presented.

Proposed Sale of Unimproved Real Property--Riggs Estate, UTS

(Considered by Finance Committee; April 24, 1974; present--Mosser, Layman, McIntyre, Westerdahl, Corey, Johnson, Joss, Maden, Snider.)

At the June 14-15, 1966 meeting of the Board, a report was made of the receipt of real property by bequest, under the will of Mae E. Riggs. Authorization was then given for the public sale of the Board's undivided one-fourth interest in, two improved and three unimproved parcels of real property. Sales attempts in June 1966, November 1966, and November 1967, resulted in the sale of the two improved parcels and one unimproved parcel and the proceeds distributed among the parties having undivided interests.

The owners of the three-fourths interest in the remaining two parcels have requested and authorized the Board's Office of Administration to make another attempt to dispose of the properties. The properties are both located in Lane County about 14 miles southwest of Eugene near Crow. One parcel contains about 44.8 acres and has questionable rights to a private road about 500 feet distant from a public road. The other parcel contains approximately 80 acres and has no legal access to a public road about 3,000 feet distant. Both parcels have some merchantable douglas fir stands and reproduction timber ranging in age from 15 to 40 years old. Two real estate appraisals and one timber appraisal on each of the two parcels have been obtained. Based upon advice of the appraisers, including the consulting forester, a minimum price of $19,900 for the 44.8-acre parcel and $16,500 for the 80-acre parcel appears to be fair and equitable. The other parties in interest have concurred in those minimum prices.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that--

(1) The Board's Office of Administration take the initiative in contacting prospective purchasers, advertise the properties for sale at public bid in accordance with applicable State Law and arrange for the conveyance of title to the highest bidder by bargain and sale deed.

(2) The minimum acceptable prices be established at $19,900 for the 44.8-acre parcel and $16,500 for the 80-acre parcel with terms to include a down payment of not less than 25 percent of the bid price and the balance payable in installments over a period of ten years or less with interest at the rate of 8 percent per annum.

(3) The President and Secretary of the Board be authorized to execute the conveyance of title or contracts to the highest bidder(s).

(4) Net proceeds of sale(s) be placed in the Mae Riggs Hospital Bequest Quasi-Endowment of the Medical School.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Finance Committee recommended that the Board approve the recommendation as presented, with the understanding that the right to reject all bids would be reserved. It was also understood that if only one bid were received or if the bids were low, consideration would be given to the effect on the bids of the lack of access to the property.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.
Meeting #416-9
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Bequest of Nora A. Colvin, Quasi-Endowment, UOMS

Staff Report to the Board

The last will and testament of Nora A. Colvin, deceased, dated May 19, 1969, provided for a bequest to the Doernbecher Memorial Hospital for Children of the University of Oregon Medical School of one-fourth of the residual estate designated for unrestricted utilization. Distributions to date, consisting of cash, stocks, and a real estate contract, total $43,089, and the estimated ultimate total is $43,500.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that pursuant to Board action of March 28, 1972, a quasi-endowment be established in accordance with AR 64.072, since the bequest is in excess of $10,000.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Increase in Teaching Hospitals and Clinics Patient Fee Schedules, UOMS

Staff Report to the Board

Pursuant to the authority granted by the Board at its November 27, 1972, meeting, the Chancellor has approved, effective May 1, 1974, the recommendation of the Dean of the University of Oregon Medical School that patient fees charged at the Medical School Hospital and University Hospital-North be increased over those in effect since August 1, 1973. The recommended increases amount to approximately 25 percent for the University Hospital-North and 18 percent for the Medical School Hospital. The rates were set after public hearing, held in accordance with the procedures as set out under the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act of the State of Oregon.

The following excerpt from the minutes of the Public Hearing held May 7, 1974, at the University of Oregon Medical School outlines the need for the rate adjustments:

Prior to the inception of the Economic Stabilization Program in August 1971, rate setting at the Hospitals and Clinics, including Multnomah Hospital, operated at that time by the Board of Multnomah County Commissioners but now operated by the University of Oregon Medical School as University Hospital-North, was based on the prior year's operating costs. Rates for the 1971-72 fiscal year had not been adjusted based on 1970-71 fiscal year costs at the time the President's Executive Order 11615 dated August 15, 1971, was issued. The Hospitals and Clinics units, therefore, began the Economic Stabilization Program with substantial discrepancies between the level of operating costs and the level of charges made to patients. That is, operating costs were higher than charges to patients. Those differences have continued to exist and in some cases increased due to restraints of the Economic Stabilization Program and the inability of the Hospitals and Clinics to obtain approval of exception requests to the program regulations.

Inasmuch as the authorizing legislation for the Economic Stabilization Program expired on April 30, 1974, it is the intention of the University of Oregon Medical School Hospitals and Clinics to make necessary adjustments in rates to recover the costs of operation of the Hospitals and Clinics on May 1, 1974. These adjustments make no attempt at trying to recover prior differences between the level of costs and charges but only to cover current operating costs. The new rates will apply to outpatients and inpatient admissions to the hospitals beginning May 1, 1974. Patients hospitalized prior to May 1, 1974, will continue to be charged at the rates existing at the time of their hospitalization.

The composition of rates is being restructured to improve the equity in charging patients as well as to comply with Public Law 92-603 which amends the Social Security Act covering Medicare and Medicaid by improving the relationships between charges and costs of specific services. It is estimated that the overall impact of these rate adjustments is an increase of 17 percent.
It is contemplated that a number of minor adjustments will be made over the next several months to continue to improve the equity of charges and the cost to charge relationship.

In accord with Board policy, the following rate schedule is being filed with the Board and shall be maintained for at least ninety days following its implementation:

**UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MEDICAL SCHOOL**

**HOSPITALS & CLINICS**

**Rate Schedules**

(Effective May 1, 1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inpatient Routine Care</th>
<th>Room, Board and Nursing Charge (1)</th>
<th>Per Diem (2) Ancillary Services</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry (UN)</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetrics (UN)</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery (UN)</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Surgery</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, Surgery, Pediatric &amp; Other Services</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Care Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Intensive Care</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgical Intensive Care</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Crisis Unit (UN)</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric Intensive Care (UN)</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-Natal Intensive Care</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>205.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal Transplant (UN)</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>185.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac Recovery Room (UN)</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>330.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outpatient Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Hospital-North</th>
<th>Emergency Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Complexity/Intensity I</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Complexity/Intensity II</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Complexity/Intensity III</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Complexity/Intensity IV</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Complexity/Intensity V</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(1) Applies to both the Medical School Hospital (MSH) and University Hospital-North (UIN) unless otherwise noted.

(2) Includes Routine Laboratory, Routine X-Ray, Routine Drugs, EKG, EEG, ECG, Radiation Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Physical Therapy, Respiratory Therapy, Pathology Services, and Medical Supplies. Services not covered by the per diem ancillary services charge, include Nuclear Medicine, Angiography, Non-Routine Drugs, Cardiac Catheterization, Patient Appliances, Cytogenetics Laboratory, Pulmonary Function Laboratory, Gastroenterology Laboratory, Renal Transplant Laboratory, Hemodialysis, Operating Room, Anesthesia, Recovery Room, Echocardiography.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

(Considered by Academic Affairs Committee; April 23, 1974; present--Johnson, Corey, Maden, McIntyre.)

Staff Report to the Committee

Portland State University requests authorization to change the general university requirement for the BA/BS degree in English composition--

From: WR 121, 222, 323. English Composition. 3 hours each.

To: WR 121, 323. English Composition. 3 hours each.

The present request is the result of a review by the Portland State University English department, in 1971, of six years' experience of the department with the vertical composition program (one course in English composition in each of the freshmen, sophomore, and junior years).

The second term of English composition, WR 222, has, for many years, been devoted entirely to the writing of research papers. Portland State University has found that many students coming to Portland State University, particularly those who were identified in high school as college-bound, have already had detailed instruction and experience in writing term papers. The institution suggests that to require all students to complete a course in writing the research paper, whether or not they need the instruction, is to create make-work for faculty and students. Under the proposal, WR 222 would continue to be taught for those students wishing this instruction, but the number of sections scheduled would be reduced to the number needed to serve students enrolling in the course voluntarily.

Instruction in English composition has been repeatedly reviewed by faculties of the state system institutions over the past decade. In the mid-sixties there was a movement among state system institutions to extend required instruction in composition over three of the four years of the student's college career. Instead of three terms of composition completed during the freshman year, as was formerly required, one term was to be completed at the freshman level, one term (the research paper) at the sophomore level, and a third, more sophisticated course, after the student had attained upper-division status.

During the late 1960's, the English composition staffs of the institutions reported that they had observed that many of their students were coming into the composition program with greater competency in language than had been true earlier in the decade. Efforts were made to devise better ways of waiving the composition requirement for these students and consideration was given to changing the requirement itself. The Board of Higher Education in 1970 authorized three of its institutions (Oregon State University, University of Oregon, Southern Oregon College) to make modifications in the institutional English composition requirements for graduation effective 1970-71, as indicated below, with the provision that each institution would prepare a study stating the goals and objectives it seeks to reach in its composition requirement, an evaluation of how well the proposed requirement is meeting these goals and objectives, and recommendations, if any, for additional changes or new approaches.
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Oregon State University was authorized to change its English composition requirements from three terms of English composition, one term to be completed in each of the freshman, sophomore, and junior years, to satisfactory completion of WR 121 English composition, 3 hours, or its equivalent.

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

Southern Oregon College was authorized to change its requirement of three terms (9 hours) of English composition to a competency requirement which might be met either through successful completion of a proficiency examination or through completion of six hours of writing courses numbered 100 or above.

Reports of the three institutions were duly received by the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs over a two-year period, and in November 1972 the Committee presented to the Board for its approval the following statement of its views concerning required English composition. The statement was approved as presented.

The Committee recognizes and appreciates the fact that the institutions are seeking ways of providing more effective instruction in communications. And the Committee believes that its institutions must continue to seek improved instruction in these fields to the end that students graduating from State System institutions may have the capacity to communicate effectively at a level appropriate to a person holding a baccalaureate degree from a good quality institution. The Committee does not insist that, where institutions are convinced that courses in English composition taught in the past are not effective, they continue to teach those courses. Nor does the Committee insist that the best or the sole answer to the communications issue is to require any specific number of credit hours of instruction in English composition. But the Committee does feel that the institutions have the obligation (a) to establish some reasonable level of effectiveness in communication that is to be required of students who receive their baccalaureate degrees, (b) to devise ways and means for evaluating competence in communication and the means for achieving competence that will guide the institution in its efforts to serve its students in this field and (c) to report periodically to the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs as to (1) the success of the institution's efforts in accomplishing the above aims, and (2) the steps the institution is following to ensure that the desired ends in the field of communications are being achieved.

The Committee does not believe that it is wise to ask the institutions to report annually on matters cited immediately above. But it does believe that periodical reports ought to be made to the Committee on Academic Affairs on these matters. The Academic Affairs Committee recommended therefore that the reports from Oregon State University and the University of Oregon be accepted by the Board and that the Board ask Oregon Institute of Technology and its six multipurpose institutions to report to the Board on the foregoing matters when one class has passed through its freshman through senior years under the current policies relating to communications (1974-75). At that time, the Committee desires that Oregon Institute of Technology and the six multipurpose institutions report on the matters cited in the above paragraph.

Board's Office Recommendation

The proposal presented by Portland State University for revision of its English composition requirement is the result of a three-year study of Portland State University's composition program. Conclusions from the study and recommended changes in the requirement are similar to changes already approved for Southern Oregon College and the University of Oregon.
The same forces which led the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Southern Oregon College to seek and to secure from the Committee and the Board authorization to reduce their long-standing English composition requirement of 9 credit hours now impel Portland State University to seek the same authorization for change.

This ferment in the State System institutions in the area of English composition is but a local manifestation of what is widespread in the colleges and universities of the United States. Institutions across the land, dissatisfied with the results of the traditional English composition requirement are seeking to reexamine the whole aspect of English composition, to find some way of overcoming the weaknesses that are apparent in the composition programs. This effort is being led by the English departments themselves, which, in a way, runs counter to what conventional wisdom would expect. For English departments, by reason of long-standing institutional requirements of three terms of English composition, usually are among the largest departments on a campus. Any recommendation that the requirements be reduced or be made more flexible may well reduce the department's size. Yet, in the face of this, the departments of English are recommending action of this sort.

The Board's office recommends that the Portland State University request be approved by the Board as being consistent with the statement of the Academic Affairs Committee which was approved by the Board in November 1972, as earlier quoted in the present discussion.

Committee Discussion

Mrs. Johnson said it was her opinion that the Board is not in a position to say to an institution that it cannot drop a particular course. But when the question is one of graduation requirements, she continued, the Board cannot back away from requiring the student's attainment of a reasonable level of competence as a condition for graduation.

Miss McIntyre asked whether the new SAT examination in writing would provide the institution with a means for determining student writing needs. She noted that under the Portland State University proposal, students would seek tutorial help in writing or would enroll in WR 222 on a voluntary basis rather than because the institution perceived that they needed additional work in writing. Dr. Blumel said this was true so far as the institutional requirement was concerned, but that individual departments could require work in writing beyond the institutional requirement. Student deficiencies in writing or inability to write a research paper are most apparent to the various departments to which they submit written work, he said.

Mr. Corey asked whether the Academic Affairs Committee's action to request a report from Oregon Institute of Technology and all of the multipurpose institutions in 1974-75 concerning their efforts to assure that graduating students have the capacity to communicate effectively at a level appropriate to a person holding a baccalaureate degree from a good quality institution, had carried with it any implication that no further changes in English composition requirements should be made by any institution until after those reports have been received by the Board's Committee. Dr. Romney responded that, so far as he knew, there had been no such implication in the Committee's action. That, rather, the Committee had felt that it was wise to ask the institutions to report annually on these matters as they had been doing in 1971 and 1972, and felt, rather, that a report in 1974-75 would suffice.

Mr. Corey and Mr. Maden said they did not believe Portland State University should be treated differently from other State System institutions (University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Southern Oregon College) in respect to modification of the English composition requirement. Mr. Maden said he felt that development of quality in student writing is the responsibility of the entire faculty, not just the English department.
Committee Recommendation

The Committee recommended that Portland State University be authorized to modify its graduation requirement in English composition as proposed. Mrs. Johnson voted no, explaining that she did not want to get into the approval or disapproval of specific courses but, rather, wished to emphasize the concern the Board should have in establishing sound graduation standards.

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Johnson moved that the Board approve the Committee recommendation as presented. She reserved the right to speak against her motion. Mrs. Johnson said it was an established position that the Board should not involve itself in the dropping of a particular course. However, she said, in her opinion, the Board did have a concern in the matter of quality, competency, and requirements for graduation from an institution. She said any listing of desired competencies for college graduates included the ability to communicate in written and spoken form. Mrs. Johnson said it was indicated many high school students have had college preparation courses in English in high school. This would not deal with the problems of nontraditional learners who may not be well prepared. In addition, there is evidence that many students are not as well prepared as has been assumed and high school and college grades are not necessarily valid indicators of competency. Mrs. Johnson said the institutions have a real responsibility in preparing teachers of writing and different kinds of writing ability may be demanded in the new emphasis on career education.

Mrs. Johnson stated that the matter of communication is a prime objective of institutions and said she would vote against the recommendation to emphasize these concerns. She also expressed the wish that the report to be received in 1974-75 would deal with these issues.

Dr. Romney indicated that the action recommended by Portland State University applied to the English requirement for all students and not to the requirements for teachers of English. He said the requirements for teachers had been changed since earlier studies revealed that many teachers who were teaching English courses had not majored in English or their courses were primarily in literature rather than writing.

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

MS in Urban Studies, PSU

(Considered by Academic Affairs Committee; April 23, 1974; present--Johnson, Corey McIntyre, Maden, Mosser.)

Staff Report to the Committee

Portland State University requests authorization to offer a program leading to a Master of Urban Studies (MUS) degree.

The Proposed Program

The proposed program is described by Portland State University as a two-year program requiring completion of a minimum of 72 credit hours of graduate courses, at least 48 of which must be taken at Portland State University. Students with an MA/MS degree in one of the social sciences could be granted up to 30 credit hours toward the 72 credit hours required for the degree.

The program would include:

1. A thorough grounding in urban studies concepts and methodology, acquired as follows:

   Systematic exposure to the fundamental urban-relevant knowledge of three of the traditional social sciences. This exposure may be achieved by either of two approaches:
Meeting #416-15

May 21, 1974

Completion of the equivalent of Portland State University's urban studies undergraduate certificate requirements in three of five social science disciplines (economics, geography, political science, psychology, and sociology).

Completion of three of the five 5-credit pro-seminars (in economics, geography, political science, psychology, sociology) offered in the PhD urban studies program.

(The pro-seminar is a seminar offered at the graduate level, primarily for non-majors, to give them an overview of the field.)

Completion of the following:

- At least three 4-credit hour urban studies interdisciplinary core seminars. 12 credit hours
- A three quarter urban problems sequence 9 credit hours
- Urban studies methodology 6 credit hours
- Urban data systems 5 credit hours

2. An area of specialization to be selected from two options:

  Research option 30 credit hours

  The research option "incorporates the basic requirements for the first two years of the PhD program."

  The research specialization may be:

  - Wholly in one of the traditional academic departments associated with the program (economics, geography, political science, psychology, or sociology).
  - In an urban-related multi-disciplinary area approved by the student's committee and the director of the program (e.g., gerontology, health services delivery system, public administration).
  - One of the areas of specialization recognized in the PhD program (i.e., urban structure, urban policy analysis, or urban life styles and human development).
  - A specialization in research analysis and techniques.

  Professional option (planning) 30 credit hours

  The proposed professional option would lead to a Master of Urban Studies with concentration in planning (Urban Studies-Planning). Portland State University asserts that the emphasis would be on the socio-economic aspects of planning.

  At least 18 of the required 30 credit hours must be in practicums or workshop courses; 9 credit hours must be in specialized academic courses "related to the student's applied interests [e.g., social services planning, economic/regional analysis, public management, environmental design and protection]."

  The professional option would emphasize the "area of planning for future urban and regional development." The curriculum of this option will center around "planning theory and method, housing and real
estate in its multiple aspects, city building and rebuilding, regional analysis, transportation, social services, community development, slums and poverty and the interrelationships among the various levels of government."

Theory, methodology, and practical application would be integrated in specially designed workshops and community practicums, according to Portland State University.

3. Satisfactory completion of a culminating 7-hour written examination, followed two weeks later by an oral examination.

Resources

Courses. "All of the elements of the course of study [proposed for the master's degree program] will be in operation as part of the Urban Studies PhD Program and the associated departmental master's degree programs in the 1973-74 academic year except the practicum courses and certain specialized methodology courses," Portland State University asserts.

The practicum and the specialized methodology courses that would be added are described as follows:

- "Initially, a year-long workshop course carrying six credit hours per term will be established. . . Subsequently, 6-12 more hours of practicum workshop courses will be offered, providing experience in criminal justice agencies, private industrial and service delivery agencies, and quasi-public policy and coordinating groups."
- "While most of the courses needed for the research analysis are already available in academic departments (including social science departments, mathematics, and systems science), it is probable that eventually as many as three new specialized courses will be added, probably in the areas of qualitative techniques of data gathering, sampling, and ethics of social research."

Library. Portland State University reports that it would allocate $2,000 per year in 1975-76 and 1976-77 to library acquisitions in the special interests of the proposed master of urban studies program. Library resources built up over the years in support of the undergraduate certificate program in urban studies, the PhD program in urban studies, and the master's programs in the social sciences which undergird urban studies, all have contributed to the accumulation of a substantial accretion of library resources which will support the master's program, in particular the research option of that program.

Faculty. The 19 members of the urban studies PhD program, each of whom holds a joint appointment with one of the five social science departments (economics, geography, political science, psychology, sociology) will be available to assist with the proposed master's of urban studies degree program.

It is Portland State University's intent, if the proposed program is approved by the Board, to add 1.3 FTE faculty in support of the program in 1975-76 (at a cost of $20,000), consisting of 1.0 FTE faculty with competence in urban planning and with a major orientation in land use and transportation and .3 FTE in the department of art and architecture to cover the course in mapping and graphics that would be offered students in the MJS professional option.

With the addition of the 1.0 FTE faculty in urban planning, Portland State University believes that it would have sufficient strength in urban planning to permit it to secure official recognition from the American Institute of Planners.
In 1976-77, Portland State University would plan to add an additional 1.0 FTE faculty position (at a cost of $13,000) with specialization in the socio-economic aspects of the planning process.

Portland State University states that a third faculty member would probably be added in 1977-78 or 1978-79, also in the area of the socio-economic aspects of the planning process.

Graduate Assistants. Portland State University would propose to add 1.66 FTE in graduate assistantships in 1975-76 at a cost of $12,500, and an additional .34 FTE in 1976-77 at the cost of an additional $3,000.

The above faculty and graduate assistant additions would be funded by Portland State University out of its going-level budget, according to Portland State University.

Facilities and Equipment. No special laboratories or equipment are necessary to the M.U.S program beyond what is currently available, except for the workshops in the professional option, which will require a large studio with drafting boards, or comparable individual space. This space will be made available by the department of art and architecture from space presently allocated to them, according to Portland State University.

By the end of 1975-76, it is estimated that additional office and service space will be required in Francis Manor, where the urban studies programs are housed. Allocation of an additional half floor in the Manor will accommodate the urban studies programs through 1980-81. Computer software and terminal services would be needed in Francis Manor, but not alone for the master's program. They are already necessary in the service of the PhD program in urban studies.

Purposes To Be Served By the Proposed Master of Urban Studies Degree Program

Portland State University feels the need for an additional screening mechanism for the PhD program in urban studies and considers that the proposed master's program would, among other uses, serve that function for some students.

The proposed master's program would have two options: (1) an academic program in research, and (2) a professional program in planning.

- Graduates of the research option would have, according to Portland State University, completed the first two years (of an estimated 3-1/2 required) of the PhD program. Those who have manifested doctoral quality capabilities and potentialities, would be encouraged to enter the PhD program. Those who have not would be assisted in finding appropriate employment as master's degree graduates in opportunities for which their graduate work would have prepared them.

- The planning option - as a professional program, as distinguished from the academic research option program - is thought of by Portland State University as a terminal degree. The great preponderance of graduates of the program will seek employment upon graduation. However, an able graduate of the planning option program who finds that he wishes to enter the PhD program in urban studies will have the option of taking the additional work necessary to give him the academic, theoretical base necessary to work in the doctoral program, and then of applying for admission into the PhD program.

Portland State University considers that the proposed master's program would enable them to enroll a sufficient number of graduate students (master's and doctoral students) in the urban studies area to permit a passably economical operation of its graduate work in urban studies.
Portland State University feels that its current urban studies programs, namely, the undergraduate certificate program and the PhD program, do not permit Portland State University to (1) serve its student clientele as well as it would like to, or (2) contribute as adequately as Portland State University wishes to toward meeting Oregon's manpower needs in employment areas for which an urban studies master's program would qualify one.

Portland State University believes that there are in Oregon, the Northwest region, and in the metropolitan Portland area in particular, important manpower needs which require a level of preparation intermediate between the undergraduate certificate program and the PhD program, toward the meeting of which Portland State University would like to make a more significant contribution.

Issues Related to the Portland State University Proposal

The issues that relate to the Portland State University proposal for offering a master's program in urban studies, center about the proposed professional option in planning. The questions which arise concerning this professional option relate to such matters as: (1) the definition of the planning option proposed by Portland State University, (2) the relationship of the proposed planning option leading to a master's degree in "urban studies-planning" to the master's program in urban planning offered in the school of architecture at the University of Oregon, and to the work offered at Oregon State University in the area of land use planning and transportation.

Definition of the Professional Option in Planning. Planning, like many other professional fields of study, is a field in which institutions offering such a program desire professional accreditation or recognition of the program they offer by the appropriate national accrediting body. In the case of planning, the national body to which institutions look for recognition of their programs is the American Institute of Planners. The University of Oregon master's program in urban planning has achieved such recognition, and Portland State University will wish to seek similar recognition if it is authorized by the Board to offer a master's of urban studies degree with an option in planning (urban studies-planning).

Portland State University's Definition of Its Proposed Option in Planning. Portland State University's definition of the proposed option in planning is to be gathered from the Portland State University statement of its proposal (pp. 1a-50a of the document prepared for the April 23 meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee) and from subsequent oral and written communications the Board's office has received from Portland State University officials. Referring briefly to the Portland State University proposal, we find the following relevant observations:

On p. 5a, in responding to the Board's office question, "Are there specialities that you intend to avoid, in developing the program?" Portland State University responded: "There are no particular specialities that the proposed Master of Urban Studies would avoid. Because of resource limitations, however, the proposed degree would not emphasize the purely physical design aspects of the planning process."

On pp. 23a-24a, speaking of the need for planners, Portland State University observes: "On the whole, the national manpower needs continue expanding but they also continue to change. Thus, ideally, the planner of the future will be versatile and prepared to anticipate and adapt to changing needs and times. The planner whose educational background includes a strong interdisciplinary base and whose orientation is not confined to the physical aspects of the field should be at an advantage in this kind of market. Even now, urban public and private agencies are increasingly searching for 'planners' whose responsibilities far exceed the traditional planner's role. Conducting or directing research and working with neighborhood groups are illustrations of this changed emphasis."
On page 40a, Portland State University states that "during the second year of this period, the existing program will have to add one position for an associate professor. Candidates for this position will be recruited from among urban planners, to satisfy the accreditation requirements of the American Institute of Planners."

The person chosen to fill the position must have a major orientation in the fields of land use and transportation planning." [Emphasis added.]

Responding to a request from the Board's office for clarification of the definition of the professional option, the director of the Portland State University urban studies program, Dr. Nohad A. Toulan wrote, on April 16, that the emphasis in the concentration in planning (urban studies-planning) would be "on the socio-economic aspects of planning." [Emphasis added.]

Elaborating, Dr. Toulan said:

All students would be expected to learn how to read maps and/or study the basic principles of land use planning. It does not mean, however, that any student interested in urban design, techniques of land subdivision, environmental design, and the purely physical aspects of environmental protection and management should seek admission to this Program. Rather, these areas are better covered at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University. However, if cooperation is to be allowed among Portland State University and the other two institutions [University of Oregon, Oregon State University], it may be possible to coordinate offerings and maximize benefits to students in the three universities. Both Harvard and MIT have found this practice to be efficient and helpful.

