STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN
ROOM 338, MICHAEL J. SMITH MEMORIAL CENTER
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, PORTLAND, OREGON

November 25, 1975

MEETING #427-1

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 9:30 A.M. (P.S.T.), November 25, 1975, by the President of the Board, Mr. George H. Layman, and on roll call the following answered present:

- Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter
- Mrs. Betty Feves
- Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.
- Mr. Robert C. Ingalis
- Mr. Philip A. Joss
- Mr. Marc F. Maden
- Miss Valerie McIntyre
- Mr. W. Philip McLaurin
- Mr. Louis B. Perry
- Mr. Loran L. Stewart
- Mr. George H. Layman

Absent: None.

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. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Dr. E. Rex Krueger, Vice Chancellor for Educational Systems; Mr. W. T. Lemman, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration; Mr. Edward Branchfield, Assistant Attorney General; Mr. Richard Zita, Director of Publications; Mr. John Richardson, Assistant to the Chancellor; Dr. Richard S. Perry, Director, Division of Administrative and Analytic Services; Miss Linda Gabrielson, Information Representative; Miss Wilma Foster, Assistant Board Secretary; Miss Francetta Carroll, Administrative Assistant.

Oregon State University--President R. W. MacVicar; Dr. Carol Saslow, Associate Professor of Psychology; Dr. Fred Klopfer, Assistant Professor of Psychology; Dr. David Carlson, Professor of Mathematics; Dr. Bob Newburgh, Vice Chairman, Faculty Senate.

University of Oregon--President William B. Boyd.

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center--President Lewis W. Bluemle, Jr.

Portland State University--President Joseph Blumel; Dr. Ken Harris, Director of the Budget; Dr. Leon Richelle, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Dr. James Todd, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Dr. J. R. Byrne, Mathematics Department Chairman; Dr. Norman C. Rose, Professor of Chemistry; Dr. Thomas Buell, Acting Dean of Undergraduate Studies; Dr. Richard Halley, Graduate Dean; Mrs. Orcilia Forbes, Dean of Students.

Oregon College of Education--President Leonard W. Rice.

Southern Oregon State College--President James K. Sours.

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

Oregon Institute of Technology--President W. D. Purvine.

Others--Dr. Terry K. Olson, Executive Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; State Representative Mary Rieke; State Senator Cliff Trow; State Representative A. Van Vliet; State Representative Bill Wyatt; Miss Melissa Morris.
Executive Assistant, FORE; Dr. Victor C. Dahl, Chairman, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate; Mrs. Deanne Kinsey, Administrative Assistant, Interim Committee on State Government; Mr. Bill Nelson, Executive Secretary, Oregon Federation of the American Association of University Professors; Dr. Samuel K. Anderson, State Federation AAUP; Mr. Robert L. Ackerman, ASUO Legal Services; Mrs. Maxine Warnath, Vice Chairman, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate; Mrs. Margie Hendrikson, President, Oregon Women's Political Caucus; Dr. Margaret Lumpkin, Oregon Women's Political Caucus; Mr. Gilbert Polanski, Field Representative, Oregon State Employees Association; Mr. Daniel Dorritie, Faculty Representative, OSEA; Mr. Dan Sheans, Director, Academic/Unclassified, OSEA.

MINUTES
APPROVED

The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on September 23 and October 28, 1975, and approved them as previously distributed, with the following voting in favor: Directors Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

The Chancellor said that at the time salary adjustment monies were authorized for distribution, they were underfunded by the legislature. When it became apparent that the resources were more than adequate to fund the adjustment originally suggested, the Executive Department submitted a proposal to the Emergency Board for full funding of the salary adjustments. The Chancellor reported the Executive Department proposal was not approved. However, the Emergency Board decided to impose a one percent underfunding of the salary adjustments rather than to impose the general underfunding of approximately two percent as contemplated at the close of the legislative session.

The change in the amount of the underfunding will result in a slight reduction in the negative budget account imposed on the institutions to finance the original underfunding.

Moratorium on Proposals for New Programs

The Chancellor said the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission had met with the subcommittee of the Emergency Board to report on its work plan for the 1975-1977 biennium. During the report, it was indicated that the Commission had asked for a 90-day moratorium on proposals for new programs by the various segments of education but that as yet there had been no response from the respective boards.

The Chancellor recommended that the Board take action stating to the Commission that the State Board of Higher Education would cooperate in the 90-day moratorium. He said the conditions of the moratorium were such that in the event emergency conditions exist and it seems essential to take a program to the Board and subsequently to the Commission, it would be possible to do so.

The Board approved the statement declaring its cooperation with the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission on the moratorium with the following voting in favor: Directors Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, and Layman.

Those voting no: Director Stewart.

The President declared the statement adopted.

Definition of 'Segment' in Law Establishing OECC

The Chancellor said he had been requested to have Mr. Branchfield prepare an informal discussion of the term 'segment' in the language of the law establishing the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission. There was particular concern as to whether the term referred to an institution or group of institutions.
The informal statement has been prepared and a copy of the memorandum will be distributed to the Board. Basically, Mr. Branchfield states that if an opinion were sought, the conclusion would be that segments refer to groups of institutions rather than to individual institutions. Mr. Branchfield also suggested that if an Attorney General's opinion were sought, that counsel for the Board of Education, the Board of Higher Education, and the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission would have an opportunity to confer.

The Chancellor said no further action appeared to be required at the present time. He said the issue of the definition of "segment" is a crucial one in dealing with the relationships between the boards and the commission and it may be necessary to clarify it further.

Operation of R/V WECOMA, OSU

The Chancellor reported that a contract had been signed with the National Science Foundation which provided for a five-year loan of a $3 million research vessel, the R/V WECOMA. He said Oregon State University officials will take delivery of the ship in Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin, and will operate the vessel as a charter party during the entire loan period. The agreement does not call for any expenditure of general fund money or for a rental fee. Operational costs will be provided by the federally-sponsored grants. The YACUTNA, the present research vessel acquired in 1964 by means of National Science Foundation financing, was sold on November 11 and the $277,000 resulting from that sale will be applied toward additional equipment for the WECOMA.

Athletic Programs at the Three Universities

The Chancellor said the Board had expressed considerable interest in whether there was a more intrusive, participative, supportive role which the Board might play as a consequence of the financial problems which the institutions, particularly the three universities, have been facing in relationship to intercollegiate athletics. The Board also was concerned with the relationship of the athletic programs to Title IX.

The Chancellor said the Board has characteristically remained quite distant from the intercollegiate athletic program. He said the Board apparently had concluded that remoteness from intercollegiate athletics no longer was feasible and there had been extensive discussion of the athletic programs at the Board's breakfast.

The Chancellor said his interpretation of the morning discussion was that the Board requested him to present a position paper which would include:

1. Some clarification of the role the Board should play insofar as intercollegiate athletics is concerned;
2. An analysis of whether there should be some additional financial support, particularly for the non-income producing sports and for those activities stipulated by the federal legislation in Title IX;
3. A review of the relationship in the institutions of the athletic facilities and the financing of their maintenance, because there may be some possible undesirable variation in the practices which conceivably could call for some additional financial support; and
4. A review and comparison of the admissions requirements as they may disadvantage the University of Oregon and Oregon State University in connection with the transfer of junior and community college students.

The Chancellor said the admissions requirements for nonresident students were more urgent than the other three topics if any impact were contemplated on the 1976-77 year. The Chancellor recommended that the Board authorize him to review the admissions requirements to determine the degree of differential between the
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State System schools and the other institutions in the Pac-8 Conference and to take, on a temporary basis, those actions which would eliminate any discrimination which might exist between the State System practices and those at other Pac-8 schools. The Chancellor said he would come back within the two-month period to report the temporary actions taken and make recommendations for the future.

Upon motion by Mr. Stewart, the Board authorized the Chancellor to review admissions requirements and to take temporary actions to eliminate any discrimination which might exist with respect to admissions requirements. Those voting in favor of the motion were: Directors Carpenter, Feyes, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None.

Request for Authorization of Criminal Justice Option in MUS and Ph.D. in Urban Studies Programs, PSU

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, October 28, 1975; present--Carpenter, Maden, Harms, Joss.)

Portland State University requests authorization to offer an area of concentration in criminal justice as an option in its MUS and Ph.D. in urban studies programs. (See pp. 951-2 for a brief resume of the proposed program.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's Office recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to offer an area of concentration in criminal justice as an option in the MUS and Ph.D. in urban studies programs, effective winter term 1975-76.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Romney said the proposal was being presented in order that the Board may consider it in advance of a December deadline for Portland State University to submit a request to federal agencies for continuation into 1976-77 of existing federal grants and for new grant funds. Dr. Romney said that this need places this proposal within the "emergency" category of cases the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission identified in its resolution of October 16, asking cooperation of the two state boards in observing a 90-day moratorium on "action to certify new programs as well as plans for expansion or branch locations."

Mr. Maden read the following statement concerning his participation in the discussion:

In accordance with Chapter 543, 1975 Oregon Laws, I hereby give notice that the request for authorization now before this Board to offer an area of concentration in criminal justice as an option in its MUS and Ph.D. in Urban Studies Programs is submitted by Portland State University on behalf of the Urban Studies Programs and that I am a student in the Urban Studies Ph.D. Program.

Having carefully considered the potentiality of a conflict of interest in voting on this proposal, I affirm that my only interest in the Criminal Justice Program is educational. Applying the opinion of the Attorney General (May 13, 1974) that pertains to these circumstances, I conclude that my participation in the discussion and disposition of this request before the Board is neither prohibited by statute nor public policy.

Mr. Harms commented that it was his experience that there had been a substantial increase in the educational level of people in law enforcement. After receiving the baccalaureate degree in law enforcement, individuals enter graduate work in other fields and then tend to desert the area of law enforcement. He said he felt the criminal justice option in the MUS and Ph.D. programs in urban studies at Portland State University was a needed program which would not conflict with the program in correctional administration at Oregon College of Education.
Mrs. Carpenter asked if the Board's Office had discussed the program with law enforcement officials. Dr. Romney replied that he had talked with Mr. Paul Bettiol, executive director of the police standards and training board, who said that he supported the Portland State University proposal but that he would like also for the Board to know of the interest in the Salem area in some expansion of the master's program in correctional administration at Oregon College of Education to encompass law enforcement. In respect to Mr. Bettiol's concern, Dr. Romney said, the objective of the Portland State University proposed program is to develop planners and evaluators in criminal justice and is quite different from the program which Oregon College of Education offers or wants to offer.

Dr. Romney said he also had received letters expressing strong support for the Portland State proposal from the chairman of the Multnomah County Commission, Donald Clark and from Multnomah County Sheriff Lee Brown, and copies of an independent evaluation of the Portland State University proposed program made for the federal granting agency by Dr. Daniel Glaser, University of Southern California. He said Dr. Glaser mentions in his report that he was quite impressed with some of the people he met while he was in Oregon, among them Sheriff Brown, whom he said was one of the outstanding men in the country in the field of criminology, in terms both of his academic and his practical background. In his report Dr. Glaser emphasized that the relationship between Portland State and people in the criminal justice field was one of the strengths of the program.

Dr. Romney read the letters from Commissioner Clark and Sheriff Brown commenting on the working relationship between Portland State University and their offices and the need for graduate level instruction of the kind being proposed by Portland State University, and pledging cooperation in providing practicum placements and research opportunities for students enrolled in the program.

President Blumel reviewed briefly the history of development of the program, noting that the granting agency was fully aware that the proposed program could not be implemented without approval of the Board of Higher Education.

Dr. Kersh stated that the faculty and administration of Oregon College of Education had reviewed carefully the proposal from Portland State, and heartily supported it. He said the Oregon College of Education program was quite different from the Portland State University proposal, which was clearly oriented to the development of research scholars who could also work in an area of administration of justice. The Oregon College of Education program, Dr. Kersh said, works with people who already have considerable experience in corrections and law enforcement and are being advanced into managerial positions.

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

Board Discussion and Action

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

Mr. Layman said the Board had just indicated to the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission that the Board would cooperate in the 90-day moratorium on new programs. Mr. Layman said it was indicated in the report that the program would not conflict with the private institutions. He said the proposed program would go to the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission for consideration and noted that it fell within the emergency exceptions to the moratorium because a grant was involved. Mr. Layman invited Dr. Terry Olson of the Commission to comment.

Dr. Olson said the Commission's view of the emergency clause was that if the Board certified that there is an emergency, the Commission has promised to act with haste in reviewing the program.

Mr. Joss said he would add the certification of an emergency to his motion.
The Board approved the motion by Mr. Joss, including the certification of the emergency nature of the proposal. The following voted in favor of the motion: Directors Carpenter, Peves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None.

Explanation

1. Criminal justice is an area of investigation and study that quite logically falls within Portland State University's purview.

- Portland State University is an urban university with the mission of service to an urban population.

- Among the most intractable problems of the urban scene is crime, its control and prevention. Crime is a phenomenon that is heavily concentrated in urban areas. It has shown an alarming increase with the growing urbanization of advanced societies, and it is said by some students of crime to be "related in fundamental ways to the urban social and economic structure."

- In its examination of urban problems worthy of the university's attention, the control and prevention of crime has loomed in the university's thinking as an area of investigation and study deserving the university's best efforts.

Portland State University has for long had an undergraduate program in administration of justice. The present proposal would extend that interest into the graduate level.

2. The request for authorization to offer an area of concentration in criminal justice as an option in the MUS (master of urban studies) program and the Ph.D. program in the same field is based upon an extended period of planning during which Portland State University has developed a planned program and laid a base upon which to raise the structure it now proposes.

- The proposed program is not one hastily put together by Portland State University. Rather, it is the result of planning and development extending over roughly three years during which Portland State University has had available to it substantial federal funding to assist it in its planning and development efforts.

Board members who were on the Board in 1973 may recall that in 1973, Portland State University sought and received from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) designation as a "center of excellence" in the field of administration of justice. (At the time, Portland State University had had for some years, first a certificate program, and subsequently a baccalaureate program, in administration of justice, and a doctoral program in urban studies, both of which were relevant to Portland State University's request to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.)

Portland State University was one of seven universities designated by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration as "centers of excellence." (The others were: Northeastern University, University of Maryland, Michigan State University, Eastern Kentucky University, University of Nebraska [Omaha], Arizona State University.)

With the designation came substantial federal funding—in Portland State University's case, $600,000 to be received over a three-year period (1973-74 through 1975-76).
The seven universities (National Criminal Justice Educational Development Consortium) entered into a consortium agreement by which they agreed to endeavor severally and in concert to, among other things, (a) strengthen doctoral studies programs at those institutions within the consortium where such programs already exist, (b) build or strengthen the capability of each affiliated institution to transfer the knowledge acquired as a result of its educational development and research activities to other components of the criminal justice system, (c) educate, perform research, and participate in mutually useful activities (exchange information, exchange faculty, facilitate student transfers, share reports, encourage workshops) and otherwise seek to establish needed standards and achievement goals, and (d) build plans for criminal justice or directly related doctoral studies programs where they do not exist.

To the present (1975), Portland State University has expended $290,000 of the grant of $600,000 and anticipates spending most of the remaining $310,000 during 1975-76 and 1976-77, provided the Board grants Portland State University the authorization here requested.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant to Portland State University was made by LEAA officials with full knowledge that, whatever the plan developed by Portland State University for graduate work in the criminal justice area, it could not be put into effect until faculty support for the plan had been secured, and authorization to offer the program outlined in the plan had been secured from the State Board of Higher Education. That failing on either of these two counts, Portland State University would be unable to proceed with the implementation of the plan.

The response of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration officials to Portland State University's explanation of these contingencies was that the granting of LEAA planning funds in the face of such contingencies is common; that should Portland State University be unable to proceed with the implementation of the plan, Portland State University would simply be dropped from the consortium and the grant program without prejudice or recrimination on the part of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration officials.

As a result of its planning and development efforts under the foregoing Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant, Portland State University has:

- A plan for the establishment of an option in criminal justice to be made available to master of urban studies and Ph.D. in urban studies students, if the Board approves.
- Eighteen (18) project reports and publications relating to criminal justice education and problems, which were produced by Portland State University personnel over the past two years under the federal grant, as they developed plans for a graduate option in criminal justice.
- Faculty who have developed increased expertise in the field of criminal justice and related fields, as a result of their participation in the planning and development activities of the past two years.
- $15,000 to upgrade Portland State University's basic library collection in criminal justice, and an up-to-date bibliography in criminal justice developed in concert with Arizona State University, as an aspect of the consortium activities.
Support of law enforcement and corrections personnel and agencies in the Portland metropolitan area who have cooperated with Portland State University in carrying out grant-funded research, and who are familiar with the nature of Portland State University's plan for a graduate option in criminal justice.

Portland State University's planning looks to the continuing availability of federal assistance in the further development and establishment of the program here proposed.

Portland State University's accomplishments under the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant were evaluated in 1975 by an experienced evaluator (Dr. Daniel Glaser) from the University of Southern California employed by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for this purpose. The site visit and report were highly commendatory of the Portland State University accomplishments and Portland State University's proposed graduate option in criminal justice. (A copy of the report of the site visit and evaluation is on file in the Board's Office.)

The Portland State University project staff has been awarded an additional $100,000 Law Enforcement Assistance Administration grant (additional to the $600,000) for the period July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, to provide technical assistance to the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Operations task group in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in the development of a national program of youth diversion, which is a significant aspect of crime prevention and control efforts.

Portland State University is seeking Law Enforcement Assistance Administration authorization to expend in 1976-77 any funds remaining at the end of 1975-76 from the original $600,000 grant, and is also seeking designation by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration as one of the assessment centers being established by LEAA.

3. Criminal justice is an appropriate area of investigation and study for students enrolled in Portland State University's MUS (master of urban studies) and Ph.D. urban studies programs.

In any cataloguing of urban problems, crime would rank among the most pervasive and the most serious. Crime control and crime prevention are among the most pressing of the cities' needs. It is not strange, therefore, that in an urban institution such as Portland State University, there should be provision within the broad area of urban studies for students to concentrate a measure of their graduate work in the area of criminal justice.

Urban studies is a multidisciplinary field of study. It rests upon, and draws its subject matter from, a wide variety of disciplines in the curriculum (e.g., sociology, economics, psychology, political science, anthropology). So, too, does criminal justice.

Gibbons and Blake note that:

Criminology is a well-established field of specialization in sociology; that sociologists have been traditionally concerned with "the social-structural dynamics and processes that produce criminality, the socialization and learning experiences through which persons come to embark on criminal acts and criminal careers, organizational analysis of elements of the criminal justice system such as the police, courts, or prisons... rehabilitation efforts and treatment programs."
Economists have focused their attention on "deterrence, economic trends and crime, historical shifts in economic systems and attendant alterations in crime control practices, and analyses of the costs of crime."

"A sizable body of work on criminality has also been produced by psychologists, much of it centered about the issue of the extent to which lawbreakers are characterized by personality patterns that differentiate them from nonoffenders."

Political scientists have in recent years shown an increasing interest in "the criminal law and the criminal justice machinery . . . ."

Anthropologists have a great deal to say about "comparative legal systems, varied social control systems, and the like."

It is the aim of Portland State University's proposed option to draw upon these multidisciplinary courses within some "overarching framework," in order to provide a "coherent understanding of the entire complex of criminality and reactions to it."

Portland State University asserts that urban studies students interested in the criminal justice option will be given the opportunity to "examine the major theories, concepts, and perspectives that have been developed to understand crime, criminal behavior patterns and social responses to law-breaking" and to give attention to the "the components of the criminal justice system, including organizational patterns, problems of organizational coordination, criminal justice planning, and program evaluation in criminal justice."

How the concentration fits into the urban studies programs. If this present proposal is approved by the Board, the criminal justice concentration would become one of four fields of specialization in urban studies available to the Ph.D. in urban studies student, and it would become the one field of specialization (18 credit hours) for the master of urban studies-research student, as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Curricular Requirements for Urban Studies Graduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.U.S.--Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Credits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core-Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Proseminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Community in Persp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three 510's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Methodology:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prereq: Math 364, 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Terms of Urban Studies Methodology Sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields of Specialization:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One field consisting of 18 credits with an emphasis on research methodology. (For criminal justice students, the field will be criminal justice.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Life Styles and Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Regional Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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New credit courses in support of criminal justice concentration. Nine three-credit hour courses are proposed by Portland State University in support of the criminal justice option, as follows, for all of which Portland State University has prepared syllabi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOC 507</td>
<td>Seminar in Deviance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 507</td>
<td>Analysis of Crime, Criminal Behavior, and Criminal Careers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 507</td>
<td>Criminal and Juvenile Programs and Planning I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 507</td>
<td>Criminal and Juvenile Programs and Planning II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 507</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Research I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 507</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Research II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 507</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Organization and Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 507</td>
<td>Society and Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 510</td>
<td>Criminality, Crime Control, and Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also available will be US 501, Research; US 503, Thesis; US 505, Reading and Conference.

After such adjustment in the courses as experience indicates would be desirable, they will be given regular course numbers. Brief descriptions of the courses are presented in the full report.

Admissions to the program. Course work developed for the program assumes that students will enter the program with a fairly sophisticated understanding of criminology and criminal justice developed in their undergraduate background. Students who lack adequate undergraduate preparation will be expected to remedy their deficiencies before admission. Student interest in the program to date suggests that the program will be able to limit admission to applicants well qualified to undertake the level of work expected.

Manpower needs to be served. The Portland State University program planners are intent in turning out graduates who are equipped to perform important tasks in ongoing correctional organizations, but who are also equipped to fill significant roles as criminal justice planners, evaluators, researchers, and educators. It is Portland State University's goal to develop graduates who are capable of understanding the larger social and economic trends in American society and their implications for criminal justice, and who will be capable of diagnosing criminal justice problems in the light of these basic social and economic trends.
4. The proposed option in criminal justice will not result in unnecessary duplication of programs already offered in Oregon public or independent colleges and universities, nor have an adverse impact on any other segment of Oregon education.

Other programs in Oregon. Criminal justice has been a rapidly growing field of study in recent years owing, in some measure, to the federal stimulation through funding of students and programs in criminal justice.

Over the past decade, Oregon has developed four-year baccalaureate degree programs at Southern Oregon State College (criminology), Portland State University (administration of justice), Oregon College of Education (corrections), and upper-division baccalaureate programs at Eastern Oregon State College and Oregon College of Education for students who have completed an associate degree program in law enforcement at an Oregon community college, and a baccalaureate degree program in community services at the University of Oregon.

Eleven community colleges offer associate degree programs related to criminal justice, with concentration for the most part in the area of law enforcement.

The University of Portland offers a baccalaureate degree program in administration of justice and an interdisciplinary master of science degree program in criminal justice, dealing with law enforcement and correctional administration.

The only graduate program in this general field in a public institution in Oregon is the MA/MS degree program in correctional administration, offered by Oregon College of Education. This is an advanced program in correctional administration for persons who have completed appropriate undergraduate programs of study in social or behavioral sciences and advanced work in law enforcement or corrections, and who have at least two years of satisfactory experience in a correctional or law enforcement agency in an administrative or supervisory position, or who are eligible for advancement to such a position. The programs serve the specific needs of a defined student body, many members of which are full-time employees in agencies in the Salem area. The program was planned with the cooperation of representatives of Portland State University at the request and with the participation of the Board's Office, in order to assure that the program would be complementary to a more broadly designed program in administration of justice which it was anticipated at the time would, in due course, be developed at Portland State University.

The only other graduate program in the Northwest is a master's degree program in police science and administration at Washington State University.

Impact on other segments of Oregon education. The Board's Office sent copies of the Portland State University proposal to Oregon independent colleges and universities which might have an interest in knowing of the proposal in advance of its being acted upon by the State Board of Higher Education or the Educational Coordinating Commission, asking for any comments they wished to make concerning any possible adverse effects upon their operations.

No institution has indicated that the proposed option at Portland State University would have an adverse impact on the institution or the segment of education in which the institution is situated.
As noted above, only two institutions in Oregon offer graduate work in administration of justice areas (Oregon College of Education and the University of Portland).

- The Oregon College of Education master's degree program in correctional administration was planned in cooperation with Portland State University, and serves a specialized need not likely to be affected by the addition of the proposed option at Portland State University.

- As to possible adverse impact on the University of Portland program, The Reverend Michael G. O'Brien, academic vice president, writes:

  The proposed program should have no negative impact upon University of Portland programs. The doctoral program could prove beneficial in that University of Portland MS graduates could continue at Portland State University. (Letter dated September 24, 1975.)

5. The proposed option can be offered within Portland State University's going-level budget.

Federal funding, earlier described, has given Portland State University a running start. Portland State University has a planned option with course syllabi for needed courses; it has faculty members in the subject matter areas most germane to the proposed option who have devoted full time for more than a year to research and study in criminal justice education; it has an up-to-date bibliography in criminal justice, developed in concert with Arizona State University, a sister institution in the "center of excellence" consortium growing out of the federal funding program; it has $15,000 with which to supplement the basic library collection in this area; it has effective working relationships with criminal justice agencies in the community with which it has cooperated in some of the grant-funded research activities over the past two years; and finally, it has achieved some national recognition for its accomplishments under the federal grant program.

Faculty and related budgetary considerations. As an integral part of the already established M.S. and Ph.D. program in urban studies, the criminal justice option will share faculty members with other aspects of the urban studies program.

Faculty assigned to the criminal justice option would generally hold joint appointments with urban studies and with faculty member's basic discipline.

Portland State University estimates that the urban studies budget will need to be increased by an estimated $54,000 per year to accommodate the criminal justice option.

Funding of the increase in urban studies would come from internal redistribution of instructional resources and would be entirely from state funds.

The figures above do not include any "start-up" costs. These have been provided by federal funding. Nor do the figures include an estimate of future grant funds that might be obtained for graduate fellowships, faculty research, further curricular development, or other related activities, since this support is not essential to the operation of the instructional program at the level contemplated.

The situation making possible redistribution of resources within the institution is illustrated by the shifting enrollments from social science to other instructional areas over the past three years, shown in the following figure.
Social Science Majors by Student Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Level</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Fall 1973</th>
<th>Fall 1974</th>
<th>% Change 1972 to 1974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>- 21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>- 26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>- 37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>+3700.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,922</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,560</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,479</strong></td>
<td><strong>- 23.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Enrollment in Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,635</td>
<td>13,163</td>
<td>14,881</td>
<td>+ 9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noted that whereas the total enrollment at Portland State University increased by 9.1 percent from fall term 1972 (13,635 headcount) to fall term 1974 (14,881 headcount), the number of students majoring in the social sciences declined by 23.0 percent (from a total of 1,922 fall term 1972 to 1,479 fall term 1974).

Estimated enrollments in urban studies. Admission to both the master's and doctoral programs in urban studies would be limited. Portland State University estimates that when fully operative the program would enroll approximately 30 students each year, 20 in the MUS program, 10 in the Ph.D. program. An estimated nine new master's degree students and five new doctoral students would be admitted each year to keep the program at roughly 30 students. It is expected that the master's program would generally require two years to complete, the doctoral program three years.

Portland State University estimates that the projected workload for the program--about 27 credit hours of course work each year and research and dissertation advising (a responsibility shared with other members of the urban studies faculty)--can be handled by a 2.00 FTE faculty.

During the next four or five years, graduate enrollments at Portland State University are expected to grow modestly, balanced by some decrease in undergraduate enrollment, giving Portland State University a total enrollment at about its ceiling level of 10,000 fall term FTE. Portland State University's staffing plan is designed to give the institution the flexibility needed to make shifts in instructional assignment of the staff such as would be required to offer the proposed urban studies option in criminal justice. Specifically, in respect to the next biennium, Portland State University has reviewed its resources in the light of known and projected commitments for new and existing programs and is confident resources will be available to meet the commitments as planned.

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, October 28, 1975; present--Carpenter, Maden, Harms, Joss.)

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

Presented herewith are (1) proposed changes in the Administrative Rules relating to faculty records, as they were submitted to the Board at its August 26 meeting (and augmented since by the addition of AR 42.721), and (2) proposed additional amendments to the Administrative Rules growing out of the public hearing held on August 26.

It was recommended that the Board adopt the modifications to the Board's Administrative Rules as set forth below:

Previous Board consideration of the proposed modifications. To facilitate Committee action on the above recommendation, there is presented a brief resume of earlier consideration given by the Board to the proposed modifications hereunder consideration. The Committee and Board discussions and actions are presented in greater detail in the minutes of August 26 and September 23.
1. At the August 26 meeting of the Board, there were presented for Board consideration extensive amendments to the Board’s Administrative Rules relating to faculty records to bring the rules into line with the laws relating to faculty records passed by the 1975 Legislative Assembly (Chapter 317, Oregon laws 1975 [SB 413]).

2. At this same August 26 meeting of the Board, a public hearing on the proposed changes was also held.

3. Appearing to testify at the hearing were three persons: (a) Mr. Gil Polanski of the Oregon State Employees Association, (b) Mr. Jim Bernau, University of Oregon student body president, and (c) Mr. Bill Mumford, Oregon State University student body president.

4. Following the public hearing, and some discussion by the Board, the Board approved a motion by Mr. Layman to refer the proposed modifications and suggested amendments either to an appropriate Committee or to the staff for a report at the September meeting of the Board.

5. At the September meeting of the Board, the proposed amendments to the Administrative Rules as they had been presented in August were again before the Board, together with several additional amendments recommended by the Board’s Office in response to the testimony taken at the August 26 public hearing.

After some discussion, the Board, on motion of Mr. Maden, voted to refer the proposed changes in the Administrative Rules to the Board’s Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs at its October meeting.

Modifications proposed at the August 26 public hearing. The following is a review of the proposals made by Mr. Polanski, Mr. Bernau, and Mr. Mumford at the August 26 public hearing.

1. Mr. Bernau and Mr. Mumford asked that AR 42.740 be modified to make clear that among the "institutional personnel" to whom personnel records designated as subject to restricted access may be made available, may be students acting in an official capacity as members of official institutional committees.

Mr. Mumford suggested changing the words "institutional personnel" to "persons" so that all persons having a legitimate need to review the evaluations would be included.

Staff Recommendation. Responding to Mr. Bernau’s and Mr. Mumford’s suggestions, the Board’s Office presented the following recommended amendment to AR 42.740.

Proposed amendment to AR 42.740.

1. Personal records designated as subject to restricted access in accordance with authority created in ORS 351.065 shall be available only to institutional personnel, such as faculty, administrators, students and others serving on official institutional committees or in other official institutional capacities who have a demonstrably legitimate need to review them in order to fulfill their official, professional responsibilities as defined in institutional regulations and to the faculty member who is the subject of the records as provided for in AR 42.746-[42;755] 42.765. These records may not be released to any other person or agency without the faculty member’s written consent, unless upon receipt of a valid subpoena or other court order or process or as required by state statute, federal law, or valid federal or state rules, regulations, or orders.
2. Mr. Polanski asked that AR 42.750 be amended to indicate that the faculty committee to review the contents of the confidential file, as provided in AR 42.750, shall be empowered to require the removal of any material in the confidential file which has been placed there contrary to the provisions of the law.

Staff Recommendation. The Board's Office concurred with Mr. Polanski's suggestion and presented the following recommended amendment to AR 42.750.

Proposed amendment to AR 42.750.

2(b) Should the faculty member request it, the faculty committee shall examine the contents of the confidential file to verify that it contains only those excised portions provided in AR 42.746. The committee shall have the authority to require that any other material be removed from the confidential file.

3. Mr. Polanski proposed the following additions to AR 42.715 Definitions:

2. "submitted in confidence" means information obtained with the express, written promise of confidentiality or letters or other documents which contain an express request for confidentiality.

3. "confidential file" means that file which contains only that portion of the faculty personnel files excised as provided in AR 42.746.

Staff Recommendation. The Board's Office expressed the view that these amendments are unnecessary for the following reasons:

a. The meaning of "submitted in confidence" as used in AR 42.746, numbered paragraph "1" seems sufficiently clear to make unnecessary the proposed definition.

The faculty seems sufficiently protected without the addition of the definition, inasmuch as AR 42.746 provides that all materials relating to the faculty member must be kept in the evaluative files to which the faculty member has full access, except for those portions of "letters and other information submitted in confidence... prior to July 1, 1975," or of "confidential preemployment letters and other preemployment information" received after July 1, 1975, which would reveal the identity of the person submitting the letter or information. These portions are to be excised by a faculty committee and placed in the confidential file—the only information that may be maintained in the confidential file.

It therefore seems unnecessary to the Board's Office to include the definition proposed above by Mr. Polanski.

b. The nature of the "confidential file" is already clearly set forth in the addition to AR 42.730, which the Board's Office recommends be adopted. It reads as follows:

No institution shall maintain more than three files relating to the evaluation of a faculty member, except that an institution may maintain one additional file which shall be confidential and shall contain only material excised from other records as permitted by AR 42.746. The evaluation files are those referred to in ORS 351.065 as "designated" or "authorized."

It seems unnecessary to repeat the definition.
4. Mr. Polanski recommended an amendment to AR 42.765, which would require institutional officials to provide "to any person" objective or quantitative information contained in the files which are limited as to access (i.e., the faculty records here under consideration), concerning the personnel actions affecting categories of faculty members.

Staff Recommendation. Such an amendment has the potentiality for placing an undue burden on the institutions, already hard-pressed by multifarious demands for information concerning their operation.

The rights of the faculty members in this respect seem adequately protected by AR 42.765 which calls upon the institutions to "establish procedures through which the faculty member who feels adversely affected by the institutional, school, divisional, or departmental personnel action or lack thereof may request from designated institutional officials objective or quantitative information contained in files which are limited as to access, concerning the personnel actions affecting categories of faculty members, where such actions appear to have relevance to the case of the faculty member making the request for information. . . ."

5. Mr. Bernau recommended an addition to AR 42.735, which would provide for the release upon request, and without the faculty member's consent, of "information contained in Faculty/Course evaluation questionnaires filled out by students."

Staff Recommendation. The Board's Office did not concur in Mr. Bernau's recommendation. It was not that the Board's Office was opposed to student evaluation of faculty. To the contrary, it was on the recommendation of the Board's Office that the Board adopted AR 41.160 (Criteria for Faculty Evaluation) which contained the specific mandate that "Specific provision shall be made for appropriate student input into the evidence accumulated as the basis for reappointment, promotion, and tenure."

Opposition to Mr. Bernau's recommendation stems, rather, from the feeling that it runs counter to the intent of the legislature in its enactment of SB 413.

Explanation:

At issue in the discussions before the House committee when SB 413 was before the committee, was the extent to which, if any, confidential statements concerning faculty members could be sought and accepted by institutions in the process of evaluating faculty members.

Faculty who testified in support of SB 413 were anxious that legislation be enacted which would foreclose the institutions' seeking or accepting confidential statements about faculty members in the future, as the basis for faculty evaluation.

Student witnesses were, however, concerned that should the legislature respond to the foregoing desire of those faculty witnesses favoring SB 413 by forbidding institutions to accept confidential statements, students would be unable to express any adverse evaluations of faculty performance which the students might have, without laying themselves open to retribution from the faculty member being evaluated.

Sensitive to these concerns, the legislature provided in SB 413, as it was enacted, two key provisions, as follows:
On the one hand, the legislature provided that:

After July 1, 1975, the Board, its institutions, schools, or departments when evaluating its employed faculty members shall not solicit nor accept letters, documents or other materials, given orally or in written form, from individuals or groups who wish their identity kept anonymous or the information they provide kept confidential.

On the other hand, the legislature provided that:

Classroom survey evaluation by students of a faculty member’s classroom or laboratory performance shall be anonymous. The record of tabulated reports shall be placed in at least one of the files designated in paragraph (a) of this subsection.

All survey instruments used to obtain evaluation data shall be returned to the faculty members.

It is considered significant that the legislature provided that the record of the tabulated reports of the classroom survey evaluation by students as cited above, "shall be placed in at least one of the files designated in paragraph (a) of this subsection."

The file into which the legislature requires that the record of the tabulated returns shall be placed is a "limited access" file. It is designated "limited access" because, with the exception of certain very limited kinds of information as designated in the Board's Administrative Rules, the contents of the file(s) are to be made available only to "institutional personnel who have a demonstrably legitimate need to review them in order to fulfill their official, professional responsibilities as defined in institutional regulations and to the faculty member who is the subject of the records. . . . These records may not be released to any other person or agency without the faculty member's written consent, unless upon receipt of a valid subpoena or other court order or process, or as required by state statute, federal law, or valid federal or state rules, regulations, or orders."

The information from the faculty member's file that can be released without his consent is clearly set forth by the Board in AR 42.735, as follows:

a. Directory information, that is, information generally needed in identifying or locating a named faculty member including such information as is readily to be found in published documents such as institutional catalogs.

b. Objective evidence of a faculty member's academic achievement, limited to information as to the number of credits earned toward a degree or in post-doctoral work, and certificate(s), diploma(s), license(s), and degree(s) received.

c. Salary information and the record of terms or conditions of employment.

The foregoing Administrative Rules have been in effect since August 1972, when they were adopted by the Board after extensive discussions with faculty and administrative personnel, and after appropriate public hearings. It must be presumed that faculty members sufficiently interested in the faculty records Administrative Rules as to wish them modified must be familiar with the foregoing provisions of the rules which have been in effect for more than three years. It seems likely, too, that the legislative committee which drafted SB 413 was familiar with the Board's faculty records rules.
It was the Board's Office view that the legislature, in requiring that the record of tabulated reports growing out of the classroom survey evaluation by students be placed in the faculty member's limited access file, intended that these survey results would be fully subject to the restricted access provided in AR 42.735.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee (October 28, 1975)

Dr. Romney summarized the proposed modifications, commenting briefly on the reasons for each. The Committee decided to consider the staff recommendations in serial order. It thereupon approved staff recommendations 1 and 2 which stated that the Board adopt amendments to AR 42.740 and AR 42.750 as presented in the staff report.

The Committee then took up staff recommendation 3, which states that further amendment of AR 42.715, as suggested by Mr. Polanski, is unnecessary. Mrs. Carpenter asked Mr. Polanski to explain his recommendation. Mr. Polanski commented as follows:

[The staff recommendation] seems to imply that our proposal has already been stated. It would be sufficient for our purpose . . . if the Board's minutes shows that that was true, . . . But we feel that it is important that . . . a record appears some place to define this further and we would be satisfied if it appeared in the Board minutes.

The Chairman directed that Mr. Polanski's statement be recorded.

The Committee approved staff recommendation 3.

The Committee took up staff recommendation 4, that Mr. Polanski's suggested modification to AR 42.765 not be adopted by the Board. Mr. Polanski explained that from time to time the Oregon State Employees Association has requested categories of information regarding faculty members from the institutions and does not wish to be foreclosed from securing this information in the future. The Oregon State Employees Association has paid computer costs involved in providing the information. Mr. Harms said he did not understand Mr. Polanski's concern, since under the regulation any concerned faculty member could obtain the information for the Association. He said he was concerned, however, about the change in wording proposed by Mr. Polanski, which, he said, would open the information to almost everyone since almost anyone could claim he was a member of an affected class of Oregon citizens.

The Committee approved staff recommendation number 4.

The Committee considered staff recommendation 5 that Mr. Bernau's suggested modification to AR 42.735 not be adopted. Mr. Bernau urged, in a prepared statement, that an addition be made to AR 42.735 to provide for release to students of tabulated reports growing out of student classroom survey evaluations. Mr. Bernau's statement is on file in the Board's Office.

Mr. Branchfield said it was his opinion that adoption of language such as proposed by Mr. Bernau would violate the spirit of CRS 351.065 as amended by the 1975 Legislative Assembly in SB 413.

Mr. Maden noted that SB 413 provides that tabulated reports of student evaluation of a faculty member shall be put in at least one of the files designated in the statute. Mr. Bernau agreed, but said there was no provision in the statute that these files be confidential. He said that under the present Administrative Rules of the Board, students are able to obtain faculty/course evaluation information from some departments. The student's counsel has advised that this is legal, both under the Administrative Rules and CRS 351.065. Mrs. Carpenter asked if students have access to other material from the faculty records. Mr. Bernau replied they did not.
Mr. Branchfield said there is no specific provision in SB 413 that the files as designated be confidential, yet the intent of this legislation was (1) to make certain the faculty member had access to his own file, and (2) to make certain that evaluation materials would not be publicly available.

Mr. Harms said that, in his opinion, the statute is intended to establish two things, (1) that the faculty members shall have access to their personnel files, and (2) that the institution cannot maintain a file of whose existence the faculty member is unaware and to which he does not have access. A third purpose of the bill, Mr. Harms continued, is to allow student evaluations, even though they are anonymous. Mr. Harms said he saw no ambiguity in these provisions which would leave the door open to question of legislative intent. Mr. Harms moved that the Committee recommend the addition of subitem "d" to AR 42.735 to read, "d. Records tabulated from students' classroom survey evaluations."

Mr. Maden asked Mr. Bernau to describe briefly the kinds of information obtained in student/faculty course evaluation forms. Mr. Bernau said this information related to whether the faculty member is accessible outside the classroom, the instructor's preparation for class meetings, the student's perception of the effect of the course on his or her understanding of the subject, the instructor's effectiveness in stimulating interest in the subject, work load vs. credit hours, a student's perception of the level of difficulty of instruction, the perceived overall fairness and relevancy of the examinations and papers, the instructor's allowance of expression of divergent viewpoints, his impartiality when dealing with students, the overall rating of the instructor as a teacher, the extent to which the course would be recommended to other students, and similar matters.

Mr. Richardson, Mr. Bernau, and President MacVicar reviewed the history of SB 413 as each recalled it. Mr. Joss said he favored release of the tabulated records of students' classroom survey evaluations, but suggested it might be desirable to have an Attorney General's opinion before proceeding with adoption of amendments to AR 42.735.

Mr. Branchfield said he felt it was important that the Board proceed with modification of its rules to implement changes in the statutes in respect to faculty records. He said it was quite likely the Attorney General's opinion would not be conclusive, and getting the opinion would probably take considerable time.

The Committee approved the recommendation that the Board adopt amendments to AR 42.735 with the addition of subitem "d" as stated by Mr. Harms.

The Committee then summarized its recommendation to the Board by voting to recommend that the Board adopt amendments to Section 42.700 - Board Rules Governing Institutional Regulations Relating to Faculty Records contained in the staff recommendations with the exception of AR 42.735, which would be amended to read as follows:

42.735 Release of and Access to Faculty Records

1. Appropriate information about the faculty member may be released upon request and without the faculty member's consent. Such information shall be limited to the following:

   a. Directory information, that is, information generally needed in identifying or locating a named faculty member including such information as is readily to be found in published documents such as institutional catalogs.
b. Objective evidence of a faculty member's academic achievement, limited to information as to the number of credits earned toward a degree or in post-doctoral work, and certificate(s), diploma(s), license(s), and degree(s) received.

c. Salary information and the record of terms or conditions of employment.

d. Records tabulated from students' classroom survey evaluations.

2. [Pursuant-to-authority-contained-in-Chapter-566-Oregon Laws-of-1971] All information in the faculty member's personal record file, apart from that identified in [AR-42.735-above] paragraph 1 of this section, shall be considered personal and subject to restricted access as hereinafter set forth in [rules] AR 42.740 through 42.775.

Board Discussion and Action

Upon motion by Mr. Harms, the Board adopted the proposed amendment to AR 42.740 as recommended by the staff and the Committee. The following voted in favor: Directors Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None. The President of the Board thereupon declared the proposed amendment to AR 42.740 duly adopted.

Upon motion by Mr. Harms, the Board adopted the proposed amendment to AR 42.750 as recommended by the staff and the Committee. The following voted in favor: Directors Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None. The President of the Board thereupon declared the proposed amendment to AR 42.750 duly adopted.

Upon motion by Mr. Harms, the Board adopted the proposed amendment to AR 42.715 as recommended by the staff and the Committee. The following voted in favor: Directors Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None. The President of the Board thereupon declared the proposed amendment to AR 42.715 duly adopted.

Upon motion by Mr. Harms, the Board adopted the proposed amendment to AR 42.765 as recommended by the staff and the Committee. The following voted in favor: Directors Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None. The President of the Board thereupon declared the proposed amendment to AR 42.765 duly adopted.

Mr. Layman said that although the public hearing on Section 42.700 of the Administrative Rules was held at an earlier meeting, a number of individuals wished to be heard on the proposed amendment to AR 42.735. He asked Mr. Harms to summarize the recommendation.

Mr. Harms said the recommendation dealt with the privacy of faculty records and the release to students of records tabulated from students' classroom survey evaluations. Mr. Harms referred to the Committee discussion on October 28 as presented above. He said that since October 28 additional legal opinion has been received, as well as other statements from interested persons. He said a letter from Representative David Frohnmayer, Associate Professor of Law at the University of Oregon, was of particular significance. Students had referred to Mr. Frohnmayer in their presentation, indicating that his opinion was similar to theirs with respect to release of students' evaluations of faculty members. Mr. Harms said he was certain the students had made the statement in good faith. However, Mr. Frohnmayer subsequently addressed a letter to the Committee which stated that in his opinion the Board's directing that records of student evaluations of faculty be public records would be in violation of SB 413 without at least qualifying subsection d by a requirement that there be a finding by the institutional executive that privacy rights in an adequate educational environment would not suffer by exposure.
Mr. Harms then moved that the Board adopt the proposed amendments to AR 42.735 as recommended by the Committee. Mr. Harms said if his motion failed, he would then move the adoption of a subsection d which incorporated the language suggested in the letter from Mr. Frohnayer. Mr. Layman said the motion would be held in abeyance until those present who wished to be heard had made their presentations.

Senator Clifford Trow and Representative Tony Van Viet, faculty members at Oregon State University and co-sponsors of SB 413, described the legislative background of the bill and discussed the general question of student evaluations. Their prepared statements are included in Supplement A of these minutes.

Mr. Maden asked whether Subsection 2 of Section 1 of SB 413 implied that presidents of State System institutions had authority to determine access to personal records which the Board did not have.

Senator Trow said the language of Subsection 2 was an existing statute incorporated in SB 413 as explanatory material. He said the Board does have the right to determine the meaning of limited access, but it was not the intent of the legislature in SB 413 to grant this access to students. Senator Trow said if the Board wished to grant students the right of access to faculty evaluations, the Board should consider the issue on its merits and obtain faculty viewpoints concerning the problems involved.

Senator Trow said there was no discussion of the present student proposal before any legislative committee and it represents a quantum jump from the discussions during the consideration of SB 413.

Representative Bill Wyatt of Clatsop County said it was his understanding as a supporter of SB 413 that the bill was not intended to prevent the release for publication of student evaluations. He said the essence of SB 413 was to assure faculty members that those student evaluations would be an official part of their records. Mr. Wyatt said student evaluations should not be the only means by which classroom behavior is studied, but they are important. He stated that students have a right to know what other students think of the performance of faculty members.

Representative Mary Rieke of Portland said she had attended two major meetings on the subject of teacher evaluation and would provide Board members with summaries of those meetings when they were available.

Mrs. Rieke said evaluation of the faculty is important to both students and teachers because in the past many excellent teachers have been evaluated on research and publications. They have not always received status, promotion and pay for outstanding teaching. Mrs. Rieke said she could see no reason to argue that the legislature restricted student evaluations any more than to say it intended to open them. She said the only way to get a response to the actual teaching process is from students in the classes. Therefore, it would seem the responsible thing would be for students to participate in a more systematic way.

Mrs. Rieke said, in her opinion, the intent of the legislation was to place the survey instruments in the faculty records where they would have the same position as other information about faculty members in the record. She added that the major reason for placing the evaluations in the record was to give the faculty member an opportunity to make the same reply to the accuracy of that information as was given to other information in the faculty record.

Mr. Layman then asked Mr. Larson to read a letter received from Representative Paul Walden of Hood River. The letter is included in Supplement A to these minutes and speaks in favor of the proposed amendment to release students' evaluations of faculty members.
Mrs. Carpenter requested that the letter from Representative David Frohnmayer be included in the record of the meeting. His letter also appears in Supplement A of these minutes.

Mr. Bill Nelson, Executive Secretary of the State Federation of the American Association of University Professors, read a policy statement for the University of Oregon Chapter of that organization. The statement is included in Supplement A of these minutes.

Mr. Nelson said two legitimate issues were in conflict in this question. The first is the right of students to evaluate professors and for those evaluations to be part of the file of the faculty member. He said this procedure is valuable and justified. There is also the protection of the privacy of the individual who is trying to improve his or her teaching and to grow as a faculty member. If evaluations were made public, it might be particularly damaging to a young faculty member trying to innovate and produce new curricula. The individual might receive low ratings from students who were trying to produce guidelines for other students. However, in a few years, when the course had been developed, the early experimentation might prove valuable and the same instructor would be rated very highly.

Mr. Nelson suggested that a student questionnaire contain two parts. One part would be considered confidential and be in tabulated form. This part would go into the faculty member's file. The tabulations would not be available to students for publication as a course guide. The second part would contain questions that would be available for publication as a course guide. Both parts would be developed with the cooperation of students, administrators, and faculty.

Dr. Sam Anderson, President of the Oregon State Federation of the American Association of University Professors, read a prepared statement which was distributed to the Board. The statement appears as Supplement A to these minutes.