The proposal lists some areas of specialization (p.6a) [human resources, development planning, public management, environmental design and protection, and social services] that we felt are needed in Oregon. However, it is important to state that a Professional Master's is the first degree for most enrolled students. In other words, there is no undergraduate preparation and as such students attending the two-year program in planning schools are not expected to become specialists. It is known that planning education on the level of Master's is mostly general. But students usually develop areas of emphasis. For example, a student may take an introductory course in housing and three courses in transportation. As a result, that student would graduate with a Master's in Planning but with an emphasis in transportation. To become a specialist, however, he or she would have to pursue more advanced study or develop knowledge through professional experience in planning agencies.

In general, planners are educated and trained to understand and deal with whole systems, or, perhaps, what is more commonly known as total systems. By viewing the city as a total system, planners (and we hope our Urban Studies-Research graduates) are not expected to examine or solve specific problems in isolation from the entire environment in which they occur. For example, a person examining the problems of housing the elderly would be expected to pay attention to (1) the relation of this part of the housing market to other types of housing markets and to the needs of other non-elderly segments of the population and (2) the other needs of elderly such as transportation, medical services, counseling, etc. In summary, they are trained to deal with interaction and inter-relationships between the various elements of the system. This is already the basic philosophy governing our current PhD program.

Other Planning Programs in the State System

The only program in planning in the State System leading to a master's degree is the program offered by the University of Oregon leading to a master of urban planning (MUP) degree.
The University of Oregon program, one of long standing in the State System, is a two-year degree program, recognized by the American Institute of Planners (AIP).

In a descriptive statement concerning the planning program, written for the information of prospective students, the University of Oregon says:

A primary factor relating to the development of man's culture has been his anticipation of, and preparing for, the future. In this context, a contemporary profession called urban planning has evolved. In recent years, the central focus of urban planning has shifted from an emphasis on the public guidance and control of the physical form of communities to a broader concern with issues of urban and regional development such as poverty, race, decision-making, economic development, public participation, and environmental quality. Urban planning is basically concerned with the rational guidance of future community change. Planners formulate alternative solutions to community problems and assist in effecting the solutions.

Recognizing that the field of urban planning requires extension into many areas of concern, the program offers the student an opportunity to emphasize special interests and develop professional capacities. Students may choose to pursue a generalized program and develop competence as a general practitioner in urban and regional land-use planning and implementation. Or they may choose to develop a specialty by focusing on some specific area in the planning process. The program attempts to provide some structure for the student's education, but at the same time, allows a high degree of flexibility in regard to personal goals and interests. Regardless of the selected emphasis, the student should be prepared to become involved in the basic issues of our society and to become committed to a professional career through that involvement.

Applicants must have received a bachelor's degree or its equivalent from a recognized college or university. The department makes no restriction as to undergraduate background.

In a 1973-74 booklet descriptive of the University of Oregon program, University of Oregon provides for transfer of courses from Portland State University and Oregon State University in the following terms:

Portland State University and Oregon State University in Corvallis both offer courses of study which are relevant to the urban planning profession. Opportunities at Portland State University include formal courses in urban studies and informal courses combining field placement and classroom teaching. Opportunities at Oregon State University include a variety of courses related to resource development and conservation. Students in the Department of Urban Planning at the University of Oregon may enroll in Portland State University and/or Oregon State University for up to 24 hours of transferable credit.

The University of Oregon Department of Urban Planning is situated in the School of Architecture and Allied Arts. It is not large. It has 40 students and three full-time faculty. It receives annually from 150 to 200 applications from among which it selects 18 to 20 students for the openings in its program.

One hundred students have received the Master's Degree in Urban Planning in the six years of the program's existence. These graduates are now employed in a wide variety of planning and planning-related positions throughout the United States and in some foreign countries.

Oregon State University. Although Oregon State University has no degree program in planning, it does engage in many activities through the resources of the Schools of Agriculture, Engineering, and Forestry which involve land use and transportation planning.
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The Issues Needing Further Examination

The principal issue relating to the Portland State University request for authorization to offer a master's degree program in urban studies with a professional option in planning relates to: (1) the importance to be ascribed to the development of program objectives and programs of study at the University of Oregon and Portland State University in the field of planning that are complementary, and (2) if complementarity is seen, in this instance, to be of signal importance, the extent to which the programs at the University of Oregon and Portland State University and the related activities at Oregon State University can be made more complementary than they will be if the Portland State University proposal is approved in its present form without further refinement and clarification of planning-related interests and responsibilities of Oregon's three state universities, growing out of discussions involving the Board's office, the University of Oregon, Portland State University, and Oregon State University representatives.

As things now stand, it would appear from Portland State University's presentation of its conception of the University of Oregon's Master's Program in Urban Planning that Portland State University has assumed a complementarity between the Portland State University proposed option in planning and the Master of Urban Planning program at the University of Oregon, the existence of which appears to be open to question.

Board's Office Recommendation

The Board's office recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to offer a Master's Program in Urban Studies with an option in research (urban studies-research), that it approve in principle the concept of Portland State University's offering an option in planning (urban studies-planning), but that approval of a specific program be contingent upon a further combined joint effort on the part of the Board's office, Portland State University, the University of Oregon and Oregon State University to seek a way of making the programs as complementary as is desirable and feasible.

Committee Discussion

Dr. Romney said the Board's office believes a Master's Program in Urban Studies is a legitimate program for Portland State University, which would serve the interests of the community. And the Board's office has no problem, he said, in recommending approval of the research option in the Master of Urban Studies program, which is an academic program the equivalent of the first two years of the PhD program, leading the student either into employment or into the PhD program. The only question the Board's office has, he said, centers around the proposed option in planning, and that question is whether, in the interest of providing the state with the best possible array of services, some differentiation could be made in respect to the University of Oregon program in urban planning, the Oregon State University resources in planning, and the proposed Portland State University option in planning so that programs offered by the three institutions could be more complementary than duplicatory. If the Board chooses to approve the Board's office recommendation, he said, the Board's Office would seek the expertise of consultants recommended by the American Institute of Planners, to sit down with appropriate representatives of Portland State University, the University of Oregon, and Oregon State University and the Board's office to see if some complementarity among the programs is feasible and desirable.

Acting President Anderson read a prepared statement in which he emphasized that Portland State University considers that urban studies is inherent in Portland State University's role. He said Portland State University does not object to discussing whether parts of the program might be appropriately carried on at Oregon State University or the University of Oregon, but he asked that Portland State University not be delayed in instituting the proposed program because of possible duplication of activities at other institutions.
Dr. Toulan said he did not believe Portland State University had implied that the University of Oregon program was narrowly oriented. He continued that while he believed the University of Oregon and Portland State University programs would have different emphases, he did not object to a stipulation that there be cooperation among the planning programs in the System. However, he insisted, this should come after approval of the Portland State University proposal, not as a requisite for approval. Mrs. Johnson said that an examination of the requirements for recognition by the national accrediting association [American Institute of Planners] indicates that if the two programs (University of Oregon, Portland State University) observe the American Institute of Planners broad definition of planning, without planned coordination, then obviously they may well be duplicatory. She said there appeared to be a number of omissions in the planning process through which Portland State University developed its proposal. For example, she said, there were assertions in the Portland State University proposal as to the number of employment opportunities for prospective graduates of the program, but no statement concerning Portland State University's placement experience with its certificate program.

Dr. Toulan traced the development of the planning profession, from early programs related to engineering and architectural concerns to programs covering every aspect of sociological planning. He said not every planner coming out of a planning program is expected to perform the same kind of job. Portland State University, he said, would not plan to prepare planners to work in smaller towns, but rather to produce graduates for employment in the major agencies around metropolitan areas such as the Portland area.

Mr. Mosser asked if Portland State University would anticipate that in time Portland State University would endeavor to make a case for a School of Architecture at Portland State University to support the planning, just as the master's degree is now seen as a necessary undergirding for the PhD program in urban studies. He noted that Portland State University proposes that the first new staff to be hired in the proposed program are in land use and transportation. Vice President Blumel responded that he would not say that Portland State University would not seek authorization at some time in the future for a School of Architecture but it would not do so on the grounds that such a school is necessary to support the urban studies master's program. President Anderson said Portland State University's present curricular plans do not include a School of Architecture.

Mrs. Johnson said she could not distinguish between what the University of Oregon would be doing and what Portland State University proposed to do. If the programs are indistinguishable, she asked, are two needed? Mr. Mosser said the state has duplicating programs in other areas where the production of graduates is greater than the planning area. He said both programs (University of Oregon and Portland State University programs) are small, considering the breadth of the planning profession and the demand for planners at all levels of government and in the private sector.

Mr. Maden said he was currently in the PhD program in urban studies at Portland State University. He said he had asked himself whether his enrollment should prevent him from fully participating in the resolving of this issue, and had determined that the proper course was to identify his relationship to the program under discussion, but not to withdraw from the discussion or participation in the decision-making process. He said he felt that the program proposed by Portland State University was a natural flow of consequences of what Oregon had developed at Portland State, was an unusual and creative program for which there was substantial need both by students and by agencies of the Portland area, and should be approved without delay, but with a statement encouraging cooperation among the three universities. He said he was not uncomfortable with the idea that there might be several programs in planning in the state, and that he thought that they would be somewhat differentiated in their interests and would have no difficulty working in concert.
Mr. Corey asked what time would be involved if the Board's Office recommendation were followed. Dr. Romney responded that the Board's Office would move immediately to set a date when it could meet with consultants and representatives of the institutions to examine the question of whether there are ways the institutions could work beneficially together in development of programs which are not completely duplicative but rather would emphasize complementary strengths. He said he would like to emphasize that the Board's Office recommended approval of the master's degree program in urban studies and the research option of that degree. The question of coordination of programs involves only the professional (planning) option, he said.

Miss McIntyre asked how approval of the master's degree program would affect Portland State University's admissions policies regarding its urban studies programs. Dr. Toulan replied that Portland State University would expect to admit graduate students to either the PhD or Master's degree program, depending upon their qualifications and educational objectives. Fewer students would be admitted to the PhD program under this arrangement than is now the case, when there is not a master's degree alternative.

Dean Alpert described the development of the University of Oregon program in urban planning, noting that it was an interdisciplinary program which, for administrative purposes, was lodged in the School of Architecture.

Mr. Holmes said that even if there is some duplication, the urban studies program as developed by Portland State University is a logical response to needs of the metropolitan area and approval of the program should not be made contingent on plans for complementary development of programs in the state. This can be looked at after the program is underway, he said.

Mr. Corey said it seemed to him that good planning would indicate that discussions concerning complementary development be undertaken before the new program gets underway, rather than moving ahead with the program with the possibility of changing it later. He asked how a brief delay would damage the program.

Mr. Maden said the program was ready to go, a delay would cause loss of momentum that might not be recovered. He said a vote for the Board's Office recommendation was a vote against the program. The professional option, he said was critical to the success of the master's degree program because employers are much more ready to employ persons in planning positions who have a credential indicating that they are graduates of a planning program.

Mrs. Johnson said it appeared to her that what the Board's Office was asking for was some time, to seek to work out complementary aspects in the planning programs at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University.

Chancellor Lieuallen said he felt that the conversations proposed by the Board's Office might well take place before the May 21 meeting of the Board, in which case the question would be moot. He asked if the committee wished the Board's Office to initiate the recommended conversations before the meeting of the full Board, since the committee appeared to be reaching a tie vote on a recommendation.

The committee agreed that the Board's Office should schedule a meeting of the interested groups, with consultants, to seek clarification of these questions before the May meeting of the Board, if possible.

President MacVicar said his institution would find it very helpful to be involved in such a discussion. He said discussions have been underway at Oregon State University for more than three years to see how Oregon State University's resources in land use and environmental relationships fit into the kaleidoscope of planning activities. He said that without wishing to intrude on the business of the Board, he felt it not inappropriate to suggest that at some time, now or in the future, the three universities be involved in consideration of what each can do in a significant and complementary way that will give the state a realistic plan for use of these resources over the next five years.
Committee Recommendation

Mr. Holmes and Mr. Maden indicated they favored approving the Portland State University proposal as requested. Mrs. Johnson and Mr. Corey indicated they preferred the recommendation of the Board's Office, calling for approval of the Master of Urban Studies (MUS) with the research option, but approving the professional option in principle with approval of a specific program contingent on joint exploration of the possibility of making the programs of the system as complementary as is feasible and desirable. In view of the potential tie vote of the Committee, the proposal was forwarded to the Board without recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Johnson said the Board had an obligation to approve duplicating programs only when there is a demonstrated need to do so for the benefit of the state and the students. If similar programs are authorized, they should be complementary, insofar as possible, and should offer opportunity for exchange of students and faculty.

Mrs. Johnson indicated that Dr. Romney had been asked to arrange further discussions with the institutions and with consultants prior to Board consideration of the recommendation, and called upon Dr. Romney to report developments.

Dr. Romney said the American Institute of Planning had been requested to nominate consultants, and of the names submitted, both Portland State University and the University of Oregon had agreed that Dr. Henry Hightower of the University of Arizona was an individual of considerable eminence in the field of planning and would be an excellent consultant.

Dr. Hightower reviewed a number of alternatives with the Board's Office and representatives of the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University. Dr. Romney said it was the recommendation of Dr. Hightower that Portland State University be authorized a program in urban studies planning and that the three universities cooperate fully to assure the most effective use of the resources in Portland, Eugene, and Corvallis. He said the resources in urban studies would be mutually beneficial. It was agreed that if the Portland State University program were approved by the Board, there would be an organized systematic effort to coordinate and develop a working relationship among the three universities in the general area of planning. A report would be made to the Board at the end of a two-year period when one class would have had an opportunity to complete the program at Portland State University.

Mrs. Johnson moved that Portland State University be authorized to offer a master of urban studies degree with options in research and planning developed in a fashion to be complementary in an organized and systematic fashion with the strengths and programs in planning at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University; that students at all three institutions have access to these programs and strengths; and that a report be made to the Board in two years indicating the directions the programs have taken and the nature of the cooperation.

Mr. Holmes said he would be interested in comments from Mr. Maden since he is a student in the urban studies program at Portland State University.

Mr. Maden said he would agree with the report from Dr. Hightower that Portland State University has a unique program substantially different from the programs at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University.

Mr. Maden said he did not think the Board should restrict its approval of the program. Therefore, as a substitute for Mrs. Johnson's motion, he moved that the Board authorize Portland State University to offer a masters in urban studies with options in research and planning.
Mrs. Johnson said that in view of the financial stringency, student needs, and societal needs, she believed it was appropriate to include in the motion the requirement for developing complementary programs within the State System. She said it is in the interest of the legislature and the Board to be certain that there is cooperation and an absence of unnecessary duplication in the State System and that she did not consider her motion to be a restrictive amendment to the original recommendation.

The Board discussed the meaning of the requirements stated in Mrs. Johnson's motion.

The Board then voted in favor of the substitute motion. Directors Corey, Holmes, Maden, Snider, and Stewart voted yes, and Directors Johnson, Joss, McIntyre, and Mousse were opposed.

Mrs. Johnson asked that the record indicate Board concern for some follow-up on these programs, if no formal report is to be requested by the Board. She said the Board should indicate that it is not creating a duplicating, competing program within the State System. She indicated that the Portland State University program in urban studies is an evolving program that has had a great many difficulties. She said an effort is being made to establish an excellent program in planning which can qualify for accreditation, and the Board should show some concern with its development.

The Board then approved the substitute motion that Portland State University be authorized to offer a master's degree program in urban studies with options in research and planning. Mrs. Johnson voted against the motion.

Presentation Concerning Lettuce and Grape Boycott, UO

Mr. Layman said that arrangement had been made for a presentation by representatives and students from the University of Oregon with respect to the lettuce boycott.

Miss Rosa Solano, representing the Chicana Student Union at the University of Oregon, said the group was demanding that United Farmworkers lettuce be used on the campus. She said the groups supporting the farmworkers are fighting for better living and working conditions for all human beings.

Mr. Tony Gregg, representing the United Farmworkers Solidarity Committee at the University of Oregon, said that the resolution presented to the Board was almost identical to the resolution passed by 71 percent of the students voting in a non-binding referendum on May 9. He then described some of the activities which occurred prior to the passage of the resolution, including petitions, picketing, and a boycott of the Student Union. He said student money supports the Student Union and the students and faculty should have some control over the expenditure of the funds.

Mr. Gregg said the Teamsters Union had not organized the farmworkers in California until the United Farmworkers Union of America had already succeeded in organizing them. He charged that the Teamsters then entered the controversy as a strike-breaking force at the request of the growers and farm bureau in order to try to break the United Farmworkers Union. He said it is clear the only union that represents the farmworkers of California is the United Farmworkers Union. This is the basis for the demand that lettuce and table grapes not produced under the auspices of the United Farmworkers be removed from campus, as set forth in the following resolution presented to the Board:

Be it resolved that Oregon Institutions of Higher Education refrain from the purchase or sale of non-UFWA head lettuce and table grapes, except Oregon grown head lettuce and table grapes.

Mr. Robert Liberty, President of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, said the problem should be resolved because it is creating problems for students, faculty, and administrators as long as it remains unresolved. He referred to the referendum and indicated that as a representative of the students he supported their clearly-expressed sentiments. He then discussed alternatives available in terms of neutrality in the controversy.
Mr. Liberty said there are differences of opinion among the students with respect to the boycott but all agreed that the present policy is not neutral and the continuance of this dispute is damaging to the University. He urged the Board to accept the democratically-expressed wishes of the students and direct the administrators at the University of Oregon to refrain from purchasing all non-UNW head lettuce and table grapes. If this is not done, he asked the Board to adopt the recognized neutral policy of buying only uncontested produce.

President Clark responded that the proposed resolution would involve the University as an active agent in taking action against the purchase of lettuce and, therefore, in a political act. He said students have an opportunity to express their personal convictions through their individual or organizational groups in the boycott of the contested produce. He said the University of Oregon has had a long tradition of noninterference in action that is politically motivated and it should not change that policy.

Miss McIntyre asked why the University of Oregon is deviating from the normal purchasing practices of the Student Union if it is not trying to take a public stand. Dr. Clark said the only deviation has been an effort to purchase United Farmworkers lettuce in order to please some of the consumers. He also indicated it was not always possible to buy equal amounts of both types of lettuce because they are not always available.

Mr. Holmes commented that Board members may have great sympathy with the lettuce boycott on an individual basis but the central point is the question of whether there should be a change in the policy of keeping the State System free from politics. He said he hoped the Board would never let the institutions get into politics, no matter what the issue or the personal beliefs of the Board members.

Mr. Layman said the question before the Board is not the economic conditions of the workers or the conditions that may exist in the field, many of which may be deplorable. He said it is a question of whether the Board, in administering a state educational system, should get involved in such issues.

During the discussion of possible courses of action, it was indicated that present Board policy is expressed in Section 42.110 of the Board's Administrative Rules and in a policy statement adopted by the Board and reaffirmed on February 18, 1969, with respect to the grape issue.

Mr. Joss moved that the Board again reaffirm the policy statement presented by President J. W. Forrester, Jr., and reaffirmed by the Board on February 18, 1969. The statement appears below:

The Board long has had a basic policy that institutions, as institutions, take no action favoring or opposing a particular position on public issues. This policy of institutional neutrality on public issues was adopted soon after the Board was established and has served the System well. This long-established policy is reaffirmed.

The Chancellor said he agreed that the Board should take specific action to settle the conflict. He said the motion by Mr. Joss to reaffirm the previous policy statement seemed to be in the best interests of the System and he urged the Board to approve the motion.

The Board approved the motion to reaffirm the policy statement as stated at the Board meeting of February 18, 1969.

Mr. Stewart suggested that University administrators take action to eliminate the outside kitchens set up on the campus of the University of Oregon in connection with the Student Union boycott.
The administration of Portland State University has encouraged the staff of
the Department of Environmental Quality to consider the development of its
laboratory and office facilities within the two levels of Science Building II
which currently are being used for vehicular parking. Such an arrangement could
be mutually beneficial.

The Department of Environmental Quality needs to relocate from its present leased
space in Southwest Portland in order to obtain larger and more adequate laboratory
facilities. With the assistance of the Executive Department, it is exploring
a number of alternatives, including the possible construction of a new building,
at various locations in and around the Portland metropolitan area as well as in
Salem and Corvallis. Proximity to the instructional and research facilities at
Portland State University would provide benefits to the professional and technical
staff members of the Department, such as the availability of library resources,
meeting rooms, food service, scientific equipment and access to opportunities
for continued training through the curriculum there.

The institution anticipates many benefits from such an association, including
cooperative research in the University's program of environmental science,
part-time employment opportunities for students, and the sharing of knowledge
and techniques in solving environmental problems. The prospect of removing the
192 parking spaces currently available in the structure does not appear to be of
major concern, particularly in view of the efforts by the City to reduce the
number of vehicles within the downtown area.

It is believed that significant benefits would accrue in construction cost
savings and in the time required to provide laboratory space for the Department.
The existing mechanical and electrical systems, accommodated principally within
the basement of the building, below the two parking levels, are adequate to
serve the proposed additional laboratory areas. The 11-foot clearance between
floor and ceiling would be sufficient for the conversion of the space into laboratoories and offices with the appropriate service areas. Although the two
levels of parking contain approximately 67,000 gross square feet, the maximum
area which would be made available to the Department on a lease basis would be
about 50,000 square feet. The University plans to retain the remaining area,
at the south end of each level, for potential future laboratories for Applied
Science and Engineering.

The specific provisions of a lease agreement have not been formulated pending
the review and approval of the general concept by the Building Committee and
the Board as well as by others, such as the Department of General Services, the
appropriate legislative bodies, etc.

The matter has been discussed informally with the Board's attorney, however, and it
appears that the Board would have the authority to lease the space to the Department
of Environmental Quality. The rental income would need to be sufficient to amortize
the balance of the indebtedness incurred originally under the provisions of
Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution as well as to meet all operating
costs incurred in support of the tenant's activities. (Assuming arrangements
effective on or about July 1, 1975, the outstanding indebtedness on the parking
space would be approximately $493,000.) An alternative would be to obtain
sufficient resources from the state at the beginning of the lease term to permit
the rededication of the space to educational and general purposes by refinancing.

Tentatively, it is estimated that the remodeling costs for the area of 50,000
square feet would be about $1,800,000. One possibility would be to finance such
costs with a combination of a General Fund appropriation and bonding under Article
XI-G, subject to legislative authorization in 1975. Architectural planning could
proceed as soon as resources therefor could be made available by the Department of
Environmental Quality or others (e.g., the State Emergency Board).
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that approval be given to the concept of leasing approximately 50,000 gross square feet of space within the parking levels of Science II at Portland State University for the development of laboratory and office facilities for the Department of Environmental Quality and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to assist in obtaining the approval of the Legislature or other authorities having jurisdiction in this matter if such an alternative is selected. It was also recommended that the President and Secretary of the Board be authorized to execute a lease for this space when and if a final determination has been made to locate the Department of Environmental Quality’s laboratories there, a satisfactory financing plan has been developed, and the necessary approvals of regulatory state agencies have been secured or are assured. The form of the lease shall be subject to approval by the Board’s attorney.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee discussed the rental charges for comparable space elsewhere in the Portland area, the cost to construct the same amount of new space, the requirements for vehicular parking for Portland State University, city code requirements for parking spaces to be provided, and the potential uses by Portland State University for the space which would be leased.

With respect to using the proposed space for parking purposes, it was indicated that environmental concerns have resulted in changed demands for parking facilities. It is not anticipated this space would be required for parking during the period of the lease. In terms of use of the space for academic purposes, it was stated that the present enrollment trends do not indicate a major expansion of science facilities in the near future. The space which would be leased is well adapted for conversion to scientific purposes because all of the mechanical systems related to science are in the building. It was indicated that Portland State University will have space requirements for programs other than science during the period of the proposed lease but that those presently anticipated would not be appropriate in this particular location.

Mr. William Neland, Administrator for Business and Finance and Director of Facilities Planning at Portland State University, said the special provisions included in the building for science purposes resulted in a higher cost for the Science II parking facility. As a result the parking spaces in Science II do not provide sufficient revenues to retire the bonded indebtedness incurred for the parking facilities. It would therefore be of benefit to the parking program if the parking spaces in Science II were leased for sufficient income to meet the indebtedness or the space were transferred to an operating activity or to an activity which could be financed through educational and general funds. Mr. Neland said if the institution were to replace the converted parking spaces at some future time, it would be necessary to fulfill requirements of the environmental impact procedures. New restrictions with respect to parking and environmental quality in the Portland core area might result in potential problems in the replacement of the parking spaces.

Mr. Neland said it was intended that the remote parking program at Portland State University would be expanded to its maximum capacity in an effort to meet the responsibility to assist the City of Portland in its environmental problems.

In response to a question, Mr. Warren C. Westgarth, Laboratory Administrator, Department of Environmental Quality, indicated that the department was seeking a metropolitan location. For this reason it would be preferable to secure facilities in Portland rather than to locate in close proximity to an institution, such as Oregon State University, which is also working on environmental research. He said the space at Portland State University would be ideal for the purposes of the Department of Environmental Quality and that it appears to be the only suitable available site in the state. The only alternative would be construction of a new facility. President MacVicar commented that Oregon State University would welcome an affiliation with the Department of Environmental Quality and indicated that federal and state facilities available at Oregon State might also be very helpful to the Department of Environmental Quality.
Mr. Hunderup said it was not agreed unanimously that bonding authority of the Board of Higher Education could be used for this purpose. He also stated that when the Department of Environmental Quality was presenting its request to the legislative session for funding of the laboratory, the question of locating the facility at Oregon State University had been raised. Mr. Hunderup said he had been told explicitly at that time the reasons the Department of Environmental Quality considered it essential to have the laboratory in Portland.

The Building Committee forwarded the staff recommendation to the Board without recommendation by the Committee. Mrs. Johnson said she was particularly interested in the academic aspects of the proposed recommendation and that she would hope the presentation to the Board would deal with some of these issues and also with previous actions by the Board in considering related programs.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Hunderup said the discussion during the Building Committee meeting seemed to indicate that a modification of the staff recommendation would be appropriate. He said the Department of Human Resources for the Health Division should also be included in the recommendation.

Mr. Hunderup then presented the following modified staff recommendation: That approval be given to the concept of leasing approximately 50,000 gross square feet of space within the parking levels of Science II at Portland State University for the development of laboratory and office facilities for the Department of Environmental Quality and the Department of Human Resources for the Health Division and that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to assist in obtaining the approval of the Legislature or other authorities having jurisdiction in this matter if such an alternative is selected.