Mr. Dennis Mulvihill, Coordinator of the Associated Oregon Student Lobby, said the Board of Directors of the Oregon Student Lobby had voted to endorse the proposed changes in AR 42.735 and 42.740. He said it was the belief of the Oregon Student Lobby that students should have the opportunity to evaluate their instructors and have access to the results of these evaluations. Students seek access to quality information that will help them improve on the education which they obtain. Testimony prepared by Kirby S. Garrett, Chairman of the Associated Oregon Student Lobby, was distributed and is included in Supplement A to these minutes.

At this point the motion was held in abeyance and further discussion deferred until public hearings on other subjects previously scheduled for 11:00 A.M. were held. Following the public hearings, discussion was resumed.

Dr. Norman Rose, Professor of Chemistry at Portland State University, spoke as a representative of the Committee on Effective Teaching at that institution. He said the committee was composed of faculty and students. The faculty members voted against student access to the student evaluations while the students voted in favor of access. Dr. Rose said that over the years the Committee on Effective Teaching had supported student evaluation upon a voluntary basis.

Dr. Rose commented that student evaluations can serve three functions: (1) to enable faculty members to become more effective teachers; (2) to be included as part of the procedure for retention, promotion, and tenure; and (3) to assist students in choosing courses. He noted that research indicates that the only question which correlates with the attainment of educational goals is a question concerning whether the person is an effective teacher.
Dr. Rose said the faculty members on the committee felt strongly that making the data from student evaluations available to the students would retard the present rate of increased use of student evaluations by the faculty. Dr. Rose said the faculty believed that required publication of student data was a major change in philosophy which would have an adverse effect on the increased use of evaluations.

A prepared statement from Colin Dunkeld, Chairman of the Committee on Effective Teaching, is included in Supplement A to these minutes.

Mr. Steve Robbins, student member of the Committee on Effective Teaching at Portland State University, read a prepared minority statement from the student members of the committee. The statement appears in Supplement A to these minutes.

Mr. Gil Polanski, Oregon State Employees Association Representative, cited the legislative history of the bill and said that the purpose of the bill when it was originally introduced was to protect the privacy of the records of both students and faculty. He said the amendments made by the last legislature in SB 413 did not change the basic purpose.

The proposed amendment would reverse the principle of privacy and make public the student evaluations of the faculty. He said the faculty members of the Oregon State Employees Association strongly opposed the proposed change.

Dr. Daniel Sheans, Professor of Anthropology at Portland State University, said he had surveyed the faculty chapter of the Oregon State Employees Association with respect to their views on the Bernau amendment and the Board's Committee recommendation concerning it. The results were as follows: (1) Not a single person supported the amendment; (2) the resolutions passed on various campuses by both faculty senates and chapters rejected any proposed changes that would allow unlimited access to data in faculty files tabulated from classroom evaluations; (3) the Academic and Unclassified Committee of the Oregon State Employees Association also resolved that "on no conditions should such data be released to students for classroom selection purposes."

Dr. Sheans also raised the question of the type of evaluation instrument to be used and the related factors of class size, class level, and differences in teaching style. He said good faculty members who are teaching more students than they should under inadequate conditions may be hurt more by publication of student evaluations than other faculty members. He said good teaching is emphasized but not rewarded in any tangible way.

Dr. Frank Roberts, State Senator and Professor of Speech Communication at Portland State University, said the question of student evaluations of faculty should be considered as a matter of policy by the Board. He said he believed that basically it was proper and valuable for students to be able to secure information with reference to their prospective instructors in order to make choices as clients of higher education.

Dr. Roberts said the crucial question is the ability to determine the proper instrument for securing the information and the proper way of interpreting the data. The instrument and the method of collecting and evaluating it should receive very careful analysis and design to assure the validity of the information. He said the validity of the information was extremely important to both administrators evaluating faculty members and to students using the data to make educational choices.

Dr. Roberts said he would support the amendment to the rules with the clear understanding that his support should be interpreted as a directive to spend considerable effort to improve the reporting devices.
Mr. Neil Haugen, a student senator at Oregon College of Education, said he had been involved in faculty evaluations as a member of the joint student-faculty evaluation committee. Mr. Haugen said during the debate on SB 413, the students may have assumed that legislators were aware that student evaluations in existence at that time were published. He said students had merely sought to continue programs already in existence. Mr. Haugen said he thought the record would show, however, that students had indicated to legislators at one point in the discussion that student evaluations were published and would continue to be published.

Mr. Haugen then described the faculty evaluation procedure operated by students at Oregon College of Education. He said the instrument used was developed by the joint student-faculty evaluation committee with the assistance of Dr. Craig Scott, Assistant Research Professor in the Teaching Research Division. Mr. Haugen indicated copies of the student evaluation report were available and said student evaluation of faculty could be done in a responsible and reasonable manner.

President MacVicar said he would support the position of the Faculty Senate at Oregon State University as set forth in a letter from Dr. David Nicodemus, Chairman of the Faculty Senate. The letter is included in Supplement A to these minutes. President MacVicar said a reading of SB 413 leads to the conclusion that a personal record includes evaluation if used for any official purpose. The language of the law is reasonably clear. It says employment performance. A discussion of employment performance involves discussion of evaluation of teaching.

President MacVicar indicated he would be in favor of the suggestion made by Mr. Harms to modify subsection d.

Dr. Carol Saslow, Associate Professor of Psychology and a member of the Faculty Senate at Oregon State University, said testimony was needed from individuals who have had actual experience in designing these questionnaires and know their limitations, regardless of how perfect and how valid an instrument is designed. She said those who advocate publication of summaries of the results do not realize the limitations. If the information is considered out of context, it can be very inaccurate and misleading, no matter how good the instrument may be. Dr. Saslow said four years ago she had overcome the resistance of fellow faculty members to secure use of a department-wide evaluation questionnaire in the Psychology Department. After four years of consistently using the questionnaires in all departmental courses, it has been determined that the information is useful only when considered in context. Information from any particular course should be reviewed cross-sectionally in terms of the whole department, and also longitudinally, looking back over several years. To have its proper worth, the information must be considered in the light of many factors, such as: (1) The objective of the course as it fits into the total curriculum of the department; (2) how much learning actually takes place in the course, both in terms of the course itself and in terms of advanced courses for which students must have certain requisite skills; (3) whether the course is required or elective; (4) the faculty member's explanation of the factors contributing to the results; and (5) ratings of the faculty member in other courses.

Dr. Saslow said it would be most unfortunate to put an unbalanced pressure to be popular on the instructors by considering the questionnaire results out of the context of the far more important factor of whether the faculty member is successfully teaching the students something of worth.

In response to a question about the comparative fairness of faculty evaluations by students and grades given to students by faculty members, Dr. Saslow stated that, unlike the students, the faculty member has no recourse for appeal from anonymous evaluation given a faculty member by a student.

Dr. Saslow then cited the cost of providing questionnaire results, particularly when budgets are very restricted.
Dr. Frederick Klopfer, Assistant Professor of Psychology at Oregon State University, said the evaluations had been referred to as "inherently valid information." He said no questionnaire is inherently valid. Validity must be established. To construct an instrument which provides a good evaluation of teaching ability, it is necessary to define good teaching, and the definition may vary with content and level of the course. Once good teaching has been defined, a consistent scale must be developed. Dr. Klopfer said he was not against student evaluations, but he would like some assurance that if student evaluations were made public, they would be reliable and valid. He said if it is possible to develop such a useful instrument, it will take time and money to do so.

Dr. David Carlson, Professor of Mathematics at Oregon State University, said classroom surveys may have some validity, but they are an incomplete and possibly misleading source of information. When this one piece of information is distributed by the institution, added weight is given to that information in contrast to a survey developed and administered by students.

Mr. Mark Cogan, Administrative Assistant of the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, reviewed the language of SB 413 as it related to student evaluations of faculty members. Mr. Cogan said the legislation requires that the evaluations be anonymous, that the survey instruments be returned to the faculty member, and that tabulated results must be included in one of the three files allowed to contain materials relating to the evaluation of a faculty member. Mr. Cogan said the Board's staff had responded to the student proposal for access to student evaluations of faculty by saying that the information was confidential since it was to be included in evaluation files. Mr. Cogan said the student response, which had been accepted by the Committee on Instruction, stated that the inclusion of certain information in certain files in no way dictates its confidentiality. The purpose of designated three files was to provide for a finite number of places where records could be kept. The purpose of the legislation was to provide access by faculty members to the information in the files.

Mr. Cogan said the Board is granted broad authority to promulgate regulations governing access to faculty records. Within that authority, if the records are subjected to restrictions on access by the Board, the president of the institution has the prerogative of opening the records by making a finding that the public interest in maintaining individual rights to privacy in an adequate educational environment would not suffer by disclosure.

Mr. Cogan noted that the legislature took no position in opposition to the student proposal when it was considering the law on faculty records. Mr. Cogan then discussed legislative intent, including that expressed by legislators who appeared earlier in the meeting, and also the position of Representative David Frohmeyer.

Mr. Jim Bernau, Student Body President at the University of Oregon, discussed student credit-hour load. He said there was a potential significant benefit to the institutions in adopting the student proposal because students will make wiser choices and drop fewer courses. The students would also benefit because they would attain a degree in less time. Mr. Bernau said the University Senate, comprised of students and faculty, had voted 27 to 5 in favor of passage of the provision for student access to faculty course evaluation information. Mr. Bernau then referred to letters of support from faculty members and others, as included in material distributed to the Board.

Mr. Bernau said he agreed with remarks by previous speakers that the evaluation instruments should be reviewed and modified so that they would be suitable instruments for meaningful evaluations.
Mr. Bernau concluded by saying the belief that faculty members who give students good grades will receive high ratings is not correct. In fact, the converse appears to be the case. He also noted that 40 students from the University of Oregon had come to the meeting as a delegation in support of the change recommended by students. He asked that the Board give serious consideration to the proposal.

Mr. David Walsh, a representative of the University Senate at the University of Oregon, said there is presently no adequate information in regard to teachers and course descriptions. Students ask the opportunity to work with administration and faculty to develop a reliable use of faculty evaluations because the efforts of students alone are inadequate to effect the necessary changes.

Mr. Robert Ackerman, legal counsel for the Associated Students of the University of Oregon, commented on the 1971 legislation and the amendment to the law contained in SB 413. He said it is stated in the legislation that the Board of Higher Education may authorize the issuance of rules by the executives of the institutions regarding access to faculty evaluation records. He said Mr. Frohmayer's position is that student evaluations are presumptively confidential. Mr. Ackerman said if the legislators had intended that the material be confidential, they would have written that provision into the legislation.

Mr. Ackerman said it was within the Board's discretion to provide a state-wide uniform basis for the release of such information. He said if the Board delegated the responsibility to the presidents of the institutions to determine accessibility of faculty evaluations to students, there would be variations among the institutions. He said it was the responsibility of the Board to establish state-wide policy to open these private records in order to give students, who are the consumers of the educational product, a better basis upon which to make their choices.

Mr. Layman said the additional testimony was completed and Mr. Harms had moved the adoption of the proposed amendments to AR 42.735, as recommended by the Committee.

Mr. Stewart moved to amend the motion to add the following words to the recommended Section 1 d of AR 42.735: "upon a finding by the President that privacy rights in an adequate educational environment would not suffer by disclosure."

In response to a question, it was indicated that if the amendment were adopted, the presidents would make the decision concerning student access to records tabulated from students' classroom survey evaluations.

Mr. Maden said since the amendment essentially permits the president to make the decision, it was probable that some institutions would make the evaluations public and others would not. He said the matter was of sufficient importance that it should be a state-wide matter and for that reason he would vote against Mr. Stewart's amendment.

Mr. Joss said he had supported student access to faculty evaluations in the past. He also said he was intrigued with the suggestion that a divided questionnaire be developed, with one part for personnel decisions and another for student use as a course guide. He said the amendment proposed by Mr. Stewart would permit variation and experimentation with such a form. Mr. Joss stated that he would vote for the amendment but at the same time would request the Committee on Instruction to consider the matter further in terms of the questions raised with respect to the evaluation instruments. Mr. Joss said that while he could not support the present student proposal wholeheartedly, he would work for the ultimate attainment of the students' purposes. He noted that it might take a change in legislation.
The Board approved Mr. Stewart's amendment to Section 1 d of AR 42.735, with the following voting in favor: Directors Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: Directors Maden, McIntyre, and McLaurin. Director Perry was not present at the time of the roll call vote.

The Board adopted AR 42.735 as recommended by the Committee and amended by Mr. Stewart's motion. The following voted in favor: Directors Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None. Mr. Perry was not present at the time of the roll call vote.

Section 42.700 - Board Rules Governing Institutional Regulations Relating to Faculty Records

42.710 Institutional Regulations

1. The Board delegates to the chief executive officer of each institution the responsibility for the development of institutional regulations governing the form and the variety of faculty records to be maintained in the institution, the nature of the information to be collected, the way in which such faculty information is to be recorded, maintained and used, and eventually disposed of. Such institutional regulations shall be consistent with the laws of Oregon and the administrative rules of the Board of Higher Education. Copies of faculty records rules adopted by each institution shall be presented to the Chancellor and shall be maintained on file in the Chancellor's Office.

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

42.715 Definitions

1. "Personal records" means records containing information kept by the institution, school, division, or department concerning a faculty member and furnished by the faculty member or by others, including, but not limited to information as to discipline, counseling, membership activity, other behavioral records, professional preparation and experience, professional performance (e.g., assignment and workload, quality of teaching, research, and service to the institution), personnel data relating to such matters as promotions, tenure, leaves, retirement credits and the like, and professional activities external to the institution, including, but not necessarily limited to, awards, recognition, research activities, travel.

2. For purpose of compliance with ORS 351.065, "records of academic achievement" shall mean the record of credits earned toward a degree or in post-doctoral work and/or certificate(s), diploma(s), license(s), and degree(s) received.

42.721 Confidential Information Relating to Employed Faculty Not To Be Sought Nor Accepted

The Board, its institutions, schools or departments when evaluating employed faculty members shall not solicit nor accept letters, documents or other materials, given orally or in written form, from individuals or groups who wish their identity kept anonymous or the information they provide kept confidential.
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**42.725 Certain Information Not Required To Be Given by Faculty Members**

No faculty member shall be required to give -- but may voluntarily provide -- information as to race, religion, sex, political affiliation or preferences, except as the giving of such information may be required by state statute, federal law, or valid federal rules, regulations, or orders. In those instances in which the faculty member is asked for such self-designation for any purpose (including federal requests for information), the request shall state the purpose of the inquiry and shall inform the individual of the right to decline to respond.

**42.730 Locations and Custody of Faculty Records**

Official faculty personal records shall be kept in locations central to institution, school, division or department by which they are maintained, with the custody thereof assigned to designated personnel specifically charged with maintaining the confidentiality and security of the records in accordance with clearly delineated institutional regulations. No institution shall maintain more than three files relating to the evaluation of a faculty member, except that an institution may maintain one additional file which shall be confidential and shall contain only material excised from other records as permitted by AR 42.746. The evaluation files are those referred to in ORS 351.065 as "designated" or "authorized".

**42.735 Release of and Access to Faculty Records**

1. Appropriate information about the faculty member may be released upon request and without the faculty member's consent. Such information shall be limited to the following:

   a. Directory information, that is, information generally needed in identifying or locating a named faculty member including such information as is readily to be found in published documents such as institutional catalogs.

   b. Objective evidence of a faculty member's academic achievement, limited to information as to the number of credits earned toward a degree or in post-doctoral work, and certificate(s), diploma(s), license(s), and degree(s) received.

   c. Salary information and the record of terms or conditions of employment.

   d. Records tabulated from students' classroom survey evaluations, upon a finding by the President that privacy rights in an adequate educational environment would not suffer by disclosure.

2. All information in the faculty member's personal record file, apart from that identified in paragraph 1 of this section, shall be considered personal and subject to restricted access as hereinafter set forth in AR 42.740 through 42.775.
Confidential Records - Restrictions on Release

1. Personal records designated as subject to restricted access in accordance with authority granted in ORS 351.065 shall be available only to institutional personnel, such as faculty, administrators, students and others serving on official institutional committees or in other official institutional capacities who have a demonstrably legitimate need to review them in order to fulfill their official, professional responsibilities as defined in institutional regulations and to the faculty member who is the subject of the records as provided for in AR 42.746 - 42.765. These records may not be released to any other person or agency without the faculty member's written consent, unless upon receipt of a valid subpoena or other court order or process or as required by state statute, federal law, or valid federal or state rules, regulations, or orders.

2. Institutional regulations shall provide for designation of institutional officials to appear in court to test the validity of a subpoena or other court order or process relating to release of faculty records when validity is in question.

Access to Files by Faculty Members

Faculty members shall be allowed full access to their own personal files and personal records kept by the institution, school, department or division, except as provided in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this section.

1. Letters and other information submitted in confidence to the institution, school, department or division prior to July 1, 1975, shall be maintained in the evaluation files permitted by AR 42.730. However, if a faculty member requests access to such letters and other information pertaining to the faculty member, the anonymity of the contributors of letters and other information obtained prior to July 1, 1975, shall be protected. The full text shall be made available to the faculty member except that those portions of the text which would serve to identify the contributor shall be excised and may be retained thereafter in the confidential file permitted by AR 42.730.

2. Confidential letters and other information received by the institution, school, department or division after July 1, 1975, prior to the employment of a faculty member, shall be placed in the evaluation files relating to the faculty member. If the applicant is not employed, the confidential information submitted concerning the applicant shall remain confidential. If an applicant who is employed requests access to his or her files, the anonymity of the contributors of confidential pre-employment letters and other preemployment information shall be protected. The full text shall be made available, except that those portions of the text which would serve to identify the contributor shall be excised and may be retained thereafter in the confidential file permitted by AR 42.730.
3. Any evaluation received by telephone shall be documented in each of the faculty member's evaluation files by means of a written summary of the conversation with the names of the conversants identified.

4. If the institution, school, department or division solicits or accepts student survey evaluations of the classroom or laboratory performance of a faculty member, such survey evaluations shall be conducted anonymously. The reports tabulated from student evaluations shall be placed in the evaluation files defined in AR 42.730. Survey instruments from which evaluation data are obtained shall be delivered to the faculty member. No other evaluative material shall be accepted from students unless the students are first clearly informed that the faculty member will have access to such material and that the anonymity of the student cannot be preserved.

42.750 Entry Into File of Comments, Explanations and Rebuttals

1. The institutional, school, divisional, or departmental official shall, upon request, offer the faculty member opportunity to enter into the evaluation file a rebuttal, refutation, or explanation of any observations contained therein.

2a. Should the faculty member request it, an appropriate faculty committee, as defined in institutional regulations, shall examine the contents of the faculty member's file to verify that all statements therein have been provided. If not, the committee shall require that the information be made available.

2b. Should the faculty member request it, the faculty committee shall examine the contents of the confidential file to verify that it contains only those excised portions provided in AR 42.746. The committee shall have the authority to require that any other material be removed from the confidential file.

3. A copy of the periodic, regular written evaluation of the faculty member containing or having attached to it a statement to the effect that the faculty member may, discuss the evaluative statement with the evaluating administrator, shall be given the faculty member. A copy of the evaluative statement, signed by the faculty member signifying receipt of a copy thereof, shall be placed in the faculty member's evaluation file. The faculty member may enter into the evaluation file such comments, explanations, or rebuttals as desired. There shall be attached to each copy of the evaluative statement retained by the institution, school, division, or department a copy of such comments, explanations, or rebuttals as the faculty member shall make in relation thereto.

42.760 Retention of Evaluative Materials Concerning Candidates for Possible Employment

It is expected that the evaluative materials brought together by the institution as it evaluates an individual's qualifications in connection with possible employment will, if the individual is not employed, be retained for such period of time as may be necessary to respond to affirmative action investigations and investigations of any claimed violation of the civil rights of any person in connection with employment. Thereafter, they will be disposed of by a manner as to protect their confidentiality, in accordance with the rules of the State Archivist.
When federal rules or orders require certain personal records to be compiled before the employment of a faculty member and retained thereafter such records pertaining to persons not employed which have been obtained with the promise of confidentiality will be closed to all persons except as required by such federal rules or orders.

42.765 Availability to Faculty Members of Objective Information Concerning Categories of Staff

Institutional regulations shall establish procedures through which the faculty member who feels adversely affected by the institutional, school, divisional, or departmental personnel action or lack thereof may request from designated institutional officials objective or quantitative information contained in files which are limited as to access, concerning the personnel actions affecting categories of faculty members, where such actions appear to have relevance to the case of the faculty member making the request for information. Such information may include but need not be limited to: assignment, load, list of publications. It shall not include any evaluative statements concerning faculty members.

42.770 Availability of Faculty Records for Research Purposes

The need for educational institutions to make available information about the faculty member for research purposes shall be acknowledged and provided for, contingent upon the institution's having adequate provisions to conceal the identity of the faculty member whose personal data or information are being included in the research. If the regulations protecting the confidentiality of faculty records would seem to be jeopardized in any way by the release of the information for research purposes, institutional regulations shall provide that the institution is to obtain the written consent of the faculty member prior to releasing personal information for research purposes.

42.775 Permanence, Duplication and Disposal of Faculty Records

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

2. The permanent retention of faculty records shall be limited to those which the institutional executive or the State Archivist shall determine to be of long-range value to the individual faculty member, to the institution, or to the public. ORS 351.065 provides that access to personal records more than 25 years old may not be limited.

3. Duplication of faculty records shall be kept to a minimum. Such duplicated records as are made shall be destroyed at a time to be determined and set forth in institutional regulations and in such manner as to protect their confidentiality in accordance with the rules of the State Archivist, or with the Archivist's approval.
(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, October 28, 1975; present--Carpenter, Maden, Harms, Joss.)

Staff Report to the Committee

The Subcommittee's Charge

Subcommittee 5 of the Ways and Means Committee of the 1975 Legislative Assembly adopted the following budget note, calling upon the Department of Higher Education to (1) inventory and review systematically, existing centers and institutes, and (2) establish a procedure providing for Board approval prior to establishment of centers and institutes:

"It is the intent of the Subcommittee that the Department of Higher Education establish an administrative procedure which requires approval by the Board of Higher Education prior to the establishment of centers and institutes. The Subcommittee is concerned with both the financing and the propriety of such centers, etc., as they relate to the missions of the individual institutions, those of other post-secondary institutions and the needs of Oregon citizens. Within the context of the procedure and the concerns described above, it is the further intent of the Subcommittee that the Board of Higher Education inventory and begin a systematic review of existing centers and institutes. A report showing compliance with this budget note is to be presented to the Emergency Board before January 1, 1976."

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Board establish the procedures called for above by (1) amending AR 20.020, as indicated below, and (2) adopting the procedures on pp. 975-976.

20.020

Board Surveillance of Higher Education Curricula and Departments

In accordance with the provisions of ORS 351.070 [(as-shown-in AR-20:01B)], the Board of Higher Education exercises general oversight of curricula and instruction in the State System, including but not limited to curricular allocations[, and establishment of centers, institutes, and similar agencies serving instructional, research, or public service functions. It maintains a statement of policies underlying the curricular allocations within the System. The Board acts upon institutional requests for modification of existing curricular allocations, including the addition and dropping of curricular programs, in accordance with the policies of the Board. The Board delegates to its administrative staff authority to act upon institutional requests for authorization to add, drop, or alter courses in the curricular programs that have been authorized the institutions by the Board, and to act in such other capacities in curriculum and instruction as the Board may determine.

It is the policy of the Board to keep abreast of the educational needs of the state and to encourage the institutions to plan vigorously for meeting the changing needs of public higher education in Oregon.

In meeting its curricular responsibilities, the Board has as its primary consideration the assurance of adequate availability of educational opportunities to qualified youth without unnecessary or unwise duplication of educational resources.

It was also recommended that at the December meeting of the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, the Committee begin the review of existing centers and institutes, as they are listed on pp. 981-982.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board adopt the proposed amendment to AR 20.020, and the procedures as proposed in the staff recommendation. It was understood that a review of centers and institutes would be presented at subsequent meetings of the Committee.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Layman said that the time set for public hearing on the proposed amendment to AR 20.020 had arrived. He asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed changes. There being no response to his request, Mr. Layman declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Stewart asked what had caused Subcommittee 5 to call for the review procedure. The Chancellor said it was a generalized concern about the possibility of interinstitutional rivalry on some issues generated through centers and institutes rather than through regular curricular programs. He said it was brought on, at least at one point, by a review of proposals for institutes related to solar energy.

Upon motion by Mr. Maden, the Board adopted the proposed amendment to AR 20.020 as recommended by the Committee. The following voted in favor: Directors Carpenter, Fife, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, Stewart, and Layman.