In response to a question from Mr. Stewart, Mr. Hunderup indicated Oregon State University had been considered as a possible site for the laboratory. However, the Department of Environmental Quality is constructing a testing-type laboratory and the majority of its work is in the Portland metropolitan area. Immediate access to the freeway is also required.

Mr. Kessler Cannon, Director of the Department of Environmental Quality said there were advantages to the department to obtain space designed for laboratory use which is readily available for conversion to full laboratory use. There is mutual benefit from a shared exchange of staff and facilities with Portland State University. The Board would be relieved of bonding responsibility for space not currently essential to Portland State University. In discussing proposed financial arrangements, Mr. Cannon said it would be expected that the rental would include a pro rata share of the cost of the indebtedness for the space to be occupied, including charges for bonds issued only for the remodeling costs.

Mr. Joss said he had received a request from Mrs. Betty Cook, Senior Instructor in Chemistry at Portland State University, to indicate her concerns with respect to this project.

Mrs. Cook requested the Board to consider the following factors before reaching a final decision on the leasing of space in Science II at Portland State University:

1. Through a communications break, there was no knowledge of this proposal transmitted to three of the four science departments housed in Science II until the Friday, April 19, 1974, publication of the Vanguard. More complete details were published in the April 23, 1974, Vanguard. This left no time for any action before the 9:00 A.M. Building committee meeting.

2. With last winter's temperatures averaging 55°F to 62°F in Science I and Science II, the taxing of present heating facilities by two more floors seems highly possible. The failure twice of the electrical system in Science II coupled with the inability to use the distilled water system for laboratories makes the facilities less usable for us alone.
3. The elevator usage for Science II is supposed to be maintained by access through a rather narrow service ramp. This ramp is not as satisfactory as direct access and may be limited to certain types of vehicles.

4. The service ramp will be the only access to Science II by handicapped. There are no elevation or degree rise figures to show that a non-electrified wheelchair could negotiate it. The crosswalk doors from Science I would be the only other access. These doors open inward while on a slant and many times the reverse pressure in the building makes it difficult for strong people to open them.

5. The removal of the 192 parking spaces may not be of major concern to many members of the administration but it is to many other people using it. As one whose bus service requires a 0.4 mile hike uphill and poor service available, I am concerned. The only other covered structures are three blocks away in the Services Building. A hike in inclement weather to or from a heavily used facility is of concern. The gravel lots near Sciences I and II will doubtless have additional pressure from DEQ cars.

6. The flexibility of Science II parking levels was to accommodate possible future need through growth. Laboratory facilities are costly. If the Portland area population increases and with it a need for new science laboratories, we would have no space available. The possible arrival of large environmental chambers for chemical study is very possible. Would we be able to use them?

7. It has been made dramatically apparent that the present and future of the University depends upon student enrollment. The undergraduate program supports the graduate programs. We must have a happy satisfied "customer" to "stay in business." Since we do not know how the students will react to the noises, clutter and disruption that the remodelling will entail, it could affect (very drastically) the student enrollment in Science courses. The presence of accommodating community colleges could drain our FTE and staff and faculty. This is something that the science departments of Physics, Biology and Chemistry should be allowed to review before a drastic change is made.

The request that I put before you is this:

Could you delay a final decision until the departments of Physics, Chemistry and Biology have had a chance to confer and offer any recommendations.

Mrs. Louise Weidlich, President of Mothers for Children, spoke in opposition to the proposed lease. She urged the Board to postpone action until there had been an opportunity for the citizens of Portland and the science departments at Portland State University to react to the proposal.

Mr. William Neland responded to the comments made during the discussion. He indicated that the departments mentioned in Mrs. Cook's memorandum had been notified through the department heads. He said the electrical deficiency was in connection with a breakdown related to the cooling and had no relationship to the proposed project. The cool temperatures during the winter were a result of the fuel oil crisis which caused a lowering of temperatures throughout the University. Science facilities are ventilated at a more rapid rate than academic buildings and suffered more severely from the overall reduction. However, the capacity of the system was not a factor.

Mr. Neland said the project had been discussed at length with officials of the City of Portland and with the Portland Development Commission.
In terms of parking, he said remote parking will be stimulated through control of vicinity parking. At the same time the parking program will benefit from the transfer of funding responsibility to some other source.

Mr. Hunderup commented that additional capacity in the heating plant which services this building had been authorized by the legislature and cleared by the Emergency Board.

Mr. Mosser prefaced his motion by saying it was not intended to prevent the presentation of a different financial program but he believed the plan he would suggest was the only one that could be implemented. He said if the Board approved the motion, and if the Attorney General rules that the use of the bonds is Constitutional and the Emergency Board approves the issuance of the bonds, it would be possible to proceed immediately to design and construct the modifications to the facility.

Mr. Mosser said his motion was designed: (1) to fulfill the Constitutional responsibility in the use of Article XI-F(1) bonds to have adequate revenue to make the facility self-supporting and self-liquidating; (2) to protect the right to recapture 17,000 square feet of the total for future institutional use; and (3) to protect the parking spaces allocated to Portland State University.

Mr. Mosser then moved that the Board authorize issuance of Article XI-F(1) bonds, if approved by the Attorney General and authorized by the Legislature or Emergency Board, to finance conversion of parking space in Science II at Portland State University to 67,000 square feet of laboratory space, provided:

1) that the Department of Environmental Quality or the Department of Environmental Quality and the Board of Health enter into leases at a rate sufficient to amortize
   a) the existing indebtedness on the parking space,
   b) the additional bonds to be issued under this resolution, and,
   c) to cover costs of operation;

2) that the Board of Higher Education have the right to recapture up to 17,000 square feet of space for Portland State University programs at any time on 12-months' notice by pro rata reduction of rent;

3) that the Board of Higher Education guarantees no parking space to the Department of Environmental Quality or the Board of Health at any time parking space authorized at Portland State University is reduced below 2,100 cars by action of any governmental authority.

The Board discussed the requirements set forth in the statute for financing projects through Article XI-F(1) bonds, subsequent opinions of the Attorney General, and the legal or moral commitment made to the public at the time the bond measure was submitted to the voters.

The possible use of XI-G bond financing was mentioned.

It was indicated that the motion made approval contingent upon a favorable opinion of the Attorney General as to the Constitutionality of using Article XI-F(1) bonding capacity to finance the project. Mr. Holmer said concurrence of the bond attorney also would be required as to the constitutionality of financing the project from Article XI-F(1) bonds before the bonds could be issued.

The Board approved the motion as presented by Mr. Mosser.
Meeting #416-32
May 21, 1974

J. C. Blumel, Appointment as President, PSU

Chancellor Lieuallen said the search committee to identify nominees for the presidency of Portland State University had interviewed over 500 nominees for the position. He said the Board had interviewed some of the nominees submitted to it and had narrowed the field to two nominees, Dr. Joseph Blumel of Portland State University and Dr. Phillip Sirotkin of the State University of New York in Albany, New York. The Chancellor commended the search committee for the tremendous task which it had accomplished.

The Chancellor indicated the details concerning these two nominees and the report of the search committee were available to the Board and invited the Board to review the data and take any appropriate action.

The Board approved a motion by Mr. Stewart to appoint Dr. Joseph C. Blumel as President of Portland State University, effective immediately.

Mr. Layman congratulated Dr. Blumel on his appointment and thanked the search committee for its time and effort.

The Board then approved a motion by Mr. Stewart to express thanks to Dr. H. Dean Anderson for his services as interim and acting president during the last several months.

The Board approved a motion by Mr. Moser that the Secretary of the Board be instructed to express the Board’s appreciation to the search committee members for the conscientious and thorough manner in which they conducted the search.

(Considered by the Academic Affairs Committee, April 23, 1974; present--Johnson, Corey, Maden.)

Combined Standard Norm Programs in Language Arts-Speech and Language Arts-Drama, OCE

Staff Report to the Committee

Oregon College of Education requests authorization to offer standard norm programs in speech and drama in combination with its standard norm program in language arts, as options for students completing programs leading to the MS in education, MA in teaching (MNT), or Oregon College of Education’s 45-hour post-baccalaureate non-degree program for teachers.

Oregon College of Education presently offers undergraduate combination programs in these areas leading to the BA/BS degree in education and endorsement for basic norm certification in two fields, language arts and speech, or language arts and drama.

Oregon College of Education also offers standard norm programs in language arts leading to the MS in education or MNT degrees, but is not authorized to offer standard norm programs in speech or drama. Oregon College of Education is not prohibited from including advanced work in speech or drama in its language arts program - although it has not done so - but it cannot, under its present authorization, endorse teachers for certification in these fields (speech or drama).

Under the proposed program, the language arts teacher wishing to complete standard certification at Oregon College of Education would have three options within the humanities major:

1. Complete a total of 21-30 credit hours of work in the following fields: literature (3-21 hours), writing (3-6 hours), language (3-9 hours), and literary criticism (3 hours) leading to standard norm endorsement in language arts.

2. Complete a total of 24-30 credit hours of work in the following fields: literature (6 hours), writing and language (6 hours), speech (9 hours), and (for the MNT) six hours of language arts electives, leading to standard norm endorsements in language arts and speech.
3. Complete a total of 24-30 credit hours of work as above with 9 hours of work in drama in place of the work in speech, leading to standard norm endorsements in language arts and in drama.

Students admitted to the proposed language arts-speech and language arts-drama standard norm programs would have to meet all of Oregon College of Education's usual requirements for admission to a graduate program and would have to hold basic norm certification in the areas of study in which they wished to earn the standard norm. Teachers whose basic norm preparation was in a single area, but whose teaching assignment or professional desires indicated need for preparation in two areas, would need to make up deficiencies in the area in which he or she did not have the requisite background before being admitted to the program.

Resources To Offer Program

Courses. Oregon College of Education does not have an extensive array of course work in these areas, but does offer basic undergraduate course work prerequisite to the advanced courses contemplated in this proposal. The proposal could be implemented with nine hours of additional course work in speech and an upgrading of the theater course offerings. Courses would be offered primarily in the late afternoon and evening hours and during summer term to serve employed teachers as well as full-time academic-year students.

Library. A staff survey of the library collections in speech and drama has led to the conclusion that expenditures of about $600 in the field of drama and $300 in speech would bring these collections up to a basic level. Oregon College of Education does not propose to make a special budgetary allocation to strengthen the library, but will make these purchases as it is able, through its regular library acquisition budget.

Facilities and Equipment. Facilities to offer the program will be enhanced by completion of the fine arts building, construction of which was authorized by the Board March 26, 1974. This building, however, is needed primarily in support of undergraduate and general campus programs of the institution, not for graduate work contemplated in this proposal.

Board's Office Discussion and Recommendation

The Board's Office sees no need in the state for additional standard norm programs serving teachers whose basic preparation and teaching assignment is solely in speech or drama. Such assignments are possible only in large high schools. The needs of the few teachers with such assignments can be taken care of in the master's degree programs at the University of Oregon and Portland State University.

Speech and drama, however, are not distinctly separate fields of preparation. All language arts teachers must have some work in speech or drama, and many find themselves with split teaching assignments even though their preparation in oral communications is minimal. Because of the great amount of overlap in the norm requirements, students preparing to become teachers can, with very little additional work, complete norm requirements in two and even three fields. The combined program meets a very real need in terms of effective use of teachers in a state where most of the secondary schools (82 percent) have fewer than 1,000 students.

Oregon College of Education is not asking authorization for distinct new norm programs, nor is it requesting authorization to offer master's degree programs for teachers whose area of preparation is only in the areas of speech and drama. What Oregon College of Education is requesting is that language arts teachers with appropriate undergraduate background in speech or drama who are enrolled in Oregon College of Education's standard norm program in language arts be permitted to incorporate nine hours of advanced work in speech or drama in their master's degree program, thereby strengthening their preparation for combined teaching assignments in the public schools, and that Oregon College of Education be authorized to endorse such teachers for standard norm certification in language arts-speech or language arts-drama.
The Board's Office recommended that the request be approved.

Committee Discussion and Recommendation

Mr. Haden said he felt the proposal was a reasonable one and moved its approval.

The Committee recommended by unanimous vote, that Oregon College of Education be authorized to offer combined norm programs in language arts—speech and language arts—drama as an option for students completing subject matter concentrations in the humanities leading to the BS in education or MA in teaching degrees, or for use in Oregon College of Education's 45-hour post-baccalaureate non-degree program for teachers.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

BA/BS in Social Science-Law Enforcement (Considered by Academic Affairs Committee, April 23, 1974; present--Johnson, Corey, Haden.)

OCE Staff Report to the Committee

Oregon College of Education requests authorization to offer an undergraduate program in social science-law enforcement, leading to the BA/BS degree, effective in 1975-76.

Implementation of the program would be dependent upon replacement of one of the four staff members in Oregon College of Education's corrections program (scheduled to retire at the end of 1974-75) with a person competent in the area of law enforcement. Law enforcement courses required for the program would be offered beginning 1975-76.

Clientele To Be Served

The clientele Oregon College of Education wishes to serve, as identified by the institution, are:

1. Full-time employees of law enforcement agencies in the Salem-Monmouth area who want and need baccalaureate degree work in law enforcement.

2. Pre-service students interested in preparing for a career in law enforcement who prefer, for a variety of reasons, to attend Oregon College of Education.

3. Graduates of associate degree programs in law enforcement from Clackamas, Linn-Benton, and Chemeketa community colleges who would prefer to attend Oregon College of Education.

Oregon College of Education estimates that approximately 60 of the students presently enrolled in the Oregon College of Education BA/BS degree program in social science-corrections fall into categories 1 and 2 above, and would transfer into a program in social science-law enforcement were one available at Oregon College of Education.

Oregon College of Education believes that the largest source of new students to be served by the proposed program in law enforcement would be the graduates of the associate degree students of the three community colleges located in the region (Chemeketa, Linn-Benton, Clackamas), many of whom accept employment in the mid-valley area. Seeking to assess the extent of that clientele, Professor Joe Dunn of Chemeketa Community College has conducted a survey of students and former students of the law enforcement programs at the foregoing three community colleges to determine how many state that they would enroll in a baccalaureate program in law enforcement at Oregon College of Education were one available. He reports that 242 persons responded that they would be interested in enrolling in such a program at Oregon College of Education. That number includes those who are
presently enrolled in community college law enforcement programs, recent graduates in law enforcement from these colleges, and employed persons in the regions served by these colleges who are enrolled in, or have completed, courses at these community colleges, and who may or may not have graduated from one of these programs.

To accommodate students enrolled in and graduated from the law enforcement programs in the three community colleges earlier identified, Oregon College of Education has worked out with them a contract in which Oregon College of Education agrees to accept in transfer not to exceed 45 credit hours of the law enforcement work completed by students at these institutions under vocational-technical course numbers. This agreement is of some importance in reckoning the appeal that Oregon College of Education's proposed program may have to the students and graduates of these community colleges. For until recently these three community colleges have offered their professional law enforcement curricula under vocational-technical course numbers. This has made it difficult for their graduates to secure transfer credit for their work toward the requirements for a baccalaureate degree in a four-year institution.

Nature of the Proposed Program

Requirements for the proposed program leading to the BA/BS in Social Science-Law Enforcement are outlined below.

1. A 72-credit-hour major program to include:
   a. 36 credit hours of lower-division work
      27 credit hours of specified courses in the social sciences
      9 credit hours LE 111, 112, 113 Law Enforcement and Society
   b. 36 credit hours of upper-division work
      Law Enforcement Courses
      LE 4 Advanced Criminal Law. 3 hours
      LE 4 Police Administration. 3 hours
      LE 4 Police and Community Relations. 3 hours.
      LE 407. Law Enforcement Seminar. 3 hours.
      Corrections
      SSc 452. Corrections Process. 3 hours.
      SSc 453. Penology. 3 hours.
      SSc 454. Parole and Probation. 3 hours.
      Supplementary Social Science
      SSc 450. Criminology. 3 hours.
      SSc 451. Juvenile Delinquency. 3 hours.
      PS 351. Introduction to Public Administration. 3 hours.
      Soc 454. Sociology of Deviant Behavior. 3 hours.
      PS 302. State and Local Government. 3 hours.

2. A 27-credit-hour minor program to be selected with the approval of the student's adviser, including 12 credit hours of upper-division work.

3. Oregon College of Education's 64-credit-hour liberal arts core curriculum.

4. Electives to bring total credit hours to 192.

That the Board may understand more clearly the workings of the proposed program, we describe briefly below its operations in the case of three hypothetical students representative of the varieties of students that Oregon College of Education would hope to serve with this program: (1) the graduate of the community college associate
degree program which has been designed to provide the student with a maximum of college transfer work, (2) the graduate of the community college associate degree program which has been designed primarily to prepare the student for employment, with little concern for providing the student with college transfer work, and (3) the student with no prior work in law enforcement education.

The graduate of the community college associate degree program which has been designed to provide the student with a maximum of college transfer work.

Such a student may well have, upon entering Oregon College of Education, 90 to 108 credit hours of college transfer work, including the law enforcement courses which constituted his major in the associate degree program. It is likely that he will have had, at a minimum, the following 24 credit hours of law enforcement work:

- LE (or CJA) 111, 112, 113. Introduction to Criminal Justice. 3 hours each.
- LE (or CJA) 211, 212. Introduction to Criminal Law. 3 hours each.
- LE (or CJA) 213. Introduction to Evidence. 3 hours.
- LE (or CJA) 214. Introduction to Criminal Justice. 3 hours.
- LE (or CJA) 219. Introduction to Community Relations. 3 hours.

For the foregoing courses constitute the recommended law enforcement core for associate degree programs, as approved by both the four-year institutions and community college criminal justice educators.

But some of these transferring students will have had more than these 24 credit hours of law enforcement courses, for many such students use electives to enlarge their law enforcement educational experience.

He will, in his community college work, also have completed general education courses and introductory course work in the social sciences which will be applicable to core curriculum and lower-division major requirements.

He may find that some Oregon College of Education liberal arts core requirements as well as possibly the entire Oregon College of Education minor requirements will need to be met after his enrollment at Oregon College of Education, but he should have no difficulty completing baccalaureate degree requirements in the proposed social science-law enforcement curriculum in a two-year period following enrollment at Oregon College of Education.

With the 12 credit hours of upper-division law enforcement course work which Oregon College of Education proposes be offered in the proposed Oregon College of Education law enforcement program, this student would graduate from Oregon College of Education with a minimum of 36 credit hours of work in law enforcement courses - and perhaps more.

The graduate of a vocational-technical community college associate degree program which emphasizes the occupational aspects of the program, with little regard to offering the student college transfer work.

Until recently, the three community colleges in closest proximity to Oregon College of Education (Chemeketa, Linn-Benton, Clackamas) offered such programs. The bulk of the courses carried vocational-technical course numbers, and generally were creditable toward a baccalaureate degree, if at all, only in those special instances in which the four-year college or university had signed a contract with the community colleges agreeing to accept in transfer a certain bloc of vocational-technical credits clearly designated in the contract. And then, usually, only a portion of the work taken is allowed to count toward degree requirements.

As we have earlier noted, Oregon College of Education is willing to enter into contracts with these community colleges to accept not to exceed 45 credit hours of course work in law enforcement courses carrying vocational-technical course numbers.
Graduates of a community college vocational-technical program of law enforcement (as distinguished from a college-transfer program) may be expected to enter Oregon College of Education's program with a heavy concentration in law enforcement - perhaps as many as 60 to 70 credit hours of work - of which but 45 credit hours would be acceptable toward the baccalaureate degree. Such a student, by the time he completes his baccalaureate degree program, may have completed a total of 70 to 80 credit hours of law enforcement work, a minimum of 12 hours of which would be law enforcement work completed at Oregon College of Education. Of that law enforcement work, however, 67 credit hours would show on his transcript as applicable toward degree requirements (45 credit hours accepted by Oregon College of Education from the community college plus the 12 credit hours of upper-division work in law enforcement completed at Oregon College of Education).

These students will be admitted to the upper-division major program in law enforcement on the basis of their associate degree programs, but will be required to make up whatever work is needed to meet degree requirements at Oregon College of Education as outlined earlier. These students will require three or more years of work after entering Oregon College of Education in order to meet baccalaureate degree requirements.

Students with no prior work in law enforcement. Students entering the proposed program as freshmen or transferring from general academic programs of study, would complete degree requirements as earlier outlined on p. 35.

They would enter the upper-division component of the program with but a single introductory sequence (LE 111, 112, 113. Law Enforcement and Society. 3 credit hours each). They would not have completed, as would the transfer students from the community college law enforcement programs, introductory course work in criminal law, evidence, criminal investigation, community relations, which, together with LE 111, 112, 113 constitute the basic program of the associate degree law enforcement programs. These students would, then, graduate from Oregon College of Education with a total of 21 credit hours of work specifically directed to their major area of study (LE 111, 112, 113 and 12 hours of upper-division work at Oregon College of Education).

It seems likely that Oregon College of Education will be able to offer little more than the 21 credit hours in law enforcement identified above, without special funding. These 21 credit hours would be made possible only because Oregon College of Education states that it will employ a qualified faculty member in the field of law enforcement by filling a retirement vacancy with a professor in the field of law enforcement.

Resources To Offer the Program

The faculty for the proposed program would consist of (1) the faculty member to be employed in the field of law enforcement, if the proposed program is authorized Oregon College of Education, (2) the corrections faculty, which would offer some of the courses in the program taken by law enforcement students, and (3) the faculty of the supporting social sciences.

The question naturally arises as to whether a baccalaureate program in law enforcement can effectively be mounted with a staff of but one faculty member - however qualified he may be - and even though the corrections faculty and the faculty in the underlying social sciences will bring significant strength to the program. The Board's Office is of the view that if all of the law enforcement courses (lower-division as well as upper-division) necessary to a strong baccalaureate program in law enforcement had to be taught by a single faculty member, the program would not have the strength normally required in the offering of baccalaureate degree programs.

If, however, the law enforcement faculties of community colleges can, in effect, be drawn upon to assist in the teaching of lower-division law enforcement courses, a single faculty member on the Oregon College of Education faculty, supported by his colleagues in corrections and the basic underlying social sciences, con-
Recognizably could offer a selection of upper-division law enforcement courses of sufficient breadth and depth to assure that the law enforcement students graduated from Oregon College of Education would be of a substantive quality.

Library resources have been built at Oregon College of Education in the field of corrections and the basic, underlying social sciences, some aspects of which very naturally serve the interests of a law enforcement program. But, if the law enforcement program is authorized Oregon College of Education, additional strengths, specifically in law enforcement areas will need building.

No special physical facilities or equipment are needed to offer the proposed program beyond what is available to Oregon College of Education.

Discussion of the Proposal

In endeavoring to project the potential enrollment of an Oregon College of Education program in law enforcement, it is helpful to review (1) the changing character of associate degree programs in law enforcement offered by Oregon community colleges, for it is from these programs that presumably Oregon College of Education would draw students, (2) the experience of the major programs in law enforcement and the administration of justice at Southern Oregon College and Portland State University, and (3) the experience in Florida, which, like Oregon, has a state system of higher education, and where there has been some study given to the relative importance of in-service programs in administration of justice as distinguished from pre-service programs in that field.

1. Changing Character of Community College Associate Degree Programs in Law Enforcement

The Board's Office, directors of the four-year administration of justice programs, representatives from the State Law Enforcement Council, the State Police, the Bureau of Police Standards and Practices, and directors of the two-year programs have worked together over a period of years to encourage development of articulated programs in law enforcement providing both (a) employment competency upon the completion of the associate degree, and (b) full transferability into a baccalaureate program. A curricular pattern has been developed, primarily through the work of Portland Community College in cooperation with Portland State University, and Southern Oregon College in cooperation with Umpqua Community College, which accomplishes these two objectives. This pattern has been adopted with minor variations by about half (six) of the Oregon community colleges offering law enforcement curricula, and most of the others offer some portion of this curriculum, together with more skill-oriented non-transfer course work. Those community colleges offering the transfer curriculum are sending many of their graduates on into four-year institutions in Oregon.

Chemeketa, Linn-Benton, and Clackamas have not moved as rapidly as some other of Oregon's community colleges in increasing the transfer content of their curricula, and their graduates have experienced difficulty in finding baccalaureate administration of justice programs which will accept them without discounting very heavily their community college work and thus lengthening the time required to earn a baccalaureate degree.

Clackamas, Chemeketa, and Linn-Benton have worked closely with the staff of Oregon College of Education to develop an arrangement providing for transfer of their associate degree graduates into an Oregon College of Education major program in law enforcement. The present Oregon College of Education proposal is in part the result of these meetings. Oregon College of Education has signed a formal agreement with Chemeketa Community College to accept 45 hours of vocational-technical credits earned in law enforcement courses toward baccalaureate degree requirements and has expressed willingness to sign similar agreements with other community colleges. Meanwhile, however, all three institutions have moved to decrease the number of skill-type courses in their programs and to increase the number of courses offering college transfer credit. As these institutions move toward adoption of completely trans-
ferable programs, their graduates will have ready acceptance into baccalaureate degree programs at Portland State University (administration of justice), Southern Oregon College (law enforcement), University of Oregon (Community Service and Public Affairs), Eastern Oregon State College (social science), and Oregon State University (liberal studies of social science), and, for that matter, into social science or social science-corrections programs at Oregon College of Education, as well as into programs of many other institutions, both private and public. Students electing to transfer to Oregon College of Education will do so on the basis of convenience to their places of employment or quality of the program offered, and not because they are tied to the institution for reasons of credit.

2. Enrollment Experience at Portland State University and Southern Oregon College

Sources of enrollments in the Portland State University administration of justice and Southern Oregon College law enforcement programs are indicated below.

Portland State University, Winter Term Enrollment, 1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of majors</th>
<th>250</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New from high school</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that transfer students account for 74 percent of Portland State University's enrollment in administration of justice programs. Two metropolitan community colleges (both of which offer fully transferable associate degree programs) provide 65 percent of all of Portland State University's transfer students. These 120 students represent 48 percent of the total enrollment in the program.

Portland State University's metropolitan service is also apparent in the source of administration of justice students new from high school: 80 percent (52) come from the tri-county (Humboldt, Clackamas, Washington) metropolitan area. Some 50 of Portland State University's students majoring in administration of justice (20 percent) are employed in criminal justice agencies in the metropolitan area.