Those voting no: None.

The President of the Board declared the amendment duly adopted as recommended. AR 20.020, as amended above and in the following item, appears as Supplement B to these minutes.

Explanation

The recommended amendment to AR 20.020, and the adoption of the procedures will respond to the subcommittee's expressed intent that the Board of Higher Education should adopt procedures that require approval by the Board of Higher Education prior to establishment of centers and institutes.

As to the presently-operating centers/institutes, the review of them by the Board's Committee beginning at the December meeting will permit the Board to review the center/institute objectives, modus operandi, sources of support, and the congruence of center/institute objectives and achievements with the mission and goals of the individual institutions.

In the remaining pages of this present presentation we present background information that will provide the Board with information useful in understanding the nature of centers/institutes:

- Centers and Institutes in the College and University Structure. pp. 976-977
- Centers and Institutes in State System Institutions. pp. 979-981
- List of Centers/Institutes in State System Institutions. pp. 981-982

Procedures For Establishment
Of Centers/Institutes, and Similar Agencies
Serving Instructional, Research and Public Service Functions

Centers, institutes, and similar agencies serving instructional, research, and public service functions, may be established by institutions when prior approval has been secured from the State Board of Higher Education.
In seeking authorization of the Board to establish a specific center, institute, or similar agency, the institution shall submit to the Board's Office for review by the Board, the following information:

1. Title of the proposed center/institute or similar agency.
2. Locus within the institution's organizational structure.
3. Objectives, functions (e.g., instruction, research, public service), activities of the proposed center/institute.
4. Resources necessary to the center/institute:
   a. Personnel - FTE academic, FTE classified.
   b. Facilities and equipment.
5. Funding requirements (estimated annual budget), and sources thereof:
   (state sources [institutional funds--state general fund, tuition and fees, indirect cost recoveries], federal funds, other funds as specified).
6. Relationship of the proposed center/institute or similar agency to the institutional mission.
7. Long-range goals and plans for the center/institute (including a statement as to anticipated funding sources for any projected growth in funding needs).

Centers and Institutes in the College and University Structure

An understanding of the role of centers and institutes in the colleges and universities of the State System requires that they be seen in the context of the other structural units within the institutions, namely the schools, colleges, or divisions, and the academic departments.

Divisions, Schools and Colleges. To facilitate their administration, colleges and universities are commonly organized internally in terms of divisions, or schools or colleges and--in the larger institutions--into smaller, sub-units, namely, academic departments.

Smaller colleges tend to be organized into divisions which group together faculty in broad areas, e.g.,

- Southern Oregon State College has divisions of business; education-psychology; health and physical education; humanities, social sciences; science-mathematics; graduate studies.
- Oregon College of Education has divisions (called departments by OCE, but in reality divisions as we are using the term) in education and psychology; health, physical education and athletics; humanities; social science; natural sciences and mathematics. (OCE also has departments of art and of music.)
- Eastern Oregon State College has divisions of business and social science; education, physical education, and psychology; humanities; mathematics and science; graduate studies.

The larger colleges and the universities tend to be organized in terms of schools or, in the case of universities, schools and colleges. For instance:

- The University of Oregon has a college of liberal arts (encompassing humanities, social sciences, and sciences) and a variety of professional schools and colleges: school of architecture and
allied arts; school of community service and public affairs; school of journalism; school of law; school of librarianship; school of music; college of business administration; college of education; college of health, physical education, and recreation.

- Oregon State University has an undergraduate college of liberal arts (encompassing only the humanities and social sciences); a college of science; and a variety of professional schools: school of agriculture, school of business and technology, school of engineering; school of forestry; school of health and physical education; school of home economics; school of oceanography; school of pharmacy.

- Portland State University has a college of arts and letters, a college of science, a college of social science, and schools of business administration, education, social work.

Academic Departments. In the larger colleges and in the universities, the divisions, and the schools and colleges are further subdivided into academic departments, to facilitate planning and administration of the institution.

Academic departments are the organizational sub-units within the professional schools (e.g., business administration, engineering, education) or the school or college of liberal arts which permits the organization of faculty into working units consisting of professors of similar subject matter interest (e.g., English, history, mathematics).

It is in the academic departments that decisions are made as to faculty teaching assignments, class schedules, faculty workload (within basic policies established for the school or college within which the department is lodged), and it is from the academic departments that emanate important initial, basic recommendations as to salaries, promotions, and tenure status of individual faculty members within the department.

In those institutions organized into academic departments, the department is the center of professional activity.

The departmental organization has undoubted strengths.

- It brings together faculty of similar curricular interests and similar goals and objectives.
- It provides the structure which makes possible the advancement of work in the discipline, and it has the capacity, through application of departmental incentives and sanctions, to generate faculty production of a high quality in the discipline.

But the departmental organization also has weaknesses.

- It may so tend to emphasize the discipline around which it is organized that it inhibits interdepartmental or interschool activities which in important instances are essential to research and instruction.
- Unless there is careful coordination at the school level, departments may offer courses that are unnecessarily duplicative of courses in another department.

As we shall note in greater detail below, it was to encourage interdepartmental and interschool research and instructional activities that many of the centers and institutes to be found in the State System institutions came into being.
Centers and Institutes

Nationally, the most widespread attempt to modify departmental structure has taken the form of the creation of centers and institutes. This is especially true in the universities; particularly the research universities.

The impetus for creation of centers and institutes derives from a number of forces of which the following are illustrative:

- The increasing need for faculty to collaborate across departmental and disciplinary lines in serving instruction, research, and service functions.

- The basic and applied research problems with which the universities must deal in their graduate training and research programs have become increasingly complex.

- Many of them will yield only to the concerted attack of scholars from a variety of disciplines working together in a coordinated effort.

- Traditional disciplinary and departmental boundaries are too constraining.

- In this need, the institutions have turned to centers or institutes as the agencies of leadership and coordination in these multidisciplinary efforts.

- What is said of research may be said equally of the university’s instructional programs for the education of graduate students competent to work at the boundaries of knowledge as members of multidisciplinary teams in the future teaching and research roles for which they are preparing.

- The university’s felt need to make visible to the academic community, to the public it serves, and to a wide range of funding agencies, the university’s interest in and capacity for undertaking research and instruction in given multidisciplinary areas, in particular in those areas in which there appears to be a manifest or even latent interest among the funding agencies.

This need more often than not grows out of the universities’ desperate need for nonstate funding in order to improve their capacity for service.

The universities must, if they are to maintain effective instruction and research programs, be vigorous in their efforts to attract funding from nonstate sources—i.e., federal agencies, private foundations, private industry, professional associations, and the like.

This the legislature and the State Board of Higher Education have long recognized, as witness the following:

- The Legislative Assembly has directed the State Board of Higher Education (ORS 351.130) to encourage gifts to the institutions and to other units of the State System either directly or through an affiliated organization, and has authorized the Board and its institutions to accept grants and gifts from the federal government (ORS 351.490).

- The State Board of Higher Education has adopted a policy statement observing the fact that research and graduate instruction in the universities are inseparably connected; that the development and
maintenance of the resources essential to effective graduate education and research—e.g., libraries, laboratories, highly qualified scholar-teachers, field stations, equipment and machinery—is, relative to undergraduate education, more costly (albeit a productive investment); that such programs will be better nurtured if the universities are vigilant, vigorous, and successful in their efforts to attract nonstate funding.

Accordingly, the Board of Higher Education has established guidelines (AR 63.020-63.030) for the institutions in their search for such funding. The Board's aim has been to encourage the institutions in these endeavors while, at the same time, assuring that the institutions do not, in accepting such funds, commit the state or the institution to continue programs funded through gifts, grants, or contracts, in the event such funds are discontinued in the future.

An examination of the funding sources for budgeted research in the State System institutions over the past decade and more, reveals that without the federal government's role in research support and without the funding solicited by institutions from private industry, foundations, professional associations, and other like groups, the State System universities would have suffered severely from a dearth of separately-budgeted research funds.

The creation of a center or an institute, with some modest institutional support, has proven repeatedly to have been the sowing of seed which has borne fruit thirty, sixty, or a hundred-fold or more. Modest institutional funding has made the center visible; being visible, the center has been able to attract nonstate funding beyond anyone's capacity to predict.

A case in point is marine science at Oregon State University. Twenty years ago (1955), as a result of multidisciplinary research earlier carried on by Oregon State University with very limited funding, a $10,000 federal grant in marine science was secured. Now, after two decades, Oregon State University is, by reason of federal and other grants, one of the major sea-grant universities of the nation. This, to be sure, is a dramatic example. But there are others.

In sum, the creation of centers and institutes is seen by colleges and universities in Oregon as being, in part, a response to the encouragement received from the Legislative Assembly and the State Board of Higher Education to seek vigorously nonstate funds as a means of expanding institutional capabilities for research, instruction, and service. That some centers and some institutes have proven to be the source of growth in institutional capacity for service, and in institutional prestige, with all that flows therefrom, has not been lost on the institutions.

**Centers and Institutes in State System Institutions**

There is presented in tabular form on pp. 981-982 a listing of centers and institutes in the several institutions of the State System.

**Salient Characteristics of Centers and Institutes.** An examination of the data and information submitted by the institutions as to their centers and institutes reveals a number of relevant facts, of which the following are among the most significant.
1. Centers and institutes are to be found principally in the universities and in the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center.

This is consistent with a series of related facts:

- Research (usually coupled with graduate instruction) is a major objective of many of the centers and institutes.

- It is to the universities and the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center that the Board of Higher Education has given the principal responsibility for research and graduate education.

- With their research and graduate education capabilities, the universities and the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center are in a favorable position to attract the attention of federal and private funding agencies of various kinds, which provide the funding so necessary to the maintenance of centers and institutes.

2. Nonstate sources of revenue (e.g., federal agencies, foundations, private industry) provide the predominant part of funding for State System centers and institutes.

In the two older universities in 1975-76, it is projected that nonstate sources will account for more than 83 percent of the budget for centers and institutes, and in the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center more than 75 percent is projected to come from nonstate sources. At Portland State University the proportion of nonstate support for centers and institutes appears to be somewhat lower than that. In many instances, the state contribution is for overhead costs and these are largely reimbursed by the federal agencies, leaving a small net cost for the state.

3. Centers and institutes have the capacity to expand and contract in accordance with their success in attracting nonstate sources of funding.

It is in the nature of centers and institutes, dependent as they are on nonstate sources of funding, to expand and contract in accordance with their success in attracting outside funding.

In some instances, a center or institute may not be successful in attracting any significant outside funding. It may be that the funding sources that were thought by the institution to have an actual or latent interest in the objectives the center or institute was established to serve, prove not to have. Or, though interested, the funding sources have higher priority uses for their funds.

In other instances, the center or institute simply loses out in the fierce competition that characterizes efforts to secure gifts, grants, and contracts that will augment the institution's always scarce resources.

For these reasons it may be that, at any given moment, any one of the universities or the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center may have one or more centers or institutes that is either totally, or largely, unfunded. This circumstance leads to the pejorative observation that institutions have "paper centers or institutes."

But such is the nature of centers and institutes.

4. Existing centers and institutes differ in a variety of ways, apart from their levels of funding and the source of their funding.
a. Some are designated as national centers; some as regional centers; others are neither.

b. Some are multidisciplinary, drawing together faculty and resources from a variety of academic departments and cutting across disciplinary and school lines; others are created by a single academic department to serve faculty and students of the department.

c. Some emphasize instruction; some research; and others public service, although most consider that they have, in some measure, an instructional function, often coupled with research.

List of Centers/Institutes in State System Institutions

University of Oregon

Bio-Social Research Facility
Bureau Governmental Research & Service
Career Information System
Center at Oregon for Research in the Behavioral Education of the Handicapped
Center for Capital Market Research
Center for Educational Policy and Management
Center for Environmental Research
Center for Gerontology
Center for International Business Studies
Center for Media Research
Center for Sociological Study of Women
Center for Volcanology
Community Parent-Teacher Education Center
DeBusk Memorial Center
Environmental Studies Center
Evaluation Center

Experimental Center for Advancement of Invention and Innovation
Forest Industries Management Center
Institute for Community Art Studies
Institute for Land Use Research
Institute for Social Science Research
Institute of Industrial and Labor Relations
Institute of Molecular Biology
Institute of Theoretical Science
Northwest Area Learning Resource Center
Northwest Community Ed. Development Center
Northwest Regional Resource Center
Oregon Institute of Marine Biology Research and Training Center-Mental Retardation
Solar Energy Center
Transport and Logistics Center
University Affiliated Faculty

Portland State University

Cartographic Center
Center for Economic Education
Center for Population Research and Census
Center for Public Health Studies
Center for Sociological Research
Center for the Moving Image
Clinics in Speech and Hearing
Education Center
Futures Research Institute
Helen Gordon Child Development Center

Institute for Psychological Study of Living Systems
Institute on Aging
Institute on Workmen's Compensation
Middle East Studies Center
Political Research Bureau
Regional Institute for Human Services
Transportation Study Center
Urban Studies Center
Women's Psychological Clinic

Oregon State University

Air Resources Center
Environmental Health Sciences Center
Environmental Programs Committee
Environmental Remote Sensing Applications Laboratory
Genetics Institute
Institute for Manpower Studies
International Plant Protection Center
Land Use Program Committee

Nuclear Science and Engineering Institute
Nutrition Research Institute
Office of Energy Research and Development
Radiation Center
Survey Research Center
Transportation Research Institute
Water Resources Research Institute
Western Rural Development Center
Course Changes--Amendment of AR 20.020

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, October 28, 1975; present--Carpenter, Maden, Harms, Joss.)

Staff Report to the Committee

Subcommittee 5 of the Joint Committee on Ways and Means, 58th Legislative Assembly specified, in budget note 

"It is the intent of the Subcommittee that the Board of Higher Education take official notice of changes in course offerings (including additions, deletions and significant modifications) and that such notice be accompanied by statements reflecting the current and future budgetary implications on the institutions, programs, employees and students affected by such changes. A report showing procedural compliance with this budget note is to be presented to the Emergency Board before January 1, 1976."

Under Administrative Rules of the Board (AR 20.020), modification of existing curricular allocations, including the addition and dropping of curricular programs, can be accomplished only by action of the Board. The Board has delegated to its administrative staff authorization to act on institutional requests for authorization to add, drop, or alter courses offered in support of curricular programs authorized by the Board.

Under this delegation of authority, the Board's staff can approve only those courses necessary to carry out institutional programs authorized by the Board. The Board's Office cannot approve development of course offerings in areas of instruction in which the institution does not have a Board-authorized program.

The Board's Office has, from time to time, prepared for presentation to the Board summaries of institutional requests for modifications of course offerings as approved by the Board's Office. The most recent of these reports, presented to the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs June 24, 1975, concerned extensive reorganization of the course offerings of Eastern Oregon State College. However, there is no requirement in the Administrative Rules that such reports shall be made.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

To provide for the official notice of course additions, deletions, and modifications required by budget note (4), the Board's Office recommended the additional modification of AR 20.020 of the Administrative Rules as shown below.

20.020 Board Surveillance of Higher Education Curricula and Departments

In accordance with the provisions of ORS 351.070 (as-shown-in AR-20.030), the Board of Higher Education exercises general oversight of curricula and instruction in the State System, including but not limited to curricular allocations[-], and establishment of centers, institutes, and similar agencies serving instructional, research, or public service functions. It maintains a statement of policies underlying the curricular allocations within the System. The Board acts upon institutional requests for modification of existing curricular allocations, including the addition and dropping of curricular programs, in accordance with the policies of the Board. The Board delegates to its administrative staff authority (1) to act upon institutional requests for authorization to add, drop, or alter courses in the curricular programs that have been authorized the institutions by the Board, with the provision that the Board's Office shall submit a report to the Board each year as to the courses added, deleted, and significantly altered with comments on the budgeting implications of these changes on institutions, programs, employees, and students affected by these changes, and (2) to act in such other capacities in curriculum and instruction as the Board may determine.

It is the policy of the Board to keep abreast of the educational needs of the state and to encourage the institutions to plan vigorously [for-meeting-the-changing-needs-of-public-higher-education-in-Oregon] to meet these needs.

In meeting its curricular responsibilities, the Board has as its primary consideration the assurance of adequate availability of educational opportunities to qualified [youth] persons without unnecessary or unwise duplication of educational resources.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mrs. Carpenter asked how many courses were involved each year, saying, she would think that for the System as a whole it would be a very large number. Dr. Romney said that was correct, the number was very substantial, but that it was not anticipated that the Board would review each course change. Instead, the Board's Office will review the proposals for course changes in detail, as is done now, and the Chancellor will make the decision as to whether the proposed change will be approved or disapproved. The Board's Office will prepare a tabulation of the changes, by departments, of courses added, deleted, or changed, with a brief explanation of the reason for the major changes proposed for the Board. This report can be fairly concise.

Dr. Terry K. Olson, Executive Director of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, asked how the Board's staff perceived the way in which course requests would be presented by the individual institutions to the Board. He said the Budget Note prepared by Subcommittee 5 indicates the concern of its members for budgetary implications of course changes and new course offerings. He asked if the report proposed by the Board's Office would be an autopsy at the end of the year of course changes accomplished during the year.
Dr. Romney said the approval of the Chancellor is in no way an autopsy. Course changes requested for the following academic year come to the Board's Office once a year, after having gone through departmental review, school review, all-institutional faculty review, and review of the President's Office. It is these proposals that are the basis for the Board's Office review. The bound records of the Board, year after year, show that course change proposals are carefully reviewed and some are disapproved at the Chancellor's level.

Mrs. Elizabeth Johnson, member of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, said that when Subcommittee 5 was considering the question of course review, she had asked if perhaps they were thinking of review of programs rather than courses. The response was that the word courses was used intentionally because the subcommittee was concerned that courses are added or dropped making a de facto program or in response to faculty interests. Mrs. Johnson said she felt the subcommittee simply wanted the Board's Committee on Instruction to have a closer look at the rationale and fiscal impact of what was being done. She said the subcommittee expects the Board to look at more than a list of courses.

Dr. Romney said it was the intent of the Board's Office to provide the Board not only with a summary of courses added or dropped by the various departments and schools in the institutions, but with a brief explanation of the purpose and implications of the changes.

Mrs. Kahananui said the initial review of institutional requests for course modifications eliminates all requests which are not within the authorization of the Chancellor to approve course modifications for programs approved by the Board. Courses which are eliminated can only be approved by bringing them to the Board's Committee on Instruction as a program modification or new program.

The Committee recommended that the Board adopt the staff recommendation with modification in the wording of the second and third paragraphs of AR 20.020 as indicated on p. 983.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Layman said the time set for public hearing on the proposed amendment to AR 20.020 had arrived. He asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed changes. There being no response to his request, Mr. Layman declared the public hearing closed.

Upon motion by Mr. Joss, the Board adopted the proposed amendment to AR 20.020 as recommended by the Committee. The following voted in favor: Directors Carpenter, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, Stewart, and Layman.

Those voting no: None.

The President of the Board declared the amendment duly adopted as recommended. AR 20.020, as amended in the preceding two items, appears as Supplement B to these minutes.

Staff Report to the Committee

A course, in the State System of Higher Education, is "an instructional subdivision of a subject offered through a single term," e.g., Wr 121 English Composition, Ed 468 Diagnostic and Remedial Techniques in Reading, Bi 515 Neurochemistry.

The level of instruction is identified by the course number: 100-200 numbered courses are lower-division (freshman and sophomore), 300-400 are upper-division (junior and senior), 400 courses identified with a 'g' or 'G' admit both upper-division and graduate students, and 500-numbered courses are graduate courses restricted to graduate students.
The educational effort involved in a course is expressed as "credits" or "credit hours." The State System defines a credit as representing "three hours of the student's time each week for one term (10-11 weeks). This time may be assigned to work in classroom, laboratory, or outside preparation."

Courses and course changes for already authorized programs are usually initiated by faculty at the departmental level in response to instructional needs. Proposed new courses and course changes are reviewed by a faculty curriculum committee, the faculty as a whole, and the President before they are forwarded to the Board's Office for approval. Examples of instructional needs which may lead to course changes are:

1. New information needs to be incorporated into the instructional program.
2. Instruction needs to be reorganized to introduce material at a different level, to give greater or lesser emphasis to a particular area of instruction, to eliminate duplication or overlap between courses, to provide more efficient instruction of students with different backgrounds.
3. Information covered in the course has become obsolete, or overlaps with another course, or is no longer considered pertinent to the students' educational goals, or attracts little student interest.
4. Student enrollment in a subject area has increased to the point that existing courses must be scheduled in multiple sections, thereby presenting the opportunity to increase educational service in terms of courses offered (and to vary faculty teaching assignments to take advantage of special competencies and interests), without adding to instructional costs.
5. Student enrollment in a subject area has decreased to the point that the department can no longer schedule all courses authorized even on an alternate-year basis.
6. Retirements or employment of new faculty have changed faculty competencies.

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, October 28, 1975; present--Carpenter, Maden, Harms, Joss.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee (October 28, 1975)

It was recommended that Administrative Rules Section 33.000 be modified as follows:

1. AR 33.010--No change.
2. AR 33.020--Repeal (see proposed AR 33.095).
3. AR 33.030--Repeal.
4. Adopt new AR 33.015 through 33.090.
5. Adopt new AR 33.095.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee (October 28, 1975)

Mr. Branchfield presented the proposed changes to the Administrative Rules Section 33.000 and explained the reason for the recommended action in each instance. He said the intent was (1) to prevent discrimination and (2) to encourage a prompt investigation at the institutional level of any complaints and to provide a procedure for handling such actions.

Mr. Branchfield said the provision for financial sanctions was specified in response to the statute.
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Dr. Harry Alpert, Vice President and Provost at the University of Oregon, asked for a further definition of the persons eligible to file a complaint and whether complaints would be limited to those from faculty and students or would include complaints from the general public.

Mr. Branchfield said any person who is participating or seeking to participate in any educational program or other activity in higher education who feels that discrimination has taken place is free to make a complaint. He said it is felt the statute does not apply to employment. The statute does use the word "unreasonable" and in the proposed rules discrimination is defined as any act which "unreasonably differentiates" among persons. Mr. Branchfield continued that further clarification of the meaning of discrimination is going to have to come through case-by-case decisions.

The Committee recommended that the Board adopt the proposed amendments to Section 33.000 of the Administrative Rules as presented in the staff recommendation to the Committee.

Board Discussion and Action (November 25, 1975)

Mr. Layman said the time set for public hearing on the proposed amendments to the Administrative Rules, Section 33.000, had arrived. He said Dr. Margaret Lumpkin, Professor of Education at Oregon State University, had requested an opportunity to be heard.

Dr. Lumpkin said she was one of two persons representing the Oregon Women's Political Caucus and she was not representing Oregon State University in any capacity. She introduced Mrs. Margaret Hendriksen as the newly-elected president of the Caucus and an attorney, and as the other representative from that organization.

Dr. Lumpkin read the following prepared statement, which was distributed to the Board:

To: Members of the State Board of Higher Education

From: Margaret Lumpkin, Representing Oregon Women's Political Caucus

Re: HB 2131, now Chapt. 204, Oregon Laws of 1975, Section 1, (3) "The State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education shall establish rules necessary to insure compliance with subsection (2) of this section in the manner required by ORS Chapter 183."

Executive Order No. EO-75-21, filed October 8, 1975, p. 3 "It is further ordered and directed that the concept of Affirmative Action be applied to programs as well as employment activities, and that each state agency shall review its operating policies and procedures............"

The amendments to the Administrative Rules of the State Board of Higher Education relating to discrimination deal solely with the handling of complaints through amendments to AR 33.010 and through AR 33.095. We believe that the proposed rules are a disingenuous interpretation of the law and are thwarting the intent of the law through failure to develop a totally new and appropriate set of rules which structure programs, services, and activities in compliance with the state and federal laws. This attempt to write regulations is clearly insufficient in that the proposed regulations are not adequate to carry out intent of the law as revealed by legislative history.
We urge the Board to delay action on these rules and to direct the Chancellor's office to submit rules that are fully in accord with the letter and intent of the law. We ask that the Board fulfill its role in providing leadership in structuring rules which provide guidelines for review of programs and services that are fully in accord with the law.

We prefer to appeal to the Board at this time on a rational basis rather than a legal basis.

Dr. Lumpkin said the Board's action on athletic programs earlier in the meeting was an exact point in question. She said she assumed the funding proposal referred only to males. She said it would be very simple for the Chancellor's Office to make rules and policies, as mandated by law, which would provide equal opportunity in services and programs to both men and women.

Mrs. Hendriksen said the Oregon Women's Political Caucus is a group of politically active women concerned with both equitable representation on various decision-making boards and equitable policies for women. She said as taxpaying citizens the members were concerned about the route the Board seemed to be taking for implementation of the law. She said the Board was establishing a costly adjudication route for individual complaints rather than developing administrative law promulgating positive rules.

Mr. Ingalls said the Board's action on athletic programs was one which could be accomplished immediately and that it referred to transfers from junior colleges and community colleges to the institutions, regardless of sex. Furthermore, there had been considerable discussion of women's athletics and the possibility of additional appropriations for women's athletics from the legislature. He asked for specifics in which the proposed rules were considered to be discriminatory.

Dr. Lumpkin replied that the basic principle was the need to state in unequivocal terms that no services shall be offered without equal opportunity for all races, sexes, etc. She said she had a number of specific suggestions and the group would be pleased to assist on any committee to implement those suggestions. She said signatures of fifty people had been secured to institute a class action proceeding should the Board not follow the law.

Mr. Jess asked if the proposed regulations could be adopted to avoid requesting another extension from non-compliance with the law. The suggestions from the Oregon Women's Political Caucus could then be considered by the Caucus and the Board's staff for possible implementation at a later time.

Dr. Lumpkin said the proposed rules could be adopted in partial compliance, but it would be bad practice to say that they represented total compliance with HB 2131. She said the proposed rules were the negative side of compliance, not the positive side.

Mrs. Carpenter commented that the Board already had requested its staff to prepare more recent information on affirmative action and the kinds of actions that have been taken within the State System and the Board's Office on affirmative action. The report should be available within the next few months. She asked whether the objection was to the actual hearing procedures that were being established or was it believed that the proposed changes were inadequate and the administrative procedures should also be included in the Board's action.

Dr. Lumpkin said in her opinion the proposed rules were inadequate and an inadequate interpretation of the legislative intent of HB 2131.

Mrs. Hendriksen said a grievance procedure was necessary, but because there were no positive policy guidelines prepared the policy would be evolved out of individually-contested cases. She said this is costly and extremely time-consuming for complainants.
In response to a question, Mrs. Hendriksen said the proposed rules were not necessarily inconsistent with the law, but they were inadequate and not within the spirit of the law requiring establishment of positive guidelines and rules. Consequently, no changes will occur until decisions are reached on complaints challenging each area of discrimination.

Mr. Branchfield said the statute requires the Board to take away part of the funding of any institution which violates the statutory prohibition against discrimination. A procedure must be developed in the event it is necessary to penalize an institution. He said the statute does not require the adoption of guidelines although it speaks clearly that there shall be no discrimination on a number of different types of criteria. Other laws also require affirmative action programs. Mr. Branchfield said in his opinion the rules presented to the Board did comply, both in language and intent, with the statutory requirements of HB 2131, now Chapter 204, Oregon Laws 1975.

Mr. Maden moved that the Board adopt the proposed changes as recommended by the Committee.

Mr. Ingalls moved that the question be referred back to the Committee on Instruction. In discussing the motion to refer, it was indicated that the Board should try to expedite adoption of the rules to comply with provisions of HB 2131.

Mr. Joss and other Board members said they would like specific suggestions for modification of the proposed rules which could be cleared with the Board's legal counsel and staff and then discussed by the Committee on Instruction. However, Mr. Joss said the Board had been admonished to respond to the statute by a certain time and had been granted one extension. He said he would vote for adoption of the proposed rules with the clear understanding that such action in no way should preclude further consideration of the suggestions or testimony.

The motion to re-refer the matter to the Committee on Instruction was approved, with the following voting in favor: Directors Feves, Ingalls, Maden, McIntyre, McLaurin, Perry, and Layman. Those voting no: Directors Carpenter, Harms, and Joss. Mr. Stewart was absent from the meeting at this time.

Staff Report to the Committee (October 28, 1975)

The reasons for the above recommendations were as follows:

1. AR 33.010 is still current and valid and no change was recommended.

2. AR 33.020 merely quotes the relevant statute. It is believed inappropriate to quote statutes in our Administrative Rules and proposed that a more concise statement be developed to implement the purposes of the statute (see proposed AR 33.095).

3. AR 33.030 merely refers one to AR 30.030 (regarding immunization). This subject is not a matter of discrimination and need not be referenced in this Section.

4. Proposed AR 33.015 through 33.090 is responsive to Chapter 204, Oregon Laws 1975, which states that "(2) No person in Oregon shall be subjected to discrimination in any public elementary, secondary or community college education program or service, school or interschool activity or in any higher education program or service, school or interschool activity where the program, service, school or activity is financed in whole or in part by monies appropriated by the Legislative Assembly."

"(3) The State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education shall establish rules necessary to assure compliance with subsection (2) of this section in the manner required by CRS Chapter 183," (The Administrative Procedures Act.)

5. AR 33.095 was proposed to be adopted in lieu of present AR 33.020.
Section 33.000 - Board Rules Governing the Handling of Complaints of Discrimination

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

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

33.020 [Students-Unable-Because-of-Religious-Beliefs-to-Attend-Classes-on Certain-Days]

[ORS 352.370--Students-unable-because-of religious-beliefs-to-attend-classes-on-certain-days.]

(1) As used in this section, "school-of-higher education" means:

(a) Any school, institution or department under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Higher Education;

(b) Any community college;

(2) No student shall be refused admission to a school-of-higher-education or be expelled from such a school-for-the-same-reason that because of his religious beliefs, he is unable to attend classes on a particular day;

(3) Any student in a school-of-higher-education who, because of his religious beliefs, is unable to attend classes on a particular day shall be excused on that day from any examination; study requirement or work requirement; However, at his own expense the student shall make-up the examination; study requirement or work requirement missed because of his absence;

[Formerly 351.765; amended in 1965 c 160 s 347]

33.030 [Student-Refusal-to-be-Immunized-Because-of-Religious-Beliefs]

[See AR 30.030 for provisions regarding student-refusal-to-be immunized-because-of-religious-beliefs.]

33.015 Definition of Discrimination

As used in AR 33.015 to 33.090, "discrimination" means any act that either in form or operation and whether intended or unintended unreasonably differentiates among persons on the basis of age, handicap, national origin, race, marital status, religion or sex.

33.020 Discrimination Prohibited in all Higher Education Programs, Services and Interschool Activities

No person in Oregon shall be subjected to discrimination in any Higher Education program or service, school or interschool activity where the program, service, school or activity is financed in whole or in part by moneys appropriated by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon.
33.025 Procedure for Reporting Discrimination

1. For the purpose of insuring compliance with AR 33.020, each institution or agency of the Department of Higher Education shall designate a compliance officer to receive complaints of alleged noncompliance with AR 33.020. Reasonable efforts shall be made to give notice of the name, office address and telephone number of the compliance officer to all applicants for and recipients of the services of each institution or agency of the Department of Higher Education.

2. All complaints shall be made to the compliance officer at the respective institution or agency and shall be reduced to writing by the compliance officer if not submitted in writing, and signed by the complainant, setting forth the factual basis of the alleged noncompliance, within 120 days from the date of the alleged noncompliance.

3. Upon receipt of the complaint, the compliance officer shall promptly cause copies of the complaint to be delivered to the President of the institution or head of the agency involved and to the Chancellor of the Department of Higher Education. The compliance officer shall retain a copy of the complaint in files established at the institution or agency for that purpose.

33.030 Investigation of Complaints

1. Within 30 days after receipt of the complaints, the institution or agency of the Department of Higher Education shall complete such investigation of the matter as it deems necessary, order the corrections of any noncompliance that is found to exist or to have occurred and transmit a report of the findings of its investigation and corrective action to the Chancellor, to the complainant and to the compliance officer with whom the complaint was filed.

2. The 30-day period allowed under subsection (1) of this section may be extended upon application by the institution or agency to the Chancellor.

33.035 Appeal to the Chancellor

1. Whenever, in the judgment of the Chancellor, an institution or agency fails to conduct a satisfactory investigation, fails to take appropriate corrective action or fails to make reports on complaints within the 30-day period where no extension has been granted or within the period allowed under the extension, the Chancellor shall initiate his own investigation of the complaint.

2. Whenever the complainant is not satisfied with the report, or no report is made within the time allotted, the complainant may request in writing that a hearing on the complaint be held. The request shall state the grounds upon which the complainant deems the report is unsatisfactory. The request shall be filed with the compliance officer who shall forward a copy promptly to the Chancellor. Upon receipt of the request, the Chancellor shall order the hearing.

33.040 Appointment of Hearing Officer

The hearing shall be conducted by a hearing officer appointed by the Chancellor. The hearing shall be conducted at the institution or site of the agency at which the complaint was made.
Notice of Hearing: Time and Place

The hearing officer conducting the hearing shall set a hearing date not more than 20 days after receipt of the request for a hearing. Written notice of the time and place of the hearing shall be given to the complainant and the respondent institution or agency at least 10 days prior to the date set for the hearing. The hearing officer may postpone the hearing for valid and sufficient cause, with notice to all parties. The hearing officer shall not permit unnecessary delay.

Written Statement of Case

Not less than five days before the date set for the hearing, the respondent institution or agency may file with the hearing officer such written statement of its case as it elects to file and shall file a copy of the report of its investigation and action. The hearing officer shall review the written complaint and the respondent's statement, if any, and report prior to the hearing.

Observers Present at Hearing

The hearing shall be open, except that the hearing officer, in his discretion, may require that the hearing be limited to a few observers, including representatives of the news media.

Conduct of Hearing

1. A verbatim record of the hearing shall be kept.

2. The testimony of witnesses, upon oath or affirmation, and other evidence concerning any disputed facts shall be received by the hearing officer. The hearing officer shall exclude irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence, but shall accept all other evidence of a type commonly relied upon by reasonably prudent persons in conduct of their serious affairs.

3. The hearing officer shall encourage stipulations of undisputed facts, and may seek to conciliate the dispute either before or after the hearing.

4. The hearing officer shall make findings according to the preponderance of the evidence.

Presentation of Evidence

The complainant shall have the responsibility of producing satisfactory evidence of respondent's noncompliance with AR 33.020. Both the complainant and the respondent shall have the right to appear and to participate in the hearing, to present relevant evidence to the hearing officer, to cross examine witnesses and to submit rebuttal evidence.

Position Summaries

At the conclusion of the testimony, the hearing officer may permit each party to make a summation; if this privilege is extended to one side, it must be extended to both. The hearing officer may request the timely submission of written summations.

Findings and Recommendations

1. The hearing officer shall make explicit findings of fact respecting the alleged noncompliance of the respondent institution or agency. The findings shall be based upon the hearing record.
2. If the hearing officer finds that noncompliance has occurred, the hearing officer shall formulate a curative recommendation for compliance.

3. In formulating the curative recommendation, the hearing officer shall consider the willingness and ability of the respondent to eliminate the noncompliance and any other factors relevant to the particular case.

4. The hearing officer shall submit his findings of fact, conclusions and curative recommendation to the Chancellor.

33.080 Order by Chancellor

1. The Chancellor may accept, modify or reject the findings of the hearing officer, shall issue an order containing any findings of fact based on the hearing or on investigation by the Chancellor under AR 33.035 and the action necessary for compliance, if the institution or agency is found in noncompliance. The order shall be issued no more than 15 days after completion of the hearing and copies shall be given promptly to the respondent, to the complainant and to the compliance officer of the affected institution or agency.

2. If the Chancellor believes sanctions should be imposed against any individual in addition to action necessary for compliance, he shall so notify the head of the institution or agency, giving his reasons thereof. Any proceedings thereafter taken against any individual pursuant to this paragraph shall be according to Administrative Rules of the Board or rules of the institution or agency, as appropriate.

3. If requested, the hearing record shall be reduced to writing and shall be made available to the complainant and the respondent institution or agency for copying, or copies thereof shall be made for them. The cost of reducing the record to writing, and of the making of copies thereof, shall be borne by the party so requesting.

33.085 Sanctions Against Institution or Other Agency

1. If, based on the Chancellor's own investigation of alleged noncompliance or as a result of the Chancellor's examination of the findings of fact of the hearing officer, the Chancellor concludes that any institution or agency has willfully violated AR 33.020, that the institution or agency has a record of noncompliance, that the magnitude and effect of the institution or agency's noncompliance is sufficient to warrant monetary sanctions, or that there is unwillingness of the institution or agency to comply with AR 33.020, or any combination of these conclusions, he may impose a monetary sanction against the institution or agency.

2. A monetary sanction imposed under this rule shall not exceed the amount of legislatively appropriated funds received by the institution or agency against whom it is assessed. No monetary sanction in excess of $10,000 shall be assessed without approval of the State Board of Higher Education.

33.090 Requirement of Prompt Attention to Complaints

It is the desire and direction of this Board that, in carrying out the duties imposed upon them by AR 33.015 to 33.085, the Chancellor, Presidents, compliance officers, hearing officers and other personnel shall give high priority to the performance of such duties and shall proceed as expeditiously as possible to ascertain whether discrimination exists and to take curative measures.
Students Unable Because of Religious Beliefs to Attend Classes on Certain Days

Any student who, because of his religious beliefs, is unable to attend classes on a particular day shall be excused from attendance requirements and from any examination or other assignment on that day. The student shall make up the examination or other assignment missed because of such absence.

In accordance with Board regulations, the following Board members represented the Board in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas for the Summer Term 1975 graduating classes at the indicated institutions. Signed copies of the degree lists are on file in the Board’s Office.

- Eastern Oregon State College
- Portland State University
- University of Oregon

Louis B. Perry
Marc F. Maden
Loran L. Stewart

The Board confirmed the action of these Board members in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas. Those voting in favor were: Directors Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, McLaurin, Stewart, and Layman.

Those voting no: None.

Directors Carpenter, Maden, McIntyre, and Perry were absent from the meeting at this time.

President Layman announced that the next meeting of the Board’s Committees would be held on December 15-16, 1975, at Portland State University.

The Board then approved the following schedule for Board and Committee meetings for 1976:

1976 BOARD AND COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOARD MEETING DATES AND PLACES</th>
<th>COMMITTEE MEETING DATES AND PLACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places</td>
<td>Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 20 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
<td>December 15-16, 1975 Portland (Monday and Tuesday)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
<td>February 24 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
<td>April 27 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
<td>June 22 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*September 20 (Tuesday)</td>
<td>*August 24 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
<td>October 26 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 25, 1977 Portland (Tuesday) (Tentative)</td>
<td>December 14 (Tuesday) Portland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A joint meeting with the State Board of Education and the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission also will be held in Salem during the month of September. Time and place will be announced.
The following voted in favor: Directors Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, McLaurin, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None. Directors Carpenter, Maden, McIntyre, and Perry were absent from the meeting at this time.

Mr. James Whittenburg, Portland, distributed a statement urging support of intercollegiate athletic programs in the State System. It was suggested in the statement that an investigation be made of the possibility of financing a portion of the salaries for the coaches from the general education budget. Since the Board had already discussed and taken some action with respect to athletic programs, there was no further discussion of the statement.
Awards for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I, (Langton Hall, Dearborn Hall, Women's Building and Gilbert Hall), OSU

Five bidders entered quotations on October 21, 1975, for automatic fire sprinkler system installations within four separate buildings at Oregon State University as part of the program for the correction of safety deficiencies approved by the 1975 Legislature. Drawings and specifications had been prepared by C. W. Timmer Associates, Inc., consulting engineers, Beaverton, and had been accepted by the Board's Office following review and approval by institutional officials. The low and high bids received for the work in these buildings were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Low Bid</th>
<th>High Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Langton Hall</td>
<td>$7,506</td>
<td>$14,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dearborn Hall</td>
<td>12,512</td>
<td>21,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Building</td>
<td>12,012</td>
<td>26,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Hall</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>24,603</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bid form provided an opportunity for an optional combination bid; however, selected combinations of the lowest bids resulted in savings so contract awards were made to two firms and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

- Direct construction costs -
  - M. B. Hinds Co., Beaverton
    (Langton Hall, Dearborn Hall and Women's Building) $32,030
  - National Sprinkler Company of Oregon, Portland
    (Gilbert Hall) $13,500
  Total Subtotal $45,530

- Professional services fees $4,097
- Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs $3,600
- Contingencies $2,493
- Total $55,720

To comply with the latest code requirements for life-safety, the four buildings are to be equipped with automatic fire protection systems in the form of automatic sprinklers and ionization detectors. These latter detectors will be capable of activation by products of combustion, some not visible to the naked eye.

Funding is being provided in equal shares from the General Fund appropriation in Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975, and from proceeds from the sale of bonds issued pursuant to the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARDS

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I (Langton Hall, Dearborn Hall, Women's Building and Gilbert Hall)

Engineers - C. W. Timmer Associates, Inc., Beaverton

Board's priority - Portion of No. 1 in 1975-1977 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975

Total project costs (out of $1,650,000 being allocated to OSU from legislative authorization of $5,920,000 for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I) $55,720
Meeting #427-54

Total direct construction costs $ 45,530

Scheduled completion - February 1976

Tentative financing plan:
  General Fund appropriation $ 27,860
  Article XI-G bonding 27,860
  Total $ 55,720

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Hewlett, Jamison, Atkinson & Luey, Architects, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for Housing Unit II at the Yaquina Bay Marine Science Center of Oregon State University was accepted as of March 28, 1975, subject to the completion of minor unfinished items on the punchlist. Through an oversight, the acceptance was not reported to the Board previously.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the approved post-bid budget reported to the Board on January 21, 1975:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COSTS:</th>
<th>Revised Budget 3/28/75</th>
<th>Original Budget 12/3/75 (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. C. Malin Co., Beaverton $49,474</td>
<td>$48,380</td>
<td>$1,094 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional service fees</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>5,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant costs and miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>1,750 (94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>3,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000 (1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes adjustments within two change orders for revisions in underground water piping and in wall and ceiling insulation; the installation of ionization detectors and other minor modifications.

The new dormitory-type facilities will provide housing for approximately 32 students participating in instructional and/or research programs at the Center on a short-term basis.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OSU Yaquina Bay Marine Science Center Improvements (Housing Unit II)

Architects - Hewlett, Jamison, Atkinson & Luey, Portland

Board's priority - No. 25 (Auxiliary Enterprises) in 1969-1971

Legislative authorization - Chapter 664, Oregon Laws 1969

Estimated gross area:

- Living units, excluding porches and wood decks 1,632 square feet
- Porches and wood decks 800 square feet
- Total 2,432 square feet
Report of Bids and Contract Award for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I, (Deady Hall and College of Education), UO

Balzhiser & Colvin, Eugene, consulting engineers, prepared drawings and specifications for the correction of safety deficiencies within Deady Hall and the College of Education buildings at the University of Oregon in accordance with the program authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975. Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, these documents were accepted on behalf of the Board and bids for the work were opened in Eugene on October 23, 1975. Because the five bids received, ranging from a low of $30,031 to a high of $53,000, were well within the engineers' estimates and the direct construction cost allowance, a contract award was made to the low bidder and the following tentative project budget was approved for the project:

| Direct construction costs - National Automatic Sprinkler Company of Oregon, Portland | $ 30,031 |
| Professional services fees | 3,003 |
| Construction supervision | 1,080 |
| Physical Plant and miscellaneous costs | 4,483 |
| Contingencies (8% of direct construction) | 2,403 |
| **Total project costs** | **$ 41,000** |

The work includes the installation of automatic fire sprinkler systems complete with alarm valves, alarm bells and hose connections for use by the fire department. It is part of the program for safety deficiency corrections, Phase I, for which an expenditure limitation of $1,675,000 was authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975.

**RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT**

Project - UO Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I, (Deady Hall and College of Education)

Engineers - Balzhiser & Colvin, Eugene

Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1975-1977 (Educational & General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975

Estimated total project costs | $ 41,000 |
Estimated total direct construction costs | $ 30,031 |
Scheduled completion - January 1976

Financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation | $20,500 |
- Article XI-G bond proceeds | 20,500 |
**Total** | **$ 41,000** |

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Meeting #427-56

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I, (Villard Hall Stage Hardware & Rigging and Ladder & Platform Work), UO

Staff Report to the Board

With the assistance of W. E. Group, P. C., Eugene, project architects, drawings and specifications were prepared for the correction of safety deficiencies within Villard Hall at the University of Oregon, which had been authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975. Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, these documents were accepted on behalf of the Board and bids for the work were opened in Eugene on October 16, 1975. Because of the special nature of the work, separate bids were received (a) for the replacement of unsafe stage hardware and rigging and (b) for ladder and platform work. (It is expected that the major portion of the safety deficiency corrections and remodeling work in Villard Hall will be bid within the near future, as soon as the architects have completed the planning.)

Two bids were received for the stage rigging work: one for $72,776 and the other for $126,102. Three quotations were received for the ladder work ranging from a low of $22,410 to a high of $33,278. Inasmuch as the low bids were within the estimates and authorized allowances, contract awards were made to the low bidders and the following tentative project budget was approved for this portion of the project:

Direct construction costs -
Stage hardware & rigging, Stagecraft Industries, Inc., Portland
Ladder and platform work - S2 Contractors, Springfield
Professional services fees
Construction supervision
Physical Plant and miscellaneous costs
Contingencies
Total project costs

*to be adjusted when contract awards are made for remaining work within Villard Hall

The project costs are included as a portion of the expenditure limitation of $1,675,000 for safety deficiency corrections, Phase I, authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT

Project - UO Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I (Villard Hall Stage Hardware & Rigging and Ladder & Platform Work)

Architects - W. E. Group, P. C., Eugene

Board’s priority - Part of No. 1 in 1975-1977 (Educational & General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975

Estimated total project costs $ 111,404
Estimated total direct construction costs $ 95,186

Scheduled completion - January 1976

Financing plan:
General Fund appropriation $55,702
Article XI-G bond proceeds 55,702
Total $ 111,404

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of the University of Oregon and the project architects, The Amundson Associates, Springfield, the work of the prime contractor for the Straub Hall Remodeling, Phase II, at the University of Oregon was accepted as of September 8, 1975, subject to the completion of minor unfinished items. The work was inspected by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning on behalf of the Board.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the approved post-bid budget reported to the Board on July 23, 1974:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Revised Budget 9/4/75</th>
<th>Original Budget 7/23/74</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Nelson Construction Co., Eugene</td>
<td>$1,513,327</td>
<td>$1,380,376</td>
<td>$132,951 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated requirements for change order modifications to restore some of the items omitted from the base bid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>(60,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>131,065</td>
<td>136,274</td>
<td>(5,209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision</td>
<td>19,440</td>
<td>19,440</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>14,755</td>
<td>10,891</td>
<td>3,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>36,413</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72,019</td>
<td>(72,019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,715,000</td>
<td>$1,715,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes an added exhaust air system (reinstated Alternate No. 9); renovation of a central classroom area (reinstated Alternate No. 10); stiffening of the roof structure; addition of utility tunnel ventilation fan system; addition of structural stiffening at stairwells; installation of new pipe enclosures in four rooms; rerouting of existing plumbing in certain areas; revisions to room interconnections; revisions to telephone conduits and panels; provisions for 2-inch steam line and return line to maintain existing service active during work; and other miscellaneous minor modifications included within twenty approved change orders.

Based upon a gross area of 57,759 square feet of area remodeled, the direct construction costs of $1,513,327 reflected in the revised budget averaged approximately $26.20 per square foot.

Except for general purpose classrooms, which are expected to be available for institution-wide assignment, Straub Hall will be used for the Psychology Department.

The Automated (Cognitive) Laboratory in the basement, which was begun under an earlier authorization and a separate construction contract, is now complete through the addition of two offices, nine laboratories (experimental cubicles), and electric shop, wood shop, a darkroom, a conference space and storage area. The first floor is remodeled for Child Research and administrative offices of the department. The second floor is assigned to the Psychology Clinic and additional faculty and staff offices. Space on the third is used for Experimental Research, Marital Studies Clinic, Child Studies Center, Clinical Sexual Dysfunction Laboratory and various offices; and the fourth floor is used for Social Research, Learning Laboratories, Memory Laboratories, Visual Perception, Behavioral Excesses Clinic, Community Studies Clinic and Social Skills Clinic.

The building has been brought into compliance with the requirements for accessibility by physically handicapped persons through the installation of an elevator, the construction of an enclosed passage at the second floor (around the two-story central space that previously interrupted the connection of the north and
south portions of the building at that level), the provision of four interior and seven exterior ramps, and the modification of toilet stalls and drinking fountains.