Southern Oregon College, Winter Term Enrollment, 1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of majors</th>
<th>275</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New from high school</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enrollment pattern in Southern Oregon College's law enforcement program is the reverse of that of Portland State University's administration of justice program. The bulk of the enrollment of 275, winter term 1973-74, (67 percent), consists of students new from high school, with transfer students comprising only 33 percent of the enrollment.

Of the 184 students new from high school, just over one-third (65 - 35 percent) are from the Willamette Valley: Multnomah, 14; Marion, 14; Linn, 13; Clackamas, 10; Lane, 5; Benton, 4; Yamhill, 2; Washington, 2; Polk, 1; Total, 65.

Of the 275 majors, 224 (81.8 percent) are pre-service students and 51 (18 percent) are in-service students employed in administration of justice agencies. This is almost precisely the same ratio as at Portland State University (80 percent pre-service, 20 percent in-service).
3. Experience in Florida in respect to in-service educational needs.

The State University System of Florida has just issued (August 1973) the final report on an exhaustive two-and-one-half year study of Manpower and Education for Criminal Justice in Florida: Assessment and Projected Needs of the System. Some of the findings of this report in respect to in-service education are of interest in respect to the Oregon College of Education situation.

Six of the nine member institutions of the Florida state university system offer undergraduate major programs in criminal justice. Three of these programs are four-year programs leading to the baccalaureate degree and three are upper-division programs only, designed specifically to accept persons who have completed degree programs in a community college.

In-service enrollment in five of these six programs (two four-year and three upper-division) ranges from 50 to 70 percent of total enrollment.

In 1972-73, 33.1 percent of Florida's law enforcement personnel pool were participating in a college educational program, 26.7 percent in community college programs and 5.4 percent in programs offered by four-year institutions. In-service enrollment in educational programs in both Florida and Oregon has been encouraged by availability of federal LEEP-funded student support. Support of pre-service students was sharply curtailed in fiscal year 1974. However, the President's budget for the fiscal year 1975 calls for continuing support for in-service students.

Board's Office Recommendation

The Board's Office, having examined the matter carefully, is of the view:

1. That there is no need in the State System for an additional free-standing four-year program in law enforcement education. We have two such now: the Southern Oregon College program in law enforcement which enrolled in winter term 1974, 275 majors, and the administration of justice program at Portland State University with a winter term 1974 enrollment of 250 majors.

2. That to authorize Oregon College of Education a free-standing, four-year baccalaureate program in law enforcement would be to: (a) duplicate unnecessarily what is presently available already in abundance in the mid-Willamette Valley area, namely strong lower-division offerings in law enforcement in the community colleges (Chemeketa, Linn-Benton, Clackamas), and what is available in the Southern Oregon College and Portland State University programs (free-standing baccalaureate degree programs in law enforcement and administration of justice), (b) introduce additional competition for the Portland State University and Southern Oregon College programs (for students who desire a four-year baccalaureate program in law enforcement or administration of justice), where no such competition is needed or warranted, and (c) place upon Oregon College of Education an added burden in staffing, for to offer such a free-standing, four-year baccalaureate degree program, Oregon College of Education would be obliged to add a minimum of two faculty members in law enforcement.

3. That if Oregon College of Education is to make a contribution in the law enforcement field, it should only be in concert with the community colleges in the mid-Willamette Valley area, which have the staff and resources to offer substantive associate degree programs in law enforcement.

4. That an upper-division law enforcement program leading to a baccalaureate degree at Oregon College of Education would permit Oregon College of Education effectively to meet the in-service needs of the agencies and individuals in Oregon College of Education's commuting area. There are a total of some 886 sworn city, county, and state police officers in the six-county area from which Oregon College of Education might draw students.
If Oregon College of Education were authorized an upper-division program in law enforcement, it would be necessary to modify their present proposed program so as to establish prerequisites in law enforcement such that students desiring entry into an upper-division program at Oregon College of Education would be required to acquire a substantive background in law enforcement education. Thus to insure that what could be made available in the upper-division program at Oregon College of Education in law enforcement and supporting work from the corrections and basic social science fields would produce a graduate with substantive preparation in his chosen field.

The Board's Office recommended:

1. That the present Oregon College of Education proposal, asking authorization to offer a free-standing, four-year program in law enforcement, not be approved, for the reasons cited above.

2. That the Board authorize the Board's Office to work with Oregon College of Education in the development of an upper-division program leading to a baccalaureate degree in law enforcement, the program to rest upon a strong base in law enforcement education acquired at the lower-division level in the community colleges or in some other institution having a law enforcement or administration of justice degree program.

Committee Discussion and Recommendation

President Rice said Oregon College of Education felt the solution proposed by Dr. Romney for meeting the needs of the mid-Willamette Valley, as stated in the Board's Office recommendation, was a very good one.

Mrs. Johnson inquired as to whether emphasis on transferability of programs, as implied in the development of an upper-division program articulated with the work of the community colleges, would have an adverse effect on those students who really wanted a how-to-do-it kind of program. President Rice said he doubted that the community colleges would take any action they did not feel was in the best interests of their students. He said he did not think the community colleges would be dictated to by the needs of Oregon College of Education.

Mrs. Johnson said it appeared Oregon College of Education had a potential for doing in the area of law enforcement what had been done so successfully by Oregon Institute of Technology. She said this type of program development had real merit and would be increasingly important in the future. President Rice said the Board's Office recommendation was addressed to this kind of need. Dr. Kersh added that the recommendation was in the spirit of Oregon College of Education's work with community colleges in its area over the past year.

Upon motion by Mr. Corey, the Committee approved the Board's Office recommendation as presented on p. 40 and recommended its adoption by the Board.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Revision of Campus Boundaries, CCE

(Considered by Building Committee; April 24, 1974; present--Joss, Haden, Snider, Johnson, McIntyre.)

Staff Report to the Committee

Oregon College of Education was notified recently that a house and lot at 160 N. Youngs Avenue was available for purchase. The property is located immediately south of West House at the southern edge of the campus and is within the projected campus boundaries approved by the Board on January 25-26, 1965. The parcel is part of a half block immediately south of West Jackson Street that was intended to be developed at some future time for vehicular parking near the science building and other instructional facilities.
Institutional officials have been reviewing the College's space needs in relation to recent enrollment patterns and projections, parking requirements, and energy-transportation concerns. Because of apparent reductions in the forecasts of need for additional parking, and in the absence of revenues from parking to provide resources for the acquisition and improvement of land therefor, they have recommended that the projected approved campus boundaries be revised to exclude the following two parcels of land which are not owned by the Board:

Parcel A (.31 acre) - Identified as Lot 4, Block 6. This property is the one located at 160 N. Monmouth Avenue which was offered for sale. The lot has an 82.5 foot frontage on Monmouth Avenue and is 100 feet deep.

Parcel B (.10 acre) - Identified as the south 50 feet of Lot 3, Block 6. This property is located at 161 N. College Street and is part of the same half block as Parcel A. It has a 50 foot frontage on College Street and is 82.5 feet deep.

The remainder of this half block south of West Jackson Street is owned by the Board and includes two wood-frame structures, Arnold Arms and West House, which accommodate various instructional activities of the College.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the approved projected campus boundaries of Oregon College of Education be revised to exclude two parcels of land, comprising a total of approximately 0.41 acre of land, located at 160 N. Monmouth Avenue and 161 N. College Street, which are not owned by the Board and which do not appear to be needed for the development of the campus.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

(Considered by Academic Affairs Committee; April 23, 1974; present—Johnson, Cory, Mladen, McIntyre.)

Staff Report to the Committee

Southern Oregon College requests authorization to change the designation of its BA/BS in law enforcement to BA/BS in criminology.

The department of law enforcement staff, and the administration of Southern Oregon College, believe the department's philosophy and program would be better identified to prospective students and employers with the academically oriented title "criminology" than with the more agency-oriented title "law enforcement." Southern Oregon College has sought to develop an academically sound program firmly rooted in the social sciences, and is not tied in its present law enforcement program to serving the particular needs of any single agency.

The Board's Office reports that over the past decade there has been rapid development of collegiate programs related to crime and societal response to it. However, while there is increasing recognition of an emerging body of knowledge which can be organized into academically respectable crime-related programs, and increasing agreement as to how these programs should be organized, there is no agreement as to the title to be attached to these programs. The most popular titles for broadly based, academically oriented programs such as has been developed at Southern Oregon College are "criminal justice" and "criminology."
The four full-time staff members of Southern Oregon College's department of law enforcement are products of institutions using the designation "criminology." They believe the Southern Oregon College program is best identified by this title.

Board's Office Recommendation

The Board's Office recommended that the baccalaureate degree program in law enforcement at Southern Oregon College be redesignated as a program in criminology. Since the purpose of the change in designation of the program is more accurately to identify for students and employers the nature of the program offered at Southern Oregon College, the Board's Office recommended that the change in name be effective with the June 1974 graduating class.

Committee Discussion

President Sours introduced students from Southern Oregon College who were present to testify in support of the recommended change in designation. Miss McIntyre asked if graduates were really limited in prospective employment by the name of the degree program. The students responded that they had found this to be true. They emphasized the importance of making the change effective with the 1974 graduating class.

Dr. Romney commented that the problem of name had been a problem across the country. He said the most extensive study of the matter had been conducted in Florida. This study concluded that there was no single preferred name, but recommended that Florida institutions be authorized to title their programs criminal justice or criminology, whichever they choose.

Committee Recommendation

The Committee recommended that Southern Oregon College be authorized to change the name of its BA/BS degree program in law enforcement to criminology, effective June 1974.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.

Proposal for Establishment of Tri-State Program in Veterinary Medicine

The Board's Office presented to the Committee for its consideration a proposal developed by Oregon State University in accordance with and upon the recommendation of a statewide advisory committee on veterinary medicine and veterinary medical education that a tri-state, shared-curriculum program in veterinary medical education be established, using resources of Washington State University, Oregon State University, and the University of Idaho.

The proposal grows out of a series of studies that have been made over a two-year period.

The first of these studies was developed at the request of the Board's Office by an Oregon State University faculty committee, consisting of faculty from the department of veterinary medicine (Dr. E. Edward Wedman, chairman). Entitled Veterinary Medical Manpower Needs and Education in Oregon, the study was completed in December 1972, and submitted to the Board's Academic Affairs Committee at its February 20, 1973 meeting.

The Academic Affairs Committee accepted the report and recommended:

- that a planning committee be established by the Board's Office.
that the planning committee be charged with making an in-depth study of alternative approaches to meeting Oregon's needs for (1) an adequate supply of veterinary practitioners, and (2) adequate opportunities for qualified Oregon residents to gain entry into veterinary medical education.

that the planning committee recommend which of the alternative approaches identified by the committee appears to the committee to be the most desirable approach to meeting Oregon's needs.

that the planning committee provide a clear explication of the nature of the recommended approach to meeting Oregon's needs, together with an estimate of the costs involved.

that special funding be sought from the 1973 legislature in the amount of $25,000 to cover the costs of the planning.

Accordingly, the Board sought and received a $25,000 appropriation from the 1973 legislature for the foregoing study. Whereupon, the Chancellor, under authority of the Board, appointed a statewide committee consisting of individuals from various categories of users of veterinary medical services, the veterinary medical profession, Oregon State University, the Board's Office, and the public at large.

Named as chairman of the committee was Mr. J. W. Forrester, Jr., a former long-time member of the State Board of Higher Education, and a distinguished former president of the Board. Dr. E. Edward Wedman, head of the Oregon State University veterinary medicine department was named as executive secretary of the committee, with Dr. B. W. Kingrey, former dean of the school of veterinary medicine at the University of Missouri, as consultant to the committee.

Appointed in July 1973, the advisory committee rendered its report to the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs at the Committee's December 19, 1973, meeting. The report - Alternatives in Veterinary Medical Education - identified six alternative approaches to meeting Oregon's needs for veterinary medical education, and concluded by recommending to the Board that of these alternatives, the one which the committee felt had the most promise for Oregon, in terms of cost-effectiveness, is the development of a tri-state shared-curriculum program, tying together in a mutually beneficial way, the resources of the college of veterinary medicine at Washington State University and the hospital-clinic and related facilities to be built at Oregon State University and the University of Idaho.

In expressing its recommendations, the committee asserted:

- That the committee had solicited the views of a variety of organized groups, including the Oregon Veterinary Medical Association, Oregon Cattlemen's Association, Humane Society of the Willamette Valley, Oregon Animal Health Council, the Oregon Quarter Horse Association, and the Veterinary Medical Examining Board.

- That the concept of regional solutions to regional problems, exemplified by the recommended tri-state approach to veterinary medical education, is a long-established and proven concept in such areas as water conservation and use, woodland and recreation resource development and conservation, pollution control, transportation, and power development.

- That as plans are developed for the recommended tri-state shared-curriculum program in veterinary medical education, guidance and concurrence from the Council on Education of the American Veterinary Medical Association, the accrediting body for veterinary medical education, must be sought and obtained, for a shared curriculum involving three states is a new concept in veterinary medical education.
The Academic Affairs Committee of the State Board of Higher Education accepted, with an expression of appreciation, the committee's report as presented by Mr. Forrester (December 19, 1973) and asked (1) that work continue in the development of plans for a tri-state program; (2) that the "fleshed out" proposal be submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee, and, subsequently, to the Board of Higher Education, at the earliest practicable moment, consistent with the need for thoroughness, objectivity, and realism.

Mr. Forrester indicated that the committee felt that it had completed its principal task; that the development of the curricular and instructional programs and the funding and facility plans for the proposed programs are matters best dealt with by professionals such as Dr. Wedman and Dean Kingrey; that Drs. Wedman and Kingrey would develop the plans necessary to the establishment of the proposed program for consideration by the Academic Affairs Committee and by the Board.

The present proposal, titled Proposal for Establishment of a Tri-State Shared-Curriculum Program in Veterinary Medicine (Washington, Oregon, Idaho) is the result.

The Board's Office analysis of the Oregon State University proposal, included in the report of the proposal referred to above, is presented in a series of responses to selected questions designed to illuminate various aspects of the proposal in a manner we hope will be helpful to the Board. This analysis may be summarized as follows:

Is There a Need For a Program of Veterinary Medical Education in Oregon?

The program Oregon State University proposes is designed to assure Oregon:

- The veterinary medical manpower Oregon will need in the future.
- Reasonable access for qualified Oregon residents into a program of veterinary medical education opening up to them entry into the veterinary medical profession.

Meeting Oregon's Veterinary Medical Manpower Needs

As it stands at the present time, the only contribution Oregon is making toward the production of new veterinarians to meet its veterinary medical manpower needs is through the funds it pays to neighboring states (Washington, California, Colorado) for the Oregon residents they admit into their veterinary medical education programs through the student exchange program of the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE). (Twelve Oregon students were admitted into these programs in 1973-74.)

For each such student the state of Oregon pays the receiving institution $4,000 per year.

Compared with what it costs Oregon to educate students generally, that seems a large sum - approximately three times what Oregon appropriates annually per full-time student in the six multipurpose institutions. But compared with what the American Veterinary Medical Association says that it costs for veterinary medical education (approximately $10,000 per student per year), or compared with the state appropriation in Oregon for medical and dental education (approximately $7,500 and $6,750, respectively, per student) $4,000 seems a bargain.

Although Oregon is presently contributing little to the support of veterinary medical education, under this arrangement, Oregon has been able to attract to Oregon a sufficient number of veterinarians (there were 331 in 1972) to provide a ratio of 15 veterinarians per 100,000 population. An adequate, if not optimum, ratio of veterinarians to population has been suggested by the American Veterinary Medical Association as being 17.5 per 100,000.
Oregon might, were it sedulously to set about recruiting veterinarians, find it possible to recruit from among the Oregon residents who have completed their veterinary medical education in neighboring states, and from among other veterinarians in other states, enough veterinarians to meet Oregon's needs. Were that our goal, the Oregon State University study of veterinarians in Oregon (Veterinary Medical Manpower Needs and Education in Oregon, p. 43) indicates that we should need to recruit an average of approximately 29 veterinarians per year each year from 1972 to 1987 if, by 1987, Oregon is to move from its present ratio of 15 veterinarians per 100,000 population to the American Veterinary Medical Association-recommended 17.5 per 100,000 population.

However, there is from all accounts a nationwide shortage of veterinarians. The veterinarians Oregon attracts to the service of its people, beyond the contribution that Oregon makes toward the production of new veterinarians through the WICHE student exchange program, must be drawn from an already insufficient supply of veterinarians.

What Oregon's obligation ought to be toward meeting Oregon's needs for veterinarians through a veterinary medical education program producing new veterinarians is a matter of opinion and of judgment.

The option of increasing its contribution toward production of new veterinarians through the WICHE student exchange program or through some similar contractual relationship with existing colleges of veterinary medicine seems not open to Oregon. The limited and relatively inelastic enrollment capacity of colleges of veterinary medicine in neighboring states - and elsewhere, as well - coupled with the high interest of young people in those states in veterinary medicine as an occupational outlet, makes it apparent that access of Oregon residents to these colleges is, in the future, more likely to be diminished than increased.

Providing Access for Qualified Oregon Residents to a Program of Veterinary Medical Education

Whether and to what extent Oregon has an obligation to offer to qualified Oregon residents access to a program of veterinary medical education is, again, a matter of opinion and judgment.

It is a fact that:

- The number of student applicants to colleges of veterinary medicine has increased dramatically in the 17 colleges (of the total of 19 in the United States) for which data were available when Oregon State University made its study. In 1970-71, there were 5,551 applicants. By 1973 that number had risen to 10,018 - an 87 percent increase.

- The total number of students admitted to these 17 veterinary colleges had increased from 1,129 in 1970-71 to 1,306 in 1973-74 (an increase of 15.7 percent).

- The percentage of applicants who were admitted by these 17 colleges has declined from 21.1 percent in 1970-71, to 13.0 percent in 1973-74.

- Existing colleges of veterinary medicine have been holding the number of non-resident students admitted relatively constant, but with clear signals that, owing to finite resources and strong resident student interest they intend reducing the number of non-resident students admitted.

Obviously, if sufficient contract spaces in colleges of veterinary medicine could be assured Oregon residents under the favorable arrangements provided through the WICHE student exchange program, the costs to the state of producing a given number of veterinarians would be substantially below the cost of their production through a college of veterinary medicine established by Oregon or under the tri-state, shared-curriculum program proposed by Oregon State University.
Of course, such contract arrangements do not provide to the state some of the benefits that a state-based program of veterinary medical education would do, notably in the area of research and service to the state.

Inquiry has been made of existing colleges of veterinary medicine, including Washington State University, University of California at Davis, and Colorado State University, as to their willingness to provide places or an increased number of places in their entering classes for Oregon residents under the WICHE or similar student exchange programs. The response was the same in each case, namely that there was no likelihood that these institutions could guarantee admission of a larger number of Oregon residents; that the likelihood was greater that the current number (an average of 11 total over the past six years) will be reduced than increased.

Is the Tri-State, Shared-Curriculum Program the Answer?

The principal merit of the tri-state, shared-curriculum program such as is here proposed by Oregon State University is its relative economy when compared with the cost of establishing a college of veterinary medicine in Oregon to serve the state's needs.

There is general agreement among those most knowledgeable in the field of veterinary medicine that something in the neighborhood of 70 faculty members are necessary to the adequate coverage of the various specialized areas essential to a good quality college of veterinary medical education.

Obviously, resources of this magnitude can be economically used only when there is a sufficient enrollment to provide the critical mass of students necessary to a reasonable per pupil cost. That mass is assured when three states unite their needs and their resources. The entering class in the proposed program would be 110 students when the program is fully in operation (15 from Idaho, 30 from Oregon, 65 from Washington and other states).

But over against the expected economies made possible by a shared program must be set the complexities introduced by the program's dependence upon the actions of three state legislative assemblies, three separate Boards of Higher Education, three separate university faculties and administrations. These complexities must be understood and anticipated if reasoned decisions are to be made as to the wisdom of the tri-state, shared-curriculum approach to veterinary medical education for Oregon.

The complexities introduced by the shared-curriculum program arise out of the need to (1) arrive at an equitable distribution of the costs of the program among the three states, (2) insure the necessary legislative commitment to assure the establishment of the program and its continuation on a solid foundation, (3) insure the necessary rapport among the governing boards in the three states and the institutional faculties and administrative officers to assure that the interdependent aspects of the program that reach across three states are sufficiently integrated to assure an effective program, (4) assure that there is sufficient administrative muscle in some one locus to bring about the necessary coordination of institutional efforts. (Some institutional autonomy must be surrendered if the program is to be maintained on a continuing basis.)

It is the view of the Board's Office that if the proposed program is established, its merits will be sufficiently demonstrated as to commend it to the three legislatures for continuing support.

And the Board's Office believes that a lively awareness of the urgency of shared needs and of the mutual benefits which collaboration in the shared-curriculum program promises will be persuasive with governing boards and faculties alike; that they will willingly relinquish as much of the treasured institutional independence as may be necessary to assure the success of this important collaborative effort.
In that spirit, the Oregon State University proposal is that the program be managed by a council of deans operating under the administrative direction of a "super" dean, who might well be the dean of the college of veterinary medicine at Washington State University. It is felt that such an arrangement will provide adequately for the knitting together in rational fashion of the interdependent parts of the total program so as to qualify the total program for accreditation by the American Veterinary Medical Association.

What of the Curriculum?

The proposed tri-state program would provide (1) basic veterinary medical education programs, (2) opportunities for a limited number of residencies in selected fields of veterinary medicine, and (3) some continuing education resources.

A tentative curriculum for the basic program in veterinary medical education, has been drawn up by Oregon State University in collaboration with institutional representatives from Washington State University and the University of Idaho.

The basic professional program in veterinary medicine consists of four years of work, culminating in the awarding of the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) degree.

The proposed basic professional program described by Oregon State University in its present report consists of a core of course and clinical work, required of all students, and a variety of elective course and clinical work from which the students may select in building strengths in specific areas of specialization in veterinary medicine of special interest to them in their preparation for a professional career in veterinary medicine.

The division of the student's program between core courses and elective courses according to the present tentative proposal would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core courses</th>
<th>91 semester (136 quarter) hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elective courses</td>
<td>46 semester (69 quarter) hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The core would be required of all students, and would consist of 91 semester (136 quarter) hours of work in the basic biological processes related to an understanding of the nature, causes, and control of animal diseases, and the maintenance of animal health. Specifically, the core would consist of courses in the following areas: anatomy (gross and microscopic), physiology, pharmacology, microbiology, pathology, radiology, laboratory diagnosis, large animal medicine, surgery, small animal clinic.

Of the 91 semester (136 quarter) hours of required core courses, 76 semester (114 quarter) hours would be offered by the Washington State University and University of Idaho faculties in the Washington State University facilities in Pullman during the first two-and-a-half years of the student's program. The remaining 15 semester (22 quarter) hours in the core (consisting of four courses, one each in special animal medicine, large animal medicine II, surgery II, and large animal clinic orientation) would be offered at both Washington State University (for 65 students) and Oregon State University (for 45 students) during the last year-and-a-half of the student's program.

Elective courses would be available to students in the proposed program beginning with the second half of their second year in the program. Through these elective courses, students would build toward the completion of an area of specialization in veterinary medicine. Three areas of specialization are to be available in the program, as follows:

- Large animal medicine (beef and dairy cattle, sheep, swine, horses), to be available at both Washington State University and Oregon State University. Students electing this area of specialization would be required to complete 30 semester (45 quarter) hours in this area of specialization, of which 6 semester (9 quarter) hours must be in clinics.
Oregon State University would provide through its course offerings and clinical training programs in-depth training in bovine (cattle) and equine (horse) medicine, surgery, and reproduction.

Washington State University would give greater emphasis through its clinical programs to large animal medicine, swine, and equine medicine.

- Small animal medicine (dogs, cats, and other small pets) to be available at Washington State University. Thirty semester (45 quarter) hours would be required in this area of specialization for those students who elect to specialize in small animal medicine. Six semester (9 quarter) hours of this required work must be in clinics.

Oregon State University would offer some work in small animal medicine, but these courses would not be sufficiently specialized to enable a student to get the depth of preparation necessary to specialization in small animal medicine.

- Veterinary science (for students desiring careers in teaching, research, public health, or regulatory animal disease work), would be available at both Washington State University and Oregon State University. A minimum of 12 semester (18 quarter) hours in course work and 6 semester (9 quarter) hours of clinics in this area would be required of students who select this as an area of specialization.

Apart from the foregoing three areas of specialization from which students would be required to select their specialization area, Oregon State University and Washington State University would offer courses and clinical training relating to the care and treatment of animals, as follows:

- Oregon State University would offer courses and clinical training relating to captive and semi-captive animals, wildlife, poultry, and aquatic animal medicine.

- Washington State University would offer a greater range of courses in pathology and microbial (fungal, viral, bacterial) diseases.

Preceptorships. A significant aspect of the proposed program are the preceptorships which would be available to students in their senior year, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nature of Preceptorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willamette Valley, under auspices of Oregon State University</td>
<td>Equine medicine General practice (large, small animals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise Valley, under auspices of the University of Idaho</td>
<td>Food animal medicine Ovine (sheep) medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullman, under auspices of Washington State University</td>
<td>Small animal medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A preceptorship is in the nature of an internship in which the student has opportunity to work with practicing veterinarians in an organized program designed to offer the student opportunity to see applied, and to practice in applying, under field conditions, the principles of medicine which he has learned in the classroom and laboratory.

Laboratory diagnostic services from the campus-based hospital-clinic at Oregon State University and the University of Idaho clinic would provide important support for the preceptorships in Oregon and Idaho, respectively.

Post-Graduate Programs. The proposed program envisions the offering of residency training programs after the program gets under way. Those to be made available at Oregon State University are in internal medicine, surgery, theriogenology
(animal reproduction), radiology, and anesthesiology. Residencies would be available for the first time in 1979-80 when two residencies are proposed. The number would never be large.

Master of science degrees are now offered by Oregon State University in veterinary microbiology, veterinary pathology, veterinary toxicology, and veterinary parasitology. These programs would be strengthened by the staff additions in the proposed college of veterinary medicine, and at some point in the future, Oregon State University would probably give consideration to the possibility of requesting authorization to offer programs leading to the PhD degree in selected of the veterinary medical sciences.

Continuing Education. It is anticipated that some provision would be made for continuing education for veterinarians, through work offered off-campus as well as through on-campus work. For instance, practicing veterinarians would be permitted to enroll in some of the regular campus clinical work on a space-available basis to sharpen their existing skills or to acquire new skills.