Financing was provided in equal amounts from proceeds from the sale of bonds under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution and from the General Fund appropriation within Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UO Straub Hall Remodeling, Phase II
Architects - The Amundson Associates, Springfield
Board's priority - No. 2 in 1973-1975 (Educational and General Plant)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973
Estimated area remodeled - 57,759 square feet
Total project costs $1,715,000
Direct construction costs - Total $1,513,327
Average (per square foot) - $26.20
Financing plan:
General Fund appropriation $857,500
Article XI-G bond proceeds 857,500
Total $1,715,000

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

Report of Bids
Award for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I, and Remodel of Gerlinger Hall, UO

Staff Report to the Board
Drawings and specifications for the correction of safety deficiencies and certain remodeling work within Gerlinger Hall at the University of Oregon, authorized by Chapters 48 and 331, Oregon Laws 1975, were prepared by SRG Partnership, Portland, project architects. Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, these documents were accepted on behalf of the Board and bids for the work were opened in Eugene on October 23, 1975. As adjusted to include an additive alternate being exercised for work funded separately, the six bids received ranged from a low of $115,800 to a high of $138,557. Because these quotations were within the available resources, a contract award was made to the low bidder and the following tentative project budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - John T. Moody &amp; Sons Construction Company, Junction City</td>
<td>$115,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>$23,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision</td>
<td>$2,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>$9,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable equipment</td>
<td>$9,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies (8% of direct construction)</td>
<td>$9,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$169,636</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less - Portion applicable to remodeling near the east lobby, funded separately from the Physical Plant budget for maintenance and operations (but bid concurrently as an additive alternate)</td>
<td><strong>$35,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net project costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>$134,636</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The basic work included within the contract involves improvements in ventilation, circulation, exiting, electrical wiring and increased fire-rating of partition construction as well as the remodeling of the locker room to make the facilities usable by both sexes.

Of the net project costs, $29,636 was included as a portion of the expenditure limitation of $1,675,000 for safety deficiency corrections, Phase 1, authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975, and the remaining $105,000 constituted a portion of the expenditure limitation of $1,450,000 for various campus buildings remodeling authority by Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT

Project - UO Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I, and Various Campus Building Remodeling (portion for Gerlinger Hall)

Architects - SRG Partnership, Portland

Board's priority - Part of Nos. 1 and 4 in 1975-1977 (Educational & General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapters 48 and 331, Oregon Laws 1975

Estimated total project costs $134,636

Estimated total direct construction costs (excluding bid alternate of $21,900 for remodeling of offices and restrooms adjacent to the east lobby, funded separately) $93,900

Scheduled completion - February 1976

Financing plan:

General Fund appropriations:
- Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975 $14,818
- Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975 $52,500

Subtotal $67,318

Article XI-G bond proceeds $67,318

Total $134,636

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Pursuant to authorization granted by the Board on August 26, 1975, a request was presented to the State Emergency Board to increase the expenditure limitation for the remodeling within McArthur Court at the University of Oregon, for additional spectator seating, from $250,000 to $300,000 and to utilize such construction materials as may be donated in addition to other gifts, restricted fund reserves and revenues.

Immediately following the approval of the Emergency Board on September 12, 1975, a contract award was made to the lowest bidder, Gale M. Roberts Co., Eugene, in the amount of $211,000. (This figure excluded the bid alternate of $43,000 for steel which is being purchased directly by the University of Oregon Development Fund and being furnished to the contractor.)

The total project budget of $300,000, including professional service fees, construction supervision, miscellaneous costs and a contingency reserve as well as the direct construction costs, is being financed entirely from gifts, restricted fund reserves and Athletic Department revenues as described in prior reports to the Board.
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November 25, 1975

Report of Bids and Contract Award for Esslinger Hall Remodel, UO

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

With the assistance of Morris - Redden & Associates, Eugene, consulting architects, drawings and specifications were prepared for the remodeling work within Esslinger Hall, a physical education building at the University of Oregon, which had been authorized by Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975. Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, these documents were accepted on behalf of the Board and bids for the work were opened in Eugene on September 10, 1975. Six bids were received, ranging from a low of $44,063 to a high of $59,087. Inasmuch as the bids were within the resources available, a contract award was made to the low bidder and the following tentative project budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Morris P. Kiely, Eugene</td>
<td>$44,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>$4,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision</td>
<td>$2,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Plant and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movable equipment</td>
<td>$3,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies (5% of direct construction)</td>
<td>$2,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total project costs</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work included within the contract includes locker and shower room remodeling to make the facility usable by both men and women. A new outside entrance to the basement altered area is also being provided.

This project constitutes a portion of the various campus buildings remodeling for which an expenditure limitation of $1,430,000 was established within Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT

Project - UO Various Campus Buildings Remodeling (portion for Esslinger Hall)

Architects - Morris - Redden & Associates, Eugene

Board's priority - Part of No. 4 in 1975-1977 (Educational & General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total project costs</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated total direct construction costs</td>
<td>$44,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled completion - December 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing plan:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund appropriation</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-G bond proceeds</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Staff Report to the Board

At the March 25, 1975, and May 20, 1975, meetings of the Board, reports were made of the appointments of various architectural and engineering consultants who are assisting the staff of the University of Oregon in the study, preparation of drawings, specifications and cost estimates, and in the contract administration of units of work included within (1) the correction of safety deficiencies (Phase I), and (2) various campus buildings remodeling authorized by the 1975 Legislature.

Subsequently, in response to the request of institutional officials, arrangements were made for the professional services of Marquess Engineering Co., consulting engineers, Eugene, relating to the correction of safety deficiencies within Lawrence Hall (old section), the main campus library and the facilities at the Institute of Marine Biology at Charleston. Under the provisions of the agreement, compensation is based upon time and materials within a maximum of ten percent of the direct construction costs, tentatively estimated to be approximately $227,400.

Funds required for the planning are being provided from the state appropriation within Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Inasmuch as the final plans and specifications for the steam service improvements at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, as prepared by Cornell, Howland, Hayes & Merryfield/Hill, consulting engineers, Portland, were in substantial conformance to the plans reviewed and approved previously by the Board, and inasmuch as the necessary clearances were obtained from local jurisdictional agencies and the State Emergency Board, bids for the project were received at 8 P.M. on October 14, 1975. Four bidders submitted quotations ranging from a low of $1,259,000 to a high of $1,404,768. Because the bids exceeded the engineers' estimates and the amount available for direct construction, it was necessary to exercise three of the four deductive alternates and to make further minor modifications for a change order credit of $25,570 simultaneously with the contract award to the lowest bidder, as indicated within the following tentative budget which was approved for the project:

Direct construction costs - Temp-Control Corporation, Portland (basic bid less deductive alternates exercised) $1,144,300

Less-credit for Change Order No. 1 issued simultaneously with contract award 25,570 (1)

Net amount of direct construction costs $ 1,118,730

Professional services fees 48,000

Construction supervision 18,000

Physical plant and miscellaneous costs 13,600

Contingencies 36,670

Total project costs $ 1,235,000

(1) Includes changing the type of stack for the boiler and miscellaneous piping and valve changes in the boiler room. In the opinion of the consulting engineers, these changes will not compromise the performance or operation of the utility improvements.
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The contract work includes the construction of the building and site improvements needed for the starter unit of a new central heating plant on the South campus containing a new boiler with a rated capacity of 40,000 pounds per hour, deaerator and other auxiliary equipment. It also includes the construction of a new steam distribution tunnel serving the South campus, interconnected with the existing steam distribution piping from the utility plant in University Hospital South.

Of the total project budget, $50,000 is being provided from self-liquidating bond borrowings under Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from auxiliary enterprise balances and the remainder of $1,185,000 is being financed in equal shares from the General Fund appropriation within Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975, and from the proceeds from the sale of bonds issued under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Constitution.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT

Project - UOHS Utility Improvements (Steam Service)

Engineers - Cornell, Howland, Hayes and Merryfield/Hill, Portland

Board's priorities - No. 2 in 1975-1977 (Educational and General Plant); and
- No. 1 in 1975-1977 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975

Estimated total project costs $1,235,000

Estimated total direct construction costs $1,118,730

Scheduled completion - June 1977

Financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $592,500
- Article XI-G bond borrowings $592,500
- Subtotal $1,185,000
- Article XI-F(1) bond borrowings and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $50,000

Total $1,235,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

With the assistance of Keith Kruchek Consulting Engineers, Inc., Portland, project engineers, drawings and specifications were prepared for fire protection systems within University Hospitals North and South at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center. This work had been authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975, as part of the program for the correction of safety deficiencies on the various campuses.

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, the planning documents were accepted on behalf of the Board and bids for the work were opened in Portland at 8 P.M. on October 2, 1975. Bids were received from three contracting firms whose quotations ranged from a low of $1,029,237 to a high of $1,275,235. All of the bids were below the engineers' estimates. A contract award was made to the low bidder and the following tentative project budget was approved for the project:
Direct construction costs - Cosco Fire Protection Division of Zurn Industries, Inc., Milwaukie, Oregon $ 1,029,237
Professional services fees 90,000
Construction supervision 20,000
Physical Plant and miscellaneous costs 20,763
Contingencies 85,000
Total project costs $ 1,245,000

The contract work includes the installation of automatic fire sprinkler systems complete with alarm valves, alarm bells and hose connections for use by the fire department. Ionization detectors and annunciator panels are also to be installed by the contractor.

As noted, the project costs are chargeable against the expenditure limitation of $5,920,000 for safety deficiency corrections, Phase I, authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT

Project - UOHC Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I
(Hospital Fire Protection Systems)

Engineers - Keith Kruchek Consulting Engineers, Inc., Portland

Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1975-1977 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975

Estimated total project costs $ 1,245,000
Estimated total direct construction costs $ 1,029,237

Scheduled completion - November 1976

Financing plan:
General Fund appropriation $622,500
Article XI-G bond proceeds 622,500
Total $ 1,245,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Marquess & Marquess, consulting engineers, Medford, assisted the Physical Plant Department of Southern Oregon State College in the preparation of drawings and specifications for the All-Weather Track and Bicycle Trail portion of the Recreational Facilities project authorized by Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973. Separate bids were received in Ashland on October 15, 1975, for general work and for the special track surfacing. Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, including athletic department personnel, following investigations of the alternative track surfacing types, a contract award was made to Rogue River Paving Company, Inc., whose quotation for the combination of the general work, additional fencing and the Marathon Resilient Pavement was in the amount of $97,807.50. The comparable figure from the only other bidder, Tru-Mix Construction Co., with a Reslilite surface for the track, was $101,071.00. The following tentative budget was approved for the project:
A complete description of the work was reported to the Board on August 26, 1975. Bids received earlier (on September 3, 1975) were rejected because they were too high. It was determined that the time allowed for completion in the original bid invitation was extremely short and accounted for extra costs. A longer period was specified in the rebidding of the work.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT

Project - SOSC Recreational Facilities (All-Weather Track and Bicycle Trail)

Engineers - Marquess & Marquess, Consulting Engineers, Medford

Board's priority - Part of No. 6 in 1973-1975 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973

Estimated total project costs $ 110,000.00

Estimated direct construction costs $ 97,807.50

Scheduled completion - July 1976

Financing plan:

Bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-F(1)
of Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises $ 110,000.00

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

In accordance with authorizations from the Board on August 26, 1975, and the State Emergency Board on September 12, 1975, construction bids were solicited for the proposed ice rink within the lower level of the Stevenson Union at Southern Oregon State College as soon as the project architects, Robert J. Keeney/Balzhiser, Longwood, Smith, Paul and Anderson, had completed the planning. The base bid quotations received in Ashland on October 22, 1975, from eight contractors ranged from a low of $178,900 to a high of $224,900. Inasmuch as a number of deductive alternates had been provided, it would have been possible to proceed within the expenditure limitation authorized for these recreation facilities.

Because of the lack of student support for the project, however, as confirmed by action of the student senate several days after the bids had been received, institutional officials recommended that the bids be rejected and that the plans for the ice rink be abandoned. Notices were provided to the bidders that they were being released from their bids and bid security. Further study will be given to alternate uses of this area within the Stevenson Union before further recommendations are presented to the Board.
Out of the expenditure limitation of $455,000 authorized within Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973, for various recreation facilities at Southern Oregon State College, all of which would be financed exclusively from resources available for auxiliary enterprises, only the allocation of $110,000 for the all-weather track and bicycle trail improvements (noted in a separate agenda item) has been approved.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board received the report as presented.

**Report of Bids and Contract**

**Award for Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I**

(Ackerman Hall and Administration Building), BOSC

With the assistance of Morrison, Funatake & Associates, Portland, project engineers, drawings and specifications were prepared for the correction of certain safety deficiencies within Ackerman Hall and Administration Building at Eastern Oregon State College, authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975. Upon the recommendation of institutional officials, these documents were accepted on behalf of the Board and bids for the work were opened in La Grande on October 9, 1975. Three bids were received for the work in each of two contracts, ranging from a low of $13,437 to a high of $18,000 for Ackerman Hall and Administration Building Fire Alarm Systems and from $20,430 to $28,500 for Ackerman Hall New Electrical Service. The lowest bids were well within the engineers' estimates and within the resources available. Although an optional combined bid for the two items of work was provided in the bid form, separate awards were determined to be in the best interests of the State; therefore, contracts were awarded and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct construction costs:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zephyr Electric, Inc., Pendleton (Ackerman Hall and Administration Building Fire Alarm Systems)</td>
<td>$13,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alam Electric, La Grande (Ackerman Hall New Electrical Service)</td>
<td>20,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal | $33,867 |

Professional services fees | $5,384 |
Construction supervision and Physical Plant and miscellaneous costs | 8,019 |
Contingencies | 3,500 |

Total project costs | $48,770 |

The contract work includes the installation of fire alarm signal systems and improvements of exit lighting and emergency lighting for both buildings and the installation of a new electrical service, complete with new transformer, for Ackerman Hall.

The total project costs of $48,770 are being financed within the allocation of $100,000 to Eastern Oregon State College from the expenditure limitation of $5,920,000 authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975, for safety deficiency corrections, Phase I.

**RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND AWARD OF CONTRACT**

**Project -** BOSC Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I (Ackerman Hall and Administration Building)

**Engineers -** Morrison, Funatake & Associates, Inc., Portland

**Board's priority -** Part of No. 1 in 1975-1977 (Educational & General Plant)
Legislative authorization - Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975

Estimated total project costs $ 48,770

Estimated total direct construction costs $ 33,867

Scheduled completion - February 1976

Financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $24,385
- Article XI-G bond proceeds 24,385
- Total $ 48,770

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Developing Writing Proficiency Among Students of OSSHE

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, October 28, 1975; present-Carpenter, Maden, Harms, Joss.)

Staff Report to the Committee

The Genesis of This Report

This report on institutional efforts to develop writing proficiency among students in the State System of Higher Education responds to a request made in November 1972, by the Board's Committee on Academic Affairs that a report be rendered to the Committee following the close of the 1974-75 school year. (The background from which the Committee request emerges is presented on pp. 5-7 of the full report which is on file in the Board's Office.)

The Committee's mandate was couched in the following terms:

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 periodic reports ought to be made to the Committee on Academic Affairs on these matters. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends, therefore, that the reports from Oregon State University and the University of Oregon be accepted by the Board and that the Board ask Oregon Technical Institute
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 Technical Institute and the six multipurpose institutions report on the matters cited in the above paragraph.

Accordingly, at the request of the Board's Office, the institutions submitted in mid-summer of 1975, the report called for in the foregoing Committee request, copies of which reports are on file in the Board's Office and summarized on pp. 9-50 of the full summary report.

Salient Developments in Improving Writing Proficiency Revealed in the Institutional Reports

Efforts of the institutions to improve the writing proficiency of their students have included but not been limited to the following (see pp. 29-41 of the full report.)

1. Refinement of procedures for assessing proficiency in writing.
   a. as a diagnostic tool
   b. as a basis for waiver of institutional course requirements
   c. as a basis for placement

2. Expanded opportunities for remedial work.
   a. new or additional remedial courses
   b. improvement and expansion of writing clinics

   a. to provide better coordination of instruction
   b. to determine minimal competency standards
   c. to develop measurable course objectives

   a. to require remedial work where needed
   b. to define more clearly acceptable proficiency in writing
   c. to provide for upper-division or exit proficiency examination or demonstration

5. Encouragement of all-campus commitment to improvement of student writing proficiency.
   a. establishment of departmental composition requirements
   b. development of interdisciplinary writing courses
   c. assistance to faculty wanting to help students with writing skills
   d. faculty recommendation that faculty evaluate student performance on both mastery of content and writing proficiency (SOSC)


7. Participation in statewide activities looking to the improvement of writing proficiency among students.
   a. cooperation with high school writing staffs
   b. participation in work of interinstitutional committee involving two- and four-year colleges, public and private, established by the State System-Community College Coordinating Committee
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's Office has reviewed the institutional reports, and based upon that review, made the following recommendations for Board action:

1. That the State Board of Higher Education accept the institutional reports.

2. That the Board continue its policy of emphasizing to the institutions the desired objective of assuring that students in the State System institutions develop, and manifest in their writing, competence in the use of standard written English.

3. That the Board accept institutional proposals for improving their effectiveness in developing writing proficiency among students, as they are summarized on pp. 29-41 of the full report.

4. That the Board continue to authorize among its institutions divergent institutional requirements in the field of written communication, so as to permit the institution flexibility in thought and action that will enable each institution to approach institutional objectives for development of student competency in writing in a manner consistent with the institution's best judgment as to how that objective may most feasibly be attained.

5. That the Board comment (a) collaborative efforts of the State System institutions, community colleges, and independent colleges and universities to achieve greater validity and reliability and greater uniformity among two- and four-year institutions (public and independent) in the measurement of proficiency in English composition, and in establishing the basis for granting waivers of institutional requirements in English composition, described on pp. 43-44 of the full report, and (b) joint efforts of Oregon's colleges and universities and the public elementary and secondary schools to improve writing proficiency in public school students, described on pp. 45-50 of the full report.

6. That the Board continue to ask that its institutions review periodically how effectively each is developing writing proficiency in its students, and what steps the institution proposes to take in the future to enable it more surely and more efficiently to attain that objective.

7. That the Board continue to request that periodically the institutions make formal reports to the Board's Office, for review with the Board, of (a) the institution's definition of the level of effectiveness in writing proficiency that it will accept as meeting institutional requirements, (b) the ways the institution has devised for measuring competence in student writing proficiency, (c) the means being employed in developing writing proficiency, (d) the success the institution feels it has attained in meeting student writing proficiency objectives, and (e) the steps the institution proposes to follow to approach more nearly the desired objectives in the future.

8. That the institutions be asked to evaluate their programs for preparation of public school teachers with a view to assuring, as nearly as may be, that those who are preparing to become elementary and secondary teachers (and in particular, teachers of English) are equipped to perform effectively in assisting elementary and secondary school pupils to develop the capacity to communicate in standard written English at a level appropriate to their grade level.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Harms said he would favor deferral of action on the Board's Office recommendations until more time was available because there were a number of areas in the report that deserved extended discussion.
The Committee agreed to defer action but to hear those who were present to testify concerning the proposal.

Mr. Harms asked Dr. Nathaniel Teich, Director of English Composition at the University of Oregon, to comment on Dr. Teich's recommendation to return to the three-term, nine-credit freshman composition sequence.

Dr. Teich said the proposal to do away with the present vertical sequence and return to the three-term freshman sequence had received tentative approval in the English Department and had been transmitted to the College of Liberal Arts. Additional institutional review would be required before the tentative proposal would be authorized. Dr. Teich said one major difficulty was staffing because the present English composition requirement is six hours--three hours at the lower-division level and three hours at the upper-division level--and it would be difficult to staff a nine-hour requirement at the lower-division level without additional staff resources.

Mr. Harms commented that it might be interesting for one institution to return to the former nine-hour freshman composition requirement as a comparison with the vertical requirement.

Mrs. Elizabeth Johnson said facing the issue of writing proficiency was one of the many important needs at this time and that the Board should keep in very close touch with this vital program, rather than just receive reports periodically.

Dr. Terry Olson said the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission had organized itself into three standing subcommittees, one of which deals with student achievement. This subcommittee will be giving close attention to the subject of writing proficiency. He said the commissioners serving on this subcommittee might wish to attend any subsequent meeting called by the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs to discuss the Board's Office report.

The Committee deferred action on the recommendations pending further consideration at the next Committee meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, October 28, 1975; present--Carpenter, Maden, Harms, Joss.)

Staff Report to the Committee

At the request of the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs a review of low-degree conferral programs at the graduate level in the State System has been conducted by the Board's Office of Academic Affairs in cooperation with the State System institutions.

Master's programs conferring an average of three or less degrees and doctoral programs conferring an average of one degree or less per year over the past five years were identified and have been or are in the process of being reviewed (34 at Oregon State University, 5 at the University of Oregon, 3 at Portland State University).

This report presents the review with analysis and recommendations for 23 of the 42 programs (5 at the UO and 18 at OSU) identified as low-degree conferral. Those programs not included in this report will be presented at a later meeting of the Board's Committee.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

For each of the graduate low-degree conferral programs reviewed and included in this report, the Board's Office recommended that the Board approve the recommended action for each program as indicated on pp. 7-37 of the full report and summarized below.

1. Continuation of Program

University of Oregon
MA/MS, Dance
MLA, Landscape Architecture
MA, Linguistics

Oregon State University
MS, Horticulture
MAG, MS, Ph.D., Poultry Science
MS, Veterinary Medicine
Ph.D., Foods and Nutrition
MA/MS, Home Management

2. Continuation on a Conditional Basis

University of Oregon
Ph.D., Art History
MA, Classics

3. Consolidation of Programs

Oregon State University
MS, Ph.D., Pharmaceutical Chemistry
MS, Ph.D., Pharmaceutical Science
MS, Ph.D., Pharmacognosy
MS, Ph.D., Pharmacology
MS, Ph.D., Pharmacy Administration

The Board's Office supports the action taken by the school of pharmacy in combining its five graduate programs into one program at the master's level and one program leading to the doctoral degree.

4. Suspension or Termination

Oregon State University
Ph.D., Home Management (suspension)
MS, Institution Management (termination)

Review Procedures

Criteria for Review

The Board's Office used the following basic criteria in arriving at judgments about recommendations for continuation, modification, suspension, or termination of the programs reviewed:

- Need for the program. To what extent is the program duplicated at other state institutions or in other northwestern states? Does the program meet student interests and demands? In what ways does the program relate to the community and the larger area served? Is the program compatible with institutional purpose and mission? Does the program emphasize service to students in other programs rather than the conferral of degrees? What is the job placement situation for the graduates?
Prospects for the program in the future. What are the plans for the program in the future with respect to level of support, efforts to increase enrollments, changes in admission standards, etc.? What are the degree conferral and student credit hour production trends over the past five years? In terms of these trends and the projected plans for the program, what are the prospects for the program in the future?

Quality of the program. Is the program accredited? What are the qualifications of the faculty? What evidence can the department muster to give some indication of the quality of the program; e.g., student and alumni reactions, demand for graduates, accreditation or other evaluation reports.

Cost of the program. What do the data concerning class size, student credit hour production, and student-faculty ratios in the departmental graduate courses reveal about the efficiency and cost of the program? What savings might be effected if the program were eliminated?

Procedures

Institutional review. After identifying the graduate low-degree conferral program according to the standard set for inclusion in the review (three or less master's and one or less doctoral degrees awarded on the average over the past five years), the Board's Office requested that the institutions develop, review internally and supply to the Board's Office essential information concerning the graduate programs identified as low-degree conferral. The information requested was based on the criteria and the questions listed above.

After the preparation and review of the foregoing information and data, the institution was asked to make its recommendations concerning the programs under review.

Board's office analysis and recommendations. The Board's Office has made an analysis of the review data and the information submitted by the institutions for each program, collected additional evidence as needed, and conferred with institutional representatives in order to get a clear picture of the nature of and need for the program.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Maden said the report distributed to the Board and others was an excellent report which deserved special attention and should be deferred until sufficient time could be allocated for thorough discussion. Mr. Maden also expressed appreciation to Dr. A. M. Rempel, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, for his efforts in preparing the report.

The Committee deferred action on this report pending further consideration at the December Committee meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Annual Report of Affiliated Organizations, State System Institutions

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, October 28, 1975; present--Perry, McIntyre, Ingalls, Stewart, Carpenter, Harms, Joss.)

Staff Report to the Committee

AR 61.060 requires that each institution prepare an annual summary report of amounts received from each affiliated organization, purposes intended, expenditures therefrom, and such other information about the relationship between the affiliated-organization and the institution as may be pertinent to the full disclosure of the resources held for the institution.
The table shown on the following page contains summary totals of income and expenditures of each affiliate, percentage of income expended through the institution's business office, and a breakdown of the institution's expenditures of the income from the affiliate by classification support; e.g., instruction and research, student, faculty, capital outlay, and general administration and miscellaneous.