What of the Cost?

The cost to Oregon of the proposed program consists of:

- The capital costs necessary to the construction of a hospital-clinic during the period 1976-77 and 1977-78 - at a cost of $6.0 million in 1973 dollars for the building and necessary moveable equipment.

- The current annual operating costs which would begin at an estimated $50,600 in 1975-76, when the only current operating costs would be for the salaries of two part-time faculty and one secretary who would be involved in the planning process, and rise to an estimated $983,030 by 1981-82.

Offsets against the foregoing estimated costs, are projected as follows:

- Although there can be no certainty about the availability of federal funding to offset a portion of the estimated $6.0 million cost of the building and equipment, HEW officials in the Pacific region suggest that significant federal participation in the cost of the building is possible. Every effort will be made to secure as much federal funding as possible.

- The offsets against current operating costs are estimated by Oregon State University to be some $320,150 in 1981-82, when the program is in full operation. If this estimate is reasonably accurate, the new state funds required to cover operating costs in 1981-82 would be $662,880 ($983,030 less $320,150).

The source and amount of these offsets in 1981-82 are projected as follows:

- Clinic fees, $65,000
- Student fees, $105,000
- HEW Capitation funds, (if available) $150,150

The Division of Costs
Among the Three States

One of the complexities of a regional instructional program arises from the need to parcel out to each participating state, in an equitable manner, the benefits of the program in the form of student access to the program, and to assign to each state a share of the costs of the program commensurate with the benefits expected to accrue to the state and its people.
The Oregon State University proposal is that there be reserved to resident students from each state the slots necessary to provide the state with the veterinarians that it projects it will need in the future to maintain a reasonable ratio of veterinarians to the total population. According to the Washington State University, Oregon State University, and University of Idaho representatives these numbers would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Slots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington (and other WICHE states whose students Washington desires to admit)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution among the three states of the costs of the program is presently proposed as follows:

- **Capital costs.** Washington already has a physical plant in which it offers its veterinary medical education program. But the plant is deficient, according to the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), the national accrediting association, and is one of the reasons that the Washington State University college of veterinary medicine does not presently have AVMA accreditation.

  Washington State University proposes to seek legislative support for remedying this shortcoming by constructing a $12 million building as an addition to its existing physical plant.

  The University of Idaho is asking the Idaho legislature for $1.5 million in construction funds to be expanded in 1975-76 and 1976-77 for the construction and equipping of clinic facilities in Idaho.

  Oregon State University's proposal is that the legislature be asked to fund the construction of a hospital-clinic on the Corvallis campus at a cost of $6.0 million in 1973 dollars.

- **Current Operating Costs.** The division of the current operating costs among the three institutions is not presently entirely clear and will await some further clarification as the planning proceeds.

  In the first years of the program (1975-76 and 1976-77), Oregon State University proposes that the State of Oregon continue to pay to Washington State University, as it now does, $4,000 per year per Oregon student in the Washington State University veterinary medical education program. Beginning in 1977-78, however, Oregon State University proposes that such payments be discontinued, and that it be deemed that the shared-curriculum is in full effect, with each school making its contribution toward the total program in kind - that is through the programs that it offers, with no exchange of money between or among the institutions or between or among state governments and the institutions in the neighboring states (Washington and Idaho, in Oregon's case).

  Under these arrangements, the University of Idaho is seeking from the Idaho legislature a current operating appropriation amounting to $135,000 in 1974-75, $270,000 in 1975-76, $495,000 in 1976-77, and $675,000 in 1977-78.

  Washington State University will seek continued funding of its veterinary medical education program, the budget for which is presently $3,200,000.
Oregon State University is proposing the the Board of Higher Education seek from the legislature, current operating funds ranging in amount from $50,600 in 1975-76 to $983,030 in 1981-82 when the program is fully in effect. The projected offsets against the cost are shown on p. 41. Although no one may know for certain what the chances are of Oregon State University getting capitation grants, which are an offset against the cost of the program, in the light of recent developments, it would appear that to count on such capitation funds in the future may be quite unrealistic.

Board's Office Recommendation

The Board's Office recommended that the Academic Affairs Committee accept, as a logical expression of the recommendations of the state advisory committee on veterinary medical manpower and education, the present proposal to the effect that Oregon participate with the states of Washington and Idaho in the development of a tri-state shared-curriculum program in veterinary medical education; and that the Committee endorse the state's participation in a shared program, contingent upon the funding plans, as they are finally evolved, being acceptable to the Committee.

Acceptance by the Academic Affairs Committee of the concept of a tri-state, shared-curriculum program need not imply the Committee's endorsement of every aspect of the present draft of the proposal. For in the development of the plans for such a program there are necessarily difficult problems of coordination growing out of the participation in the planning of three different universities, in three contiguous states, managed by three different Boards of Trustees and funded by three different state legislatures. As the present proposal indicates, there remain important consultations to be held among university officials in the three universities.

As Oregon officials confer further with their Washington and Idaho counterparts in the further clarification of the proposal for joint action in the field of veterinary medicine, it would be helpful to have some expression from the Academic Affairs Committee as to whether the general concept, as it is now seen, seems acceptable.

If the Academic Affairs Committee acts favorably upon this recommendation, it is assumed that Dr. Wedman and Dr. Kingrey, the staff for the study, will continue to work with their counterparts in Washington and Idaho to refine the plans still further, so that by the time the Board of Higher Education considers the recommendations of its Academic Affairs Committee, additional refinements will have been made in the preparation of the proposal for submission to the legislature - assuming, of course, that the plan, as it is developed, is endorsed by the Board.

Committee Discussion

Dr. Romney said the regional approach to provision of adequate veterinary medicine educational facilities has great appeal, and is well accepted both regionally and nationwide. While the approach does have some inherent complexities, given the great interest in the tri-state program on the part of the three universities which would be involved, it is felt the program could be operated effectively and with advantage to the contributing states. Dr. Romney continued that he had sought review of the proposal by some of the outstanding veterinary medical educators in the nation. He summarized responses received from Dean William J. Tietz, Colorado State University; Dean W. W. Amistead, Michigan State University; and Dean W. R. Pritchard, University of California (Davis). The deans indicated that they had reviewed the Oregon State University plans in detail, that they felt (a) that the proposed program was academically sound, and (b) that estimates of operating budget and physical plant costs were reasonable in terms of 1973 dollars. The deans were particularly complimentary about the plans for preceptorships incorporated in the proposed program.
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In respect to costs, Dr. Romney observed that building costs for a teaching hospital and clinic in Corvallis were estimated at $6,000,000 in 1973 dollars and operating costs for the instruction in Oregon, once the program was fully operative, in excess of $900,000 per year. Offsets to the operating cost in the form of student fees, clinic fees, and federal assistance might bring the annual operating cost to be financed by state appropriation to $600,000-$700,000 per year. This is considerably more than the $172,000 per year the state is paying for 43 students enrolled in out-of-state veterinary medical schools under WIGHE contracts, but is not excessive if compared with the cost of educating some 120 Oregon students (30 students entering the program each year as proposed in the tri-state program) in out-of-state schools, especially if the cost per student goes up to the $7,000-$8,000 per year being charged for contract students by some veterinary medical schools. The fact is, he said, there appears to be no possibility that the veterinary medical education needs of the state can be met through contracts with out-of-state schools.

Dr. Romney said the cost figures for Washington and Idaho included in the report do not appear directly comparable with estimates projected for the Oregon portion of the operation. Officials of the three universities will be meeting in early May to develop budgetary estimates which will give a clear picture of the financial contribution each state would make under the shared-curriculum program.

Mr. Corey said he assumed there would need to be some kind of interstate compact to assure adequate and continued funding of the school. He noted that one legislature cannot bind a succeeding legislature to any program or funding pattern.

Dr. Romney said this was a problem with any multi-state program. Regional programs must be based on interstate compacts, and this is the procedure that would be followed for the veterinary medicine proposal.

Mr. Westerdahl observed that the only issue before the Committee was whether it agreed or disagreed with the tri-state approach, and wished or did not wish officials of Oregon State University to continue discussions directed toward working out the details of how the curriculum and costs would be equitably shared. He said he felt the tri-state approach made a lot of sense. Responding to Mr. Corey's observation, he said that no legislature could commit succeeding legislatures to a funding pattern, but this has not been a real problem for other interstate programs.

President MacVicar said WIGHE was very concerned about the problem of veterinary medical education, and had appointed a task force to look into ways of increasing opportunities in this field. Of the 10-11 options examined by the task force, the overwhelming first choice was for regional development. A shared-curriculum program, such as is being proposed in the northwest, has decided advantages in maintaining continued support from the participating states, in that each state's money is being spent at home in a way that builds local identification and support and provides in-state diagnostic and continuing education services, rather than being used to buy services in some other state. He said he believes it could be shown that the investment of Oregon money in veterinary medical education would more than be returned to the state in taxes, because of increased income to producers resulting from improved animal health. He said he had no hesitancy about coming to the Board in a time of financial exigency with a proposal to add a professional program, because not only would the program provide opportunity for young men and women to enter the profession of veterinary medicine, but it would very substantially add to the wealth of the state. Here is something we ought to do, he concluded, not only because it is right but because it is in the state's economic interest.

Mr. Corey asked if there was any way Eastern Oregon State College could participate in the program. Dr. Wedman said the present proposal would provide two preceptorships, and the present thinking is that one would be in eastern Oregon and one in western Oregon, but that the precise location for the preceptorships had not been determined.
Mrs. Johnson inquired concerning student fees for a veterinary medical program. Dr. Wedman said Washington State University presently charges students nearly $1,000 per year, and this figure might well be increased.

Mr. Corey asked if any provision had been made for WICHE students in the tri-state program. Dr. Wedman said present thinking is that 15 WICHE students would be accepted each year as part of the Washington State University student quota. However, after the program gets underway, he said, there might be a possibility of increasing the numbers of students who would take the latter portion of their work on the Corvallis campus, thereby enabling the program to increase the number of slots made available under WICHE agreements. Montana, Nevada, and Utah all have asked how they might participate in the program, he said, and in the beginning at least, it is expected this participation will be under WICHE contracts.

Mrs. Johnson asked if there was any other movement in the west to create regional programs. Dr. Lieuallen said that there was no proposal as detailed as the one under consideration by the committee, but that Colorado was proposing to solve this problem by asking other states to contribute to expansion of veterinary medicine educational facilities in Colorado. The OSU-WSU-UI proposal has merit, he said, because the contributions of each state will be used to develop resources within that state which will not be lost, should the state decide at some future time to develop individual programs.

Mr. Mosser asked if the cost estimates incorporate an inflation factor. President MacVicar responded that all figures were in 1973-74 dollars.

Committee Recommendation

Mr. Holmes moved that the Committee approve the tri-state shared-curriculum concept. Mrs. Johnson, Mr. Corey, and Mr. Maden concurred.

The Committee asked Oregon State University to proceed forthwith with discussions with Washington and Idaho, with the anticipation that more detailed proposals concerning the contribution of each state to the support of the program would be available for presentation to the Board at its May 21 meeting, if possible.

Board Discussion and Action

President MacVicar said he had further discussions with the presidents of Washington State University and the University of Idaho following the April 23 Committee meeting. The relationships between Washington State University and the University of Idaho are substantially under way. A draft of a memorandum of understanding has been prepared and will be considered by the State of Idaho later this year. The Idaho Legislature has appropriated funds for capital construction and operations and as a result Washington State University admitted 12 students this year from Idaho. Dr. MacVicar said Washington State University has applied for a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to assist in the implementation of the plan. He said preliminary discussion seems to indicate the plan is feasible and appropriate although there are still many details to be resolved in the matter of curricular development.

The Board approved the concept as recommended, with the understanding that there would be further reports and discussions in the development of the program.

(Considered by the Academic Affairs Committee, April 23, 1974; present--Johnson, Corey, Holmes, Maden, McIntyre.)

Staff Report to the Committee

The Academic Affairs Committee forwards to the Board, with recommendation for acceptance, the 1973-74 report of the Oregon State System Commission on the Marine Sciences.
Precedent to the preparation of its report, the Commission visited and examined the resources of the Oregon State University Marine Science Center at Newport and the University of Oregon's Oregon Institute of Marine Biology at Charleston (in July 1973), and subsequently met on a second and third occasion (November and December 1973) with the staffs of these two centers to hear further reports of activities being carried on there, and to examine and discuss proposed plans for further development of the two centers.

Copies of the report are on file in the Board's Office.

In its 1973-74 report, the Commission affirms its conviction:

1. That the Marine Science Center at Newport and the Oregon Institute of Marine Biology at Charleston are both significant educational centers, offering programs consistent with the missions of the Universities and the State System of Higher Education.

2. That Oregon State University has principal responsibilities for instruction and research in fisheries and oceanography; that all three State System universities (OSU, UO, PSU) require access to marine science resources as integral parts of the programs in the biological sciences authorized them by the Board of Higher Education; that there is evidence of cooperation and sharing of instructional and research facilities in the marine sciences at Newport and Charleston.

3. That the Marine Science Center at Newport and the Oregon Institute of Marine Biology at Charleston should continue to be administered separately by Oregon State University and the University of Oregon; that coordination ought to be effected by interaction of faculties and administrators, aided by the State System Commission on the Marine Sciences which reviews proposed program developments involving new facilities or significant changes in existing facilities at Newport and Charleston.

4. That the proposed facilities improvements, as set forth in the Commission's report (pp. 5a-10a), be accepted as a guide for facilities development, subject, of course, to periodic review by the managing universities, the Commission on the Marine Sciences, the Building Committee and other members of the State Board of Higher Education.

(It should be noted that the facility improvement plans for Newport p. 6a do not coincide in every particular with the list of building priorities of the Office of Facilities Planning. The Commission expects, however, that those items on the list of proposed improvements which are not specifically included in the Office of Facilities Planning list will either be subsumed under one of the marine science items in the Office of Facilities Planning list - e.g., 'Marine Science Dormitory Addition' - or that the item will be funded by a gift or grant, subject to appropriate action by the Board and the Legislature.)

5. That the continuing development of facilities, as proposed in the Commission report, will improve the instructional and research capacities of these two universities, enabling them to serve more effectively not alone their own students, but equally, students from the public schools and from other public and independent colleges and universities, and the general public, as well.

Attention is invited to the precepts upon which are based the proposed plans for the development of the physical facilities of the UO Oregon Institute of Biology at Charleston as they are reproduced immediately below. For they speak somewhat to the differentiation of the proposed developments at Charleston from those proposed for Newport, and they clarify several matters concerning which there have, on earlier occasions, been questions by members of the Board.
1. There will be no significant increase in the size of the existing program (100 students).
2. The program will continue to emphasize undergraduate education.
3. The Institute will continue to offer low-cost accommodations.
4. The physical facilities will continue to be located on the lower "boat basin" site.

[The Board may recall that on earlier occasions, the long-range plan proposed by the University of Oregon for the development of the Institute's physical facilities, had envisioned the establishment of new physical facilities on an eminence overlooking the boat basin - an area substantially more removed from the harbor area than the existing facilities. That plan has been abandoned in favor of the existing site, contiguous to the Charleston harbor.]

5. The facilities will be blended into the Charleston harbor so as to maintain the character of the harbor.
6. Existing temporary facilities will be replaced over a ten-year period.
7. The facilities will be available to all of Oregon's institutions of higher education.

Board's Office Recommendation

The Board's Office recommended that the Academic Affairs Committee:

. Accept the report of the Commission on Marine Sciences.
. Accept the general premises set forth by the Commission. [Summarized as priorities 1-5, p. 55 of these minutes.]

The foregoing action by the Board's Committee would not imply the Committee's approval in detail or in the time sequence proposed in the Commission's report of the additions to or modifications in the physical facilities at Newport and Charleston, proposed in the Commission's report. It would be expected that all capital construction requests would be reviewed in the usual manner by the Building Committee and other members of the Board.

Committee Discussion

Dr. Roy A. Young, Vice-President for Research and Graduate Studies, Oregon State University, Chairman of the Commission, presented the Commission's report. He noted that the Commission was established some three years ago, consisting of representatives from Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University. There were on the committee, in addition to Dr. Young, Dr. Aaron Novick, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Oregon, and Dr. Karl Dittmer, Dean of the College of Science, Portland State University. The Commission was expanded last year to include three public members: Mr. Don Frisbee, Portland; Mr. Nils Hult, Eugene; and Dr. Ralph Purvine, Salem. Dr. Young commended the Board for its decision to add public members to the Commission, saying they had contributed generously of their time and experience to the Commission's work.

He said it was obvious to the Commission that programs of the coastal installations had been limited by facilities. The Commission found the proposals for new facilities well designed to meet the needs of the institutions and the increasing needs from other institutions, public and private, and of public school students.
The Commission recommends that the Charleston installation continue under separate (University of Oregon) administration. The Commission found that good coordination of the Charleston and Newport facilities and programs is being obtained, and do not believe there is undesirable duplication. It noted both facilities are used to capacity.

The Commission regretted the necessity of returning the Port Orford property to the federal government, but felt that considering the difficulties in operating the facility efficiently, the decision was wise.

The Commission also feels the University of Oregon's decision to continue the Charleston Institute on its present site, rather than moving to the hilltop location, is wise.

Dr. Novick confirmed that it is the decision of the University of Oregon to keep the institute facility where it is, and to maintain its present informal atmosphere. He pointed out that the physical plant improvement program at Charleston is really a maintenance plan to enable the Institute to continue to provide its present level of services. He said the present dormitories are totally inadequate and must be replaced, but the new facilities will be kept simple. The only funds to be requested from the legislature are for small teaching laboratories, one accommodating 20 students in the 1975-77 biennium and a larger one, accommodating 40 students, in 1979-1981.

Dr. Young reviewed the facility improvement program for the Newport station, as presented in the Commission's report. He said some of the improvements requested will enable the institute to accommodate people from other institutions, which cannot be done at this time.

Mr. Corey asked the location of the 20 acres of land recently donated to the University of Oregon for the Marine Biology Institute at Charleston, and inquired as to whether there was any need to expand the facility. Dr. Novick said the land was given for research and educational purposes, and is to be kept in its natural state. He said he did not contemplate that money would be available to expand the facility, and the University had no plans for expansion.

Mrs. Johnson said she agreed the decision to keep the facility at its present location is a wise one. She asked Dr. Dittmer if he could comment on how much cooperation there is between the Charleston and Newport facilities, and how much cooperation between the facilities and other institutions.

Dr. Dittmer said the summer program at Charleston is open to students from a variety of institutions. The fall term is devoted primarily to courses for regularly enrolled students of the University of Oregon, although students from other institutions enroll without difficulty. Winter term is fairly open, and staffs of other institutions find it fairly easy to schedule the facility for two-week stays. Spring term, the facility is heavily used by the University of Oregon for its interdisciplinary "Man and the Coast" program. He said as far as he knew, Portland State University had never had any difficulty using either the Newport or Charleston facilities. He said Portland State University feels the State System has a wonderful investment in these two facilities, that there is good cooperation, and the programs are complementary. He pointed out that there is no need for cooperation between the ship facility at Newport and the facility at Charleston, because the Charleston facility is not engaged in oceanic research. The need for coordination comes in the basic sciences, and here there is cooperation. There is some duplication of instructional programs, but dormitories at both facilities are filled to capacity, and students attending one program could not be accommodated in the other.

Dr. Young said he knew the Board had been concerned about whether the facilities would be better operated under a single administrator. He said the Commission concluded that all that would be accomplished by such a change would be to add another layer of administration, which is not needed.
Dr. Novick said he was sensitive to the Board's desire that the University of Oregon and Oregon State University not engage in foot races with each other. He said he was extremely pleased about the present relationships that had been developed between the two coastal facilities, but feels it wise to continue to review the situation periodically. In response to a question from Mrs. Johnson, he said a single administration for the two facilities would not assist the installations in seeking federal funds, because they do not compete with each other but rather with researchers and institutions nationwide.

Mr. Maden moved to accept the report of the Commission and the general premises set forth in the summary.

Committee Recommendation

The Committee recommended that the Board accept the report of the Commission on Marine Sciences and the general principles set forth by the Commission. (Points 1-5, p. 55).

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Committee

The Board's Office proposes the development in Portland of a Pacific Rim Studies Center, the central, dominant purpose of which will be development of long-term, positive relationships between Portland, the state as a whole, and the Pacific Rim countries, to the mutual benefit of Oregon and the Pacific Rim nations.

Oregon, as a state fronting on the Pacific, with four international ports (Portland, Coos Bay, Astoria, Newport), and with an energetic and enterprising population, has a great stake in maintaining an active, creative role in the developments that will shape the relationships of the United States - and particularly of the Pacific Coast - with countries of the Pacific Rim in this last quarter of the 20th century.

In economic terms, Oregon's ties with its Pacific Rim neighbors are already very considerable. In a recent 12-month period, trade between just one of these East Asian countries (Japan) and Oregon amounted, according to Governor McCall, to almost one-half billion dollars, $300,000 of it moving from Oregon's ports to Japan. More than 300 Portland export and import firms did business with Pacific Rim countries in 1972. By 1980, it is predicted by the Port of Portland that approximately 88 percent of the foreign trade of the Portland Harbor will be with Pacific Rim countries.

The foregoing is one aspect of the context within which there has developed in Oregon governmental circles, in the Oregon business and industrial community, and in Oregon's colleges and universities, a lively interest in working together to develop long-term, positive, mutually beneficial relationships between Oregon and its Pacific Rim neighbors.

The present proposal is the most recent in a series of developments through which the State Board of Higher Education has become involved with the Pacific Rim Studies concept. These developments culminated with an allocation of $100,000 by the Emergency Board for the development of a Pacific Rim Studies Center which, although interinstitutional in character, should be located at Portland State University with the director responsible to Portland State University's president, but with an advisory committee consisting of representatives of State System institutions and the business community serving to advise in the development and maintenance of the center.
The Center was established in September 1973, with Dr. Easton Rothwell, a former member of the Stanford University faculty with substantial educational and governmental experience, as the acting director. Dr. Rothwell, with the assistance of two advisory committees - one statewide, the other national - developed a program plan and a proposed 1973-1975 biennial budget of $672,000 for the center, and launched a number of planning and other activities. During the 1973 legislative session, the foregoing budget request was reduced to $435,000, but the legislature appropriated no funds for the support of the center, whereupon the acting director of the center resigned and the Portland State University center ceased its operations for lack of funding. The legislature did appropriate $375,000, which it placed with the Emergency Board, to be released when a plan for its expenditure satisfactory to the Department of Economic Development had been developed.

In August 1973, Chancellor Llewellyn, with the concurrence of the Department of Economic Development and the Port of Portland, submitted to the Emergency Board a proposal, a brief description of a proposed State System center to determine whether the Emergency Board would be interested in the State System's presenting a "fleshed out" plan of the character suggested by the Chancellor's brief presentation.

The present proposal is that "fleshed out" expansion of the outline presented to the Emergency Board by the Chancellor in August.

Nature of the Center's Program

The economic warrant for Oregon's interest in establishing closer ties with our Pacific neighbors is apparent. What must be equally apparent, if Oregon's interests - including its economic interests - are to be served, is that the key to effective relationships with these neighbors and trading partners lies in our developing an understanding of and appreciation for their cultures, their mores and customs, their value systems, their languages and their political and economic systems - and all that makes them different from, and like us.

Hence, while the center's initial emphasis will be upon social, economic, and political aspects of Pacific Rim nations, the center must also be concerned, in some aspects of its operations, with the philosophical, literary, artistic, and historical backgrounds of the peoples of the Pacific Rim countries.

It is the Board's Office thesis that Oregon's colleges and universities are repositories of rich resources - in the form of their faculties and students - upon which the state ought to draw in generating enduring, mutually beneficial relationships with its Pacific Rim neighbors.

The proposed center would place these institutional resources at the disposal of the state through (a) public service programs, (b) research programs, (c) instructional programs. These, it will be noted, are the three major functions of colleges and universities, although they are, under other circumstances, traditionally listed in the reverse order. Each of these elements of the center's program is described below.

Public Service Programs. Public Service programs of the center would include such activities as: (1) short courses, conferences, seminars, public lectures, tours and exhibitions, relating to matters having relevance to the building of mutually beneficial ties between Oregon and Pacific Rim nations, (2) maintenance of a clearinghouse for accumulation and dissemination of information concerning relevant economic, social, political trends in Pacific Rim countries, and, to the extent resources will permit, a record of current research under way or completed, (3) the promotion of exchange visits of students, faculty, businessmen, artists, and the like, with Pacific Rim nations.

The clearinghouse function is seen as an integral, essential part of the center's services.
It would enable the center to become a source of information about a great variety of matters relating to the Pacific Rim countries and Oregon's relationships with those countries (e.g., information concerning available educational programs and courses in Oregon's colleges and universities which relate to the Pacific Rim nations; a current roster of personnel from Oregon's academic, professional, and business communities who are engaged in Pacific Rim-related activities; information concerning available Pacific Rim consultants; sources of technical help, and business possibilities; information concerning relevant research being carried on in Oregon or elsewhere of particular relevance to Oregon's known or potential interests in Pacific Rim nations).

The extent of the clearinghouse function would depend upon the resources available. Initially, it would be a modest operation, but as it proved itself, its capacity for service could be expanded.

Research. Research and consultative capacities of the universities would be used in a variety of ways to develop important ties with Pacific Rim neighbors.

- For instance, the universities would provide research and consultative services under contract or grant to government, business, and other agencies and groups in the Pacific Rim countries in identifying and helping to solve problems of policy and practice that require resolution or amelioration if these countries are to develop economically and to have stable and representative political processes, and external security.

- Those same university research resources would be available to American firms, governmental units and other agencies in the study of problems related to Pacific Rim countries and Oregon relationships therewith. During its brief existence (1972-73), the Portland State University Pacific Rim Studies Center contracted for one such research effort which has since been published, entitled "Study of Oregon Trade and Investment in Pacific Rim."

It is proposed that a portion of the Legislative funds for support of a Pacific Rim Studies Center be designated for promotion and funding of relevant research, and that these funds be allocated to the universities participating in the center activities on the basis of approved research proposals.

To assure the relevance of the research undertaken, a research grant award committee would be established and charged with the responsibility: (1) to establish criteria in terms of which research proposals will be evaluated, and (2) to evaluate research proposals and to make the research grant awards.

It is expected that the small center staff would not, itself, carry on any research, but would serve important functions in the furtherance of the research effort by: (1) serving as a clearinghouse of bibliographic records pertaining to research undertaken in participating institutions and from elsewhere, as well, as having particular relevance to the Pacific Rim region, (2) serving as a catalyst in assisting in the identification of needed research and in identifying the kinds of research that ought to have priority, (3) encouraging and participating in the search for funds from private sources with which research of relevance to the center's interests may be carried on.

Instructional Programs. Initially, the center will build upon existing programs and courses relating to the Pacific Rim, which are already available in Oregon's public and independent colleges and universities.

However, study would be given to the development of additional curricula necessary to integrate existing Pacific Rim programs and courses, and to add, where it seems desirable, additional curricula in the institutions for the purpose of providing for specialized degrees or certificates relating to the application of particular disciplines to the cultural, social, economic, political, religious, and similar aspects of the Pacific Rim area.
Illustrative of possible approaches to integration of existing Pacific Rim courses is the proposal for a Pacific Rim certificate program developed at Portland State University.

In addition to assisting the institutions in the development of organized certificate or degree programs, the director of the center, in consultation and cooperation with the colleges and universities or other appropriate agencies, will organize special workshops, seminars, conferences, public lectures, tours, exhibits relating to the Pacific Rim countries.

Administrative Organization and Function

The central office of the center will be established in Portland.

The center's activities will be under the general management of the director, who will be administratively responsible to the Chancellor.

To advise with the director and the Chancellor concerning the continuing development of the center, an advisory committee will be appointed, giving representation to (1) the executive branch of government (Department of Economic Development), (2) the legislative branch of government, (3) Oregon's international ports, (4) representatives of business and industry, (5) representatives of higher education in Oregon, including public and independent colleges and universities.

The center will have a small staff, consisting of the director and one assistant director to whom will be assigned developmental and supervisory responsibilities, (as the director shall determine to be desirable) and necessary secretarial assistance. Funds assigned to the director's office will be used in support of the small central office staff and to purchase released time of faculty and others on a temporary basis.

The primary efforts of the central office staff will be to work with existing agencies, organizations, and institutions in the identification of the activities and functions that ought, under the Pacific Rim Studies concept, to be given priority, and then to work with these and other organizations and agencies in identifying the most effective ways of undertaking the activities thus identified.

In most instances, the role of the center staff would be that of a catalytic agent - to get things going and to encourage their continuing improvement. The center itself would seek to work through other organizations in the achievement of the center's objectives.

The proposed budget for 1974-75 for the Pacific Rim Studies Center is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary 4 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel, telephone and supplies</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPE</td>
<td>$7,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$63,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Rental and Equipment</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Service
Short courses, seminars, colloquia
Conferences, exhibits and visiting speakers
Exchange Travel

Research
Program of research grant awards

Instructional Support

Total

Board's Office Recommendation

The Board's Office recommended that the Board approve the proposal for the establishment of a Pacific Rim Studies Center as proposed in this present report, or as amended in accordance with the wishes of the Board, and that the Board authorize the Chancellor to request funds from the Emergency Board to launch the Pacific Rim Studies Center in 1974-75.

Committee Discussion

Dr. Romney said the present proposal for a Pacific Rim Studies Center is very similar to the proposal for such a center approved by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board at its August 29, 1972, meeting. The principal difference between the proposals is that in the proposal before the Committee the center would be autonomous within the State System, reporting directly to the Chancellor, rather than attached to a single institution.

Mrs. Johnson asked what was the involvement of the independent institutions in Oregon in the preparation of the plan for the center. Dr. Romney replied that the independent institutions were not involved in preparation of the present proposal, but they were actively involved in preparation of the 1972 presentation. The examples of resources and possible research projects in the present proposal could easily have included listings of resources of the independent institutions, he said, and this probably should have been done. He said he would expand the examples given to include examples of resources of both independent colleges and universities and non-educational agencies in further presentations of the proposal.

Mr. Mosser asked if job descriptions had been developed for the director and assistant director positions. He said he could not visualize why two administrators would be needed. Moreover, he said he would like to be assured that in selecting people for these positions, the System had clearly in mind the job to be done by each.

Dr. Romney said the Board's Office would be pleased to provide job descriptions. He said it was contemplated the director would have overall administrative responsibilities and be responsible for the planning and administration of the programs, including efforts to generate new support for the programs of the Pacific Rim and the assistant director would be responsible for the clearinghouse activities and for assisting the director in the manifold responsibilities he will have.

Mrs. Johnson asked if any of the plans developed by Portland State University during 1972-73 when they had $100,000 for the support of a Pacific Rim Studies Center would be helpful. Dr. Romney said material prepared by Dr. Rothwell had been made available to the Board's Office. He said the Portland State University plan was much more centered at Portland State University than the program presently proposed for Board consideration, but the areas of service considered are pretty much the same (public service, research, instruction).
Mrs. Johnson asked if the Department of Economic Development had been involved in development of the plan. Dr. Romney said that the Department was given copies of the proposal in rough draft form and later in finished draft form and was asked for any suggestions they might have. Mr. Westerdahl said he felt the Department looked at the proposal somewhat in the same way as the Port of Portland - that it was appropriate to review the proposal in a general way, but not appropriate to become involved in development of specific details of the plan.

Professor Karlin Capper-Johnson, Lewis and Clark College, discussed the role of the independent colleges. He said the advisory committee should be an important resource for the center and observed that advisory committees such as are provided for in the plan before the Board can perform greatly different roles - they can be largely ignored or they can be effective bodies whose advice is sought and frequently taken. Dr. Romney said the latter role is the one envisioned by the Board's Office.

The Committee reviewed the role of the recommended advisory committee. Dr. Lieuallen said usually committees of this kind are appointed by the Chancellor and report to the Board's Office and to the Board, and he assumed this would be the procedure in the appointment and employment for this committee. Dr. Romney said that in the selection of the proposed advisory committee, the Board's Office would seek recommendations from all the agencies, groups, and institutions whom it was hoped would be involved in the work of the center, including the legislative and executive branches of the state government, public and private institutions, the port authorities, private business and others.

Acting President Anderson said Portland State University is prepared to cooperate fully with the center, and has submitted to the Board's Office an assessment of the potential existing at Portland State University for research projects and the existing curricular offerings deemed relevant to the Pacific Rim. In the development of the plan for the center submitted to the 1973 Legislature, he said, Portland State University gave much thought to how the center could foster interinstitutional cooperation involving both public and private institutions, and concluded that while instructional programs could not be operated in that fashion, service and research activities could. The plans developed by Portland State University for the center were very similar to those now before the Committee, with the exception that the core of the proposed Portland State University program was undergraduate instruction, conducted at the center.

Dr. Anderson said he felt the administrative housing of the center was an important question, because the question really is whether the Board wishes to set up centers having a heavy instructional assignment independent from one of the institutions. He said he felt there were many factors, including political ones, which led to legislative rejection of Portland State University's proposal for the center, and that some of these factors are no longer operative.

Mr. Westerdahl asked if Dr. Anderson differed with the recommendation before the Committee other than in respect to how it should be administratively housed. Mr. Westerdahl said the original proposal for the center came to the Board on the Board's initiative. The recommendation from the original advisory committee appointed by the Board (1972) was that the center be administratively responsible to and operate directly under the Chancellor. This was changed by the Board to give responsibility for the center to Portland State University. He asked if Portland State University was now asking the Board to follow the same course of action again. He said that previously certain faculty and student elements at Portland State University had been strongly and very vocally opposed to the development of the Pacific Rim Studies Center. He asked if there was still opposition to the center from student and faculty groups at Portland State University. Vice-President Blumel said he could not say that there would be no opposition of this kind if the center were again assigned to Portland State University, but that the program proposal developed by the center during its year of operation (1972-73) had done much to reassure the faculty concerning the kind of activities to be carried on by the center.
Mrs. Johnson said her concern about assigning an activity of this kind to a single campus was that institutional interests would tend to encourage development of instructional programs and resources at the center which are already available on other campuses in the state, both public and private.

Dr. Blumel said it was Portland State University's opinion that the instructional program would have to be institutional, but that research and public service programs could clearly be interinstitutional, and this was the intent of the Portland State University plan.

Mrs. Johnson said she recognized the difficulty of drawing upon instructional resources of a variety of institutions, including the public and private four-year institutions and the community colleges, but this is a problem that must be confronted, and the most likely mechanism for accomplishing this objective is a centralized activity not responsible to any single institution.

Mr. Maden said he believed Pacific Rim studies is a very important program. He said he was disappointed the program did not go the last time around, but felt the administrative arrangement and program now proposed would assure success. He moved approval of the proposal as presented.

Mrs. Johnson asked if the report defined clearly what was proposed. Dr. Romney said that the center would be a catalytic agency concerned with public service, research and instruction. It would not, however, be engaged in offering degree programs apart from the institution.

Dr. Lieuallen commented that one of the things he had been particularly pleased about over the last year or two was the efforts of the institutions to repackage their curricular offerings in arrangements more useful to students. He said he felt that an important function of the center would be to help the institutions repackage their institutional resources in ways to make them more useful to the state and its citizens. This would be accomplished through the regular academic machinery of the institutions and the Board's Academic Affairs Committee.

Mr. Craig Henry, Student Body President, Portland State University, urged that the Pacific Rim Studies Center be made a part of Portland State University in order that it be more accessible to concerned faculty and students. He said it was difficult for students to deal with different agencies in the development of their programs of study, and this problem could be easily resolved, since the center was to be located in Portland, by putting it under the Portland State University administration.

Professor Capper-Johnson said he had long been interested in the Pacific Rim concept and thought the proposal for a studies center was excellent. He was concerned, he said, that the many contributions that might be made to the center by the state's independent institutions not be overlooked. He suggested that an important first activity of the center should be to make a comprehensive survey of all the resources in Oregon which might contribute to the center's work. A survey of resources would identify both resources of the independent institutions and those of the business community. The center's relationship with the business community, he observed, will be an important factor in how well it succeeds in its assignment. [A survey of resources of the independent colleges and universities in Oregon relating to the Pacific Rim was included in the March 28, 1972, report titled Preliminary Report to the Board on the Proposed Pacific Rim Studies Center.]

Mr. Corey said he would favor approval of the proposal, with the reservation that there might be a change in the proposed budget after review of the job descriptions requested by Mr. Mosser. Dr. Romney said the job descriptions would be made available before the matter came before the Board.

The Committee approved the establishment of the center by unanimous vote, contingent upon its funding by the legislature.
Committee Recommendation

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the proposal for the establishment of a Pacific Rim Studies Center as proposed, and that the Chancellor be authorized to request funds from the Emergency Board to launch the center in 1974-75.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented. Directors Corey, Joss, McIntyre, Maden and Snider voted in favor of the motion. Directors Johnson and Mosser were opposed.

Confirmation of Institutional Degree Lists

In accordance with Board regulations, the following Board members represented the Board in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas for the 1974 Winter Term graduating classes at the indicated institutions:

Mr. Marc F. Maden Portland State University
Miss Valerie McIntyre University of Oregon

A signed copy of the degree lists are on file in the Board's Office.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board confirmed the action of these Board members in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas.

(Considered by Building Committee; April 24, 1974; present--Joss, Snider, Corey, Westerdahl, Holmes, Johnson, Layman, McIntyre, Mosser.)

Staff Report to the Committee

Sometime ago, in response to suggestions from members of the Board, the Chancellor appointed an ad hoc committee to review and provide recommendations concerning properties of historical and/or architectural value which are owned or administered by the Board. Mr. Thomas Vaughan, Director of the Oregon Historical Society, has served as chairman and has been assisted by Miss Elisabeth Walton, Mr. Robertson Collins, Mr. Jack Evans and Mr. George McMath. Their preliminary report, prepared in 1970, was reviewed with institutional officials and the Board's staff. Within the past few months, the Committee has re-examined its earlier recommendations, has met with the Chancellor and other Board and institutional officials, has visited some of the campuses again, and has prepared a draft of its report for presentation to the Board's Committee on Buildings and Other Physical Facilities. It is expected that copies of the report will be available for distribution with the agenda of the April 24 meeting of the Committee. Copies will also be forwarded to institutional officials with a request for comments which should be considered when the recommendations are discussed.

The introductory section of the report outlines the basic general precepts which the ad hoc committee believes should be applied in the management of properties having historic significance and lists the specific criteria applied in the evaluation of the various properties owned or managed by the Board. Ratings of selected buildings or other improvements are grouped under three major categories:

(1) Of prime significance. Top priority for preservation or restoration, as appropriate.

(2) Of secondary significance. Recommended for consideration in future planning.

(3) Also noted.
For each campus covered in the report, the ad hoc committee has identified the individual properties or groupings which it believes should be designated for preservation, restoration, consideration in future planning, etc.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the report of the ad hoc committee on Board properties of historical and/or architectural value be accepted and that the recommendations contained therein be used as guidelines in the facility planning of the various institutions governed by the Board. Specifically, it is expected that the buildings and other improvements rated "Of prime significance" would be preserved. In the event consideration is to be given to the possible removal or major modification of such facilities in the future, such matters would be brought to the Building Committee and the Board for review and appropriate action. Similarly, with respect to structures rated "Of secondary significance," they shall be considered in the future planning of the institutions and shall not be razed, relocated or modified substantially without prior concurrence of the Board.

It was also recommended that expressions of appreciation be extended to the members of the ad hoc committee for their gracious and valuable assistance to the Board in the evaluation of properties having historical and/or architectural value.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Thomas Vaughan described the report presented by the ad hoc committee and indicated that the specific criteria used in the evaluation were set forth in the report. He said age alone was not the only criterion for including a structure in the list of buildings to be preserved.

Mr. Vaughan said the Committee had attempted to provide the Board with the necessary knowledge with which to evaluate each of the structures when the preservation of a particular building was considered. However, he said he recognized it might not be possible to preserve all of these historic buildings.

Mr. Hunderup said the report would form a basis for planning at each institution in considering the preservation of historic buildings. Mr. Vaughan urged the Board to consider the report in every sense as a charge to give the buildings the recognition and analytical time that they deserved.

Mr. Hunderup said the committee had indicated it would give strong support to the Board in accepting the responsibility on a state-wide basis for the interest of the public in preserving or restoring various buildings. He said he would like to acknowledge that effort and commitment on the part of the committee.

The Building Committee recommended that the Board accept the report for use in future planning and that the Board express its appreciation to Mr. Vaughan and the members of his committee for their great contribution to the state in rendering this report.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented.
HISTORICAL PROPERTIES OF THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION - RECOMMENDATIONS
BY THE AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HISTORICAL BUILDINGS

The following recommendations concerning historical properties owned by the State Board of Higher Education were prepared at the request of the Chancellor's office. They are intended to assist the Committee on Buildings and Other Physical Facilities in formulating guidelines for consideration of the State Board as a whole.

The recommendations are based upon the report submitted to the Chancellor's office in April 1970. Certain modifications to the earlier report are the result of visits to Oregon College of Education and Oregon State University campuses on January 9, 1974. The whole of the former report has been reevaluated and represents the concerted judgment of the ad hoc advisory committee on historic buildings.

GENERAL PRECEPTS

Since historic preservation emerged as a specialized discipline following the Second World War, certain basic precepts have governed the professional approach to management of historic structures.

- Historic structures enrich and illuminate the cultural heritage of the state and the nation. Accordingly, it is appropriate and desirable that they be made available for public use to the greatest extent practicable.

- In general, it is better to preserve than to restore; and better to restore than reconstruct. Preservation is a treatment designed to sustain the form and extent of a structure essentially as existing. It aims at halting further deterioration and providing structural safety but does not contemplate significant rebuilding. Restoration is the process of accurately recovering, by the removal of later work and the replacement of missing original work, the form and details of a structure or part of a structure, together with its setting, as it appeared at some period in time. Adaptive Restoration is the treatment for structures that are visually important in the historic scene but do not otherwise qualify for exhibition purposes. In such cases, the facade or so much of the exterior as is necessary should be authentically restored so that it will be properly understood from the public view. The interior, in these circumstances, is usually converted to a modern, functional use. The restored portion of the exterior should be faithfully preserved in its restored form and detail. Reconstruction is the process of accurately reproducing by new construction the form and details of a vanished structure, or part of it, as it appeared at some period in time. (Such treatment would not normally be applicable to the management of campus facilities.)

- Historic structures of prime significance bear an important relation to their sites, and, therefore, should be preserved in situ. Those of secondary significance may be moved when there is no feasible alternative for their preservation. In moving a historic structure, every effort should be made to reestablish its historic orientation, immediate setting and general relationship to its environment.

- Modern additions, such as air-conditioning and fire detection and suppression equipment, are appropriate in historic structures of prime significance to the extent that they can be concealed within the structure or its setting. Other modern construction may be added suitably to historic structures of secondary significance when necessary for their continued use. The new work should be harmonious with the old in scale, proportion, materials and color. Such additions should be as inconspicuous as possible from the public view and should not intrude upon the important historic values.

- New construction, including structures, roads and parking areas, should be designed in such a manner that the integrity and immediate setting of historic structures of prime significance may remain intact.
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It is understood that certain of the oldest structures are in need of considerable work to bring them into conformance with requirements of the Occupational Safety and Health Act. In some cases the condition and significance of a historic structure are such that an extensive outlay for preservation is perhaps unjustified. In no case encountered, however, is preservation or adaptive restoration believed to be technically infeasible. In certain notable cases, structures are considered of such primary importance that the costs involved in preservation or restoration are a lesser factor. In many cases, it is believed that adaptive restoration is a more economical course of action than replacement.

SPECIFIC CRITERIA

For purposes of evaluating properties owned by the State Board of Higher Education, a rating sheet was devised which bracketed properties in one of three categories for action, as follows:

- Of prime significance. Top priority for preservation or restoration, as appropriate.
- Of secondary significance. Recommended for consideration in future planning.
- Also noted.

Following are the specific criteria for evaluation.

HISTORICAL ASSOCIATIONS - Is the structure associated with the origins of the institution or the development of the community? Is it one of the original structures?

STYLISTIC CHARACTER - Does the structure set or contribute to a stylistic pattern on the campus or define important space?

SYMBOLIC VALUE - Does the structure have high symbolic value? Has it become synonymous with the institution?

REPRESENTATION OF TYPE - Is the structure a prime example of a stylistic or structural type?

RARITY - Is the structure one of the last examples of its style and type remaining in the state?

MASTER WORK - Is the structure a work of an architect noted in the history of architecture in Oregon?

INTEGRITY - Has the fabric of the structure remained essentially as originally constructed?

CONDITION - Is the general condition of the structure good?

ADAPTABILITY - Is the structure suitable for adaptive restoration? Do its condition and relationship within or accessibility to the campus justify continued use?

VULNERABILITY - Is the structure vulnerable to replacement or relocation by its location, size or relative significance?

THE FINDINGS

The evaluations are listed below on a campus-by-campus basis. Brief supporting statements and illustrations are given only for those structures about which some question or controversy has been raised.

University of Oregon

On the University of Oregon campus, the ensemble grouping, or definition of spaces by related structures, is particularly noteworthy. If this quality is to be preserved, interrelationships of the older units of the campus should not be intruded upon. Those alterations or additions which are strictly necessary should be made to harmonize with the established organization.
The earliest and most historic campus unit, or ensemble, is formed by Deady Hall and Villard Hall. It is linked to Gerlinger Hall, Hendricks Hall and Susan Campbell Hall, the second most connotative grouping, by Friendly Hall, the Faculty Club, and Johnson Hall. Structures in the Girls’ Dormitory unit designed by Dean Ellis Lawrence were built through the support of alumnae and public subscription before formation of the State Board of Higher Education. A third ensemble of note is that formed by the University Library and the Art Museum.

Of Prime Significance - Top Priority for Preservation or Restoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year (or Acquired)</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deady Hall</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>W. W. Piper</td>
<td>Second Empire Baroque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villard Hall</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>W. H. Williams</td>
<td>Second Empire Baroque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad’s Gates</td>
<td>1940-1941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Club</td>
<td>1885-1886</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italian Bracketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Museum</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>E. F. Lawrence</td>
<td>Modernistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
<td>Modernistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerlinger Hall</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>E. F. Lawrence</td>
<td>&quot;Georgian&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks Hall</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>E. F. Lawrence</td>
<td>&quot;Georgian&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Campbell Hall</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>E. F. Lawrence</td>
<td>&quot;Georgian&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of Secondary Significance - Recommended for Consideration in Future Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year (or Acquired)</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly Hall</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Jacobean&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Hall</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Roman&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Straub Hall</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Georgian&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President’s House</td>
<td>1923 (Acquired)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norman Farmhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's House</td>
<td>1938 (Acquired)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Craftsman Bungalow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also Noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fenton Hall</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td></td>
<td>Renaissance Revival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The core of the Oregon State University campus is comprised of three major units, or ensembles. The greatest concentration of early structures is found in the easterly unit surrounding Benton Hall, which is the symbol of the institution. Structures in this grouping which are more or less contemporaneous with Benton Hall share a common orientation toward the southeast. The other principal units are associated with quadrangles formed by (1) the Memorial Union-Home Economics Building, and (2) Kidder Hall-Kerr Library. New construction has been successfully integrated into the north side of the latter quadrangle, namely by the addition of the Milne Computer Center east of Kidder Hall.

Of Prime Significance - Top Priority for Preservation or Restoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benton Hall</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td></td>
<td>Second Empire Barque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks Hall</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Walter D. Pugh</td>
<td>Renaissance Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Union</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Thomas and Mercier</td>
<td>Queen Anne Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Playhouse</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Anne Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleontology Lab</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Anne Revival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of Secondary Significance - Recommended for Consideration in Future Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Architect</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apperson Hall</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Edgar Lazarus</td>
<td>Romanesque Revival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of a noted Portland architect whose master work in masonry construction is Vista House at Crown Point on the Columbia River Highway. Originally Mechanical Hall. Third story later altered (see Figs. 13 and 14). An anchor on the north side of the Benton Hall ensemble. Recommended for preservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Hall</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Burgraff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| An anchor on the south side of the Benton Hall ensemble combining elements of the Romanesque Revival and "Chateauxque" Style. Recommended for preservation.
McAlexander
Fieldhouse 1911 Bennes and Hendricks
Also known as the Armory. A monumental structure recently upgraded for continued use. Interesting historic detail. Recommended for preservation.

Dad’s Gate
Weatherford Hall 1928 Bennes and Herzog
Interesting example of academic architecture. A popular landmark on an important corner of the campus. Recommended for preservation.

Kidder Hall 1917 John V. Bennes
A good example of early academic, or Beaux Arts architecture. A key element of one of major ensembles of campus. Recommended for preservation.

Women’s Gym 1926 John V. Bennes
An interesting example of academic architecture in the "Mediterranean" Style. Defines west side of the prime quadrangle. Recommended for preservation.

Also Noted
Waldo Hall 1907 Burgraff
"Chateauesque"
A typical example of the "Chateauesque" Style with pleasing coloration and detail. Its location apart from the major ensembles and its state of disrepair make its position on the list of structures recommended for preservation marginal.

Oregon College of Education

The original building on the campus of Oregon College of Education, Campbell Hall, was enhanced by an ensemble of structures built within a few years' time and which set the pattern for later growth. Jessica Todd Hall, Senior Cottage, and Maple Hall, the old gymnasium, are a cohesive stylistic group framing an interior quadrangle. The Elementary School, which is of the same period of construction, forms a link to the newer additions of the campus.

Of Prime Significance - Top Priority for Preservation or Restoration

Campbell Hall 1871 - (tower demolished October 1962) Gothic Revival
1889 - South wing
1898 - North wing

Jessica Todd Hall 1917 A. E. Doyle "Tudor"
Work of a leading Portland architect of the early 20th century. Strongly supportive of Campbell Hall in scale, color and texture. Defines a corner of the north entrance to campus. Recommended for preservation.

Senior Cottage 1917 A. E. Doyle Queen Anne Revival
A notable example of the "Shingle Style" of the Queen Anne Revival which reflects influence of the Arts and Crafts Movement. A complementary element adjacent to Todd Hall and pleasingly sited in the interior quadrangle. Recommended for preservation.

Maple Hall 1913 A. E. Doyle "Jacobean"
An anchor of good, period design on the west side of the main axis of campus. Opposite other prime buildings. Recommended for preservation.

Of Secondary Significance - Recommended for Consideration in Future Planning

Administration Building 1936
A good example of Moderne architecture. Its color, texture, scale and proportions are in sympathy with historic styles of the original campus buildings. Recommended for preservation.

Portland State University

Of Prime Significance - Top Priority for Preservation or Restoration

Fruit and Flower Day Nursery 1928 Fred Fritsch "Georgian"

Of Secondary Significance - Recommended for Consideration in Future Planning

"Old Main" (Lincoln High School) c.1915 M. H. Whitehouse
The original campus structure by a noted Portland architect.
Howard (Robert S.)
Residence c. 1893
1632 S.W. 12th Avenue. Brick masonry, clapboard and shingle cottage in tradition of the Queen Anne Revival. Built for noted Louisiana banker-realtor R. S. Howard, who settled in Portland in 1891.

Southern Oregon College

Of Prime Significance - Top Priority for Preservation or Restoration

Chappel-Swedenburg House 1905 Frank Clark Colonial Revival
A good example of Colonial Revival architecture with unusually fine detail. A gracious complement to campus facilities. Recommended for preservation.

Of Secondary Significance - Recommended for Consideration in Future Planning

Churchill Hall 1925 John V. Bennes
Peter Britt Estate, Jacksonville 1852
Grubb Barn, Ashland 1860s

Eastern Oregon State College

Of Secondary Significance - Recommended for Consideration in Future Planning

Administration Building 1929 John V. Bennes

No recommendations are offered at this time concerning Oregon Institute of Technology, the University of Oregon Dental School, or the University of Oregon Medical School.
Staff Report

The annual budget preparation for year 1974-75 was begun in December 1973 when guidelines were submitted for Finance Committee approval. The guidelines and proposed budget allocations for the Education and General Services Program were approved, as modified by the Committee, at the Board meeting on January 22, 1974.

The primary guidelines are summarized as follows:

Enrollment projections, revised after fall term 1973 experience, include a limitation of 15,000 fall FTE for the University of Oregon. The 3-term FTE of 48,441 for the nine institutions consists of 45,361 for the colleges and universities, 1,554 for OIT, 1,123 for ODS and 403 for UOES.