Activities worthy of special recognition are as follows:

- **OIT Development Fund**: Income increased over 1973 by $2,721 or 200%.
- **OCE Development Fund**: Allocation to College increased over 1973 by $2,160 or 200%.
- **SOSC Foundation**: Allocation to College increased over 1973 by $25,295 or approximated 50%.
- **PSU Foundation**: Income increased over 1973-74 by $12,755.
- **OSU Agricultural Research Foundation**: Income increased over 1973-74 by $94,247.
- **OSU Foundation**: Receipts from all sources increased over 1973-74 by $998,219 or almost 33%; deferred giving increased by $1,351,694.
- **UO Foundation**: Contributions from all sources increased over 1973-74 by $49,203; endowment funds by $61,707.
- **Oregon Foundation for Dental Research & Development**: Income increased over 1972-73 by $14,177.
- **UO Medical School Advancement Fund**: Received notification from attorneys of $6,000,000 in bequests through deferred giving, including $2,000,000 irrevocable trust. Annual fund raising drive resulted in increase of 1973-74 of $20,000.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board receive the report as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
### SUMMARY OF CORPORATE AFFILIATE FINANCIAL ACTIVITY

#### Income and Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Ending</strong></td>
<td>9-30-75</td>
<td>12-31-74</td>
<td>12-31-74</td>
<td>12-31-74</td>
<td>6-30-75</td>
<td>6-30-75</td>
<td>6-30-75</td>
<td>10-31-74</td>
<td>6-30-75</td>
<td>6-30-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$11,248</td>
<td>$4,109</td>
<td>$306</td>
<td>$75,101</td>
<td>$165,038</td>
<td>$9,572</td>
<td>$297,619</td>
<td>$3,205,848</td>
<td>$1,239,674</td>
<td>$92,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$18,730</td>
<td>$4,059</td>
<td>$3,221</td>
<td>$60,239</td>
<td>$125,983</td>
<td>$9,043</td>
<td>$224,821</td>
<td>$963,576</td>
<td>$364,966</td>
<td>$6,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transferred to Institution</strong></td>
<td>$10,912</td>
<td>$4,109</td>
<td>$3,170</td>
<td>$73,101</td>
<td>$84,144</td>
<td>$9,043</td>
<td>$224,821</td>
<td>$963,576</td>
<td>$364,966</td>
<td>$6,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% Transferred to Institution</strong></td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES THROUGH INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>EOSC</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OCE</th>
<th>SOGC</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>Oregon Med. Sch. Advancement Fund</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction &amp; Research Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. Asst. &amp; Fellows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib.-Instr. Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$3,848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction &amp; Research Support</td>
<td>$32,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,541</td>
<td>$34,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin. Need Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110,241</td>
<td>5,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ath. Grant Aid &amp; Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148,987</td>
<td>231,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu. Loans &amp; Wages (Misc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181,490</td>
<td>222,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,980</td>
<td>15,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel &amp; Moving Exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>22,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment &amp; Misc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>35,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay Sup.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. &amp; Res. Fac. &amp; Equip.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Instr., Ath/Rec Fac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Rare Book Acq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Office Furn. &amp; Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Adm. &amp; Misc. Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Wages % Sal. College &amp; Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Supplies &amp; Misc. Exp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Instruction Support</strong></td>
<td>$10,912</td>
<td>$1,659</td>
<td>$3,170</td>
<td>$60,239</td>
<td>$84,144</td>
<td>$224,821</td>
<td>$963,576</td>
<td>$364,966</td>
<td>$6,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting 4-27-75**

**November 24, 1975**
Meeting #427-74
Report of Endowments and Investments as of June 30, 1975

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, October 28, 1975; present--Perry, McIntyre, Ingalls, Stewart, Carpenter, Harms, Joss.)

Staff Report to the Committee

The Administrative Rules require that a semiannual report on investments be made to the Board. Mr. Holmer indicated that copies of two reports, entitled "Schedule of Investments, All Funds" and "Report of Endowment Investments," had been mailed to Board members. These reports are on file in the Board's Office.

The schedule of investments identifies the investment of all Board funds available for investment as of June 30, 1975. This document will be included in the 1974-75 Controller's Report. Investments in the Current Donation and Plant Funds are limited by law essentially to obligations of agencies of the federal government and certificates of deposit.

Investment of pooled endowment and quasi-endowment funds are limited by Board policy to those permitted under the "prudent man" rule, with the understanding that not more the 50 percent of the Endowment Fund, or more than 60 percent of the Quasi-Endowment Fund, may be in common stocks. Not more than five percent of either fund may be in obligations of any one corporation.

Some endowment and quasi-endowment investments are held unpoled in the name of the Board, either because the gift instrument so requires or there is no ready market for the sale of the holding. It was also indicated that some of the items had only recently been received and disposition thereof, with proceeds going to the endowment pools, had not been consummated.

The pooled Endowment and Quasi-Endowment Funds are managed by two investment management firms (Loomis & Kennedy, Inc., of Seattle, and George D. Bjurman & Associates, of Los Angeles) which were retained by the Board as of June 30, 1975. On September 13, 1975, pursuant to action by the 1975 Legislature, responsibility for management of the endowment funds of the Department of Higher Education was transferred to the Oregon Investment Council. The Council has retained Loomis & Kennedy and George Bjurman under policy guidelines previously adopted by the Board.

The Board of Higher Education has had authority to invest endowment funds in common stocks only since 1971. Prior to that time, the Board could hold or sell stock given to it but could not purchase stock. The first investments in common stocks were made (by management firms), beginning in January 1972.

The Board, as primary trustee, has a responsibility to satisfy itself that the endowments are prudently managed. The Controller monitors the transactions to assure conformity with Board guidelines; the Vice Chancellor for Administration is regularly invited to attend the monthly meetings of the Oregon Investment Council and either he or the Controller does, in fact, attend these meetings. The feature of each meeting is a review of portfolio management by one of the eight managers retained by the Council. It is expected that the Council will invite Board representation at reviews by Loomis & Kennedy or George Bjurman.

Although a more profitable investment record than that reported would have been preferred, the report is not believed to warrant any modification of existing Board policy or specific recommendations for action by the Oregon Investment Council.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee discussed the effectiveness of the management under the investment managers and the legal responsibility of the Board for making management decisions with respect to the investment portfolio. It was stated that the legal responsibility
probably would rest with the Board, but it could be transferred to the Oregon Investment Council as a result of the statute passed by the 1975 Legislature.

Concerning the timing of the reports to the Board, Mr. Holmer said that semi-annual reports to the Board were required and that an effort is made to bring these reports to the Board in February and August.

The Chancellor said the Board has the authority to exercise any control it wished with respect to gift funds. The requirements established in the investment guidelines could be modified by the Board.

Mr. Ingalls requested a further delineation of the responsibility of the Board in the investment of funds which it receives from gifts. It was indicated that a subsequent report would be made to the Board.

The Committee recommended that the Board receive the report as presented, and that further information be provided when the study of the Board's legal responsibility is completed.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

| Condition of Board's Special and Plant Rehabilitation Reserves | CONDITION OF BOARD'S SPECIAL AND PLANT REHABILITATION RESERVES  
As of November 25, 1975, for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1976 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Board's Unallocated Reserve</td>
<td>(No funds reserved in allocation plan for Fiscal Year 1975-76.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance as of September 23, 1975</td>
<td>$ 164,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Transfer to SOSC for air-conditioning unit repair</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance estimated as of November 25, 1975</td>
<td>$ 158,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Board's Reserve for Plant Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance as of September 23, 1975</td>
<td>$ 626,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance estimated as of November 25, 1975</td>
<td>$ 626,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Computer Systems Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance as of September 23, 1975</td>
<td>$ 1,207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance estimated as of November 25, 1975</td>
<td>$ 1,207,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Accreditation and Instructional Services and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance as of September 23, 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance estimated as of November 25, 1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Report of Appointment of Naval Architects - Marine Engineers for R/V WECONA, OSU

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon State University, arrangements were made for the professional services of Nickum & Spaulding Associates, Inc., Naval Architects - Marine Engineers, Seattle, for the preparation of drawings, specifications and cost estimates for adapting and outfitting the R/V WECONA,
now under construction in Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin. The $3.1 million vessel is being built for the National Science Foundation and will be brought to Oregon as a replacement for the R/V YAQUINA. The new 177-foot, 862-ton vessel is expected to start its voyage to Newport following the acceptance trials beginning on or about November 25, 1975. The routing will be via the Great Lakes, the St. Lawrence seaway into the Atlantic Ocean and through the Panama Canal into the Pacific.

Much of the specialized equipment that now is used on the YAQUINA—radar, communications gear, cranes, winches, research instruments, etc.—will be transferred to the new ship on the West Coast. Additional equipment items also will be installed. In view of the involvement of the Architects-Engineers (then under the firm name of W. C. Nickum & Sons, Co.) in the conversion of the 30-year-old YAQUINA from service as an FS freighter-type vessel for use by Oregon State University as an all-weather oceanographic research vessel about ten years ago, they were thoroughly familiar with the program requirements. For their services in relation to the new vessel, they are being compensated on a time and materials basis within a stipulated maximum.

A significant portion of the funds required for the adapting and outfitting of the R/V WECONA is being provided from proceeds from the recent sales of the R/V YAQUINA and the SISU, supplemented with additional gift and grant funds (including indirect cost allowances for instructional and research contracts and grants, if necessary).

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Total</th>
<th>Cumulative Total for Current Year</th>
<th>Comparable Cumulative Total for Preceding Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 22, 1975</td>
<td>$13,636,435.23</td>
<td>$13,636,435.23</td>
<td>$8,914,842.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23, 1975</td>
<td>$18,196,102.74</td>
<td>$31,832,537.97</td>
<td>$30,491,269.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 25, 1975</td>
<td>$16,197,215.73</td>
<td>$48,029,753.70</td>
<td>$42,612,625.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following gifts and grants to the institutions have been approved for acceptance and expenditure by the institutions and the Board's Office in accordance with Board action on January 27-28, 1964. It was recommended that the Secretary of the Board be authorized to call upon the institutions to make suitable acknowledgement on behalf of the Board to the donors and grantors. The Board approved the recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, Joss, McLaurin, Stewart, and Layman. Those voting no: None. Directors Carpenter, Maden, McIntyre, and Perry were absent from the meeting at this time.

Oregon State University

Scholarships & Fellowships Gifts totaling $255,037.57 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

Agriculture Engineering Scholarship, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis $500.00
Aid Association for Lutherans, Appleton, Wisconsin 200.00
Alpha Tau Omega Foundation Fund, Champaign, Illinois 535.00
Alumni Physicians Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis 500.00
American Association of University Women, Oregon City 150.00
American Business Women's Association, Anchorage, Alaska 150.00
American Dental Hygienists Association, Chicago, Illinois 900.00
American Legion Auxiliary, Portland 800.00
American Smelting and Refining Company, New York 750.00
American Society of Civil Engineers, Portland 639.00
Amoco Foundations, Inc., Chicago, Illinois 900.00
Aileen S. Andrew Foundation, Oakland Park, Illinois 466.00
Arizona Sawyers Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis 1,100.00
Armour and Company, Oak Brook, Illinois 500.00
Ashland Senior High School, Ashland 217.00
Associated General Contractors of America, Portland 561.00
Bank of Oregon, Woodburn 500.00
Elmer Bankus Memorial Scholarship Fund, Brookings 235.00
Kate Bartholomew Memorial Scholarship, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis 500.00
Walter H. and Beatrice Beane Trust, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 2,180.00
Beaverton Schools, District No. 48, Beaverton 500.00
Benton County Medical Foundation, through Good Samaritan Hospital, Corvallis 500.00
Bernice Pauahi Bishop Estate, through the Kamehameha Schools, Honolulu, Hawaii 1,000.00
Bixby Scholarship, Charlestown, New Hampshire 150.00
Boeing Company, Seattle, Washington 3,800.00
Bohemia Foundation, Inc., Eugene 450.00
Boise Cascade Corporation, Boise, Idaho 5,075.00
Britt Memorial Scholarship Fund, Medford 300.00
Brookings Emblem Club No. 265, Brookings 100.00
Don Burlingham Memorial, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis 500.00
Canby Union High School, Canby 200.00
Central Lincoln Public Utilities District, Newport 639.00
Central Point School District #6, Central Point 664.00
John Lind Ching Memorial Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis 1,000.00
Cockerline Memorial Trust Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Salem 200.00
Colton Education Association, Colton 400.00
Corvallis High School Parent-Teacher Association, Corvallis 200.00
Co Signers Engineering Wives Club, Corvallis $ 175.00
Cottage Grove High School Associated Student Body, $ 400.00
Cottage Grove
Leone Elliott Covert Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon $ 200.00
State University Foundation, Corvallis
Joe M. Crahan Memorial Scholarship, through the Oregon $ 1,000.00
State University Foundation, Corvallis
Crescent Valley Associated Students, Corvallis $ 250.00
Criswell Scholarship Fund, through the U. S. National Bank
of Oregon, Portland $ 2,500.00
Crown Zellerbach Corporation, San Francisco, California 1,250.00
Dallas Women's Club, Dallas 100.00
Delta Gamma, Portland Suburban Alumnae Chapter, Portland 947.50
DeWus Keckritz Educational Trust, La Grande 750.00
Douglas County Home Economics Extension, Oakland 300.00
Dow Chemical Company, Midland, Michigan 1,000.00
E. I. du Pont de Nemours Chemical Company, Wilmington, 900.00
Delaware
Dyress Air Force Base Officers Wives Club, Abilene, Texas 300.00
Eagle Point High School, Eagle Point 750.00
Ebony Social Soc, Pittsburgh, California 1,000.00
Elks Lodge No. 1934, Brookings 1,000.00
Elks Lodge No. 1950, Independence 550.00
Elks Lodge No. 1663, Lebanon 1,000.00
Elks Lodge No. 1168, Medford 200.00
Elks Lodge No. 2146, Milton Freewater 200.00
Elks Lodge No. 2145, Springfield 450.00
Elks National Foundation, Chicago, Illinois 1,000.00
Evans Products Company Foundation, Portland 3,000.00
Evans Scholars Foundation, Golf, Illinois 764.00
Samuel Evans Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon State 100.00
University Foundation, Corvallis
Exxon Corporation, Houston, Texas 650.00
First National Bank of Oregon, Portland 1,000.00
First Presbyterian Church Deacons Fund, Portland 200.00
Max C. Fleishmann Foundation, Carson City, Nevada 350.00
Forestry Minority Scholarship Fund, Corvallis 600.00
Eldon Frink Memorial Fund, through the Oregon State 200.00
University Foundation, Corvallis
Future Business Leaders of America, Salem 300.00
General Foods Fund, Inc., White Plains, New York 3,500.00
General Telephone Company Employees Scholarship Fund, 400.00
Beaverton
Georgia Pacific Foundation, Portland 2,000.00
Gladys Whipple Goode Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon 600.00
State University Foundation, Corvallis
Grand Assembly Scholarship Fund, Tillamook 125.00
Grand Chapter Order of the Eastern Star, Portland 4,325.00
Grants Pass High School, Grants Pass 533.00
Gresham Union High School, Gresham 100.00
Grolier Foundation, Inc., New York 184.00
Hanna Ladies, Riddle 200.00
Dr. Milton Harris, Washington, D. C. 1,200.00
Helm Foundation, Inc., Redwood Valley, California 4,361.00
Robert C. Herrick Jr. Memorial Scholarship, through the 150.00
Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis
Rachel and Harold Hollands Memorial Scholarship, through 400.00
the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis
Hood River Valley Scholarship Fund, Hood River 200.00
Hyslop Research Memorial Fund, Corvallis 1,200.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institute of International Education, New York</td>
<td>$9,566.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Order of Jobs Daughters, Inglewood, California</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT Rayonier Foundation, Hoquiam, Washington</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. R. Jackman Institute, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvalis</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson County Home Extension Scholarship Fund, Medford</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Foundation, through the U.S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson-White Scholarship Fund, through the U.S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine County Home Extension Homemakers, Grants Pass</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction City High School, Junction City</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Achievement Columbia Empire, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Achievement of Eugene, Springfield, Inc., Eugene</td>
<td>166.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation, Oakland, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauaiani Home for Girls Trust, through the Hawaiian Trust Company, Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller Lumber Company, Roseburg</td>
<td>260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin J. Kelsey Charitable Foundation, Petaluma, California</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert F. Keniston Memorial Scholarship, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvalis</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonora Hamilton Kerr Memorial Scholarship, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvalis</td>
<td>639.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath County Cowbelles, Bonanza</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb Weston, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop Memorial Scholarship, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvalis</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon Union High School, Lebanon</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Lepper Memorial Scholarship Fund, Albany</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denabelle Linville Endowment, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvalis</td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Litster Scholarship Fund, through the U.S. National Bank of Oregon, Medford</td>
<td>371.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview Fiber Company, Longview, Washington</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Pacific Foundation, Portland</td>
<td>375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal Order of Moose, Mooseheart, Illinois</td>
<td>912.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras Produce Company, Madras</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madras Senior High School, Madras</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur County Home Economics Extension Study Group, Ontario</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen McDowell Memorial Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvalis</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. E. McKay of Coos Bay, Inc., Coos Bay</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Edwin and Edith McKay Memorial Scholarship, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvalis</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie River Schools, Finn Rock</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford Senior High School, Medford</td>
<td>2,356.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. J. Meechan Scholarship in Science, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvalis</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Arthur Melling Educational Foundation, Inc., Monmouth, Illinois</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessie Millar Scholarship Fund, through The Oregon Bank, Portland</td>
<td>2,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobil Oil Corporation, Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molalla Union High School, Molalla</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Olive Grand Chapter of Order of the Eastern Star of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Tabor Presbyterian Church, Portland</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation March of Dimes, Benton County Chapter, Corvallis</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Honor Society Crook County High School, Prineville</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Teachers Association, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Secretaries Association, Eugene</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Society of Professional Engineers Educational Foundation, Washington</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Food Processors Association, Portland</td>
<td>$213.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. E. Olinger and Sons, Milton Freewater</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Association of Future Farmers of America, Salem</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Association of Nurserymen, Portland</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Cattlemens Association, Portland</td>
<td>$561.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., Portland</td>
<td>$252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Dairy Industries, Corvallis</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, Salem</td>
<td>$213.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Horticultural Society, Aloha</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Industrial Education Association, Philomath</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon School Employees Association, Salem</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State Association of Emblem Clubs, Grants Pass</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State Elks Association, Salem</td>
<td>$5,108.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State Employees Association, Chapter #3, Sweet Home</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State Federation of Garden Clubs, Inc., Corvallis</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Book Stores, Inc., Corvallis</td>
<td>$3,834.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Dads Club, Corvallis</td>
<td>$12,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Dames Club, Corvallis</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Folk Club, Corvallis</td>
<td>$1,034.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation</td>
<td>$2,661.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Merit Scholarship, through the Oregon State University</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University Mothers Club, Salem</td>
<td>$6,390.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Egg and Poultry Association, Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panhellenic Association of Portland, Portland</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Industry Management Association, Everett, Washington</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEO Sisterhood, Newport</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEO Sisterhood, Oregon State Chapter, Medford</td>
<td>$4,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi Cola Bottling Company, Corvallis</td>
<td>$1,666.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Kappa Phi Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity, Cleveland, Ohio</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philomath High School, Philomath</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix High Scholarship Fund, Phoenix</td>
<td>$334.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Rose Festival Association, Portland</td>
<td>$338.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procter and Gamble Company, Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George M. Pullman Educational Foundation, Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quincy High School Future Farmers of America, Quincy, Washington</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Bernardo Womens Club, San Diego, California</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie V. and Stella J. Raymond Foundation, Raymond, Washington</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Employees Union, Local 1092, Portland</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth P. Ritchie Memorial Scholarship, through the Oregon State University</td>
<td>$6,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Riverman Scholarship Fund, through The Bank of California, Portland</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Program</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riviera Motors, Inc., Hillsboro</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue River Kay Cee Corporation, Grants Pass</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg Senior High School Associated Student Body, Roseburg</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotana Club of McMinnville, McMinnville</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of Albany, Albany</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of Forest Grove, Forest Grove</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of Hermiston, Hermiston</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of Medford, Medford</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of The Dalles, The Dalles</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Club of Windward Oahu, Honolulu, Hawaii</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Ruttinger Memorial Scholarship Fund, Brookings</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azalea and Charles Sager Memorial Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem Hospital Auxiliary, Salem</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Union High School, Sandy</td>
<td>700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Agriculture, Corvallis</td>
<td>739.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank W. Settlemier Scholarship Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Companies, Houston, Texas</td>
<td>780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Cascade Logging Conference, Redding, California</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton Hospital Auxiliary, Silverton</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverton Union High School Associated Student Body, Silverton</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph E. Simmons Memorial Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
<td>463.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Memorial Presbyterian Church, Fairview</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soroptimist Club of Corvallis, Corvallis</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santiam Educational and Research Project, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Santiam Forestry Fellowship Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
<td>11,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Oil Company of California, San Francisco, California</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stauffer Chemical Company Foundation, Richmond, California</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinbach Foundation, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena M. Steinmetz Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley and Mertie Stevens Memorial, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretch and Sew, Inc., Eugene</td>
<td>2,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Stuta Memorial Fund, through the Corvallis Women's Club, Corvallis</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale Women's Club, Sunnyvale, California</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Home Community Scholarship Fund, Sweet Home</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derald D. Swift Memorial Fund, Sherman Oaks, California</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tektronix Foundation, Beaverton</td>
<td>2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Carnival Association, Albany</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Trindle Memorial Award, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Tucker Scholarship Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>999.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulana Farms, Inc., Klamath Falls</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Turner Educational Trust, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Bancorp, Portland</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland</td>
<td>2,343.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Florence $100.00

Flora M. Von Der Ahe School Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland $1,475.00

R. M. Wade Foundation, Portland $300.00

Edward L. Ward Scholarship Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland $1,000.00

Western Conference of Teamsters, Burlingame, California $250.00

Weyerhaeuser Company, Tacoma, Washington $5,000.00

Willamette Industries, Inc., Portland $2,000.00

Willamette Valley Panhellenic Association, Salem $800.00

Woodrow Wilson High School, Portland $150.00

David Wolfson Memorial Scholarship Fund, through the Oregon State University Foundation, Corvallis $250.00

The Eric Yasui Trust, Hood River $300.00

Julia Zumwalt Scholarship Fund, through the First National Bank of Oregon, Klamath Falls $500.00

American Chemical Society Grant of $24,000 from the American Chemical Society, Washington, D. C., for research entitled, "X-Ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy of Atoms and Small Molecules," September 1, 1975, through August 31, 1977, under the direction of Dr. T. Darrah Thomas, Professor of Chemistry.

Mrs. M. Aufderheide Gift of $500 from Mrs. Muriel Aufderheide, Eugene, for the "Robert Aufderheide Memorial Scholarship Fund."

Duke University Grant of $9,500 from Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, for "the conduct of a Junior Science and Humanities Symposium," September 10, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Thomas P. Evans, Chairman, Science Education.

Exxon Nuclear Company, Inc. Grant of $20,000 from the Exxon Nuclear Company, Inc., Bellevue, Washington, for "research on the use of neutron radiography as a special analytical technique applicable to nuclear fuel," May 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Alan H. Robinson, Associate Professor of Nuclear Engineering.

Mr. J. Morray Gift of 20 volumes of the periodical Internation Organization, from Mr. Joseph P. Morray, Corvallis. The gift is valued at $450.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Grants totaling $197,067 from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Boulder, Colorado, for the following purposes:

1. $137,537 - "The conduct of field studies to estimate the distribution, abundance, diversity, and productivity of benthic organisms," April 1, 1975, through September 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Andrew G. Carey, Jr., Associate Professor of Oceanography.

2. $59,530 - "Summarization of Existing Literature and Unpublished Data on the Distribution, Abundance, and Life Histories of Benthic Organisms of the Beaufort Sea," April 1, 1975, through September 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Andrew G. Carey, Jr., Associate Professor of Oceanography.

National Science Foundation Grants totaling $580,500 from the National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C., for research and other purposes, as follows:

1. $37,700 - "Saturated Atomic Fluorescence in Laser Plumes," September 1, 1975, through February 28, 1977, under the direction of Dr. Edward H. Piepmeier, Associate Professor of Chemistry.
2. $18,600 - "Invertebrate Mechanisms of Internal Defense," September 1, 1975, through February 28, 1977, under the direction of Dr. C. J. Bayne, Assistant Professor of Zoology.

3. $54,000 - "Mesoscale Wind Field Over the Upwelling Area Off the Oregon Coast," August 1, 1975, through January 31, 1977, under the direction of Dr. Wayne V. Burt, Associate Dean, School of Oceanography.

4. $8,500 - "The Tracer Method: Some Unsolved Problems," August 1, 1975, through January 31, 1977, under the direction of Dr. Octave Levenspiel, Professor of Chemical Engineering, and Dr. Thomas J. Fitzgerald, Associate Professor of Chemical Engineering.

5. $107,000 - "Climate, Long-range Investigations, Mapping and Prediction (CLIMAP): Global Paleo-Oceanographic Studies of the Late Quaternary Ocean Circulation and Climate," August 1, 1975, through January 31, 1977, under the direction of Dr. Jorn Thiede, Assistant Professor of Oceanography.

6. $5,400 - "Biogenesis of Sodium and Potassium-Activated Adenosine Triphosphatase," December 15, 1973, through May 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Richard Ewing, Assistant Professor of Zoology.

7. $58,500 - "Analysis of Photosynthesis through Mutation Studies," September 1, 1975, through February 28, 1977, under the direction of Dr. Norman I. Bishop, Professor of Plant Physiology.

8. $34,000 - "Environmental Origin and Systematics of Klebsiella Pneumoniae," September 1, 1975, through February 28, 1978, under the direction of Dr. Ramon J. Seidler, Assistant Professor of Microbiology.

9. $8,400 - "Selective Petrochemical and Stratigraphic Studies of Columbia River Basalt," September 15, 1975, through August 31, 1977, under the direction of Dr. William H. Taubeneck, Professor of Geology.

10. $45,100 - "Hydrodynamic Forces in a Circular Cylinder Near a Plane Boundary," September 1, 1975, through February 28, 1977, under the direction of Dr. John H. Nath, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, and Dr. Tokuo Yamamoto, Research Associate in Civil Engineering.

11. $38,500 - "Electronic Properties of Amorphous Thallium-Tellurium Alloys," March 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977, under the direction of Dr. Melvin Cutler, Professor of Physics.

12. $30,800 - "Molecular Vibrations Mainly in Crystals," September 1, 1975, through February 28, 1977, under the direction of Dr. John C. Decius, Professor of Chemistry.

13. $93,100 - "Convection in Sea Water," September 1, 1975, through February 28, 1977, under the direction of Dr. Douglas R. Caldwell, Associate Professor of Oceanography.

14. $5,000 - "Physical Oceanography of the Winter-Spring Transition on the Oregon Continental Shelf," July 1, 1975, through May 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Robert L. Smith, Associate Professor of Oceanography.

15. $37,500 - "Continued Studies of Cenozoic Sedimentation and Paleoceanography Based on Deep Sea Drilling Project Cores," October 1, 1975, through March 31, 1977, under the direction of Dr. Tjeerd H. van Andel, Professor of Oceanography.
Grant of $740 from the Oregon Arts Commission, Salem, "for performance of the OSU Baroque ensemble," September 24, 1975, through November 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Marlin Carlson, Associate Professor of Music.

Grant of $15,576 from the Oregon Committee for the Humanities, Portland, "for adult education programs in the humanities," October 1, 1975, through May 31, 1976, under the direction of Mr. Austin Walter, Professor of Political Science.

Grants totaling $210,289 from the Oregon State Department of Education, Salem, for the following purposes:

1. $10,000 - "To recruit and train vocational teachers from business and industry," July 17, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Arnie Heuchert, Instructor, Vocational Education.

2. $7,000 - "To train career and vocational education personnel for improvement of administrative competencies," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Arnie Heuchert, Instructor, Vocational Education.

3. $5,410 - "To train a cadre of resource persons to conduct career guidance workshops," July 29 through September 30, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Arnie Heuchert, Coordinator, Professional Development Center.

4. $29,500 - "To help provide programs and resources to assist in meeting the objectives for disadvantaged and handicapped," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Arnie Heuchert, Instructor, Vocational Education.

5. $11,006 - "For the conduct of a series of training workshops to improve the competencies of teachers and to bring them up to state educational standards," July 1, 1975, through August 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Arnie Heuchert, Instructor, Vocational Education.

6. $100,989 - "Maintenance of a Field Based Career Education Personnel Development Center," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Arnie Heuchert, Instructor, Vocational Education.

7. $21,384 - "Vocational Leadership," September 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Warren Suzuki, Assistant Professor of Vocational Education.

8. $25,000 - "Assistance to the disadvantaged and handicapped to meet educational needs," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Mr. Juan Guzman, Instructor, Vocational Education.

Grant of $2,000 from the Oregon State Department of Environmental Quality, Portland, for a course in, "Soil Science and Subsurface Disposal Methods," October 6 through December 31, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Moyle E. Harward, Professor of Soil Science.

Grant of $20,550 from the Oregon State Department of Forestry, Salem, "for a project to complete a forest volume inventory and a demonstration forest conditions map," July 25, 1975, through September 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Barry J. Schrumpf, Director, Environmental Remote Sensing Applications Laboratory.
Grant of $603 from the Oregon State Employment Division, Salem, "to furnish useful employment to unemployed or under-employed persons," May 6 through August 30, 1975, under the direction of Mr. Earle Jossy, County Extension Chairman.

Grants totaling $383,551 from the Oregon State Executive Department, Salem, for the following purposes:

1. $204,606 - "To provide work experience opportunities for poverty level youth between the ages of 14 and 22," July 30 through September 30, 1975, under the direction of Mr. James McAlister, Neighborhood Youth Corps Supervisor.

2. $4,000 - "For the provision of employment training for adults in the Wallowa County area," August 1, 1975, through January 31, 1976, under the direction of Mr. Charles Gavin, Wallowa County Extension Agent.

3. $174,945 - "For employment training for low-income youth," August 1, 1975, through January 31, 1976, under the direction of Mr. James McAlister, CETA Coordinator.

Grant of $12,000 from the Oregon State Land Board, Salem, "for a study of potential natural areas within state owned lands and to gain and record information relating to the character and condition of the vegetation resources within these areas," July 1, 1975, through June 20, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Barry J. Schrumpf, Director, Environmental Remote Sensing Applications Laboratory.

Grant of $20,265 from the Oregon State Marine Board, Salem, "to research the activities of registered boat owners in Oregon," August 1, 1975, through June 15, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Robert E. Frenkel, Associate Professor of Geography, and Mr. Robert E. Pfister, Research Assistant in Geography.

Grant of $5,123.90 from the Pioneer Trust Company, Salem, "for the use of the department on behalf of Mr. William Logan Wigle," September 16, 1975, through September 15, 1976, under the direction of Dr. G. H. Arscott, Head, Poultry Science.

Grant of $1,800 from Rand McNally, Chicago, Illinois, "to establish a Science Curriculum Improvement Study Center and to conduct approximately eight workshops," September 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Karl J. Nice, Assistant Professor of Science Education.

Grants totaling $110,985 from the Rockefeller Foundation, New York, for the following purposes:

1. $30,225 - "Biological Nitrogen Fixation," September 1, 1975, through August 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Harold J. Evans, Professor of Plant Physiology.

2. $80,760 - "For finding methods for wheat improvement in the Middle East and North Africa," July 1 through December 31, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Warren E. Kronstad, Professor of Agronomic Crop Science.

Grant of $109,819 from the Stanfield/Westland Irrigation Districts, Stanfield, "for the evaluation of the economic feasibility, benefits and costs of irrigation system development alternatives in Umatilla and Morrow Counties," July 3, 1975, through July 3, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Frederick W. Oemiller, Extension Community Resource Development Specialist.

Grant of $10,000 from Union Carbide, New York, for research entitled, "Immunization of Salmonid Fish for Control of Vibriosis," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. John L. Fryer, Professor of Microbiology.
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U. S. Agency for International Development

Grant of $127,495 from the U. S. Agency for International Development, Washington, D. C., "for a project involving the raising of wheat in Turkey," April 1 through November 30, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Warren E. Kronstad, Professor of Agronomic Crop Science.

U. S. Department of Agriculture

Grants totaling $125,949 from the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Portland, for research and other purposes, as follows:

1. $11,319 - "For the conduct of a literature and records search to investigate and evaluate known (archaeological and historical) resources for the Siuslaw National Forest lands," August 1, 1975, through July 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Richard E. Ross, Assistant Professor of Anthropology.

2. $30,000 - "To develop a system for collecting and transmitting rural development type information," July 1, 1975, through September 30, 1976, under the direction of Mr. Ted Sidor, Assistant Director, Extension Service.

3. $64,500 - "To improve wheat farm management," April 18, 1975, through September 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Gene A. Nelson, Extension Farm Management Specialist.


5. $44,500 - "To advise and assist Forest Service Staff and Management personnel in the appropriate utilization of modern computerized analytical processes and techniques," February 24 through June 30, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Charles W. Dane, Professor of Business Administration.

U. S. Department of the Army

Grants totaling $38,420 from the U. S. Department of the Army, Portland, for the following purposes:

1. $6,089 - "For a preliminary evaluation on the impacts of maintenance dredging, Willamette and Yamhill Rivers," June 30, 1975, through February 28, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Wayne Seim, Instructor, Fisheries and Wildlife.

2. $32,281 - "Baseline Benthic Assemblages in the MCR Disposal Site Study Area," July 1 through August 31, 1975, under the direction of Dr. Andrew G. Carey, Jr., Associate Professor of Oceanography.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Grants totaling $4,149,626 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C., for the following purposes:

1. $470,825 - "Educational opportunity grants for needy students," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Mr. Richard Pahre, Director of Financial Aids.


3. $1,451,175 - "National Direct Student Loans," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Mr. H. F. Jeffrey, Jr., Director of Business Affairs.

4. $1,806,356 - "For a program of work study," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Mr. Richard Pahre, Director, Financial Aids.
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Grant of $19,980 from the U. S. Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia, "to complete the analysis of the seismic reflection, refraction, microearthquake and seismic noise data of the Vale, Oregon, known geothermal resource area," May 29, 1975, through May 28, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Richard Couch, Associate Professor of Geophysical Oceanography.

Grant of $985 from the U. S. Department of Justice, Washington, D. C., "to provide grants under a Law Enforcement Education Program," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Mr. Richard Pahre, Director of Financial Aids.

Grants totaling $7,500 from the U. S. Department of Transportation, Washington, D. C., for the following purposes:

1. $5,000 - "For a fellowship grant in behalf of Stephen Blair Loop," September 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Layton, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering.

2. $2,500 - "A Highway Technology Scholarship award in behalf of Richard Lee Woelk," September 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Robert D. Layton, Associate Professor of Civil Engineering.

Grants totaling $41,540 from the U. S. Energy Research and Development Administration, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, for the following purposes:

1. $18,000 - "For a training program for graduate students in nuclear engineering," September 1, 1975, through August 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. C. H. Wang, Director, Radiation Center.

2. $23,540 - "Ionocyte Formation in Animal Salt Secreting Epithelia," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Frank P. Conte, Professor of Zoology.

Grant of $45,084 from the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D. C., "for a training program in water quality," September 1, 1975, through August 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Frank D. Schaumburg, Head of Civil Engineering.

Grant of $3,093 from the U. S. Marine Mammal Commission, Washington, D. C., for research entitled, "The Numbers, Sex, and Age of Breeding and Non-Breeding Populations Throughout the Year of Pinnipeds Hauled Out from Mazatlan, Mexico to Vancouver Island, British Columbia," August 12, 1975, through April 1, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Bruce R. Mate, Research Associate, Oceanography.

Grants totaling $364,683 from the U. S. Public Health Service, Bethesda, Maryland, for research and other purposes, as follows:

1. $14,407 - "Steady-State Intoxication by Simple Hydrazines," March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Frank N. Dost, Research Associate, Veterinary Medicine.

2. $20,508 - "A development award in behalf of Lyle R. Brown," September 1, 1975, through August 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. P. R. Elliker, Chairman of Microbiology.

3. $148,911 - "Health Professions Educational Improvement Training Grant," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Charles O. Wilson, Dean of the School of Pharmacy.

4. $32,847 - "Laboratory Animal Resources Improvement Program," September 1, 1975, through August 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Nephi M. Patton, Director, Laboratory Animal Resources.
5. **$500** - "A postdoctoral research fellowship in behalf of Rocky W. Chen," July 1, 1975, through June 30, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Philip D. Whanger, Associate Professor of Agricultural Chemistry.


7. **$43,100** - "Inborn Errors and Pyruvate Kinase Isozymes," September 1, 1975, through August 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Mary J. Cardenas, Assistant Professor of Biochemistry & Biophysics.

8. **$3,000** - "A postdoctoral research training fellowship in behalf of Dr. David H. Coombs," August 1, 1975, through July 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. George D. Pearson, Assistant Professor of Biochemistry & Biophysics.

9. **$55,264** - "Metabolic Changes Induced by Tumor Virus," September 1, 1975, through August 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. George S. Beaudreau, Professor of Agricultural Chemistry.

10. **$35,740** - "Nucleic Acids: Their Conformation and Function," November 1, 1975, through October 31, 1976, under the direction of Dr. Walter C. Johnson, Jr., Associate Professor of Biochemistry & Biophysics.

**Grants to Agric. Exper. Stations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>604.14</td>
<td>Representing the value of equipment transferred from the Agricultural Research Foundation to the various departments and experiment stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>To cover the cost of office space, materials and supplies for the ARF, under the direction of Dr. J. R. Davis, Director, Agricultural Experiment Station.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369.20</td>
<td>&quot;Soil Analysis,&quot; under the direction of Dr. Lloyd W. Martin, Associate Professor of Horticulture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>&quot;For black raspberry leaf samples for nitrogen and spectograph analysis,&quot; under the direction of Dr. Lloyd W. Martin, Associate Professor of Horticulture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>&quot;Chemical analysis of pesticides,&quot; under the direction of Dr. Leon C. Terriere, Professor of Biochemistry and Insect Toxicology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637.50</td>
<td>&quot;Testing fungicides for the control of diseases of trees,&quot; under the direction of Mr. Iain C. MacSwan, Professor of Extension Plant Pathology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>&quot;For general services of the department of botany and plant pathology,&quot; under the direction of Mr. Iain C. MacSwan, Professor of Extension Plant Pathology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>&quot;Causes of early kit loss in mink,&quot; under the direction of Dr. James E. Oldfield, Professor of Animal Nutrition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>&quot;Study the use of whey in starter feeds for dairy calves,&quot; under the direction of Dr. David C. Church, Professor of Animal Science.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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$1,000 - "Control of tree fruit pests," under the direction of Dr. R. W. Zwick, Associate Professor of Entomology.

$500 - "Research on ornamental plants," under the direction of Dr. L. H. Fuchigami, Assistant Professor of Horticulture.

$1,000 - "Soil and Plant Analyses on Potato Survey," under the direction of Dr. Thomas L. Jackson, Professor of Soil and Plant Nutrition.

$7,000 - "Study infectious diseases of salmonid fishes," under the direction of Dr. John L. Fryer, Professor of Microbiology and Fisheries.

$1,500 - "Research and operation in the management and ecology of fish and game populations," under the direction of Dr. Lyle D. Calvin, Professor and Chairman of Statistics.

$750 - "Fawn mortality in mule deer," under the direction of Mr. T. P. Kistner, Associate Professor of Veterinary Parasitology.

$6,500 - "To support research activities conducted involving Paraquat for chemical curing of range grass," under the direction of Mr. Forrest A. Sneva, Assistant Professor of Range Management.

$1,778.08 - "Restoration of Bitterbush," under the direction of Dr. A. H. Winward, Associate Professor of Rangeland Resources.

$1,500 - "Soil fertility research," under the direction of Dr. Thomas L. Jackson, Professor of Soil Fertility- Vegetables.

$750 - "K research program in Oregon," under the direction of Dr. Thomas L. Jackson, Professor of Soil Fertility and Plant Nutrition.

$4,500 - "S-Urea research for project 131," under the direction of Dr. Larry Boersma, Professor of Soil Science.

$10,000 - "Study of RS-8858 used for sheep," under the direction of Mr. T. P. Kistner, Associate Professor of Veterinary Parasitology.

$8,000 - "Research on effects of Wah Chang effluent on native aquatic life," under the direction of Dr. Charles E. Warren, Professor of Water Pollution Biology.

$1,500 - "Weed control research," under the direction of Dr. Stanley Miller, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics.

$2,417.44 - "Control of insects that affect production of grass seed," under the direction of Dr. J. Kamm, Associate Professor of Entomology.
U. S. Department of the Interior

$2,188 - "Studies on age-specific growth rates, mortality rates and recruitment for a population of red-band trout," under the direction of Dr. John D. McIntyre, Assistant Professor of Fisheries Ecology.

$1,269 - "Graduate studies of wildlife and ecology," under the direction of Dr. E. Charles Meslow, Assistant Professor of Wildlife Ecology.

$600 - "Research studies on Rare Suckers," under the direction of Dr. Carl E. Bond, Professor of Fisheries.

Washington State Bulb Commission

$1,498 - "Cause and control of diseases of nursery plants," under the direction of Dr. Larry Moore, Assistant Professor of Plant Pathology.

$1,498 - "Control and ecology of Basal Rot," under the direction of Dr. Larry Moore, Assistant Professor of Plant Pathology.

University of Oregon

Scholarships & Fellowships

Gifts totaling $94,759.67 from the following donors for scholarships and fellowships:

Aerojet Nuclear Company, Idaho Falls, Idaho $500.00
Aid Association for Lutherans, Appleton, Wisconsin 400.00
The Alaska Society of Professional Engineers, Anchorage, Alaska 500.00
All-American Collegiate Golf Foundation, New York 500.00
The Allyn Foundation, Inc., Chicago, Illinois 1,000.00
American Baptist Student Aid Program, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania 500.00
American Business Women's Association, Springfield 300.00
The American Indian Scholarship, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico 845.00
The American Institute of Architects, Washington, D. C. 3,400.00
Assist-A-Grad Scholarship Foundation, Inc., Fairfield, California 100.00
Elmer Bankus Memorial Scholarship Fund, Brookings 533.00
Lyle P. Bartholomew Scholarship and Loan Fund, through The Oregon Bank, Portland 6,000.00
Beneficial Foundation, Inc., Wilmington, Delaware 400.00
Beta Sigma Phi City Council Scholarship Fund, through the First National Bank of Anchorage, Anchorage, Alaska 1,500.00
Bohemia Foundation, Inc., Eugene 900.00
Boise Cascade Corporation, Boise, Idaho 600.00
Boise Cascade Papers, St. Helens 450.00
Britt Memorial Scholarship Committee, Medford 200.00
Carpenter Scholarship Fund, through Ashland Senior High School, Ashland 535.00
Carpenter Scholarship Fund, through Medford Senior High School, Medford 1,034.00
Carpenter Scholarship Fund, through School District #6, Central Point 100.00
The Clayton Fund, Houston, Texas 2,300.00
Cockerline Memorial Trust Fund, Salem 400.00
College Club of Ridgewood, Ridgewood, New Jersey 600.00
College Entrance Examination Board, New York 279.00
Cook Inlet Native Association, Anchorage, Alaska 350.00
Cottage Grove High School Associated Student Body, Cottage Grove 200.00
Croatian Fraternal Union Scholarship Foundation, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 100.00
Crown Zellerbach Foundation, San Francisco, California  $ 2,250.00
Cummins Engine Company, Inc., Columbus, Indiana  1,200.00
DeWuhs-Keckritz Educational Trust, through the First National Bank of Oregon, Portland  1,000.00
Elks Lodge No. 150, Astoria  150.00
Elks Lodge No. 1247, Klamath Falls  600.00
Elks Lodge No. 2105, Newport  175.00
Elks Lodge No. 288, Pendleton  300.00
Elks Lodge No. 1748, Seaside  200.00
Elks Lodge No. 2145, Springfield  100.00
Elks Lodge No. 1664, Toledo  150.00
Elks National Foundation, Chicago, Illinois  1,300.00
Elmira High School Student Body Fund, Elmira  100.00
Evans Scholars Foundation, Golf, Illinois  8,033.50
Excalibur Foundation, San Francisco, California  333.34
First Presbyterian Church Deacons Fund, Portland  400.00
Paula Fisher Memorial Scholarship, Grants Pass  167.00
Herbert Galton Law Scholarship, Portland  300.00
General Telephone Company of the Northwest, Inc., Employee Scholarship Fund, Beaverton  400.00
Georgia-Pacific Foundation, Portland  2,151.00
Glendale Scholastic and Cultural Recognition Program, Glendale  100.00
Granada Supporters Club, Livermore, California  300.00
Grand Guardian Council of Oregon, International Order of Job's Daughters, Portland  1,200.00
Grand Ronde Parent Teacher Organization, Willamina  200.00
Grant High School Rehmus Award, Portland  250.00
Grant High School Student Body, Portland  350.00
Green Valley Lumber Company Scholarship Fund, through the First National Bank of Oregon, Roseburg  333.33
John Hamilton, Eugene  100.00
William Randolph Hearst Foundation, San Francisco, California  500.00
Investment in Youth Scholarship, through Medford Senior High School, Medford  367.00
The Jackson Foundation, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland  7,200.00
Jackson-White Student Aid Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland  2,500.00
Jeld-Wen, Inc., Klamath Falls  600.00
Junior Achievement Columbia Empire, Inc., Portland  250.00
KAGI, Inc., Grants Pass  200.00
Kaiulani Home for Girls, through the Hawaiian Trust Company, Limited, Honolulu, Hawaii  250.00
KMED Sportcasters, through Medford Senior High School, Medford  100.00
Leo P. Knoerzer Foundation, through the Calumet National Bank, Hammond, Indiana  500.00
Mildred Lister Scholarship Trust, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Medford  205.00
Louisiana Pacific Foundation, Portland  375.00
Marshfield High School Hi-Y Club, Coos Bay  100.00
Marshfield Senior High School, Coos Bay  200.00
Masters, Mates and Pilots Plans, New York  2,500.00
McKenzie Willamette Hospital Auxiliary, Springfield  100.00
Medford Rotary, Medford  117.00
Mid-Columbia Japanese American Citizens League, Hood River  400.00
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Jessie Millar Scholarship Fund, through The Oregon Bank, Portland $2,300.00
Carl E. Morrison Scholarship Fund, through Family Federal Savings and Loan Association, Dallas 240.50
Multnomah County School District No. 1, Multnomah County 500.00
Mu Phi Epsilon Patrons, Eugene 200.00
National Electrical Contractors Association, Portland 250.00
Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee, Lapwai, Idaho 400.00
Oregon Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., Portland 588.00
Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs, Halsey 150.00
Oregon State Elks Association, Salem 3,173.00
Paine Scholarship Fund, through the Rhode Island Hospital Trust National Bank, Providence, Rhode Island 200.00
Paisley Parent Teacher Club, Paisley 200.00
Leslie S. Parker Memorial Scholarship Fund, through The Grand Chapter of Oregon, Order of the Eastern Star, Condon 1,000.00
Parkrose Senior High School, Portland 100.00
Pennwalt Foundation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 400.00
PBO Award, Chapter BF, The Dalles 500.00
PBO Sisterhood, Chapter T, Clatskanie 160.00
Phi Beta Patrons, Eugene 1,000.00
Portland Brokerage Agency, Portland 250.00
Portland Panhellenic Association, Portland 500.00
Portland Rose Festival Association, Portland 1,077.00
The Presser Foundation, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania 200.00
Reader's Digest Sales and Services, Inc., Portland 1,000.00
Red Devil Foundation, Union, New Jersey 167.00
Relly Foundation, Indianapolis, Indiana 200.00
Riviera Motors, Inc., Hillsboro 500.00
Roseburg Student Body, Roseburg 300.00
Rotana Club, McMinnville 300.00
Rotary Foundation of Medford & Central Point, Central Point 134.00
Royal Neighbors of America, Rock Island, Illinois 1,000.00
The S & H Foundation, Inc., New York 300.00
Owen O. Sabin Occupational Skills Center, Milwaukee 100.00
St. Andrew's Society, Lake Oswego 200.00
St. John's Hospital Guild 500.00
Marion MacCurrell Scott Scholarship Grant, through the Hawaiian Trust Company Limited, Honolulu, Hawaii 2,600.00
South Eugene High School Student Body, Eugene 416.00
Southwest Forest Industries, Phoenix, Arizona 1,000.00
Steinbach Foundation, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 400.00
Stevens Scholarship Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 6,800.00
Sweet Home High School Student Body Fund, Sweet Home 125.00
Max D. Tucker Scholarship Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 666.00
Flora M. Von Der Ahe School Fund, through the U. S. National Bank of Oregon, Portland 400.00
Waldorf-Astor Fund, through the First Presbyterian Church, Astoria 200.00
Western Conference of Teamsters, Burlingame, California 250.00
Helen Whitcomb Scholarship, through the Benjamin Franklin Federal Savings and Loan Association, Portland 200.00
Women's Choral Society, Eugene 300.00
Yasui Memorial Scholarship, Hood River 100.00
Thomas H. Youell Scholarship Fund, Portland 100.00