Tuition rates are to be increased to the level necessary to fund budgets at the legislatively-approved expenditure limitation to provide for transition staff funding and emergency reserves.

Adjustments for enrollment change are based upon cost per student by level exclusive of physical plant, general institutional expense, extension and summer session for the respective institutions.

Extension and public services activities will be budgeted at 60 percent of the existing program level, consistent with the reductions made by the 1973 Legislature. This policy has now been revised by action of the Board on March 26, 1974, to increase funding levels by $92,202 to preserve programs until Board and legislative review determine the 1975-1977 activity level.

Academic salary adjustments are to be based upon the 5 percent increase funded by the Legislature with specific salary adjustment recommendations to be reviewed at a later date.

International student fee remissions will be authorized at $700,000 in accord with 1973 legislation.

On March 26, 1974, the Board approved the Chancellor's recommendation for transition staff, utilizing $1,364,330 of the emergency reserve and providing for carryforward of institutional resources from 1973-74 to fund the remainder. Supplemental appropriations and expenditure limitation adjustments which resulted from actions of the Special Session of the Legislature have now been recorded and are included in the revised budget proposal. Special Session actions affect the Education and General Services Program through funding of a computer network director for Centralized Activities and the Child Psychiatry Day Care Center at the University of Oregon Medical School. Both activities were funded for only the first year of the biennium in the Regular Session. For the hospitals and clinics, provision was made for tuberculosis patient care in University Hospital North, outpatient tubercular care in the clinic and closure of the Tuberculosis Hospital.

Included in this report is a financial summary which displays the 1974-75 budget plan by fund group for the respective institutions and divisions. With the exception of Auxiliary Activities, each budget is planned within biennial expenditure limitations and is controlled to the General Fund appropriation reserved for use in 1974-75.

For Auxiliary Activities, expenditure levels have been developed from program needs and estimated resources. Expenditure proposals are tentative since incidental fee rates are not yet established. In addition, if the 1973-74 expenditures and the 1974-75 planned expenditures exceed the Auxiliary Activities biennial limitation, State Emergency Board approval is required before the expenditure plan can be implemented.
For the Education and General Services Program, the resources budgeted in support of expenditures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund appropriation</td>
<td>$79,527,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal funds</td>
<td>225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>28,884,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition, summer session</td>
<td>3,160,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment income</td>
<td>24,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balances</td>
<td>384,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Resources and Expenditure Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112,205,081</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board approved plan, March 1974: $111,658,925

Balances carried forward for transition staff: 234,438

Special Session:
- General Fund appropriation: 262,918
- Other Fund increase (UDMS Child Psychiatry Day Care): 48,800
- **Expenditure Plan:** $112,205,081

Board's reserves totaling $732,420 are included in the allocation plan. Within that amount, $150,000 is budgeted for plant rehabilitation and $56,405 is earmarked for reversion to the State General Fund to return the amount appropriated for operation and maintenance of new buildings which were not authorized for construction. The remainder, $526,015, is budgeted as an emergency reserve available for use at the Board's discretion.

Within the Education and General Services budget a cost of instruction for the colleges, universities, and Oregon Institute of Technology was derived from the dollar amounts authorized for expenditure. For year 1974-75 the Legislature funded the three-term FTE for the six institutions at $1,806.74 per student. Because of reduced enrollments and changes in the mix of students, the budget plan reflects a cost of $1,874.66 per student. Similar costs for Oregon Institute of Technology stand at $2,362.96 funded by the Legislature and $2,420.27 in the budget plan.

Statements provided by the institution executives describe the problems to be resolved and the program decisions included in the budget proposal. The most significant items are described as follows:

The most pressing issue is the budget reduction to adjust to reduced enrollments. Aside from the personnel issues of staff reduction and timely notice, the executives have voiced deep concern about program disruption and the capacity to maintain viable programs.

The deleterious effect of inflation pervades every segment of the Department's activities. No funds are provided in the allocations to cope with price increases. With the exception of energy-related increases, there is no indication that General Fund relief will be provided. For energy costs, funds are reserved with the State Emergency Board for release to state agencies. The Executive Department has indicated that allocation requests probably will be submitted in the fall of 1974.
At the Medical School Hospitals it has become apparent that expenditure levels approved by the 1973 Legislature will not be sufficient to operate at the number of beds anticipated in the budget. Deficiencies in the base support and inflationary increases combine to create a gap between planned and actual levels of operation. It is proposed that an operating level of approximately 95,360 patient days be approved for fiscal 1974-75 (compared with 80,337 patient days for 1973-74).

The schedule for completion of the 1974-75 operating budget calls for institutions to complete detailed budget plans by June 1, 1974. Board review of the budget plans and academic salary adjustment recommendations has been scheduled for June 25. Definitive information will be available for Board review at that time.

Staff Recommendation

It was proposed that the Finance Committee authorize institutions to proceed with budget preparation within the guidelines and dollar amounts displayed on the summary of operating budget expenditures for 1974-75, subject to modification by the Board on May 21, 1974.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

In response to a question, Mr. Holmer indicated that the budget figures did not reflect the action of the Board in allocating approximately $500,000 from the Board reserves for salary improvement. This amount will provide an addition of .76 percent, and this figure has been transmitted to the institutions for budget planning.

Mrs. Johnson raised the question of fee remissions for foreign students and whether there was any latitude to make changes in Board policy on these fee remissions.

Mr. Mosser said the Board probably could change its policy in the matter of fee remissions for international students but the institutions have probably committed the money in many instances. Mrs. Johnson suggested the question should be reexamined in discussing the next biennial budget.

The Board approved the recommendations as presented with modification of salary amounts approved by the Board at its last meeting to be included.
## Summary of Operating ...Duriture Budgets

Oregon Department of Higher Education  
Fiscal Year 1974-75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Budgeted Service Accounts</th>
<th>Service &amp; Operating Accounts</th>
<th>Auxiliary Activities</th>
<th>Gifts, Grants &amp; Contracts</th>
<th>ALL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION AND GENERAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td>$2,910,836</td>
<td>$31,827</td>
<td>$1,051,526</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$4,119,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>3,811,570</td>
<td>80,591</td>
<td>1,050,326</td>
<td>403,026</td>
<td>5,345,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>5,359,789</td>
<td>76,750</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>7,561,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>169,118</td>
<td>59,467</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>779,874</td>
<td>1,008,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Research Division</td>
<td>29,513,774</td>
<td>4,741,031</td>
<td>9,486,956</td>
<td>16,200,000</td>
<td>59,941,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>6,506,509</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>2,984,540</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>9,655,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td>28,274,019</td>
<td>2,333,230</td>
<td>9,129,046</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
<td>56,235,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>2,983,591</td>
<td>41,749</td>
<td>378,692</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>4,344,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Dental School</td>
<td>9,434,086</td>
<td>1,449,520</td>
<td>1,168,300</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>23,051,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Medical School</td>
<td>3,604,932</td>
<td>1,134,708</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>4,798,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Activities</td>
<td>732,420</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>732,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's Reserves</td>
<td>1,006,198</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>302,584</td>
<td>1,374,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Educational &amp; Public Broadcasting Svc.</td>
<td>17,898,239</td>
<td>986,127</td>
<td>2,709,350</td>
<td>4,802,863</td>
<td>26,396,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>$112,205,081</td>
<td>$11,789,020</td>
<td>$29,374,636</td>
<td>$51,197,347</td>
<td>$204,566,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEWIDE PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division of Continuing Education</td>
<td>$1,852,839</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$72,556</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$2,275,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>7,629,636</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,629,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>8,442,247</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,442,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Research Laboratory</td>
<td>1,604,675</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,604,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Clinics</td>
<td>431,991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>431,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Hospital &amp; Outpatient Clinic</td>
<td>16,976,941</td>
<td>7,371,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,348,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled Children's Division</td>
<td>3,145,839</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,145,839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB Hospital</td>
<td>14,618</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hospital - North</td>
<td>7,693,751</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,693,751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$47,797,557</td>
<td>$7,611,500</td>
<td>$72,556</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$55,591,623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL, ALL FUNDS** | $160,002,638 | $19,400,520 | $29,447,202 | $51,307,347 | $260,157,707
### SUMMARY OF APPROVED OPERATING EXPENDITURE BUDGETS

**Oregon State Department of Higher Education**

**Fiscal Year 1973-74**

#### EDUCATION AND GENERAL SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions or Divisions</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure Accounts</th>
<th>Operating Accounts</th>
<th>Auxiliary Activities</th>
<th>Service Accounts</th>
<th>Gifts, Grants &amp; Contracts</th>
<th>ALL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon College</td>
<td>$ 2,854,127</td>
<td>$ 10,065</td>
<td>$ 968,407</td>
<td>$ 20,361</td>
<td>$ 125,000</td>
<td>$ 3,977,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>4,028,198</td>
<td>52,827</td>
<td>988,939</td>
<td>26,256</td>
<td>265,125</td>
<td>5,341,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>5,432,411</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>1,375,839</td>
<td>48,600</td>
<td>725,800</td>
<td>7,603,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Research Division</td>
<td>162,472</td>
<td>26,533</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,751</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>970,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>27,519,566</td>
<td>597,838</td>
<td>8,555,399</td>
<td>3,633,647</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>55,326,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td>6,446,369</td>
<td>12,625</td>
<td>3,244,745</td>
<td>45,900</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>10,376,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>26,709,977</td>
<td>410,924</td>
<td>8,694,330</td>
<td>1,897,182</td>
<td>16,000,000</td>
<td>53,712,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of O Dental School</td>
<td>2,796,573</td>
<td>168,997</td>
<td>345,593</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>432,898</td>
<td>3,784,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of O Medical School</td>
<td>8,638,890</td>
<td>60,171</td>
<td>1,694,212</td>
<td>7,006,923</td>
<td>10,300,000</td>
<td>27,100,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Activities</td>
<td>3,531,111</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,082,829</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>4,642,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's Reserves</td>
<td>358,595</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>358,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Educ. &amp; Public Broadcast Svc.</td>
<td>972,072</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>15,788</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>520,419</td>
<td>1,541,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>17,776,445</td>
<td>248,542</td>
<td>2,455,016</td>
<td>674,115</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>24,154,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$107,226,806</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,642,822</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,718,268</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,530,764</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,432,442</strong></td>
<td><strong>$198,551,102</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STATE-WIDE PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions or Divisions</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditure Accounts</th>
<th>Operating Accounts</th>
<th>Auxiliary Activities</th>
<th>Service Accounts</th>
<th>Gifts, Grants &amp; Contracts</th>
<th>ALL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division of Continuing Educ.</td>
<td>$ 1,974,921</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ 72,783</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 304,606</td>
<td>$ 2,602,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Svc.</td>
<td>7,206,225</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,206,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agric. Experiment Stations</td>
<td>8,023,143</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,023,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Research Laboratory</td>
<td>1,504,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,504,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Clinics</td>
<td>417,651</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>417,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Hospital</td>
<td>12,250,818</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,315,817</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,566,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Clinic</td>
<td>3,416,666</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,416,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled Children's Division</td>
<td>2,857,253</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,857,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Hospital</td>
<td>955,921</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>955,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hospital - North</td>
<td>7,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly Multnomah Cty. Hosp.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 46,307,298</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 250,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 72,783</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,315,817</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 304,606</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 48,250,504</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL, ALL FUNDS**

$153,534,104

$1,892,822

$27,791,951

$15,845,581

$47,737,048

$246,801,606
Staff Report to the Committee

A staff report to the Board on January 22, 1974, described the Base Budget concept and proposed guidelines under which the budget requests were to be developed. In that report the base budget was described as the cost classification which continued the existing level of service for existing numbers of students. Workload increases and program improvements are separate classifications which combine with the base to derive the total request for the department.

The cost of instruction technique has been applied to develop base budget requests for the Education and General Services programs at the colleges and universities and Oregon Institute of Technology. All other base budgets are program oriented and are to be developed from guidelines designed to maintain the 1974-75 level of service.

I. The Colleges, Universities and OIT

A. The Cost of Instruction Request

Starting from the operating level approved by the 1973 Legislature, adjustments have been calculated on a series of changes which have cost implications for the 1975-1977 biennium. Uppermost is the change in enrollments projected for 1975-76 and 1976-77. Inflation allowances, to provide purchasing power equivalent to that intended for the current biennium, has taken on increased significance as the inflationary spiral has accelerated. These and other changes are explained in greater detail in the following paragraphs.

1. Enrollment Change

The 3-term FTE for the colleges and universities has declined from the legislatively approved 46,428 for 1974-75 to 45,063 projected for 1975-76 and 44,790 for 1976-77. The approved enrollment of 46,428 for 1974-75 compares with the revised estimate of 45,361 which was projected for 1974-75 after fall 1973 experience. See Table 1.

The adjustments to new enrollment levels take into account three factors: (1) Enrollment mix changes reflect greater numbers of graduate students which in part offset the declines for lower-division and upper-division students; (2) enrollment increases at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University, in part offset the declines at Portland State University and the colleges; (3) certain elements of the budget (such as physical plant operation and maintenance) remain at relatively stable cost levels despite fluctuations in the size of the student body. All three factors tend to increase the composite cost per student.

Cost calculations have been developed from the historic expenditures per student, which indicate that upper-division instruction is about 25 percent more costly than is lower-division instruction. Graduate instruction is about 100 percent more costly than lower-division instruction. On this scale, the 1974-75 legislatively-approved composite cost per student for the six institutions averaged $1,806.74. When distributed by student level, costs were $1,487 for lower division; $1,858.75 for upper division; and $2,974 for graduate students. The institutional variance from these averages is displayed on the attached summary.

Adjustments for enrollment change have been calculated on the variable portion of the cost of instruction. It has been assumed that costs in the functions of instruction, libraries and student services are variable and will fluctuate in direct proportion to enrollment change.
The costs in the functions of physical plant operation, general administration and general institutional expense have been treated as constants. The attached summary shows the 1974-75 distribution of costs between variable and fixed cost functions, by level of student. These variable costs have been applied to calculate the budget adjustments for enrollment change.

The procedures described above have been followed at Oregon Institute of Technology, except that costs for lower-division transfer and technical students have been substituted for the lower-division, upper-division, graduate categories applicable in the six institutions.

2. Inflation Allowances

Inflation has affected services and supplies, capital outlay and student wages, with particularly large increases in costs for the energy related categories of fuel oil, electricity, gasoline, natural gas, and hogged fuel. Studies prepared by the Board's staff reflect inflationary trends in price indices which produce a 16 percent increase for 1975-76 and a further 5 percent increase for 1976-77, over funding levels for 1974-75 in the general category of services and supplies.

Similar calculations were developed for capital outlay. Special categories for energy related expenditures have been identified to deal with the more specific and significant increases occurring in those areas. Cost estimates are developed from current year usage in recognition of the reduction in consumption accomplished through economy measures initiated at the Governor's direction.

Student wages have been identified as an inflation factor in the base budget since they are not treated as a part of the Governor's salary adjustment recommendations for academic and classified staff. Percentage increases are designed to adjust student pay scales to the newly-enacted minimum wage law and to provide an average increase of 3 percent per year for rates now in excess of the minimum.

3. Other Adjustment Items

Certain activities in the institutions, such as deferred tuition service fees and international program surcharges, generate other fund income which was not included in the 1974-75 cost of instruction. Inclusion of these amounts, entirely supported by fee income, is recommended as an adjustment to the base budget.

Fee remissions, treated as an expenditure in the 1973-1975 budget, have proved to be unwieldy and an unnecessary complication of the accounting procedures. It was recommended that these amounts be deleted from the cost of instruction and returned to the reduction of income classification used in prior biennia.

Nursing staff adjustments at Southern Oregon College were approved by the Board for the 1973-1975 biennium to provide adequate faculty for the associate degree nursing program. The funds for 1973-1975 were provided from Board's Reserves. If the positions are to be continued during 1975-1977, the funding is recommended to be included as a recurring base budget item.

Amounts provided in the 1973-1975 Centralized Activities budget for computer terminals located at the institutions are more appropriately recorded as an expense of the institutions. A transfer from the Centralized Activities budget to the institution budgets will adjust the cost of instruction but will result in no increase in the total budget.
B. **Summer Sessions**

Summer sessions were identified as a separate element of the legislatively-approved budget for 1973-1975. The base budget recommendation is to continue the program level as budgeted for 1974-75, subject to inflation allowances similar to those described for the cost of instruction.

C. **Sea Grant College, OSU**

The Sea Grant appropriation included in the Education and General Services budget for 1973-1975 is designed to provide state matching funds for federal allocations. Since it is predominantly a research program, it has been separately identified to avoid distortion of the cost of instruction. The base was recommended to be continued at the 1974-75 level, adjusted for inflation allowances.

D. **Extension and Public Services**

Extension and public services consist of activities such as the Bureau of Governmental Research at the University of Oregon; Land Grant University Program at Oregon State University; Population Research and Census, Urban Studies, Education Center, Economic Education at Portland State University; and Speech and Hearing Clinics at the colleges. The activities are separately identified in the extension function in conformance with accounting principles recommended by the American Council on Education.

The 1973 Legislature reduced certain of the activities by 40 percent in the second year of the current biennium. The 1974 Special Session authorized the Board to maintain the programs at a viable level during 1974-75 until the Board and the Legislature could review the entire activity and determine an appropriate level at which it would be continued.

The 1975-1977 base budget recommendation is intended to continue program activity at the level of year 1974-75. Funding includes the 1974-75 legislatively-approved budget and the $92,202 supplement provided by Board action of March 26, 1974.

II. **Program Oriented Budgets**

A. **Base Budget Guidelines**

Program-oriented budgets include the Education and General Services portions of the University of Oregon Medical School, the University of Oregon Dental School, Teaching Research, Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Service, and Centralized Activities.

Each state-wide public service division, the Auxiliary Activities and Operating Accounts are similarly classified. The budgets are distinguished from the cost-of-instruction programs by the manner in which base budgets are developed.

It is proposed that base budgets for each institution and division be developed within the following guidelines.

1. The base budget will use as a starting point the Board approved operating budget for 1974-75.

2. Inflation allowances on services and supplies, capital outlay, and student wages will be calculated in the same manner as described for the cost-of-instruction budgets. Special items such as food costs for dining halls will be separately identified for inflation increases, similar to the presentation for energy costs.
3. A decline in estimated other fund resources will normally result in a reduction of the base, to avoid the substitution of state general funds for other fund support of programs. Exceptions will be specifically identified for Board review.

B. The Teaching Hospitals

The agenda item dealing with the 1974-75 budget describes the operating level expected to be possible within existing resources for the Teaching Hospital and University Hospital North. Operation of a reduced number of beds will provide a short-range solution to 1974-75 resource deficiencies but will not provide an adequate number of patients deemed necessary for teaching purposes. The inability to operate the authorized number of beds results primarily from an inadequate base budget, aggravated by inflation and increasingly complex techniques for patient care.

A recommendation for base adjustments which will fund the authorized number of beds during 1975-77 is being developed and will be presented for Board review at the May 1974 meeting.

Staff Recommendation

Base budget calculations for the 1975-1977 cost of instruction at the colleges, universities and Oregon Institute of Technology have been developed by the Board's staff. It is proposed that these amounts be provided to the institutions as a dollar allocation within which the biennial base request is developed.

Base budget guidelines for other institutions, divisions, and programs are proposed through which the respective base requests will be developed. Dollar amounts of the base requests will result from application of inflation allowance and other adjustments to the approved 1974-75 operating budget. It was proposed that the Finance Committee recommend the allocations and guidelines for Board approval and authorize the institutions to proceed with base budget preparation subject to modification by action of the Board.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee discussed the applicability of full-time equivalent students as a basis for computing budget allocations. Mr. Mosser suggested that the FTE be used but that minor fluctuations of approximately 5 percent above or below would not be reflected immediately in the budget. He said this would allow time for adjustments to changes in enrollment and provide greater budget stability. It was also indicated that a systematic program review by outside personnel would be helpful.

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

(A presentation by Mr. Will R. Flavelle, a student at Portland State University, appears later in these minutes.)
### 3-Term FTE Enrolment Projections, 1974-75 Through 1976-77

#### Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>Six</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>UOMS</th>
<th>UODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1974-75 Legislative Approved</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>6,446</td>
<td>7,276</td>
<td>4,081</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>22,689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>5,563</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>4,091</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>18,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5,399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,455</td>
<td>14,349</td>
<td>9,338</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>46,428</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>Six</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>UOMS</th>
<th>UODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1974-75 Revised Estimate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>6,961</td>
<td>3,503</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>21,111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>5,837</td>
<td>6,269</td>
<td>3,393</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>18,171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6,079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,495</td>
<td>14,871</td>
<td>8,257</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>3,670</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>45,361</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>Six</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>UOMS</th>
<th>UODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1975-76 Projected</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>5,937</td>
<td>7,066</td>
<td>3,566</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>2,369</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>21,016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>6,128</td>
<td>5,972</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>17,833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6,214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,737</td>
<td>14,703</td>
<td>8,032</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>45,063</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>Six</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>UOMS</th>
<th>UODS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1976-77 Projected</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>6,171</td>
<td>7,120</td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>21,363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>5,894</td>
<td>5,736</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>17,155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6,272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,737</td>
<td>14,560</td>
<td>7,984</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>3,668</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>44,790</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fixed and Variable Cost Components

**Cost of Instruction - Institutions**

#### Basic Budget Recommendation for 1975-1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOCG</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>OIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1975-77 Legislatively Approved Budgets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of Instruction, Variable Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction, Libraries and Student Services</td>
<td>$22,317,030.00</td>
<td>$20,954,874.00</td>
<td>$13,266,010.00</td>
<td>$3,804,968.00</td>
<td>$4,647,720.00</td>
<td>$1,700,097.00</td>
<td>$66,692,609.00</td>
<td>$3,401,072.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per student, lower div.</td>
<td>1,156.77</td>
<td>1,160.87</td>
<td>1,074.20</td>
<td>967.72</td>
<td>1,030.69</td>
<td>1,124.73</td>
<td>1,116.73</td>
<td>1,223.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per student, upper div.</td>
<td>1,532.37</td>
<td>1,547.35</td>
<td>1,444.08</td>
<td>1,310.83</td>
<td>1,382.02</td>
<td>1,563.01</td>
<td>1,488.48</td>
<td>1,922.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per student, graduate</td>
<td>2,615.17</td>
<td>2,706.77</td>
<td>2,533.71</td>
<td>2,340.17</td>
<td>2,436.02</td>
<td>2,872.65</td>
<td>2,603.73</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>1,543.90</td>
<td>1,660.37</td>
<td>1,420.87</td>
<td>1,214.87</td>
<td>1,198.48</td>
<td>1,332.30</td>
<td>1,438.47</td>
<td>1,834.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| **Cost of Instruction, Fixed Costs** |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| General Administration, General Institutional Expense, Physical Plant Operation and Maintenance | $4,360,046.00 | $5,524,824.00 | $2,724,830.00 | $1,267,824.00 | $1,452,836.00 | $800,567.00 | $17,190,177.00 | $979,857.00 |
| Cost per student, lower div. | 301.63 | 385.03 | 405.31 | 404.73 | 374.64 | 627.40 | 370.27 | 528.31 |
| Cost per student, upper div. | 301.63 | 385.03 | 405.31 | 404.73 | 374.64 | 627.40 | 370.27 | 528.31 |
| Cost per student, graduate | 301.63 | 385.03 | 405.31 | 404.73 | 374.64 | 627.40 | 370.27 | 528.31 |
| Composite             | 301.63 | 385.03 | 405.31 | 404.73 | 374.64 | 627.40 | 370.27 | 528.31 |

|                      |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| **Cost of Instruction, Combined** |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |           |
| Fixed and Variable Costs | $26,677,076.00 | $26,479,698.00 | $17,052,890.00 | $5,072,282.00 | $6,100,556.00 | $2,500,574.00 | $83,883,325.00 | $4,320,929.00 |
| Cost per student, lower div. | 1,458.40 | 1,545.90 | 1,479.51 | 1,372.43 | 1,403.33 | 1,752.33 | 1,487.00 | 1,752.00 |
| Cost per student, upper div. | 1,823.00 | 1,932.38 | 1,859.39 | 1,715.56 | 1,738.66 | 2,190.41 | 1,958.75 | 2,450.78 |
| Cost per student, graduate | 2,916.60 | 3,091.80 | 2,959.62 | 2,744.90 | 2,810.66 | 3,504.66 | 2,974.00 | 2,606.14 |
| Composite             | 1,845.53 | 1,945.40 | 1,876.18 | 1,619.60 | 1,573.12 | 1,955.70 | 1,806.14 | 2,362.96 |
### Recommended Change for Enrolment Adjustments

Cost of Instruction - Institutions
Base Budget Recommendation 1975-1977

#### Legislatively Approved Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>TOTAL SIX INSTITUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$26,677,076.00</td>
<td>$26,479,680.00</td>
<td>$17,032,864.00</td>
<td>$83,883,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$26,677,076.00</td>
<td>$26,479,680.00</td>
<td>$17,032,864.00</td>
<td>$83,883,320.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Enrolment Change Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>TOTAL SIX INSTITUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$26,677,076.00</td>
<td>$26,479,680.00</td>
<td>$17,032,864.00</td>
<td>$83,883,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$26,677,076.00</td>
<td>$26,479,680.00</td>
<td>$17,032,864.00</td>
<td>$83,883,320.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Lower Division PTE

- **Cost per student, composite:**
  - Lower Division: $1,845.53
  - Upper Division: $1,845.40
  - Graduate: $2,191.80

#### Upper Division PTE

- **Cost per student, composite:**
  - Lower Division: $1,845.53
  - Upper Division: $1,845.40
  - Graduate: $2,191.80

#### Graduate PTE

- **Cost per student, composite:**
  - Lower Division: $1,845.53
  - Upper Division: $1,845.40
  - Graduate: $2,191.80

---

*OIT enrolments are classified as lower division transfer students and technical students.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COST OF INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>OIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislatively Approved Budget</strong>&lt;br&gt;Year 1974-75</td>
<td>$26,677,076</td>
<td>$26,479,698</td>
<td>$17,052,840</td>
<td>$5,072,582</td>
<td>$6,100,556</td>
<td>$2,500,574</td>
<td>$83,883,326</td>
<td>$4,380,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for 1975-76</strong></td>
<td>861,806</td>
<td>995,299</td>
<td>(1,463,568)</td>
<td>(593,213)</td>
<td>(242,398)</td>
<td>149,908</td>
<td>(292,166)</td>
<td>(448,426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services and Supplies</td>
<td>435,080</td>
<td>479,124</td>
<td>223,452</td>
<td>63,021</td>
<td>95,362</td>
<td>31,077</td>
<td>1,327,116</td>
<td>52,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Related Increases</td>
<td>163,868</td>
<td>504,361</td>
<td>302,873</td>
<td>192,117</td>
<td>57,167</td>
<td>67,055</td>
<td>1,287,441</td>
<td>13,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>216,466</td>
<td>172,809</td>
<td>107,442</td>
<td>6,068</td>
<td>28,526</td>
<td>14,375</td>
<td>545,686</td>
<td>12,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wages</td>
<td>30,116</td>
<td>21,194</td>
<td>18,318</td>
<td>5,293</td>
<td>5,902</td>
<td>3,739</td>
<td>84,562</td>
<td>7,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Staff, SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,576</td>
<td></td>
<td>155,868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Fee Programs</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>36,900</td>
<td>25,396</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Remissions</td>
<td>(144,400)</td>
<td>(88,500)</td>
<td>(65,720)</td>
<td>(50,880)</td>
<td>(12,260)</td>
<td>(38,898)</td>
<td>(400,658)</td>
<td>(330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Rental Transfers from CA</td>
<td>15,360</td>
<td>13,323</td>
<td>9,362</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>4,265</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>46,816</td>
<td>1,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for 1976-77</strong></td>
<td>(85,316)</td>
<td>(196,924)</td>
<td>(59,330)</td>
<td>(131,550)</td>
<td>18,224</td>
<td>(3,754)</td>
<td>(458,650)</td>
<td>40,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services and Supplies</td>
<td>157,459</td>
<td>172,955</td>
<td>80,841</td>
<td>22,608</td>
<td>34,604</td>
<td>11,257</td>
<td>479,724</td>
<td>19,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Related Increases</td>
<td>30,776</td>
<td>131,033</td>
<td>56,787</td>
<td>32,973</td>
<td>16,933</td>
<td>18,308</td>
<td>286,810</td>
<td>3,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>98,389</td>
<td>74,295</td>
<td>49,365</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>13,219</td>
<td>6,603</td>
<td>244,161</td>
<td>5,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wages</td>
<td>27,066</td>
<td>19,048</td>
<td>16,662</td>
<td>4,755</td>
<td>5,306</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>75,997</td>
<td>6,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Budget Recommendation 1976-77</strong></td>
<td>$28,567,746</td>
<td>$28,814,615</td>
<td>$16,354,430</td>
<td>$4,629,372</td>
<td>$6,180,982</td>
<td>$2,769,464</td>
<td>$87,316,669</td>
<td>$4,094,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIENNIAL TOTAL, 1975-1977</strong></td>
<td>$56,907,118</td>
<td>$57,428,823</td>
<td>$32,564,735</td>
<td>$9,327,668</td>
<td>$12,273,678</td>
<td>$5,503,154</td>
<td>$174,005,176</td>
<td>$8,113,806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EDUCATION AND GENERAL SERVICES**

**Summary of Base Budget Recommendations, 1975-1977**

**Colleges, Universities and Oregon Institute of Technology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colleges and Universities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Instruction</td>
<td>$85,074,053.00</td>
<td>$86,688,567.00</td>
<td>$87,316,609.00</td>
<td>$174,005,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session</td>
<td>45,381</td>
<td>45,063</td>
<td>44,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension and Public Service Sea Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$90,281,566</td>
<td>$92,237,580</td>
<td>$92,899,651</td>
<td>$185,137,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Institute of Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Instruction</td>
<td>$4,019,172</td>
<td>$4,094,634</td>
<td>$8,113,806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session</td>
<td>51,603</td>
<td>52,070</td>
<td>103,673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,070,775</td>
<td>$4,146,704</td>
<td>$8,217,479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST OF INSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1974-75</th>
<th>Year 1975-76</th>
<th>Year 1976-77</th>
<th>Year 1975-1977 Biennial Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colleges and Universities</strong></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Cost per student</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Cost per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Term FTE enrolment</td>
<td>$1,874.66</td>
<td>$1,923.72</td>
<td>$1,949.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>1,519.67</td>
<td>1,555.37</td>
<td>1,577.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>1,899.59</td>
<td>1,944.21</td>
<td>1,971.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>3,039.34</td>
<td>3,110.74</td>
<td>3,155.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Institute of Technology</strong></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Term FTE enrolment</td>
<td>$2,420.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,511.98</td>
<td>$2,522.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per student</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The budget authorized by the 1973 Legislature represented a cost of instruction in 1974-75 for:

- **Colleges and Universities**
  - $1,806.74 Composite
  - $1,487.00 Lower Division
  - $1,858.75 Upper Division
  - $2,974.00 Graduate

- **Oregon Institute of Technology**
  - $2,362.90 Composite
### EDUCATION AND GENERAL SERVICES

Colleges, Universities and Oregon Institute of Technology

**Base Budget Recommendation 1975-1977**

#### Summer Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>Six</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>OIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislatively Approved Budget</strong> Year 1974-75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,701,741</td>
<td>$50,314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment and Income Adjustment</strong> Base Budget Level 1974-75</td>
<td>$1,207,368</td>
<td>$999,175</td>
<td>$1,330,584</td>
<td>$387,204</td>
<td>$296,942</td>
<td>$138,779</td>
<td>$4,360,052</td>
<td>$50,314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for 1975-76:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation Services and Supplies</td>
<td>8,497</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>8,180</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>37,110</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wages</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Budget Recommendation 1975-76</strong></td>
<td>$1,216,475</td>
<td>$1,017,175</td>
<td>$1,339,189</td>
<td>$388,470</td>
<td>$297,505</td>
<td>$139,419</td>
<td>$4,398,233</td>
<td>$51,603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for 1976-77:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation Services and Supplies</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>6,525</td>
<td>2,965</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>13,452</td>
<td>467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wages</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Budget Recommendation 1976-77</strong></td>
<td>$1,220,103</td>
<td>$1,023,700</td>
<td>$1,342,537</td>
<td>$388,947</td>
<td>$297,710</td>
<td>$139,651</td>
<td>$4,412,648</td>
<td>$52,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biennial Total 1975-1977</strong> Base Budget for Summer Sessions</td>
<td>$2,436,578</td>
<td>$2,040,875</td>
<td>$2,681,726</td>
<td>$777,417</td>
<td>$595,215</td>
<td>$279,070</td>
<td>$8,810,881</td>
<td>$103,673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EDUCATION AND GENERAL SERVICES

Colleges, Universities and Oregon Institute of Technology  
Base Budget Recommendation 1975-1977

#### Extension and Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OGR</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>Six Inst. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislatively Approved Budget Year 1974-75</td>
<td>$99,900</td>
<td>$278,752</td>
<td>$138,646</td>
<td>$6,410</td>
<td>$8,467</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$533,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Approved Supplement</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,202</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Budget Level 1974-75</td>
<td>$164,900</td>
<td>$278,752</td>
<td>$165,848</td>
<td>$6,410</td>
<td>$8,467</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$625,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjustments for 1975-76:**

- **Inflation**
  - Services and Supplies: 2,224
  - Capital Outlay: 10,718
  - Student Wages: 1,936
  - Total: 16

- **Capital Outlay**:
  - Student Wages: 134

**Base Budget Recommendation 1975-76**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OGR</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>Six Inst. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$167,202</td>
<td>$289,470</td>
<td>$168,068</td>
<td>$6,410</td>
<td>$8,483</td>
<td>$974</td>
<td>$640,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Adjustments for 1976-77:**

- **Inflation**
  - Services and Supplies: 806
  - Capital Outlay: 3,885
  - Student Wages: 702
  - Total: 5,448

- **Capital Outlay**:
  - Student Wages: 6

**Base Budget Recommendation 1976-77**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OGR</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>Six Inst. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$168,076</td>
<td>$293,355</td>
<td>$169,024</td>
<td>$6,410</td>
<td>$8,489</td>
<td>$1,023</td>
<td>$646,377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biennial Total 1975-1977 Base Budget for Extension and Public Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OGR</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>Six Inst. Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$335,278</td>
<td>$582,825</td>
<td>$337,092</td>
<td>$12,820</td>
<td>$16,972</td>
<td>$1,997</td>
<td>$1,286,984</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EDUCATION AND GENERAL SERVICES**

Colleges, University and Oregon Institute of Technology

Base Budget Recommendation 1975-1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sea Grant</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legislatively Approved Budget Year 1974-75</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$472,110</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for 1975-76:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Budget Recommendation 1975-76</strong></td>
<td>$510,173</td>
<td>$510,173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjustments for 1976-77:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Budget Recommendation 1976-77</strong></td>
<td>$524,017</td>
<td>$524,017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biennial Total 1975-1977 Base Budget for Sea Grant</strong></td>
<td>$1,034,190</td>
<td>$1,034,190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Board Discussion and Action

The Chancellor said the base budget is described as the total amount needed to continue the existing level of services for existing numbers of students. The base budget is further adjusted by workload adjustment and program improvements. He said the difference between base budget and program improvements is not always very clear and precise. The transition funds are one example because they are needed to avoid disruption of existing programs. To continue the existing level of service for existing numbers of students requires the introduction of transition funds into the budgets of Eastern Oregon State College, Portland State University, Oregon College of Education, and Southern Oregon College.

The Chancellor also said the operating budgets are inadequate to place the inventory of equipment on a realistic replacement schedule. He said equipment replacement is an appropriate part of the base budget and the dollar amounts required to place the equipment on a more reasonable replacement schedule will be calculated for presentation in the biennial budget.

The Chancellor said the major decisions with respect to the budgets should be reached at the June Finance Committee meeting because of the deadline established for the presentation of the budget to the Executive Department. He said if there are any significant modifications to the budget at the August meeting, it would be impossible to meet the budget deadline.

The Chancellor said he had requested President Rice to explain how Oregon College of Education determined the specific amount of money and the number of positions which it deemed necessary in order to maintain the existing level of service for existing students.

Dr. Rice described staff reductions required in terms of the authorized FTE enrollments and the effect of these staff reductions on the program at Oregon College of Education.

Dr. Rice called attention to significant portions of his report which appears as Supplement A to these minutes.

In response to a question concerning the report, Dr. Rice said the minimum FTE faculty indicated in the report is core faculty which is essential for Oregon College of Education to offer the necessary services to 2,500 students. The report includes a request for $625,000 to retain 20 of the 37.5 faculty positions which would be deleted on the basis of enrollment projections.

President Clark pointed out that the essential problem set forth in the presentation by Dr. Rice was protection of the base budget. He urged the Board to consider some method of reexamining the base budget because erosion of the base budget and the lack of program improvement funds has resulted in a critical situation.

The Chancellor also stated that inflation allowances in the budget have been lower than the actual inflation rate. He said the inflation rate included in the budget for the second year of the biennium is 5 percent and he asked the Board to consider authorizing a more realistic figure of 8 percent.

Mr. Mosser said he would favor authorizing the Chancellor to proceed along the lines indicated but cautioning the Chancellor and the institution heads to use their best efforts to determine a minimum program which should be maintained. He said the credibility of the entire request could be destroyed if any positions were included which were not absolutely essential. Mr. Mosser also suggested that during the preparation of the budget the Board examine some of these base adjustments to determine what happened to the programs as a result.

Mr. Holmer said Oregon State University and Southern Oregon College face different programmatic problems and are seeking different solutions. Southern Oregon College needs transition funds for equipment, supplies, and in the support area. Portland State University falls somewhere between Oregon College
of Education and Southern Oregon College. The Board approved a motion to authorize an effort by the Chancellor to persuade the executive and legislative departments that minimum transition funds be considered base budget for the maintenance of existing programs, and that the Chancellor be instructed to bring to the Board no later than July alternative programs for systematic review of base budgets. It was understood the review might involve others in addition to members of the Board.

It was understood that the inflation factor and other items which should be included as part of a more realistic base budget might be submitted if they could be fully justified as part of the requirement for maintenance of minimum programs at the institutions.

Mrs. Johnson referred to a recent editorial in the Oregonian which indicated that Oregon ranked second in all of the states in the portion of the state appropriations used for higher education. She said the Board must be realistic in its budget requests to make certain that all unnecessary programs have been eliminated.

The Chancellor said the original document which Dr. Lyman Glenny prepared, and which served as the basis for The Chronicle report discussed in the Oregonian editorial, indicated that the percentage was calculated on state general revenues. In some states, state revenues are not all general revenues, and, in Oregon, a substantial part of the money used for state services, including the gasoline tax, is not part of the state general revenue. This can result in a distorted percentage of the state general revenue spent for higher education.

The Chancellor indicated that Oregon has extended educational opportunities because 3.66 percent of the total population in Oregon in 1972-73 was enrolled in public colleges and universities. The national average is 2.73 percent. The amount of money appropriated for higher education distributed over a larger portion of the population presents a different picture of public support for higher education.

The Chancellor said Oregon's state and local appropriations for higher education purposes averages $1,502 per FTE student, compared with a national average of $1,708. Oregon ranked 36th among the states in terms of the dollars available to provide educational services for an individual student. This amount is the crucial factor in terms of quality and the ability of the institutions to perform their function.

(Considered by Finance Committee; April 24, 1974; present--Mosser, Layman, McIntyre, Westerdahl, Corey, Johnson, Joss, Maden.)

Staff Report

Institutions and statewide public services have submitted "program improvement" requests for the coming biennium. By Executive Department definition, these have necessarily included amounts requested for "base support" at Eastern Oregon State College and funds required at Portland State University, Oregon College of Education, and Southern Oregon College to avoid program disruptions that would otherwise attend budgets reduced to reflect anticipated enrollment reductions.

After review of the submissions, it has seemed appropriate to single out certain items for priority treatment as "Departmental improvements" and to propose that other program improvements be identified as institutional or statewide public service requests. These latter requests would be limited to one percent of the biennial operating budget of the institution or service and would follow the priorities recommended by the institution or service.

1. Departmental Improvements

   a. Recognizing the necessity for a minimum level of funding at Eastern Oregon State College, the Legislature provided supplemental support for Eastern Oregon State College in 1973-1975 of $496,784. A corresponding level of funding for 1975-1977 would be $321,935.
b. Averting untenable program disruption

At Portland State University, Oregon College of Education, and Southern Oregon College, transition funding has been provided in 1974-75 to avoid giving untimely notice to tenured personnel because of enrollment reductions. Some of the transition funds have also been provided to avoid severe program disruptions that would, for example, reduce the availability of essential courses or otherwise affect adversely the ability of the institution to serve student needs. Since timely notice is being given, transition funding to avoid untimely notice for 1975-76 is not required. However, the need for substantial funds to avoid imprudent reduction of program quality will continue to exist. The amounts recommended:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>$1,095,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>625,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td>601,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,321,872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. New degree programs

Certain new or modified curricular offerings are under consideration. Programs which have been approved by the Board are included in the recommendation:

- Nursing baccalaureate (SOC) $144,620
- Graduate endodontics (UDDS) 89,532
- Total $234,152

Other offerings: Legal Assistants at Oregon Institute of Technology, $40,698, and Veterinary Medicine at Oregon State University, $101,200, would be added if the Academic Affairs Committee and the Board approve the programs as they are presently submitted for consideration. Total: $141,898.

d. Degree courses in non-urban areas (DCE) $288,634

e. Continuing education for nurses $132,300

f. Council on Economic Education $52,000

g. Computer services $2,074,484

(1) Academic Network $1,601,528
(2) Administrative Network 472,956

h. Energy-related research $500,000

i. Released time for collective bargaining 30,000

These "Departmental improvements" total $6,095,275. There is, in addition, the possibility of at least one other Systemwide request of uncertain magnitude: the automation of certain library systems. The Board is aware that the institution librarians have been reviewing the possibility of automation of many of their labor-intensive operations (purchasing, cataloging, circulation, accounting, etc.). The chairman of the Council of Librarians (Norman Alexander, SOC) has identified at least four prospective vendors of systems and services. Because the undertaking is a massive one, it appears that a major systems feasibility study (costing on the order of $110,000) is a necessary first step. A proposal for such a study, funded from Board reserves, is likely to be submitted in the near future to permit a soundly based decision about a 1975-1977 budget request. The feasibility study would not be completed, however, until after the submission of the biennial budget request on September 1. It is hoped that the benefit/cost analysis will identify modules that could be implemented in 1975-1977 with minimum net cost.
2. Institution and statewide service improvements

The foregoing (departmental) requests do not exhaust the need for program improvement in the Department of Higher Education but they are believed to be of sufficient significance to warrant the priority that has been accorded to them. The other needs for improvement reflect individual institution or service considerations. To attempt to prioritize these requests would be both difficult and inconsistent with the fact that the volume of urgent and defensible requests exceed any expectation that all could be funded. The original requests totalled in excess of $20 million. Even this total represents only those requests that were forwarded to the Board's Office.

It has seemed preferable, in the light of the priority recommended for the "departmental" requests, to suggest that each institution and statewide service be asked to review its requests and to identify those items it would include within a limitation of one percent of its base budget. The amounts available under such a limitation would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and Service</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>$ 565,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>590,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>357,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>107,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon College</td>
<td>130,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>58,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>76,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Medical School</td>
<td>188,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Dental School</td>
<td>59,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Service</td>
<td>20,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>164,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>145,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Research Laboratory</td>
<td>31,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crippled Children's Division</td>
<td>60,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Clinics</td>
<td>477,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Activities</td>
<td>209,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3,242,061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variety of items is illustrated by the following list of purposes included in the requests:

- **UO**  --Library operation and book acquisition
  - School of Librarianship
  - Use of new technology in instruction
  - Community health studies
  - School of Law

- **OSU**  --Library book acquisition
  - Faculty development
  - Instructional development and evaluation

- **PSU**  --School of Social Work
  - Equipment and library book acquisition

- **OCE**  --Support staff
  - Equipment and supplies
  - Library support

- **SOC**  --Support staff in instruction
  - Equipment and supplies in instruction

- **EOSC**  --Extension of bilingual program authorized by the 1973 Legislature

- **OIT**  --Learning Center equipment
UOMS -- Graduate teaching assistants for basic science departments
Instruction supplies and equipment
Medical technology improvement

UDIS -- Dental interns and residents for the Hospital Dental Service

OEPBS -- Separation of OEPBS from DCE
Compensation and vacation relief required by collective bargaining agreement

Agricultural Experiment Station --
Research projects recommended by the statewide advisory council, including:
  Efficiency of nitrogen utilization;
  Protecting human health from chemical residues in food crops and animal products;
  Reducing pollution from agricultural processes.

Cooperative Extension Service --
Marine Science extension agent
Area forestry agent, Southwest Oregon
Area extension agent, Columbia Basin
4-H Youth Program

Forest Research Laboratory --
Research projects recommended by the statewide advisory council

Crippled Children's Division --
Liaison educator to provide communication between the clinic and school agencies
Genetics diagnosis and counseling program

Hospitals and Clinics --
Central Services improvements in clinical laboratory, diagnostic radiology, EKG laboratory, etc.
Equipment replacements
Standardization of hospital services
Patient processing
Physical plant operation and rehabilitation

Centralized Activities --
Minority and disadvantaged student selection
Controller's Office systems
Analytic and budget systems

5. Oregon Educational Broadcasting request $ 175,000

The request is designed to provide instructional and educational enrichment programming at elementary, secondary and college levels, primarily in the field of television.

The program improvement requests recommended for 1975-1977 total $9,558,122.

Except for programs in statewide public service divisions for which other fund resources can be identified, the requests are proposed to be supported by State General Fund appropriations.

In addition, the 1973 Legislature directed the State Board of Higher Education to prepare and submit a program and time schedule for establishment of regional development institutes at appropriate state colleges. (Chapter 692, Oregon Laws 1973) Priority in establishing such institutes was given to Eastern Oregon State College and Southern Oregon College.
Tentative budgets to fulfill the obligations specified in the statute have been estimated at $496,000 for the 1975-1977 biennium. The programs are proposed for submission as a separate element of the Department’s biennial request. It is planned that these estimates be refined and presented for Board approval in May 1974.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Finance Committee authorize (subject to Board action at its May meeting) the preparation of biennial budget requests for 1975-1977 incorporating the program improvements outlined above:

| "Departmental" improvements | $6,095,275 |
| Institution and service improvements | 3,242,061 |
| OEPBS (Instructional programming) | 175,000 |
| **Total** | **$9,512,336** |

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

During the discussion, it was indicated that it would be unrealistic to develop detailed data for more than one or two percent of the program improvement requests.

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved further presentation of the program improvement requests in the preparation of the budget. It was understood that the figures appearing in the above report may be modified during further budget preparation.

Staff Report to the Board

Functional limitations were established by the 1973 Legislature for the seven institutions (colleges, universities, Oregon Institute of Technology) in the Education and General Services Program. The Ways and Means Budget Report declares "the intention that, as far as possible, the budget amounts be expended in accord with the functional distributions...as adjusted by the Subcommittee." It provided, however, that necessary transfers between functions should have Board of Higher Education approval and be reported "to the appropriate legislative body." Reports are to be submitted to the Emergency Board in the fall and spring of each school year.

Functional limitations were established on the biennial total for seven institutions. To maintain surveillance of changes recommended for Board approval, the biennial composite was reduced to fiscal year components for each institution. The initial budget plan for 1973-74 reflected the proposed variance from the legislatively-authorized plan and was approved by the Board on August 27, 1973. Further changes which have occurred since that date are summarized on the attached exhibit.

During January 1974, the Board approved functional transfers made through December 31, 1973. The approved transfers were reported to the State Emergency Board at that time. Further transfers, effective as of March 31, 1974, have been prepared by the institutions and are reflected on the attached exhibit.

Transfer recommendations include the budget adjustments for 1973-74 academic year and summer session enrollment changes, approved transfers from Board funds and the accumulation of savings to be applied toward transition funding in year 1974-75. The increase in budgeted reserves includes, in part, recently posted indirect cost credits which are yet to be distributed to expenditure accounts. The total net change in budgeted expenses is only $38,982 (out of $90.8 million) above the 1973-74 initial budget plan for the seven institutions.
Subject to Board approval on May 21, 1974, it is proposed that the functional transfers be reported to the State Emergency Board in June 1974. Following the close of fiscal year records (as of June 30, 1974) the 1973-74 report of actual functional expenditures will be submitted for Board approval before submission of the fall report to the Emergency Board. The fall report will also include shifts anticipated in the 1974-75 operating budget.

Staff Recommendation

It was recommended that the Board approve the functional transfers effective through March 31, 1974, and authorize submission of a report to the State Emergency Board in June 1974. The exhibit appears on the following page.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendation as presented.
### Change in Functional Distribution of Budgeted Expenditures

**Universities, Colleges, and OIT (Seven Institutions)**

1973-74

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legislative Limitation</th>
<th>Board Approved Change in Initial Budget</th>
<th>Initial Budget Plan</th>
<th>Planned Change July-Dec.</th>
<th>12/31/73 Board Approved Budget Plan</th>
<th>3/31/74 Adjusted Budget Plan</th>
<th>Planned Change From 12/31/73 Adjusted Approved Budget Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Related Research</td>
<td>$60,636,239</td>
<td>($556,924)</td>
<td>$60,079,315</td>
<td>$10,337</td>
<td>$60,089,652</td>
<td>$59,983,186</td>
<td>($106,466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension and Public Services</td>
<td>620,984</td>
<td>(28,832)</td>
<td>592,152</td>
<td>(26,600)</td>
<td>565,552</td>
<td>566,101</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>6,501,723</td>
<td>(79,467)</td>
<td>6,422,256</td>
<td>(79,906)</td>
<td>6,342,350</td>
<td>6,327,179</td>
<td>(15,171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td>5,615,062</td>
<td>71,001</td>
<td>5,686,063</td>
<td>(76,265)</td>
<td>5,609,798</td>
<td>5,686,008</td>
<td>76,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>17,393,085</td>
<td>(514,594)</td>
<td>16,878,491</td>
<td>(79,488)</td>
<td>16,799,003</td>
<td>16,502,974</td>
<td>(296,029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Reserves</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,108,816</td>
<td>1,108,816</td>
<td>251,497</td>
<td>1,360,313</td>
<td>1,740,627</td>
<td>380,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$90,767,093</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$90,767,093</td>
<td>($425)</td>
<td>$90,766,668</td>
<td>$90,806,075</td>
<td>$39,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Board Approved 12/31/73*

*Planned Adjusted 3/31/74*

*Planned Change From 12/31/73 Adjusted Approved Budget Plan*

**Meeting #416-96**

May 21, 1974
Institutions have submitted requests for New Building Operation and Maintenance for the coming biennium. By Executive Department definition, New Building Operation and Maintenance will appear as Program Improvements in the 1975-1977 Biennial Budget. For purposes of reporting to the Board and the development of the Biennial Budget, New Building Operation and Maintenance has been segregated from the Program Improvement request so as not to confuse a true Program Improvement from an expense item which will be occurring because of prior or pending capital construction decisions.

The requests for New Building Operation and Maintenance were developed as follows:

1. Each institution has requested operating funds for projects, approved for construction during 1973-1975, to come on-line during 1975-1977 and projects which are a part of the Capital Construction Budget for 1975-1977. The staff recommendation for New Building Operation and Maintenance funds outlined below contains funds for only those projects which are expected to come on-line on or before January 1977. Therefore, institutional requests for operating costs for several projects which are a part of the 1975-1977 Capital Construction Budget are not included because there is no certainty that on-line dates could occur during 1975-1977. Projects and completion dates have been reviewed by the Office of Facilities Planning and are consistent with construction plans and requests.

2. The cost-savings resulting from buildings being razed when new or remodeled buildings go on-line are reflected in the institutional requests for New Building Operation and Maintenance.

3. The requests include operation and maintenance funds for those institutions which have not been provided with General Fund support for physical plant costs for student unions. This request is in accord with Board policy regarding financing of student union facilities. The policy recognizes that student union facilities serve general educational purposes and that physical plant costs connected with those general educational purposes are to be provided from the institution's physical plant budget, except in those areas of the student union building used for commercial or revenue producing activities. Oregon State University received funding for this purpose in 1973-1975. Southern Oregon College and Eastern Oregon State College received similar funding when their new student unions were built. This request includes funds for the University of Oregon, Portland State University, and Oregon College of Education to bring those institutions into conformity with the financing policy.

The following schedule outlines the New Building Operation and Maintenance requirements for 1975-1977: