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A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Library-Commons Building, Oregon Institute of Technology, Klamath Falls, Oregon.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 A.M. (P.D.T.), May 27, 1977, by the Vice President of the Board, Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr., and on roll call the following answered present:

- Mr. Jonathan A. Ater
- Mrs. Ruth Daniels
- Mrs. Betty Feves
- Mr. Edward C. Harms, Jr.

Absent: Mrs. Jane H. Carpenter was out of the country, Mr. W. Philip McLaurin was absent due to business reasons, and Mr. Louis B. Perry was absent due to personal reasons.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor R. E. Lieuallen; Secretary D. R. Larson; Freeman Holmer, Vice Chancellor for Administration; J. I. Hunderup, Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning; Miles C. Romney, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; E. Rex Krueger, Vice Chancellor for Educational Systems; W. T. Lemman, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Personnel Administration; Edward Branchfield, Assistant Attorney General; Art Mancl, Director of Campus and Building Planning; Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer; Diane Richardson, Assistant Director, Public Services and Publications; Wilma Foster, Assistant Board Secretary; Francetta Carroll, Administrative Assistant; Karen McCunsey, Secretary to the Chancellor.

Oregon State University--President R. W. MacVicar; M. Popovich, Vice President for Administration and Finance; Frank Ligon, Assistant to the President.

University of Oregon--President William B. Boyd; Ray Hawk, Vice President for Administration and Finance.

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center--Carol A. Lindeman, Dean, School of Nursing; Donna Schantz, Assistant Dean, School of Nursing.

Portland State University--President Joseph Blume; James Todd, Vice President for Finance and Administration.

Oregon College of Education--President Leonard W. Rice; Ronald L. Chatham, Assistant to the President.

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

Eastern Oregon State College--President Rodney A. Briggs; James Lundy, Director of Business Affairs.

Oregon Institute of Technology--President Kenneth F. Light; W. M. Douglass, Dean of Administration; Gary Wein, Associate Professor, General Studies; Henry Kutak, Director of Financial Aid; Carl Steidley, Instructor, Math-Physics; James Hathorn, Assistant Dean of Students; W. D. Purvine, President Emeritus; Bill Clark, Director of Information; John Smith, Assistant to the President; Bill Grimes, Department Chairman, Electronics Engineering Technology; Merlyn Ives, Department Chairman, Medical Technology; Donald Hefty, Assistant Professor, Electronics Engineering
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Technology; James J. Boyle, Professor, Business Department; Tim Stanaway, Dean of Students; Charles Erekson, Director of Housing and Food Service; Joseph Riker, Faculty Senate President; Donald Theriault, Associate Dean, Instructional Services; Al Roberson, Director of Admissions; Don Skudstad, Associate Dean, Industrial Technology; Harvey Fraser, Dean of Academic Affairs.

Others--Charles Schaumburg, Planning Coordinator, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; James Bernau, Oregon Student Lobby; John Ralston, Spokesperson, and 9 representatives of Amazon Community Tenants Association.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES: Oregon Institute of Technology: Tom Noble, Ray Alley, Casey Madden.

President Light indicated that during the visitation of Board members to the campus of Oregon Institute of Technology, the Board had been given an overview of instructional programs in each department. Strengths and weaknesses were indicated, and President Light said he was certain that Board members had a greater understanding of the operation at the institution. It was his pleasure, President Light said, to indicate formally to the Board that the institution was fulfilling its assigned mission as a polytechnic institution of the State System concerned with quality technical education at the certificate, associate degree and baccalaureate degree levels.

President Light commented that Oregon Institute of Technology produced highly qualified graduates who were placed readily in satisfactory positions. Salaries for the graduates are uniformly high at both the associate and baccalaureate degree levels. In commenting on faculty at Oregon Institute of Technology, President Light said the faculty members are highly motivated with a good blend of professional experience and academic degrees. They are student-oriented and accept the challenge of trying to stay current with the state of the art in their particular subject area. This is done through attendance at conferences, short courses, professional journals, summer employment, and sabbatical leaves or leaves of absence. The application of technology is the cornerstone of curriculum development and various methods are used to keep programs at the threshold of technology.

With respect to cost, President Light stated that technical education is expensive because of the heavy reliance on laboratory equipment which must be kept current and functioning. Supply costs are also substantial. Laboratory hours in most curricula tend to produce a high faculty-student contact hour load but a low student-credit-hour load.

President Light said it has been necessary to limit enrollments in certain programs because laboratory capacity was not adequate for additional students. There is a critical need for a library building and for library acquisitions. The library building is Priority No. 4 on the capital construction list.

The need for baccalaureate nurses in the Klamath Falls region was emphasized and a request has been submitted to the Board's Office for a baccalaureate degree in nursing.

Associate degree programs at the institution would be continued and requests for additional courses at the upper-division level are anticipated. Industrial and cultural growth is of importance in the region. Geothermal energy is an area in which staff members at the institution attempt to collaborate with local industries. During the past year, the University of Oregon provided four very fine programs for the students and the Oregon Symphony was brought to the campus. Other amenities, such as an addition to the College Union and a swimming pool and tennis courts, are also needed.

Mr. Harms expressed on behalf of the Board and the visitation committee appreciation to President Light for the courtesies and hospitality extended. Mr. Harms said he had been impressed with the staff, the faculty, and the students. He said it was his impression the institution was goal-oriented and was fulfilling the mission assigned to it for the benefit of the citizens of Oregon.
The Board voted to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the regular Board meeting held on March 25 and April 29, 1977, and approved them as previously distributed, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Hammond, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Lieuallen reported that on June 17, 1977, Douglas U'Ren of Portland will receive a baccalaureate degree from the University of Oregon. He will be the seventh child of Dr. Harold U'Ren and Catherine U'Ren to graduate from a State System institution in the past 17 years. Four will have graduated from the University of Oregon, two from Oregon State University, and one from Portland State University. Their father is also a graduate of a State System institution—the University of Oregon Medical School.

The Chancellor said the confidence which the U'Rens have shown in Oregon's schools is gratifying and affirms the quality of education the state is providing for its citizens.

Facility Survey Report on Accessibility for the Handicapped

At the request of the Chancellor, Mr. Hunderup described the information contained in the following report which was distributed at the meeting:

FACILITY SURVEY REPORT

ACCESSIBILITY FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Recent federal and state legislation has been directed toward making our society more open to persons with impaired operating abilities. Specifically for educational institutions, these include:

1. Chapter 204, Oregon Laws 1975, which prohibits discrimination against handicapped in state instructional programs, and the Administrative Rules of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education which relate to the implementation of that statute.

2. Chapter 504 of the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which prohibits discrimination against handicapped in programs funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the regulations implementing Chapter 504:

The Board's Office staff took a survey of the State System of Higher Education central campus facilities to determine the probable cost of achieving an appropriate level of barrier-free access to programs. The costs of alteration to facilities that have been assigned as a result of the survey are predicated on various measurement guidelines including the desire to provide "front door" access, not "back door" accommodations; the desire to provide complete access to programs; and a recognition of the factor of financing. Factors that were considered included:

1. A physical barrier can be a psychological impairment.

2. A minimal program of facility upgrading to provide better access would, in all probability, require excessive accommodation to make programs accessible, which, in the long term, would be equally expensive and be a constant "hassle."

3. Elevators, installed for handicapped access but usable for other functions, are expected to reduce back-injury claims by institutional personnel significantly.

4. The program does not propose a maximum facility upgrading because the maximum is not required and the justification of expenditures would be questionable.
5. In response to the need for programs to be centralized to enable persons with mobility impairments to participate, the proposed facility improvements do not include outlying structures.

To enable a consistent view of each campus the survey was conducted principally by Melinda Grier and Art Mancl with assistance from various compliance officers, safety officers and physical plant personnel at each institution. Previous self-evaluations, surveys by institutional personnel and various cost estimates, including some detailed estimates for each type of upgrading, were used in arriving at cost estimates. As an introduction to barriers existing on each campus, discussions were held with a number of persons with limited mobility and visual impairments and with persons who work with the handicapped.

Estimates are for educational and general plant facilities only and, as indicated above, are principally central campus facilities. Some minimal facility improvements may have to be made to a few selected peripheral buildings. Auxiliary enterprise buildings have been less thoroughly surveyed. It is noted, however, that similar improvements are expected to be required, but the extent is considerably less than for educational and general plant facilities. Those costs have not been estimated.

The cost estimates are not detailed. They have been aggregated in categories that indicate the character and dimensions of identified facility improvements. The categories are:

1. Elevators
2. Exterior - curb cuts, ramps, sidewalk and roadway repairs
3. Newer buildings and older buildings renovated or designed for accessibility
4. Older buildings
5. Physical education/recreation facilities (separate because of funding resources)

The typical items included in the newer and older buildings categories (3 and 4 above) are:

A. Entrance way characteristics
   ramps, threshold height, door width, space between sets of doors, door actuation, kick plates, tripping hazards, etc.

B. Washroom characteristics
   entry width and turns, door actuation and door pulls, lavatory height and hot pipe protection, easy to use water controls, mirror and paper towel locations, waste container location, water closets located in stalls--are they deep enough, wide enough, equipped with grab bars, etc.

C. Drinking fountain installations

D. Visual fire alarms

E. Height and type of elevator controls and signals

F. Braille identification of locations

G. Laboratory stations in science programs
### Eastern Oregon State College

**Elevators**  
Administration, Ackerman, Library  
$260,000

**Exterior**  
30,000

**Newer Buildings**  
Classroom Building, Science  
25,000

**Older Buildings**  
Administration, Ackerman Gymnasium, Ackerman School, Library  
30,000

**Physical Education**  
(includes swimming pool lift)  
35,000

Subtotal - Eastern Oregon State College  
$380,000

### Oregon College of Education

**Elevators**  
Administration, Education, Elementary School, Humanities/Campbell Hall, Library, Todd  
$285,000

**Exterior**  
27,000

**Newer Buildings**  
Fine Arts  
1,000

**Older Buildings**  
Administration, Campbell, Education, Elementary School, Humanities, Library, Science, The Cottage, Todd  
125,000

**Physical Education**  
(includes elevators and swimming pool lift)  
62,000

Subtotal - Oregon College of Education  
500,000

### Oregon State University

**Elevators**  
Agriculture, Apperson, Benton, Bexell, Dryden, Education, Extension, Fairbanks, Farm Crops, Gilbert, Gilmore, Graf, Moreland, Social Science, Waldo, Wiegand, Withycombe  
$670,000

**Exterior**  
50,000

**Newer Buildings**  
Administration, Milne Computer Center, Library, Nash, Peavy, Oceanography, Rogers, Weniger, Wilkinson  
16,000

**Older Buildings**  
Agriculture, Apperson, Batcheller, Benton, Bexell, Chemical Engineering, Cordley, Covell, Dearborn, Dryden, Education, Extension, Fairbanks, Farm Crops, Gilbert, Gilmore, Graf, Kidder, Moreland, Pharmacy, Social Science, Waldo, Wiegand, Withycombe  
314,000
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Physical Education
Langton, Women's Building

Subtotal - Oregon State University 1,200,000

Southern Oregon State College

Elevators
Central, Churchill, Taylor $225,000

Exterior 20,000

Newer Buildings
Education/Psychology, Library, Music

Older Buildings
Central, Churchill, Science, Taylor 105,000

Physical Education 30,000

Subtotal - Southern Oregon State College 450,000

University of Oregon

Elevators
Allen, Art Museum, Chapman, Computer Center, Deady, Education, Fenton, Friendly, Gerlinger, Gerlinger Annex, Hendricks, Johnson, Law Center, Lawrence, Library, Science Complex, Susan Campbell, Villard $980,000

Exterior 30,000

Newer Buildings and Older Buildings renovated or designed for accessibility
Administration, Computer Center, Condon, Gerlinger Annex, Gilbert, Law Center, Prince Lucien Campbell Hall, Science III 20,000

Older Buildings
Allen, Art Museum, Chapman, Deady, Education, Fenton, Friendly, Gerlinger, Hendricks, Johnson, Lawrence, Library, Science Complex (except Science III), Susan Campbell, Villard 270,000

Physical Education (includes elevators and swimming pool lift) 100,000

Subtotal - University of Oregon 1,400,000

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center

Elevators
Baird/Clinics, Library, Physical Plant $ 95,000

Exterior
Includes 3rd floor bridge from Medical Research to Basic Science) 150,000
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Newer Buildings and Older Buildings renovated or designed for accessibility

Basic Science, CDRC, University Hospital North 13,000

Older Buildings

Baird, Campus Services, Clinics, Dental School, Library, Mackenzie, Physical Plant, Medical Research, University Hospital South 142,000

Subtotal - University of Oregon Health Sciences Center 400,000

Portland State University

Elevators

DCE, East Hall, Francis Manor, Neuberger, Shattuck $250,000

Exterior 20,000

Newer Buildings

Science II, University Services 14,000

Older Buildings

Cramer, DCE, East Hall, Francis Manor, Library, Lincoln, Neuberger, Science I 112,000

Physical Education

(includes outside elevator and swimming pool lift) 54,000

Subtotal - Portland State University 450,000

Oregon Institute of Technology

Will be surveyed on May 26, 1977. Cost estimated by comparison based on square footage. 400,000

Access provisions that may be required for peripheral buildings, for off-campus locations and for those items not identified in this survey 120,000

Total $5,300,000

During the discussion, Mr. Hunderup indicated no federal funds had been appropriated to assist the institutions in making these modifications. However, there is substantial pressure from colleges and universities to obtain federal funding.

Mr. Ingalls asked whether provision for assistance in the education of the blind and deaf was involved in the legislation. Mr. Hunderup said the present report was specifically concerned with the physical facilities. However, where there is the involvement of using Braille in connection with certain physical facilities, it is included in the cost estimates. The program access is a completely different area that will have to be accommodated also.

Mr. Hunderup indicated that the program to comply with accessibility requirements probably would be completed in stages. If the entire program were deferred to the second year of the biennium, it would be physically impossible to meet the requirements within the three-year period specified for compliance. No exceptions to that deadline are allowed. It was stated that funding could be divided between the two biennia approximately 50% of the funding in the first biennium would accomplish those projects which should be started first because they require the longest time span.
The Board approved a motion that the facility survey report on accessibility for the handicapped be endorsed by the Board with the request that the Legislature give consideration to additional funding for this purpose. Those voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Fergus, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Management of Higher Education Investments

At the request of the Chancellor, Mr. Holmer presented the following report on the investment policy of the Department of Higher Education.

Staff Report to the Board

The Board of Higher Education has the statutory responsibility for the management and control of all the property of each of the eight institutions of the Department. In this report, the focus is on the funds given to an institution in the form of endowments—that is, gifts intended as essentially permanent donations, the income of which is to be used for current operations.

There are, in addition, current gifts that are expected to be spent currently. Other funds requiring investment are the Bond Building and Bond Sinking Funds. These three categories may be invested only, in "dollar obligations" (chiefly, federal notes and certificates of deposit). Further, the investment of non-endowment funds is managed by the Controller, with the advice and assistance of the State Treasurer. The law governing these investments is quite explicit. The timing of maturities is dictated by expenditure requirements. The range of discretion is very limited, relating solely to the selection of specific instruments for purchase and assuring that maturities and replacement purchases are precisely coordinated.

The investment of endowment funds is a more sensitive matter because the Board has accepted the option offered by Section 6 of Article XI of the state Constitution to invest donated funds in corporate stock. Although the Constitution and ORS 293.790 authorize such investment of any donated funds, the Board's Administrative Rules distinguish between "current" donations and permanent (endowment) funds. A still further distinction is made, in that donations are always treated as "current donations" if so designated by the donor. If, however, the donor does not specify that a gift is a current donation and it exceeds $10,000, the presupposition is that it should be treated as if it were an endowment (as a "quasi-endowment"). Approximately half of the endowment funds are in this quasi-endowment category.

The Board's policy concerning investment of the endowment funds rests on the legal view that only the income from an endowment fund may be spent, whereas both income and appreciation of stock value may be expended from a quasi-endowment fund. Although there is some support for the proposition that appreciation of stock held by an endowment fund may also be spent, the Board has held to the more conservative view. The distinction is significant. One of the arguments for stock ownership is that stock appreciation was one of the means of mitigating the effect of inflation on the long-term value of a gift. Obviously, ownership of a long-term bond affords no such relief but if one may not translate stock appreciation into currently usable cash, the investment of endowments in corporate stock would need to be restricted to those with regular and comparatively high dividends. The endowment funds would thus be effectively excluded from investing in the so-called "growth" stocks; although quasi-endowments would not.

With this background of fact and law, the Board faced in 1971 several choices that might be listed in this order:

1. Should any of the funds given to the State System be invested in corporate stock? Answer: Yes, subject to the application of the so-called "prudent man rule," which is required of trustees by ORS 128.020 ("the judgment and care... which men of prudence... exercise in the management of their own affairs....), and restrictions of the gift instrument.
2. What would be the objectives of investment in corporate stock? The Board distinguished between endowments ("maximum current dividend or interest income consistent with sufficient growth in principal value...to maintain...the purchasing power of future income...") and quasi-endowment ("increases in corporate earnings which may be evidenced by increasing dividends...(or)...the market value of the investments").

3. How should investment decisions be made? The Board was reluctant to assume direct responsibility, preferring to delegate such decisions to reputable professional money management firms.

4. As trustees, what guidelines should the Board require to be observed by its investment managers?
   a. That there be two firms, each managing about half of the endowment and quasi-endowment funds.
   b. That the amount invested in corporate stock not exceed 50% of the endowment fund or 60% of the quasi-endowment fund.
   c. That stock acquired represent less than 5% of the total number of voting shares in a corporation.
   d. That no more than 5% of either fund be in the paper of any corporation.
   e. That there be regular reports (not less than semi-annually) to the Board of the transactions and the status of corporate stocks investment.
   f. Two statewide banks should serve as custodians of the stocks and other securities purchased by the investment managers and as recipients of dividends, interest, or principal payments thereon.

5. Should investments be pooled or should each gift be treated as a separate entity for investment purposes? The pooling for investment and allocation of earnings was chosen, subject to semi-annual calculation of the value of the equity in each gift account.

Developments Since 1971

The adoption of the amended Section 6 of Article XI of the Constitution in November 1970 and Chapter 339, Oregon Laws 1971, were followed by Board selection of two investment management firms on December 14, 1971.

In September 1974, one of the firms resigned its management of the funds entrusted to it and was replaced, as of December 16, 1974, by another firm. (No sales or purchases were made in the interim. The results of the inaction were not adverse.)

The 1975 Legislative Assembly (by Chapter 363), amended ORS 293.701 to require transfer of investment authority to the Oregon Investment Council, as of September 13, 1975. The Oregon Investment Council has retained the investment management firms selected in the first instance by the Board and has continued the policies previously adopted by the Board.

Members of the Board and the Board's staff regularly attend the meetings of the Oregon Investment Council at which the Council formally reviews the performance of its managers.

An Attorney-General's opinion in 1976 indicated that the Board of Higher Education retains its trusteeship, despite the 1975 transfer of investment management responsibility to the Oregon Investment Council. However, the Board meets the trusteeship responsibility by the formal transmission to the Council of its expectation that the Council will assure that its managers adhere to Board-declared policy and by the regular review by the Board's staff (and the Board) of the actions of the investment managers to assure that the policies are, in fact, being observed.
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The Future

The Board might take a more direct role in the management of endowment investments, although the risks are substantial. The expertise of the Oregon Investment Council and the investment management firms may be no greater than that of the Board but the time available to the Board to make the necessary decisions is quite limited.

Nonetheless, the Oregon Investment Council has repeatedly indicated its interest in the Board's suggestions concerning either investment policies or the selection or retention of management firms. The Board's staff recommends no change at this time on either count but it is receptive to Board suggestion with respect to the kinds of data that would be useful in the discharge of its fiduciary responsibility.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Holmer said that subsequent to the preparation of the above report, the Board's Office had been advised that Kennedy/Boston Associates had received the resignations of its principal officers and staff members in Seattle. They were Mr. Duff Kennedy and Mr. Ivan Nelson who were particularly responsible for State System investments entrusted to their care. As a result of these resignations, the management of their share of the State System portfolio devolves upon the Boston Company and its staff. The Board is thus faced with the question of whether to continue the investment management relationship with the Boston firm or to make a change.

Mr. Holmer indicated that the resignations had occurred so recently there had not been time to make a recommendation. The available options should be considered carefully because a change from a regionally-based smaller entity to a larger company will result in differences in the kind of supervision that the relatively small endowments of the State System will receive.

Mr. Holmer also reported that the results of a referendum conducted at the University of Oregon favored by a margin of three or four to one a recommendation to the Board to sell any investments in companies doing business in South Africa. There were 1,100 to 1,200 students voting in that referendum. Mr. Holmer briefly stated some of the options available to the Board and indicated that a more explicit recommendation probably would be brought to the Board at a later time.

Mr. Harms asked whether the situation with the Kennedy/Boston Company required Board action. Mr. Holmer said he had talked with the Boston Company representative and it did not appear that emergency action would be necessary. Mr. Holmer also said he planned to consult the Oregon Investment Council before making any recommendation to the Board. He indicated the Boston Company is a well-reputed firm and the State System portfolio is well structured and would be maintained in essentially the same form by the Boston Company.

Mr. Wyss said that, in his opinion, there was an immediate problem. He said he agreed the Boston Company was a highly competent organization but in order to understand the problem fully it was necessary to understand the organization of the Boston Company. It is a Boston-based organization which is coordinating a group of pre-existing investment counselors around the country and providing them with statistical information and economic studies that would give them greater competence or marketing ability.

The Kennedy/Boston group in Seattle had about $600 million under management and the State System account was a very small part of that. The Boston Company is even larger and the State System account would be even less important in comparison than it was under the Kennedy/Boston organization. One of the underlying fundamental precepts of investment management is the necessity to have a continuous supervision of a portfolio, at least that portion that is in equity management or stocks instead of bonds.
The Board is faced with a new management group being placed in charge of its portfolio and it is unlikely that the portfolio will receive much attention in view of the size of the company.

Mr. Wyss stated that he was also in the investment management business and considered both the Kennedy group and the Boston Company legitimate and capable competitors. Furthermore, his firm would have no interest in the State System portfolio because of the conflict of interest. However, he did believe it was logical for the Board to maintain the current management by shifting its contract from the Boston Company to the Kennedy group which has formed its own organization. This would resolve the immediate problem of maintaining continuous supervision of the portfolio. Ultimately, the Finance Committee and the Board should consider the alternatives for long-term management, Mr. Wyss said. He recommended that the Board ask the Oregon Investment Council to consider the wisdom of staying with the present contract as opposed to maintaining continuous supervision and moving the contract to the new Kennedy group.

Mr. Holmer said he had been unable to reach the Oregon Investment Council prior to the Board meeting.

Mr. Stewart moved that the Board adopt the recommendation made by Mr. Wyss.

Mr. Wyss said the Oregon Investment Council had indicated informally to him that the conservative approach would be to shift the contract to the Kennedy group and maintain supervision.

The Board approved a motion that the Oregon Investment Council be advised that the State System portfolio should be changed to the Kennedy group pending a final decision on the matter and thereby maintain continuous management. The following voted in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, April 29, 1977; present- Ingalls, McIntyre, McLaurin, Stewart.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Planning Assumptions and Planning Objectives that have been prepared by the staff of Eastern Oregon State College with the assistance of Mr. David Soderstrom, planning consultant, be approved as a basis for updating the Long-Range Development Plan for that institution.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In discussing the long-range development plan, Mr. Art Mancl, Director of Campus and Building Planning said a long-range development plan is a guideline for evaluating decisions regarding buildings and other facilities, as well as the roads, walks, utilities and land forms that tie the buildings together. It is not a blueprint for the future in the sense that specific decisions are made concerning the location of future buildings or when they will be built. A long-range development plan is a construction and land forms expression of institutional missions, guidelines and academic objectives of the institution.

Mr. Mancl said the assumptions and objectives are based on the supposition that Eastern Oregon State College will continue its role as a regional multipurpose institution as identified in the guidelines for the State System institutions approved by the Board in January 1973. He then commented on the changes which have occurred since the 1965 plan, including enrollment expectations and the changing academic character of the institution in view of the needs of the region and the strengths of the programs at the institution.
President Briggs said the campus planning committee had reviewed the campus plan and the necessary preliminary discussions had occurred with the City of La Grande. The proposed assumptions and objectives would permit the orderly development of a plan to meet the needs of Eastern Oregon State College. It was indicated that a comprehensive development plan was near completion for both the city and county and representatives of the institution have participated in these discussions. Mr. Hunderup said it was extremely important to realize that there has been much closer coordination than there had been in 1965 with the local government units and with students and staff.

In discussing the campus boundaries, it was stated that only four parcels of land within the campus boundaries remain to be acquired. Mr. Stewart said the boundaries should be reviewed to determine whether they are adequate or perhaps too much area is included within the boundaries. Mr. Stewart said the word "regional" was of concern to some individuals and should be eliminated.

Mr. McLaurin asked whether objective No. 7 was referring to physical accessibility for the handicapped. Mr. McLaurin responded that identifying the appropriate parameters for all of the constituencies provided a positive frame of reference which resulted in solutions which were considerably less expensive and much more appealing to people of limited mobility or sight.

In response to a question from Mr. Ingalls concerning the vacation of streets, Mr. Hunderup said the intent was to minimize through traffic on the campus as has been done at other institutions. To accomplish this objective, the streets are vacated when all of the property on both sides is owned by the State System, but at the same time, the State System must assume the responsibility for maintenance.

Mr. Ingalls also suggested the possibility of using students or staff to accomplish some of the planning and at the same time provide educational and financial benefit to those involved.

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

At its June 21-22, 1965, meeting, the Board approved planning assumptions and objectives for the development of a master plan for Eastern Oregon State College. Subsequently, at the September 13-14, 1965, meeting, the Board accepted the schematic long-range master plan which had been prepared with the assistance of Architects Hewlett and Jamison, Portland. This plan has served as a guide to the physical development of the institution with only one significant change approved by the Board on October 27, 1969, when approximately 15.77 acres were added at the southeast corner of the campus. Within the projected approved campus boundaries, there is now a total area of approximately 121.2 acres. Of this total, the Board owns 112.15 acres, about 6.61 acres are in streets and alleys not vacated, and about 2.45 acres are still in private ownership.

During the interval since 1965, some of the earlier expectations have not materialized, enrollment patterns have changed and many physical improvements have been made, including the addition of a new heating plant, the construction of the new Hoke Center and a major Classroom Building. Inasmuch as the changes and improvements are significant, and new factors must be considered, there is a need for revising and updating the long-range development plan.
The proposed planning assumptions and objectives have many similarities to those approved in 1965, such as the concern for the attractiveness of the physical environment, the development of adequate recreation and physical education facilities, functional relationships of the buildings to each other and to features such as walkways, parking and access to the campus.

There is also a reaffirmation of the institution's role as a regional multi-purpose college. This role is consistent with the "Guidelines for the State System of Higher Education and Its Institutions" approved by the Board on January 22, 1973, which identifies undergraduate teaching as the primary role but also includes some less-than-baccalaureate programs and some graduate instruction in education.

The most significant changes reflected in the proposed planning assumptions and objectives, when compared with those applicable in 1965, are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1965 Plan</th>
<th>Proposed Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student enrollment</td>
<td>4,000 (2,000 in Fall 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in proportion of total enrollment expected to reside on-campus:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackerman Hall (the laboratory school)</td>
<td>To be replaced Continue in use at present enrollment levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed assumptions and objectives reflect a concern for the needs and resources of the region as well as a recognition of the role of Eastern Oregon State College as an educational and cultural center for the region.

As noted above, and in accordance with a report to the Board on January 28, 1977, the staff of the institution has been assisted by Mr. David Soderstrom of Architects Martin/Soderstrom/Matteson, Portland, in the review of the basic planning objectives and planning assumptions upon which the updating of the long-range development plan for Eastern Oregon State College should be based.

Long-Range Development Plan for Eastern Oregon State College

Assumptions

1. Eastern Oregon State College is a regional multi-purpose college with an enrollment of 2,000 students.

2. As the only four-year baccalaureate degree-granting college East of the Cascades, Eastern Oregon State College should continue to serve the eastern region and the state as a four-year college, with some less-than-baccalaureate programs appropriate to Eastern Oregon State College's resources and the needs of the region it serves, and with some graduate level programs.

3. Eastern Oregon State College will serve as a regional educational and cultural center for eastern Oregon and will continue to sponsor the Grande Ronde Symphony Orchestra, the Eastern Oregon Arts Council, significant art displays, touring theater groups, artists and concerts.
4. Some major facilities depend upon joint educational, cultural and recreational uses, for example: Quinn Coliseum, the Art Gallery, the performing and creative arts activities and the exterior athletic facilities.

5. Eastern Oregon State College will continue to host significant seminars, short courses, and meetings for the eastern Oregon region.

6. Students living beyond regular commuting distances will continue to make up a large proportion of full-time students.

7. The average age of students will increase as more part-time and full-time adult students become part of the student mix. There will be a greater number of married students than presently enrolled.

8. On-campus residence hall students will increase from approximately 30% to over 40%.

9. The costs of energy, facilities, equipment, and labor will continue to increase for campus services, heat, lights, utilities and storage/maintenance facilities.

Objectives

1. To recognize the commitment of Eastern Oregon State College to the educational opportunities of eastern Oregon and through the process identify directions and opportunities to serve the region's needs.

2. To provide a well coordinated program of educational services to the eastern Oregon region and the State of Oregon.

3. To provide the opportunity for the Board, administration, faculty, staff, students and citizens of the community and region to contribute to the planning process.

4. To provide an environment conducive to efficient instruction in the theory and practice of teaching.

5. To provide the necessary facilities and environment to accommodate and enhance Eastern Oregon State College's Educational Programs and Objectives such as the mastery of basic skills, the maximum development of responsibility and individual qualities, and the ability to seek and appreciate beauty through active experience.

6. To recognize Eastern Oregon State College's commitment to promote and enhance regional cultural activities.

7. To recognize the need to make programs accessible.

8. To provide for maximum use of existing and new facilities by allowing multi-use opportunities for program flexibility.

9. To provide a unified and attractive physical environment through landscaping, building scale, height, and placement such as:
   a. Providing for screening of parking and landscaping definition of the transition from college to community.
   b. Land forming and visual textures.
c. Restricting buildings to three stories in height and attention to mass.
d. Maintenance and preservation of existing pleasing architectural features.
e. Providing for the proper location and housing of facilities in efficient permanent structures.
f. Recognition, maintenance and enhancement of existing unique environmental features.

10. Provide for adequate recreational and physical education facilities to accommodate expanded and inclusive programs.

11. Facilities which serve instructional, community and regional roles shall be located appropriately to accommodate pedestrian and vehicular traffic, joint use, and parking.

12. Provide for the efficient and cost effective uses of energy and support services including maintenance, HVAC systems, utilities and campus security. Consider alternative heating energy sources.

13. Consider other needs that may be identified through the planning process such as:
   a. City vehicular circulation needs and growth patterns.
   b. Campus and cemetery interface.
   c. Ackerman School student circulation and activity areas.
   d. Identify and strengthen campus entrance.
   e. Plan for the efficient extension of existing utility systems.
   f. Providing for the continued existence of Ackerman Elementary laboratory school at present enrollment levels.

Preliminary Plans (Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, April 29, 1977; present--Ingalls, McIntyre, McLaurin, Stewart.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the preliminary plans for the proposed Utility and Energy Conservation Improvements project at Southern Oregon State College, which includes both the interconnection of the north and south heating plants and the completion of the utility metering of campus buildings be approved. These plans were prepared by Marquess & Associates, Inc., consulting engineers, Medford. Pending legislative authorization for the project, further planning will be deferred. This item was assigned Priority No. 9 in the Board's listing of the Educational and General Plant requests for 1977-1979, and Priority No. 2 in the listing for Auxiliary Enterprises, and is included within the Governor's budget recommendations as revised on March 9, 1977.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

During the discussion, it was indicated that the materials chosen for the utility tunnel were selected to minimize problems of deterioration due to soil conditions. It was stated also that the project could not be justified on the basis exclusively of cost, but the matter of energy conservation is a factor. In dealing with the entire energy problem, some things will be more expensive.

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

In response to questions, Mr. Hunderup indicated that energy conservation and economic feasibility are receiving greater attention in construction budgets as a result of the energy shortage. He said some projects could be paid back in a short period of time but the particular one proposed in this recommendation involves a long-term payoff period.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in Favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

As reported to the Board on March 25, 1977, arrangements were made for the professional services of Marquess & Associates, Inc., Medford, to assist in the planning of various utility improvements at Southern Oregon State College. The portion thereof assigned the highest priority consists of interconnecting the north and south heating plants as well as completing the metering of utilities in various campus buildings. The boilers on the south campus are now operating at name plate capacity on peak load days, but there is excess boiler capacity available from the heating plant within McNeal Hall (the Physical Education Building) on the north campus. Construction of the plant interconnection would provide the additional capacity needed for the proposed new Drama Laboratory and would make stand-by capacity available to other buildings on the south campus in the event of a boiler failure. Further, significant operating economies would accrue from the project during those times of the year when there are low-load steam requirements by making it possible to shut down one heating plant and provide steam for cooking, heating domestic water and heating the swimming pool from a single energy-efficient boiler.

The proposed plant interconnection would be made within a below grade utility tunnel connecting Churchill Hall and the Siskiyou Commons on the south campus with the existing utility tunnel between the Greensprings Dormitory complex and the north campus heating plant. Approximately 125 feet of the tunnel, beneath Siskiyou Boulevard, would be a 7-foot diameter corrugated steel pipe. The remaining 825 feet of tunnel would be constructed of poured concrete and would have an interior cross section 6 feet wide and 7 feet high. The tunnel would be equipped for full utility services including steam, condensate return lines, chilled water service and electrical primary service replacing the present overhead system.

The project would also include the installation of additional storm drainage under Siskiyou Boulevard to eliminate (or at least minimize) periodic flood damage to the north campus. It is estimated that this portion of the project would be amortized in less than eight years through savings of labor, energy and the repair of damage from flooding.

The metering of utilities to campus buildings and connecting the meters to an existing central console is proposed to be completed as part of this project. The data collected from the meters will aid in setting energy management goals for the campus and for the state by differentiating energy requirements for various functions and construction types.

Based upon the price level which is expected to prevail in April 1978 when bids for the project may be solicited if legislative authorization is obtained in 1977, the direct construction costs are estimated to be $933,800 for the utility tunnel, utility services within the tunnel, storm drainage and metering. The estimated total project costs are $1,145,000. Of this latter amount, $800,000 would be financed from a General Fund appropriation and/or bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution and the remaining $345,000 would be provided from proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bonds issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from balances available to the Board and the institution for auxiliary enterprises.
RECAPITULATION UPON COMPLETION OF PRELIMINARY PLANS

Project - SOSC Utility and Energy Conservation Improvements
(Heating Plant Interconnection and Metering)

Engineers - Marquess & Associates, Inc., Medford

Board's priority in 1977-1979 - No. 9 (Educational and General Plant)
No. 2 (Auxiliary Enterprises)

Legislative authorization - Pending

Estimated total project costs $1,145,000
Estimated direct construction costs $933,800

Tentative schedule:
Bidding - April 1978
Completion - April 1979

Tentative financing plan:
General Fund appropriation and/or bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-G of the Oregon Constitution $800,000
General obligation bond borrowings under Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises 345,000
Total $1,145,000

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, April 29, 1977; present--Ingalls, McIntyre, McLaurin, Stewart.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the President and the Secretary of the Board be authorized to execute a permanent easement to the City of Corvallis for a strip of land approximately 15 feet wide and 100 feet long adjoining the easterly right-of-way of SW 35th Street where it crosses Oak Creek as well as a temporary construction easement for the use of adjacent property to facilitate the improvement of abutments and the reconstruction of a bridge over Oak Creek.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

The City of Corvallis has determined that the SW 35th Street bridge which crosses Oak Creek about 600 feet south of Washington Way is in need of replacement. The proposed replacement bridge and its abutments will be somewhat larger than the present installation and will require the use of land beyond the limits of the right-of-way of SW 35th Street. The City has requested that it be granted a
permanent easement for a strip of land 15 feet wide by 100 feet long adjoining the easterly right-of-way of SW 35th Street. The City has also requested a temporary construction easement paralleling Oak Creek and 35th Street approximately 185 feet long and 80 feet wide, roughly in the shape of a truncated rectangle. The temporary construction easement would expire on June 30, 1978. Inasmuch as SW 35th Street is a City thoroughfare which is one of the access roads for the Oregon State University campus and inasmuch as the easements would not adversely affect adjacent land uses, institutional officials have recommended granting the permanent easement and the temporary construction easement to the City of Corvallis.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that, pursuant to law, the Department of Revenue be notified that the reserve base of the Forest Research and Experiment Account has, as of February 16, 1977, a negative balance of $983,595.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

The Forest Research Laboratory at Oregon State University receives financial support from a Forest Products Harvest Tax, authorized by state law on merchantable forest lands. ORS 321.037 requires the Board of Higher Education to determine as of February 16 of each year the unexpended balance of funds in the "Forest Research and Experiment Account" and also the amount budgeted for expenditures for the remainder of the current fiscal year and for the following fiscal year. If the projected balance at the end of the following fiscal year is not estimated to equal or exceed $400,000, then the tax during the following fiscal year shall continue at the maximum statutory rate. If the estimated balance exceeds $400,000, then there is to be a 50% reduction in the tax rate.

An examination of the financial condition of the Forest Research Laboratory account as of February 16, 1977, and projection of expenditures to June 30, 1978, using the formula prescribed by the statute, shows the following:

| Actual Unexpended Balance as of February 16, 1977 | $33,697 |
| Less--Budgeted Expenditures: | |
| February 16, 1977 to June 30, 1977 | $241,948 |
| July 1, 1977 to June 30, 1978 | 775,344 |
| Statutory Reserve Base as of February 16, 1977 | Negative ($983,595) |

The reason for a negative rather than a positive balance is due to the fact that the balance in the account is determined by deducting budgeted moneys for the remainder of the fiscal year in which determination is made and deducting budgeted moneys for the fiscal year following from the February 16, 1977, unexpended balance.
Anticipated income during these budget periods is not considered. This is the insurance principle recognized in ORS 321.035. During the period February 16, 1977, to June 30, 1978, anticipated income will be approximately $1,041,250. When the $983,595 deficit is deducted from the $1,041,250 anticipated income, there will be a balance of approximately $57,655 in the Forest Research and Experiment account, provided anticipated income is received and all funds budgeted from the account are expended.

Since the balance in the Forest Research and Experiment account is negative, the tax upon all merchantable forest products harvested on merchantable forest lands will not be reduced during the fiscal year 1977-78.

Following action by the Board of Higher Education, the information is to be forwarded to the State Department of Revenue.

Appointments to Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee

It was recommended that the following individuals be appointed to the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee, each for three-year terms from July 1, 1977, to June 30, 1980:

- **Mr. Jack E. Meadows**, President of Publishers Paper Company, Oregon City, Oregon, and Vice-President, Times Mirror Company, Los Angeles, California. Mr. Meadows is a director of the Oregon Forest Industries Council and a member of the Technical Association of the Pulp and Paper Industry. On the Advisory Committee, he will represent the pulp and paper industry and a major, progressive forest landowner in northwest Oregon. He will replace Mr. Clarence Richen.

- **Mrs. Charlotte Corcoran**, representing "the public at large." She is an active member of the Oregon Environmental Council, Secretary-Treasurer of the Natural Resources Council of Oregon, an active member of the Sierra Club, and an individual with strong wildlife, forestry, and environmental interests. She will replace Mr. Spencer Beebe.

- **Mr. Richard E. Worthington**, newly-appointed Regional Forester, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Portland. He has previously served as Director of Timber Management with the Forest Service, and has formal education in forestry from Oregon State University. He will replace Mr. Ted Schlafper.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

In accordance with provisions of ORS 526.225, the Board of Higher Education approved the establishment on June 13, 1961, of two advisory committees at Oregon State University: The Forest Products Research Advisory Committee and the Forest Management Research Advisory Committee. These committees were subsequently merged into the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee at the July 26, 1971, Board meeting.

The 1975 Legislature revised provisions for the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee to add three members representing the "public-at-large." Appointments to these positions were made at the Board meeting on August 26, 1975.
Meeting #438-20

Further Alterations within University Hospital North for Diet Kitchen of Clinical Research Center, UOHS

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Inasmuch as additional resources of $49,534 are now available from federal grants supporting the Clinical Research Center at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, it was recommended that the appropriate Board officials be authorized to proceed with the remodeling on the second floor of University Hospital North to complete the diet kitchen and to equip the dining area of the patient day room. Drawings and specifications for this work have been prepared by Architects Broome, Oringdulph, O'Toole, Rudolf & Associates, Portland, under the provisions of their agreement applicable to the Metabolic Laboratories and the Clinical Research Center. The estimated direct construction costs are $31,000, the equipment costs are estimated to be $8,111 and the remainder of the total project budget will be used for professional services - fees, construction supervision, other physical plant expenses and a contingency reserve for potential change order requirements.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Peves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

As reported to the Board on October 28, 1975, applications for grant assistance were filed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the remodeling of areas on the fourth floor of the Medical Research Building to accommodate biochemistry or metabolic laboratories and on the second floor of University Hospital North to provide enlarged and improved facilities for the Clinical Research Center at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center. It was noted that approximately $117,878 was available for the first phase of the proposed alterations for the Clinical Research Center. Based upon the plans approved by the Board, and by the State Emergency Board on November 21, 1975, bids were solicited and a contract award was made for this work. The report made to the Board on July 20, 1976, mentioned that the conversion of a patient ward on the second floor of University Hospital North would provide "an intensive care unit, a future diet kitchen, a new toilet room, and the remodeling of an existing toilet room" involving a total area of about 4,243 square feet.

Within the past few days, institutional officials advised the Board's Office that additional resources of $49,534 are available from grant funds to cover the estimated expenditure requirements for completing the metabolic diet kitchen and for equipping the dining area of the patient day room. This phase of the work would be an extension of the earlier project totaling $117,878, bringing the aggregate renovation costs for the Clinical Research Center to $167,412. Specifically, the additional costs are to be funded by an award from the General Clinical Research Centers Branch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of $36,378 for alteration/renovations and $8,111 for equipment, by $2,568 from the prior year's operating grant for the Center, and by the transfer from the current operating grant of $2,477 available because of the delayed hiring of a therapeutic dietitian.

The completion of the kitchen will enable the staff of the Clinical Research Center to conduct full-scale metabolic balance studies. The room contains about 364 square feet and would be furnished with a center working island surrounded by basic equipment, with areas for preparing formulas and weighed mixed food diets, for recipe development and testing, for tray set-up and for tray clean-up. The special needs of a metabolic unit would be met: a metabolic balance scale, microwave oven for preparing individual servings, a warmer for holding pre-weighed servings, and adequate refrigerator and freezer size to permit pre-preparation and weighing and equipment for preparation of formulas. The kitchen has been designed to allow for photographing the diets used for subsequent use in patient education. The space would be air-conditioned. Included in the request for equipment are dining tables, chairs, and table service for the patient day room which will serve as the dining area.
In accordance with Board regulations, Mr. Loren L. Wyss represented the Board in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas for the 1977 Winter Term graduating class at Portland State University.

A signed copy of the degree list is on file in the Board's Office.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board confirmed the action of Mr. Wyss in approving candidates for degrees and diplomas. The following voted in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, April 29, 1977; present--Ingalls, McIntyre, McLaurin, Stewart.)

It was recommended that the Board reaffirm the 19-institution comparison as the most appropriate basis for determining average faculty salaries; that the Board file as its biennial budget request for academic salary adjustments an increase of 7.73% in each of the years 1977-78 and 1978-79; and that the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center Housestaff stipend schedule for 1977-1979 be approved as listed.

In response to a question, Mr. Lemman explained that academic salaries and averages apply to 9-months' teaching faculty, instructor through professor. Mr. Lemman distributed additional information entitled, "Salary Comparisons, Teaching Staff, 20 State Universities," which is on file in the Board's Office. He indicated there has been a slight improvement in the comparative position of the University of Oregon-Oregon State University combined salary averages. The figures shown in the comparisons are for salaries only and do not include other fringe benefits. At the time the last study was made, the State System compared favorably with the other institutions with the exception of the contribution to health and insurance programs.

The inflation rate incorporated in the recommended salary adjustment was discussed in terms of whether the amount was appropriate and also the effect of budgeting for inflation on efforts to slow inflation. It was pointed out that the salary increases are projected for periods after inflation has occurred so this does tend to reduce the impact of the increases in terms of contributing to inflation. The recommendation for the salary adjustment is based on the median salary of the 19 institutions which have been used for comparison over a period of 20 years. The inflation figure supports the recommendation and is a part of the salary changes at all of the institutions, but the State System salary recommendation is not based on the inflation figure.

Mr. Stewart indicated he would reluctantly move that the Committee recommend approval but he did not like the inflation factor. However, he said he did not think that it was realistic to anticipate a lower inflation rate.

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

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.
The Chancellor indicated general policy guidelines to assist the institutions in distributing the salary adjustment money which does become available as a result of legislative action would be presented to the Board. However, the preparation of these guidelines is awaiting more precise information on the actual legislation action.

Staff Report to the Committee

During the past several biennia, salary adjustment recommendations for academic staff have been developed on a generally consistent procedure including the following elements:

1. Annual surveys of academic salaries at 19 universities with which comparisons have been made for nearly two decades.
2. Projection of future salary trends of the 19 institutions on the basis of experience of the preceding four years.
3. Acceptance of the average salary of the 19 institutions as the objective for the average salary of the UO-OSU combined.
4. Application of the salary adjustment thus derived to the academic staffs of all institutions. (Salary adjustments at Southern Oregon State College are established by collective bargaining agreement.)

Since 1967-68, the data regarding the salaries of the 19 institutions and UO-OSU combined are thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>19 Inst Salary Average</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>Index*</th>
<th>UO-OSU Salary average</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>Index*</th>
<th>% 19 Inst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>$12,325</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$11,766</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>$12,978</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>$12,467</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>$13,715</td>
<td>5.68%</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>$13,160</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>$14,455</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>117.3</td>
<td>$13,970</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>118.7</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>$14,963</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>$14,458</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>122.9</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$15,659</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>127.1</td>
<td>$14,843</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>126.1</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$16,668</td>
<td>6.44%</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>$15,508</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$17,576</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>142.6</td>
<td>$16,110</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>136.9</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$18,986</td>
<td>8.02%</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>$18,067</td>
<td>12.15%</td>
<td>153.6</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>$20,162</td>
<td>6.19%</td>
<td>163.6</td>
<td>$19,705</td>
<td>9.07%</td>
<td>167.5</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* 1967-68 = 100

Using the actual average salary increase of the past four years as the basis for projecting increases of the 19 institutions in the succeeding biennium has usually produced conservative results. Although the experience of the last four years at the 19 institutions includes an increase in 1975-76 over the preceding year of slightly more than 8%, the composite average of those four years would still seem to be reasonably indicative of an expected increase of about 6-1/2% in each of the next two years. Using the 6-1/2% estimated increase at the other 19 institutions and allowing the UO-OSU average to reach parity in the second year of the next biennium, the table then continues thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1977-78</th>
<th>1978-79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>21,473</td>
<td>21,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>22,868</td>
<td>22,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a check on our approach for salary adjustments, we have related faculty salaries to the consumer price index using 1967 as the base year. As of February 1977 the consumer price index was 177.1. During the last 12 months (February 1976 to February 1977), the index has increased 6.0%. Many economists believe that the
The rate of inflation will continue to rise at a rate slightly above that experienced in the last sixteen to eighteen months. For the purpose of projecting the consumer price index for the next two years we have used an increase of 6.25% for each 12-month period ending July 1977 and July 1978.

The alternative approach results in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>UO-OSU Salary</th>
<th>Salary Index</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$11,766</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1974</td>
<td>148.0</td>
<td>16,110</td>
<td>136.9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1975</td>
<td>162.3</td>
<td>18,067</td>
<td>153.6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1976</td>
<td>171.1</td>
<td>19,705</td>
<td>167.5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1977</td>
<td>181.8</td>
<td>21,590</td>
<td>179.9</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1978</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>22,727</td>
<td>193.2</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both methods appear to be conservative in that salary adjustments are paid in the year following the increase in the consumer price index rather than concurrently. Moreover, both alternatives reach approximately the same result.

The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center has recommended that the stipends of Housestaff (medical and dental interns and residents) be increased by an average of 8.67% in 1977-78 and an additional 7.83% in 1978-79. The recommendation results from a survey of stipends paid housestaff at University Teaching Hospitals in the west (Universities of Colorado, Utah, Washington, California, Arizona, Southern California and Stanford University) and the Portland Council of Teaching Hospitals. Stipends paid by each group of comparison hospitals have been estimated to increase by 6.5% in each of the next two years. The recommended stipend levels are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Level</th>
<th>1976-77 Stipend</th>
<th>1977-78 Stipend</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>1977-78 (Estimated 6.5% Increase Yearly)</th>
<th>1978-79 (Estimated 6.5% Increase Yearly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,200</td>
<td>$12,750</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,850</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14,195</td>
<td>14,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15,274</td>
<td>15,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16,370</td>
<td>16,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17,404</td>
<td>17,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>18,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted Average

| TL-2.75 | 1,181 | 8.67% | 14,750 |

1978-79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Level</th>
<th>1977-78 Stipend</th>
<th>1978-79 Stipend</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>1978-79 (Estimated 6.5% Increase Yearly)</th>
<th>1979-80 (Estimated 6.5% Increase Yearly)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,552</td>
<td>$14,237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>15,118</td>
<td>15,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>16,267</td>
<td>16,238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>17,434</td>
<td>17,354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,535</td>
<td>18,511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>19,790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted Average

| TL-2.75 | 1,161 | 7.83% | 15,963 |
The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center presents for the consideration of the Board findings and recommendations coming out of a six-month statewide study of health care needs of the citizens of Oregon, nursing education programs in Oregon, and nursing education needs directed by Dr. Carol Lindeman, the new dean of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing.

These findings and recommendations are presented in three separately bound documents, (1) Proposal for Statewide Coordinated Plan for Nursing Education, (2) University of Oregon Health Sciences Center School of Nursing Long-Range Plan: 1977-1986, and (3) University of Oregon Health Sciences Center School of Nursing and Eastern Oregon State College Proposal for the Implementation of a Program Leading to the BS Degree in Nursing. The complete report of the staff and copies of the above documents are filed in the Board's Office. Contents of the documents are outlined below.

**Proposal for Statewide Coordinated Plan for Nursing Education.**

This document presents:

- Recommendations for a statewide coordinated plan for nursing education in Oregon developed by a 15-member task force knowledgeable in various aspects of nursing education and nursing service needs. (These recommendations are reproduced in these minutes as Supplement A.) pp. 5-6

- Data assembled by Dean Lindeman and her staff during the six-month study of health care needs of Oregon citizens and resources to meet these needs, including
  
  (a) a description of the study pp. 7-10
  
  (b) results of survey seeking information as to the adequacy of graduates of University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing in terms of numbers, quality, and availability of programs pp. 11-16
  
  (c) description of factors affecting health care needs, resources to meet these needs, and nursing workforce in each of five regions of the state pp. 16-21
  
  (d) projection of number of nurses available for employment in Oregon 1975-1989 if production of nurses is continued at its present level pp. 21-26
  
  (e) summary data sheets of factors affecting health care for each region of the state and the state as a whole pp. 47-63

**University of Oregon Health Sciences Center School of Nursing Long-Range Plan: 1977-1986.** This document spells out a proposed commitment, on the part of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing and the Board, toward implementation of those
elements of the statewide coordinated plan falling within the responsibilities of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing to which the school of nursing gives priority and which the school of nursing feels can be accomplished within resources which can reasonably be expected to be available. A schematic chart for the carrying out of this commitment over the next decade is shown on page 7 of the document.

Still to be presented to the Committee are recommendations for implementation of the statewide plan by Southern Oregon State College and Oregon Institute of Technology.

University of Oregon Health Sciences Center School of Nursing and Eastern Oregon State College Proposal for the Implementation of a Program Leading to the BS Degree in Nursing. This document presents recommendations for development of a baccalaureate degree program in nursing in the eastern Oregon region, regional recommendation 1 of the statewide coordinated plan for nursing education. The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing and Eastern Oregon State College have investigated the possibility of implementing this recommendation by the establishment of an extension of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center program on the Eastern Oregon State College campus. The document describes the proposed program and requests authorization of the Board to proceed with implementation of the program provided necessary financial, legislative, and legal requirements and assurance of adequate clinical facilities prerequisite to its implementation, can be worked out. The document includes:

- description of the program pp. 1-6
- the feasibility study conducted by the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center to determine the nature of the need for nursing education in the eastern Oregon region, clinical and educational resources which could contribute to meeting this need, and alternative ways of meeting the need pp. 15-30
- minutes of the Eastern Oregon State College Health Education Advisory Council, the group requesting the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center to investigate the possibility of establishment of a baccalaureate degree program in northeastern Oregon pp. 33-38
- letters in support of proposed program pp. 47-68

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's Office recommended that the Board take the following action respecting the recommendations in the three University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing reports:

1. **Proposal for Statewide Coordinated Plan for Nursing Education.**

The proposal for nursing education in Oregon, 1977-1986, found on pp. 5-6 of the document "Proposal for Statewide Coordinated Plan for Nursing Education," and as Supplement A of these minutes is not a finished plan. It is, rather, a proposal that a statewide plan be developed, and a presentation of a series of propositions that developed out of the thinking of a task force consisting of representatives of a number of the key agencies and organizations that are concerned with nursing education in Oregon.
But the proposals are presented without elaboration or explanation, and without validation in instances in which validation is necessary, as for instance, in the case of the proposal that the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center should offer a quality program leading to a doctoral degree in nursing.

The Board's Office does not suggest that the Board adopt these proposals as they are presented in the aforementioned pages. Rather, we recommend:

That the Board's Committee examine the proposals briefly, as representing the views of a 15-member task force consisting of persons from agencies and organizations vitally interested in nursing education in Oregon, and hence, of interest and use as a backdrop against which to view the specific recommendations to the Board contained in the other two documents here under consideration ("University of Oregon Health Sciences Center School of Nursing Long-Range Plan: 1977-1986," and "University of Oregon Health Sciences Center and Eastern Oregon State College Proposal for the Implementation of a Program Leading to the BS Degree in Nursing").

The Board's Office believes that these latter recommendations are not inconsistent with the proposal of the task force for a statewide coordinated plan.

That those elements of the proposal for a statewide coordinated plan for nursing education (pp. 5-6 of that report) which are not specifically spoken to in (1) the recommendations for the long-range plan for the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing, and (2) the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center--Eastern Oregon State College proposal for an Eastern Oregon State College-based program in nursing, be developed in a more definitive form, with supporting elaboration, discussion, validation where possible, for subsequent consideration by the Board, and by other agencies concerned with nursing and nursing education in Oregon (e.g., State Board of Education, State Board of Nursing, Oregon Nurses Association, Educational Coordinating Commission).

2. School of Nursing Long-Range Plans: 1977-1986

It was recommended that the Board:

a. Approve the mission, scope, and role statements, and direct that the Board's Office and the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing recast these statements in the form of guidelines for consideration by the Board as replacements for the Board-adopted guidelines for the nursing school approved in 1973.

b. Accept the recommendation that the baccalaureate degree program be considered, for planning purposes, as the entry level into professional nursing practice. (Implementation of the plan during the 1977-1979 biennium will involve a planned reduction in numbers enrolled in the baccalaureate program from 572 in 1976-77 to 432 in 1978-79. This will be accomplished by a reduction in the entering class from 209 admitted in 1976-77 to 150 each year of the 1977-1979 biennium. Projections for 1979-1981 will be based on further analyses of needs for baccalaureate degree nurses and will be brought for approval of the Board early in 1978.)
c. Accept the recommendation that the proportion of the entering classes in the nursing school who are registered nurses (RN's) be increased so that one-third of the entering class be made up of RN/BS students (registered nurses who wish to earn a baccalaureate degree) for each of the next two years, this proportion to be reduced gradually, commensurate with need, to approximately 15% of the entering class by 1986-87. (The registered nurses admitted to the nursing school program in 1976-77 constituted 12.9% of the entering class of 209. Under this plan, 50 of the 150 students admitted each year 1977-78 and 1978-79 will be RN's.)

d. Accept the recommendation that the school of nursing make a planned commitment to making the BSN/RN (bachelor of science in nursing for registered nurses) program available in off-campus locations in a manner suitable to the part-time student (outreach program).

e. Accept the concept that the graduate program leading to the master of nursing degree should be expanded as resources will permit and need can be demonstrated to include additional areas of specialization (additional to medical-surgical, psychiatric-mental health, and nursing management and administration), such as maternity, geriatric, and community nursing education, subject to further review and consideration by the Board when the proposals for specific programs have been formulated. The practicality of increased interinstitutional cooperation in the development of complementary programs should be considered.

f. Request that, prior to the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing's expenditure of time preparing a formal request for authorization of a doctoral program, and prior to the Board's being asked to make any commitments concerning the issue, the school of nursing be asked to prepare and present for Board consideration, information concerning the need for a doctoral program in nursing in Oregon, considering such factors as: present and projected rates of production of doctoral graduates in the northwest region and nationally, need for doctoral graduates, possibilities for meeting any identified needs through a cooperative regional program.

g. Accept the proposition that the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center baccalaureate nursing program has a responsibility to offer continuing education activities for the benefit particularly of nurses in the north and northeastern part of Oregon; that in so doing the focus should be on new and relevant practice issues and experimental models appropriate to the adult learner.

3. **University of Oregon Health Sciences Center--Eastern Oregon State College**

**Proposal for Offering on the Eastern Oregon State College Campus a Program Leading to the Bachelor of Science Degree in Nursing.**

The Board's Office recommended that the Board authorize the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing to offer on the Eastern Oregon State College campus in La Grande nursing instruction for 60 baccalaureate degree aspirants, provided (a) appropriate legislative approval can be secured, (b) non-state funding of start-up costs covering the first three years of the program's operation can be obtained, and (c) satisfactory arrangements can be made for clinical and other required instruction.

The students would be admitted to the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center bachelor of science in nursing program and the instructional costs for the nursing portion of the program would be an integral part of the operating budget of the school of nursing.
The Eastern Oregon State-College-based program would admit both generic (beginning, preservice) and RN (registered nurse) students. Objectives of the program would be (a) to increase the supply of baccalaureate degree trained nurses in an underserved area, (b) to encourage students from the rural eastern portion of the state, including students from Eastern Oregon State College's bilingual and Native American programs, to enroll in a professional program in nursing, and (c) to provide the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center nursing students opportunity to prepare themselves to work in a rural setting.

Start-up costs for a program providing the same level of quality in a remote setting with limited clinical facilities as is provided in the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center's fully accredited program in Portland are necessarily high. The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center has applied for a federal grant totaling nearly $600,000 to finance the developmental and instructional costs of the nursing component of the program during its first three years of operation, and, upon approval of the Board and the Legislature, a supplemental request will be made to cover necessary alterations and renovations on the Eastern Oregon State College campus to accommodate the nursing program. Preprofessional, general education, and basic science courses encompassed in the program would be offered by Eastern Oregon State College as a part of its regular academic program. After the program has been developed, instructional costs of the nursing component of the program would be an integral part of the school of nursing's program budget. If necessary approvals are granted, availability of clinical facilities assured, and federal funding obtained in time, the preparatory year of the program will be completed in 1977-78 and the first class of 20 students enrolled 1978-79. Request for state support for nursing instruction on the Eastern Oregon State College campus would first be made as part of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center budget the second year (1980-81) of the 1979-1981 biennium.

It is anticipated that assignment of 60 baccalaureate degree students to the Eastern Oregon State College campus would reduce by the same number the baccalaureate degree nursing students on the Portland campus, with the total number of students in the baccalaureate degree program to be based upon an analysis of the health workforce needs in Oregon, resources available, and requirements of quality programming, as provided in the long-range plan. The number of students to be served on the Eastern Oregon State College campus is set at 60 because (1) review of the clinical facilities in the region indicate that 60 is the maximum number of nursing students which can be accommodated in these facilities if a good quality program is to be assured, and (2) a minimum of 60 students is necessary to justify the number of staff (six) essential to the offering of a sound baccalaureate program.

What is requested now is authorization by the Board to proceed with the negotiations and arrangements prerequisite to establishment of the program on the Eastern Oregon State College campus, with the understanding that should the necessary legislative approval, or the funding for the start-up costs of the program, or needed facilities for clinical instruction not be forthcoming, the program would not be launched.

Budgetary Impact

There is no question but that changing emphases in programs at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing and efforts to make the school's instruction more accessible to students residing in the northern and northeastern regions of the state will affect the school's budgets. The long-range plan of the school proposes some expansion of the master's degree program, both in numbers of students enrolled and in areas of specialization;
a decrease in the numbers of students in the baccalaureate degree program to a level commensurate with need and with quality programming; and "outreach" or "extended campus" programs (for regularly enrolled degree students) to increase access to the school's programs, particularly for the employed RN student. The effect of these modifications in the school's services will show up for the first time in the budgets of the 1977-1979 biennium. These modifications include a planned reduction in enrollments in the baccalaureate program and a modest increase in enrollment in the master's degree program, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75-76</td>
<td>76-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Degree Programs</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were the Eastern Oregon State College program to be a free-standing program or an upper-division program for RN students only, there would be concern as to whether the program could maintain full enrollment. However, since the basic enrollment in the program would be preservice students assigned (on the basis of student preference so far as this is possible) from the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center office of admissions, full enrollment in the program is assured. If the Eastern Oregon State College program goes forward as planned, 60 of the baccalaureate enrollment projected for the 1979-1981 biennium would be stationed at Eastern Oregon State College. (Enrollment projections for 1979-1981 will be based upon further analyses of health service personnel data and resource allocation now underway at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center. They will be presented for consideration of the Board during the 1979-1981 budget review, scheduled for spring 1978.)

Intersegmental Impact

The proposal for a statewide coordinated plan for nursing education for Oregon was developed to provide Oregon with a means of directing its nursing education resources and energies toward meeting health care needs of the state for nursing services on a coordinated basis.

In the absence of such a coordinated plan, the northeastern section of the state, a deficit area in terms both of total nurses and of nurses holding the baccalaureate or higher degrees, now finds itself with two proposals for nursing programs, a proposal by Blue Mountain Community College to offer an associate degree (ADN) program in nursing which would enroll approximately 60 students and the proposal by the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing to offer a baccalaureate degree program for 60 preservice and RN students. There are four accredited hospitals in the three-county area of Baker, Umatilla, and Union with a total of 283 beds, 168 in two hospitals in Pendleton, 65 at the Grande Ronde Hospital in La Grande, and 50 at St. Elizabeth Hospital in Baker. Clinical experience for students is also available in nursing homes in the region (500 beds) and in public health departments and mental health clinics in each of the three counties, but the basic clinical resource for a professional program in nursing is the accredited hospital. The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, in its feasibility study, estimated that the clinical resources within driving distance (50 miles) of the La Grande campus would support a maximum of 60 nursing students. And 60 students also happens to be the minimum number of students required to justify the range of staff expertise required for an accredited baccalaureate degree program.
The Board's Office does not wish to enter into dispute over the issue as to whether the clinical resources in eastern Oregon are adequate to the needs of a new associate degree program in nursing at Blue Mountain Community College and a baccalaureate degree program based at Eastern Oregon State College. We are asking Board approval of the proposed Eastern Oregon State College-based program contingent upon receipt of legislative approval, Coordinating Commission concurrence, receipt of non-state funding of the program for the first three years, and the availability of adequate clinical facilities. If the program is approved by the Board, and it develops that, taking all factors into account, the clinical facilities are not adequate to the offering of a good quality program, the program will not be offered.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mrs. Kahananui summarized the reports being considered by the Committee. She emphasized that a state-wide plan for nursing education was very much needed in Oregon, but that since the plan would require action on the part of a number of agencies and organizations, development and adoption of the plan would probably come about gradually over a period of time.

She noted that the long-range plan being proposed by the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center outlines in rather broad terms the role the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing feels it should and reasonably could undertake in nursing education in Oregon over the next ten years. The proposal includes not only proposals for a planned reduction in enrollment in the baccalaureate degree program and a planned expansion of the graduate program in Portland, but also proposes a commitment on the part of the school of nursing (1) toward making the BSN/RN (bachelor of science degree for registered nurses) more readily accessible to part-time students in off-campus locations (outreach program) and (2) to continuing education for nurses in the north and northeastern regions of Oregon.

The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center-Eastern Oregon State College proposal, Mrs. Kahananui continued, should be viewed in the context of the long-range plan approved for the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing. She said the Board's Office would have been reluctant to recommend for approval a free-standing program of this size in an area remote from major medical facilities. However, she said, several aspects of the program as proposed bode well for its success:

- the proposal is part of a planned effort on the part of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center to review health care needs of the state and where it finds the Center can contribute to improved health service by moving a program or some part of a program off the Portland campus, to be willing to do so;

- interest of the health professional community in the northeastern region in participating in education programs is not transitory, likely to diminish with experience, but rather is part of a long-term, successful, grass-roots effort (called CoMed) on the part of health care practitioners in northeastern Oregon to improve their capacity to offer good health care services;

- the program will serve two needs of the northeastern region, i.e., the need for more new baccalaureate degree educated nurses and the need for advanced educational opportunities for registered nurses with diplomas or associate degrees;
because students will be assigned to the Eastern Oregon State College campus from a central admissions office at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, the program is assured full enrollment, and administrators of the program and the Board will not have to worry about failure to attract the full complement of students for which the program is budgeted, as would be the case were the program to be a free-standing one or a program for RN students only;

there is every assurance that the program will have outstanding leadership, as evidenced by the fact that Miss Dorothy Elhart, chairperson of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing department of medical and surgical nursing for the past ten years and a past president of the State Board of Nursing, a leader in nursing education who has clinical experience as a nurse in a rural setting, and who knows the eastern Oregon region, has expressed interest in the position of program director.

Mrs. Carpenter asked President Bluemle his views as to various aspects of the proposals before the Committee. President Bluemle commented as follows:

I would like . . . to put into perspective what I regard to be a unique and extremely valuable effort on the part of many people who have essentially been led in this endeavor by our Dean, Carol Lindeman. It seems to me that as we look at the evolution of nursing education in the country and in this state that it has followed a pattern which generally is more responsive to the initiatives and needs of individual communities than it has been guided by a long-range coordinated plan. Now in its worst description perhaps this could be described as disjointed incrementalism . . . and in its best image it is probably a manifestation of the free American way of doing things. But there can be no question that the consequence of this evolutionary pattern has been a series of imbalances. Imbalances between total supply and demand for nurses. An imbalance between the increasing demands for their competence to take on more and more difficult and technically complicated chores of patient care and a kind of training that has gone into the preparation of that competence, and disparities in supply and demand on a regional basis . . . best illustrated in this state in eastern Oregon . . .

The studies that have been conducted beginning last fall under Dr. Lindeman's guidance have attempted to define the state of nursing education in Oregon and some of the particular disparities and imbalances which this state must recognize if it's going to chart a rational plan for the continuation of nursing education in the future. In this regard I find the document highly competent and I happen to share the recommendations that have stemmed from it in large measure. It has been pointed out that in our state supply and demand vectors are not coordinated. In fact, very briefly, if we keep doing what we have been doing for the next 10 years we are going to end up with 150 percent of the nursing workforce in the state without . . . a 50 percent increase in the demand. It would appear according to national standards that we are training more sub-baccalaureate nurses than can be properly utilized. I witnessed myself in New York City almost the complete cycle of the generation of a lot of associate degree programs . . . but I lived there long enough to see some of these programs phased out because hospitals couldn't hire their products. Many hospitals chose to hire the baccalaureate nurse because of their increased cost effectiveness early on.

There has been a dearth of baccalaureate training opportunity for RN's in this state. It's a very natural inclination for the RN who is working in a hospital realizing that the opportunities and the need for patient care that the nurse sees every day but cannot accommodate because of limited training . . . that she or he should want to go on to avail herself or himself of that kind of additional training. It's extremely difficult in this state to do that and I have many letters to document that and we have witnesses who can attest to that here today.
We have, in my judgment, a dearth of master's and doctoral trained nurses. Ones who could right now, if they were available, fill the need to educate more nurses in the baccalaureate programs, ones who could fill supervisory roles and also roles of highly competent nurse practitioners in our hospitals.

We have an absolute shortage, I believe, of nurses in eastern Oregon...

I think the most pressing question that has to be addressed is: Should this state invest more money, appreciably more money, in baccalaureate nursing education when it’s cheaper to turn out associate degree nurses? I think the answer to that depends upon where you come from. If you’re sick in a hospital or have someone in your family who is sick, I think you have a little different orientation to your thoughts about cost benefits of training that goes into the competence of the nurse whom you’re relying on to take care of you. It’s somewhat the attitude that I think I have toward the pilot of my airplane who is going to take me back to Portland this afternoon if I’m lucky... we do depend on nurses, airplane pilots, doctors in critical life and death situations because that is the business we are talking about here. If medicine had not progressed over the last 30 years so dramatically, if our potential to restore health and save life had not reached the stage of sophistication that it has, I don’t think I would feel as strongly about the quality and depth of nursing education as I do. But I am one of those doctors who has lived through that period of increased sophistication. I spent a lot of my time before coming here in developing the artificial kidney... I have seen that whole function, dialysis, assumed by nurses. I have lived long enough to see the treatment of patients with myocardial infarctions, coronaries, become almost entirely a nursing function. That is very cost beneficial when a nurse can do what a more expensive physician or even a resident used to do...

Mr. Perry asked President Bluemle to contrast the role of the nurse in advanced technology with the role of the paramedic. President Bluemle said the difference was not always clear, but his perception of the paramedic was a person trained to deliver emergency medical care, whereas a nurse practitioner is a person with the basic educational background of a nurse, usually a baccalaureate trained nurse, who has spent additional years learning to operate relatively independently in a well baby clinic, operating a coronary care or dialysis unit, or possibly even doing many of the functions formerly done by a resident in a neurosurgical intensive care unit.

Mr. Wyss inquired as to the costs of setting up a remotely controlled program such as proposed for Eastern Oregon State College. President Bluemle said he could not speak from experience because he had never set up a joint program such as was being proposed, but that he would estimate that establishing a program on a remote campus would be approximately twice as expensive during its formative years as training the same number of students on the home academic base. As to whether the investment was justified, he said, he would have to say that he did not believe you could educate nurses in Portland and guarantee that nursing care needs of eastern Oregon would be served. Neither, he said, would setting up an independent program in eastern Oregon be more cost effective, because there would need to be additional academic investment required to meet accreditation standards which would be more expensive to set up and maintain independently than to export from Portland.

In response to further questioning by Mr. Wyss as to how confident one can be that people trained in a given geographic area will stay in the area to work, President Bluemle said there is no guarantee that the products of any program will stay where your rationale says they should stay when you develop the program. There is increasing evidence, he said, in medical education that if the school is smart in the selection of its students, looking at such things as their background, the
size of the community in which they grew up, one's percentage of success [in terms of graduates electing to practice in rural regions] can be improved. The factors that cause people to do what they do in nursing go beyond money and involve families as well, he said. Of all the alternatives to the problem of maldistribution of nursing services, he said, "there is none that is inexpensive and none that is guaranteed, but of all the ones that have gone across my mind this one, I think, is the most promising."

Mr. Wyss asked if the needs of northeastern Oregon for additional nurses could not be better served by a program for baccalaureate degree candidates who were registered nurses already employed in the region than by a program enrolling students directly out of high school. He said nurses already employed in the region would be more likely to remain in the area after graduation than would younger graduates.

Dr. Lindeman said approximately one-half of the students enrolled in the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center-Eastern Oregon State College program will be registered nurses. Many of these will wish to complete the program on a part-time basis and the school is prepared to accommodate this need. She pointed out that a program for RN's only would not provide new nurses to alleviate the nursing shortage in the region, and so both types of students are required. She said she thought new nurses graduating from the program would be more likely to remain in the area where they were educated than they would have 10 years ago because there is no longer a nursing shortage in urban areas of the state. She said it must be recognized that influencing distribution of personnel and service is an issue no one has the answer for, but it seems reasonable that nurses from the eastern Oregon region, trained in eastern Oregon, who had good learning opportunities during their training, who didn't have the whole world to choose from as they looked for jobs, might choose to remain in eastern Oregon in settings with which they were familiar. She said while students coming from northeastern Oregon who indicated a preference for training at Eastern Oregon State College would be given preference in assignment to the Eastern Oregon State College program, there would be students from other areas of the state who would prefer a program in a more rural setting and on a different type of campus than the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center and they would not be excluded from the program. She said the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing had approximately 470 fully qualified applicants for the fall 1976 class and so she foresaw no problem in terms of adequate enrollment on the Eastern Oregon State College campus.

Mr. Wyss asked if the level of compensation of nurses in the northeastern part of the state might not be a large factor explaining the relative scarcity of nurses in the region. Dean Lindeman said a specific response in terms of salaries could be made by hospital administrators who would be testifying later in the session. However, she said, the percentage of inactive nurses in northeastern Oregon was lower than the national average and not significantly higher than the percentage for the state as a whole, indicating that the level of compensation was not keeping nurses residing in the area from working.

Committee Recommendation Regarding Long-Range Plan for University of Oregon Health Sciences Center School of Nursing. Mrs. Carpenter referred the Committee to the seven recommendations of the staff in respect to the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing long-range plan [reproduced on pp. 390-391 of these minutes]. She said she felt the first part of recommendation b, that the baccalaureate degree be considered for planning purposes as the entry level into professional nursing practice, was not a decision that should be made by the Committee, since there are so many other groups involved in a decision of this kind. She expressed herself as in agreement with the other recommendations of the staff and commented that she was impressed with the major reduction in the number of students to be admitted to the baccalaureate degree program in the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing in the 1977-1979 biennium, a reduction which would not be balanced by the numbers which would be admitted to the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center-Eastern Oregon State College program.
Mr. Wyss indicated he agreed with the suggestion concerning recommendation b. He said if the baccalaureate degree does become and is appropriate as the entry level, that will be decided by the profession and by society. In respect to recommendation e, he said, there appears to be ample evidence that society is inadequately served in terms of numbers of nurses prepared at the master's degree level. He asked if there were plans for increasing enrollment in master's degree programs on the Portland campus. Dean Lindeman replied affirmatively. Master's enrollments numbered 64 in 1976-77 and are planned to increase to 78 in 1977-78 and 80 in 1978-79, with further increases anticipated in succeeding biennia. In response to further questions from Mr. Wyss, she said graduate education is more expensive than undergraduate education, but that she could not say precisely how much more expensive until cost analyses now underway were completed, probably within the next six months.

Chancellor Lieuallen suggested that Dr. Bluemle or Dr. Lindeman comment on the importance of recommendation b in the school's long-range planning. President Bluemle said the philosophical statement that baccalaureate nursing education should become the preliminary stepping stone to competency in nursing care was one to which he wholeheartedly subscribed and one which he thought would be cost beneficial to society. However, he continued, he would not feel that the progress of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing would be impeded if the Board were not to take formal action on this recommendation at this point.

Dean Lindeman said the reduction in admission to the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing's baccalaureate program, from 209 in the fall of 1976 to 150 for fall 1977 and 1978, came about through deliberate review of the ability of the school to provide quality nursing education. The school is concerned about the need to keep opportunities for baccalaureate education as open as possible. She said, but in view of the composition of the nursing work force in the state, the school feels its primary concern should be the quality of education provided. In this, she said, there were three constraints:

1. There are numerous schools of nursing in Portland all competing for use of the same clinical resources. Clinical resources available to the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing do not provide adequate clinical instruction for the numbers of students the school has admitted in the past.

2. The school of nursing does not have the financial resources to provide a quality education for 209 new students each year.

3. The school is scheduled for a National League for Nursing accreditation review fall 1977, necessitating a drastic reduction in the size of the entering class if the school is to demonstrate that it is to be able to do a reasonably good job of educating its students.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve recommendations a, c, d, e, f, and g as presented on pp. 390-391 of these minutes, and recommendation b in modified form as indicated below:

b. Approve a planned reduction in numbers of students enrolled in the baccalaureate program of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing on the Portland campus from 572 in 1976-77 to 432 in 1978-79, the reduction to be accomplished by a reduction in the entering class from 209 admitted in 1976-77 to 150 each year of the 1977-1979 biennium. (The 20 students to be admitted to the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center-Eastern Oregon State College program in 1978-79 would be in addition to the 150.)
Consideration of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center-Eastern Oregon State College BS in Nursing Program. The Committee heard testimony in respect to the program from President Bluemle; President Briggs; Mr. Bill Taylor, president and administrator of St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Baker; Ms. Nancy Burns, inservice education director of St. Anthony Hospital in Pendleton; Ms. Alice O'Brien, executive director of the Council on Medical Education and Development (CoMed); Mrs. Joan Burns, chairperson of the Eastern Oregon State College Health Education Advisory Committee; and Dr. James Eastman, physician in La Grande representing the physicians of Union county.

President Bluemle testified that he felt the proposal "a great idea," not just because it addresses health personnel needs of the state, but because it came out of critical thought and communication among all parties of interest.

President Briggs described the proposal as one which responds to an identified and documented need of eastern Oregon in a way that is both educationally and economically responsible. He said the program capitalizes on the outstanding general science and liberal arts resources of Eastern Oregon State College and the validity, support, and encouragement of the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing to provide a new dimension of cooperation between institutions of the State System and to establish a prototype of a delivery system which could be used throughout the state. The proposal itself, he said, stems from a regionally constituted advisory committee dealing with many questions of health and health care. The work of the committee has not always been smooth, he noted, particularly in respect to the establishment of priorities. However, the committee was able to bring its discussions to resolution in the proposal presently under consideration.

Mr. Taylor said the proposal was the result of efforts of health service providers in the northeastern region of the state to address nursing education and recruiting needs. Of the 167 nurses employed by six hospitals in the immediate area, he continued, only 31 hold the baccalaureate degree and only 6 hold the master's degree. Of the remaining 130, 86 are from three-year programs and 44 hold the associate degree. There is a present shortage of 38 nurses and an annual turnover of 39.

Mr. Taylor said he had discussed hiring practices with other hospital administrators in the area and had found a definite preference for hiring the baccalaureate nurse over the associate degree nurse. There are several factors in that preference, he said. One factor in this preference, he said, is cost; the cost to an institution to employ an associate degree nurse and train that person for six months, along with at least one other RN and sometimes two RN's, to the point where he or she is productive is very expensive. Another factor, he continued, is the high quality of health care that is expected not only by the public, but by government regulators reviewing the hospital services. Mr. Taylor said health care providers do not like putting an RN who is not really trained to work in areas for which the individual is not prepared, but there is nothing else they can do at the present time. He said it is interesting to note that at the same time demand for quality care increases, the production of three-year nurses is declining sharply and there is a growing gap between demand for quality care and the number of nurses qualified to provide this care.

Ms. Nancy Burns said she had reviewed assignment of nurses in her hospital and had observed that baccalaureate trained nurses were better able to assume leadership roles and to undertake activities now being expected of nurses than were associate degree nurses. She said while hospitals do not need all nurses trained to this level, nurses who are not prepared to function in this way are often put into these roles and expected to perform rather rapidly. She said it was her observation that the baccalaureate degree nurse is more adjustable and can function in different situations with less frustration than other types of nurses. Leadership positions in her hospital are filled by baccalaureate degree nurses to the extent this is possible.
Mr. Perry asked if there was any difference in pay for different levels of educational preparation. Ms. Burns said there was no differential at present, but as hospital administrators recognized that the four-year nurse could perform better than the two-year nurse, they would begin raising wages to get baccalaureate-prepared people.

Mrs. Joan Burns said she could only reinforce the testimony just given. She said she was a diploma nurse working in a four-bed coronary care unit. In her work, she said, she worked with computers, monitors, and electronic equipment, work for which she had not been trained in the accredited university-associated hospital school in which she had completed her training 15 years ago. Health care has grown in terms of complexity and the frustration is increased in rural areas because there is no backup from other nurses who are well-trained. There is no time in a two-year program to prepare a nurse for this kind of responsibility, she said. In her own case, she said, she had taken out malpractice insurance for the first time in her career because she felt she needed more education to do the job she is doing and more backup of adequately prepared personnel. She said she did not like to work under the kind of stress involved in her present assignment and would not do so except that her husband is a physician and she feels committed to the hospital. Nurses do not like to work in situations where they do not feel adequately trained, she said, and this kind of stress is a part of the problem of turnover of nurses in small, rural hospitals.

Dr. Eastman said the proposed program had his full support and the full support of the physicians in Union County. He said this support is based on the assumption that better nurses provide better care to patients. Union County now has 28 physicians, 16 of whom have come to the area within the past five years. Nine of the physicians represent specialties and ways of working that are new to the community. This puts great stress on the nurses resident in the community and turnover of nursing personnel in the hospitals is greater than is desirable for good care. Similar 'growing pains' are being experienced in surrounding counties, and special demands are being placed on nurses to perform in ways for which they have not been formally trained, as in the example described by Mrs. Burns. Younger physicians are more recently educated, he said, and many are in tune with the expanded role that nurses can play. The area is short of nurses, he concluded, but the critical shortage is for high quality nurses. A baccalaureate degree program would begin to meet this need, he said, and would stimulate an increased atmosphere of professionalism and academic excellence in the nursing service, which would have a number of indirect positive effects on the quality of health care.

Ms. O'Brien said the situations described by the other persons testifying were a consistent pattern throughout the nine hospitals of the CoMed organization. One of the most frustrating parts of her job for CoMed, she said, was to set up an instructional program in a badly needed area, emergency room care for example, and then find that one-third of the nurses scheduled for the instruction cannot attend because there is no one to relieve them from duty the day the instruction is scheduled. The shortage of nurses in northeast Oregon is so acute, she said, that the hospitals are unable even to give people who badly need instruction to do the jobs they are already doing time off to receive the instruction. The regulatory situation is such that hospitals cannot do without properly trained nurses, even if they have to begin sending the few nurses who are mobile away from the region for baccalaureate education. But this is very expensive and the cost would have to be borne by the consumers of the medical services. She said the people of northeast Oregon do not like to ask for state help and if there were any way to resolve the problem of providing primary education for nurses at the level required without state help, the area would do so. The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center-Eastern Oregon State College proposal, she said, is an effort to resolve the problem in the most equitable and economical fashion possible.
Mrs. Carpenter asked Dean Lindeman to comment on the academic and clinical resources in the eastern Oregon area to support the proposed program. Dean Lindeman said the school of nursing was very pleased with the quality of the faculty at Eastern Oregon State College who would be offering basic support work for the program. Insofar as clinical facilities are concerned, she continued, she said she had personally visited three of the four hospitals which would provide clinical facilities and had reviewed information concerning the fourth and she felt these hospitals would provide adequate clinical experiences for the 60 students contemplated. She said that in early meetings with the advisory council, it was felt the council would need to face quite frankly the fact that clinical facilities in the region could not support two programs (an ADN program at Blue Mountain Community College and the program at Eastern Oregon State College) of the size being proposed and would need to make a decision as to whether their greatest need was for a program where additional nurses could begin entering the work force within as little as one year (by adding one year of instruction to the LPN program so graduates could function as RN's) or whether a longer-range solution which would produce baccalaureate degree graduates was preferable. The people of the region debated this issue, she said, and it was by their decision that plans moved forward on the baccalaureate degree program. She said there was no doubt that there was an acute shortage of nurses in northeast Oregon and the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center school of nursing would do all it could to help in getting nurses into the area. She said she felt establishment of the proposed program in eastern Oregon would make the area more attractive to new graduates. If the program is approved and necessary funding and other arrangements completed so there is assurance students could begin work in the program in fall 1978, the school of nursing will begin immediately counseling RN's in the area who wish to enroll in the degree program so they can complete any coursework available at Eastern Oregon State College which would facilitate their completion of the baccalaureate degree program before actual inauguration of the nursing instruction. She said the school of nursing was already offering some continuing education work in the area in cooperation with CoMed, and will continue to do so. Ms. O'Brien observed that the continuing education program now underway was partially funded by CoMed. She said CoMed was very appreciative of the help the school of nursing was providing in this program, but it is an example of the brush-fire approach to the problem. The long-term solution to the health education problems of northeast Oregon, she said, was to get the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center involved, not only to help in providing primary education for nurses, the most critical need, but continuing education in other specialized areas, some of which can only be provided by that institution.

Committee Recommendation on the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center-Eastern Oregon State College BS in Nursing Program. The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented on p. 391 of these minutes.

Board Discussion and Action

The background material considered by the Committee and on file in the Board's Office was summarized by Mr. Wyss. He indicated that there has been a shift from the three-year private hospital certificate programs toward providing baccalaureate degree training opportunities in nursing education by public higher education, both as a result of increased costs and the need for additional training. At the same time there is a shortage of nurses, particularly in rural areas of the state. Several two-year programs also are helping to meet such needs.

Mr. Wyss then presented the details of the programs in nursing education which were before the Board for consideration. The recommendations pertain to nursing education in the northern region of the state and a subsequent report and recommendations will be made with respect to the southern region.
Dr. Romney said the program for the southern part of the state would involve Oregon Institute of Technology, Southern Oregon State College, and the community college programs in that part of the state. It is probable this report will be presented to the Committee in August.

Mr. Wyss concluded the presentation of the material by suggesting that ultimately it might be necessary to consider a regional service requirement for training in expensive specialized programs.

Mr. Wyss moved that the Board approve the Committee recommendations (1) to form a coordinated state plan for nursing education in Oregon, (2) to establish a 10-year plan for the school of nursing at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, and (3) to authorize a program of nursing education at Eastern Oregon State College.

Mr. Ater said he concurred with the Committee decision to delete the recommendation that the Board ratify the concept of the baccalaureate degree as the appropriate professional degree because that is a matter for the licensing board to determine. He said he had been impressed by the fact that the cooperative program for eastern Oregon was an indigenous program generated by the people of the region. He said it was highly supported and the Board should respond to that kind of community issue.

Dr. Romney explained that the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center will also be involved in the recommendations for nursing education with respect to the southern part of the state. The State System plan will be subject to review by the Educational Coordinating Commission because there are more nurses being trained through ADN programs than through baccalaureate programs.

Dr. Romney said the overall production of nurses must coordinate all nursing education programs in the state. This would include the baccalaureate programs at Southern Oregon State College and the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center, the ADN programs at Southern Oregon State College and Oregon Institute of Technology, the ADN programs available through community colleges, the baccalaureate and master's programs available at the University of Portland, and the diploma program at Good Samaritan Hospital, although the latter soon will be discontinued.

Mr. Harms said the Committee had been impressed with the dedication shown by Dean Lindeman and others within the nursing profession in assessing the nursing education needs of the state.

The Board approved the Committee recommendations, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Recommendations of the Commission on the OSU Extension Service

A Commission on the Oregon State University Extension Service was appointed by Chancellor Lieuallen in 1975 to review the Oregon State University Extension Service and to report to the Board its findings and recommendations.

The Commission was charged with the following responsibilities:

To review and examine the program of the Oregon State University Cooperative Extension Service and to determine to what degree it is meeting the obligations laid upon it as an extension agency of a land grant-sea grant university by federal and state statutes and Board policies.
To examine Cooperative Extension Service management processes to determine whether they are resulting in effective and efficient management.

To determine whether or not the program priorities (agriculture, forestry, marine resources, family living/home economics, 4-H youth, and community development) of the Cooperative Extension Service are those most likely to meet the critical needs of Oregonians for the remainder of this decade and to report any recommended reordering of priorities or reallocation of resources.

To identify those unmet needs of the state that it appears the Cooperative Extension Service has the capabilities for serving—either by itself or in collaboration with other state and federal agencies having compatible missions—and to identify procedures for meeting those needs.

To make any recommendations the Commission feels appropriate with respect to any aspect of the conduct of the affairs of the Cooperative Extension Service that would enhance its capabilities for achieving its assigned mission.

The Commission met in formal sessions a total of six times over an eight-month period.

The Commission was chaired by Mr. Howell Appling, former Oregon Secretary of State. The Commission report was made orally and in writing to the Board's Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, and the written report was presented to and accepted by the Board.

The Board asked that the specific recommendations made by the Commission be reviewed by Oregon State University and by the Board's Office, and that a report be subsequently made to the Board concerning these Commission recommendations.

Shortly after the Commission report was received by the Board, the director of the Cooperative Extension Service reached retirement age and a new director—new to Oregon—was appointed. Oregon State University felt that it was essential that the new director have an opportunity to become acquainted with the Oregon scene before responding to the recommendations. That has now been accomplished.

Since a number of new Board members have joined the Board since the Commission's report was submitted, the following materials were distributed and are on file in the Board's Office:

- A statement of the view of Oregon State University concerning each of the Commission's recommendations.
- A brief sketch of the programs, the modus operandi and the sources of funding of the Cooperative Extension Service, prepared by the Board's Office, as an aid to Board members in refreshing their memories as to the characteristics of the Extension Service.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

It was recommended:

1. That the Board accept the Oregon State University report concerning the steps being taken by Oregon State University to respond constructively to the Commission's recommendations.
It will be observed that (a) Oregon State University accepts the validity of each of the Commission's 15 recommendations with the exception of recommendation number 11, which the University is willing to consider when the new director of the Extension Service has had opportunity to acquaint himself fully with the circumstances at Oregon State University; and (b) the University is in the process of acting constructively on the Commission's recommendations within the limits of the constraints which the University identifies.

2. That the Board ask for subsequent reports as to the outcome of certain actions Oregon State University has undertaken that are intended to respond to the Commission's recommendations.

For instance, the Board may wish to ask for a report as to the results of the study currently being carried on by the new director of the Cooperative Extension Service and an ad hoc committee to establish criteria by which practical limits are set as to what the Extension Service does or does not do (Commission recommendation number 4).

Or, the Board may wish subsequent reports on the results of the work currently underway at Oregon State University (a) to examine the six Extension program areas with a view to determining the unmet educational needs within those six areas; and (b) to identify needs not being met by existing Extension programs, but for which Oregon State University has the knowledge base primarily required.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

President MacVicar introduced Dr. Henry A. Wadsworth, Director of the Cooperative Extension Service, who had joined the administration and faculty last year.

President MacVicar said Dr. Wadsworth had subsequently become well acquainted with the tasks before him as principal administrator responsible for this program of education and public service.

With respect to Recommendation 11, President MacVicar explained further the rationale set forth in his response to the recommendation.

Dr. Wadsworth said he was pleased that a report was in existence when he arrived because it reaffirmed the work of the extension service in Oregon, the mission toward which the service is directed, and the type and quality of programs being implemented. Dr. Wadsworth said he was familiar with the report before he accepted the position at Oregon State University; that the Commission report had been widely circulated nationally. The report does not solve some of the long-standing questions of program balance between rural and urban areas, Dr. Wadsworth said. He indicated agreement with the recommendations which suggested a statewide advisory council to assist in decision-making, and this recommendation will be followed.

Mr. Harms concurred with the response of Oregon State University to Recommendation II, and Mr. Wyss commented that he would encourage extending appropriate Cooperative Extension Service services (particularly 4-H) to urban areas.

Mrs. Carpenter asked whether a traditional program, such as the extension service, could become sufficiently flexible to identify with the real socio-economic problems of urban areas, and to gain full credence with an urban population.

Dr. Wadsworth explained that the food and nutrition program has been developed in urban areas through paraprofessionals who are part of the particular neighborhood groups for which the programs are intended. As a result, the success has been very good. However, these programs are largely federally-funded and have been at a fixed level since 1973. Consequently, inflation has become a major factor and threatens the continuation of some programs. Dr. Wadsworth said volunteers have been very helpful in the extension programs.
The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations and select the second alternative in the second staff recommendation. The Committee recommendation would then read as follows:

It was recommended:

1. That the Board accept the Oregon State University report concerning the steps being taken by Oregon State University to respond constructively to the Commission's recommendations.

It will be observed that (a) Oregon State University accepts the validity of each of the Commission's 15 recommendations with the exception of recommendation number 11, which the University is willing to consider when the new director of the Extension Service has had opportunity to acquaint himself fully with the circumstances at Oregon State University; and (b) the University is in the process of acting constructively on the Commission's recommendations within the limits of the constraints which the University identifies.

2. That the Board ask for subsequent reports on the results of the work currently underway at Oregon State University (a) to examine the six Extension program areas with a view to determining the unmet educational needs within those six areas; and (b) to identify needs not being met by existing Extension programs, but for which Oregon State University has the knowledge base primarily required.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendations as shown above, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Response by Oregon State University to "Extension Education in Oregon: Preparing for Tomorrow," the Report of the Commission on the Oregon State University Extension Service

Submitted by:
Robert MacVicar, President
Oregon State University

April 1977

Introduction

The Commission on the Oregon State University Extension Service was appointed and first met in March 1975. Through a series of six meetings concluding in November 1975, the Commission examined the Extension Service. Specifically, Chancellor Roy Lieuallen, acting for the State Board of Higher Education, had asked the citizen Commission to consider or act on five specific charges. The charges dealt with:

- reviewing the Extension program to determine to what degree Extension was meeting its obligations;
- examining management processes;
- determining appropriateness of program priorities;
- considering potential needs of the state; and
making any other recommendations the Commission felt would enhance the
ability of Extension to achieve its mission.

The full text of these charges and the Commission's response are contained in the
Commission's report entitled "Extension Education in Oregon: Preparing for
Tomorrow," Report of the Commission on the Oregon State University Extension
Service (Oregon State University, 1976).

The Commission report included 15 specific recommendations, to which Oregon State
University has been invited by the Board's Office to respond. The University's
response appears below. For the convenience of the reader, each recommendation
made by the Commission is quoted in full preceding the University's response to it.

Oregon State University Response to the Recommendations
of the Commission on the Oregon State University Extension Service

RECOMMENDATION 1: Extension should establish statewide task forces within each of
its present six program areas to examine the educational needs that are not now
being adequately met and to establish priorities. Each such task force should
include knowledgeable individuals from affected industries, professions or interest
groups, Extension staff, deans of the schools and colleges concerned, department
heads, and other appropriate campus staff.

The administration of the Extension Service and the University believes in the
value of systematic identification of educational needs by task forces or advisory
groups that include clients and others. Extension administration is now organizing
task forces, or clearly identifying the composition and assignments of existing
task forces for each of Extension's program areas. Although these groups are not called
"task forces," they are intended to perform the functions envisaged by the Commission
for the task forces. In addition, the Extension Service is defining the scope and
authority of these groups so their members may understand what is being asked of
them and the extent of their influence on policy and program.

Besides statewide advisory groups that relate to individual program areas, individual
county advisory committees are being revitalized. Extension programs in each
county will be developed and delivered with appropriate input from advisory committee
members. As in the case of statewide groups, the scope, authority, and composition
of these groups is being carefully defined and articulated.

RECOMMENDATION 2: An assessment similar to that specified in recommendation 1
should be made to identify needs not being met by existing programs but for which
Oregon State University has the knowledge base primarily required. Task forces as
described in recommendation 1 should be employed in such an assessment.

The director of the Extension Service is now planning, organizing, and establishing
a statewide Extension advisory council. It is intended to assess educational
needs which might be met by Extension programs and to advise Extension administra-
tion regarding their relative importance and priority. Such a statewide, Extension-
wide panel is expected to have as one of its major functions the review of needs
not now being met by Extension programs.

Most of the areas for which the university has adequate internal capacity have
been considered from time to time for inclusion within the structure of the
Extension Service. Only recently, for example, the School of Engineering has
accepted a broader role within the Extension program in the field of energy
conservation and utilization.

RECOMMENDATION 3: When a problem is identified for which Oregon State University
has neither the knowledge base nor adequate competency on its faculty to develop
such a program, Oregon State University should either: enlist assistance of
competent persons from outside the university; or help the clientele make contact
with other institutions in society that do have the competency to develop such
educational programs.
We agree. When an educational need exists but Extension has inadequate faculty
competence, potential clients are encouraged to seek alternative services if they
are available. Extension often helps potential clients locate alternative sources
of educational programs, in fact.

In other circumstances, when no existing agency serves the demonstrable needs, and
when the competence and knowledge base exists within the State System of Higher
Education, appropriate interinstitutional arrangements might be developed to meet
the need. These would permit the program to be developed and delivered using the
Extension Service model: county Extension staff members delivering program with
support from specialists provided by another institution through contract. Among
the areas in which such potentials might conceivably develop are in law with the
University of Oregon and in urban planning with Portland State University.

RECOMMENDATION 4: A policy statement should be developed specifying criteria by
which practical limits are set as to what Extension does and does not do so all
those concerned may have a clear understanding of the criteria.

We agree. In fact, even before the Commission began its work, an Extension Service
ad hoc committee on program development recognized this need. It has been dealt
with in several ways. First, the Extension Service's administrative group has at
least a working set of measures by which it judges potential programs. In addition,
the new Extension director is preparing a major program development effort, but
which has been delayed because of legislative liaison and immediate budget concerns.
This effort is expected to gain momentum later this summer and fall will have as one
of its major thrusts, the careful identification of criteria. In the process, the
involvement of client groups through advisory councils and committees will obviously
also be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION 5: The role of the Extension Service is education. It should
donit service activities except:

--- When directed by legislative or other higher authority;
--- When no other source of a needed service exists; or
--- When, by virtue of Extension participation, a possibility exists of
  stimulating some other organization to provide the service on a regular
  basis. Extension should cease providing a service after the student has
  learned the function, or the service is available from another organiza-
  tion. In any event, service activities should not be subsidized from
  funds intended for educational purposes.

The Extension Service management believes that this recommendation is fully con-
sistent with its current policies. Service activities currently carried out are
being executed either because of direct legislative involvement or because no
other source of the needed service exists. From time to time the Extension
Service stimulates some other organization to provide service by initiating its
own programs which are then "spun off" or handed over to some other agency.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Extension should pursue an increasingly active role in public
policy education. It should be a source of both information and interpretation
for the people of Oregon, providing a process through which an informed populace
may deal with matters of public policy as it relates to their individual and
collective futures. In so doing, Extension must be careful to continue to main-
tain its credibility as an educational leader by avoiding a position of advocacy
on matters of policy. In this manner, as well as through other traditional
methods, Extension may continue to organize people to help them identify the
questions they must confront and to show them how to address problems in a
community setting.

The knowledge and expertise at Oregon State University frequently is relevant to
public policy issues. When matters of policy are being considered and discussed,
Oregon State University, often through its Extension Service, can provide research-
based knowledge, information about policy alternatives, and other relevant objective
information.
Providing information on which policy decisions are to be based is not without its risks, however. Because public policy issues tend to be controversial, there is a reluctance on the part of some Extension personnel to engage in activities which are demonstrably likely to produce negative reactions from individuals who would be affected by policy decisions. Despite this, however, the Extension Service historically has committed itself to making available educational programs in areas of its competencies as they relate to policy making.

Land-use policy is a typical example of an issue which falls squarely within the purview of Extension. This is a highly controversial area and divides traditional clientele into groups which are sometimes overtly hostile to each other. Nonetheless, Extension has committed itself to an educational program for all citizens: land owners, land users, public officials, and others. In this process, Extension has been sensitive to the need to provide information and to attempt to assist communities and individuals to deal with their problems in an objective way and has avoided becoming an overt advocate for one position or another.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Extension should increase its use of paraprofessionals and volunteers, where appropriate and functional in meeting program objectives.

Extension is committed to the use of paraprofessionals and volunteers. It may be prompted to use them even more widely because of the costs of professional personnel and limits on Extension's resources.

Paraprofessionals must be trained properly and supervised. Given that, they can significantly increase the capacity of Extension to serve its clientele without seriously diminishing the quality of programming.

Volunteers present a more difficult challenge, however. In the current program, extensive use already is made of volunteers. Some 14,000 are involved in the 4-H youth program alone and more in the family living program. As these programs reach out to more people, further use of volunteers is anticipated.

In other program areas, however, the volunteer is either less effective or may not be available in the numbers and quality demanded. Particularly among certain critical client groups (disadvantaged, language- and ethnic-differentiated, physically and intellectually handicapped) there is need for a degree of sophistication in delivery methods that renders the volunteer less effective. In these same client groups, moreover, the tradition of volunteerism and mutual self-help is not as strong as is the case in the traditional rural and smaller communities in which Extension has so successfully used volunteers in the past and at present.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Extension should adopt greater use of mass media where it can enhance delivery.

The University fully accepts the challenge to use the mass media. The traditional Extension delivery methods discussed with the Commission included publications, films, radio, television, exhibits, and other means to convey educational information. In addition, the Commission observed some innovative applications of closed-circuit television and considered expanded use of present media activities to reach broader audiences, especially those in urban areas. We believe it was these innovative and expanded uses to which the Commission refers in its recommendation.

Since the Commission made its report, we have expanded modestly some of Extension's media efforts. Recently, for example, the University produced television programs which were the basis for an educational program for applicators of pesticides. The programs were delivered to the intended audience (3,500 persons) by three means: broadcast as a public service by commercial stations, broadcast as special programming by Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Service, and played to certain recipients by closed-circuit video in various communities. Extension
personnel prepared the programs which provided necessary information to pass certain examinations and, thus, successfully achieved the objective of providing an opportunity for several thousand Oregonians to conform to state and federal regulations. At the same time, it made efficient use of Extension personnel: avoiding their diversion from their regular tasks into a crash program on this subject. Special funds were available for this effort.

Also as a result of special funds, and growing from a strong demand from householders for information on home horticulture, Extension has begun to use mass media more extensively as a means of reaching urban residents. This project has demonstrated the feasibility of further use of mass media channels for educational messages, when those messages are suitably prepared, packaged, and delivered.

Although there are further opportunities for expanded use of the mass media, Extension has been limited by lack of funds. Although media are relatively inexpensive on the basis of cost-per-exposure, their absolute cost is high. Despite this, the Extension Service will move as quickly as possible, within the limits of available resources, to more media programming for certain audiences and subjects.

Definition of wholesaling from Commission report: Extension should continue to recognize and use, where appropriate, other organizations as vehicles for delivering some of its programs. We refer to this delivery mode as "wholesaling."

RECOMMENDATION 9: To the extent that wholesaling offers an opportunity for gains in efficiency or effectiveness, or for eliminating unnecessary duplication of programs, Extension should wholesale its materials and programs.

We agree with the Commission that there are opportunities for wholesaling. For example, Extension for many years has wholesaled some of its educational information through agricultural field representatives. This has been an important means of delivering information about controlling weeds, insects, and plant diseases in commercial agriculture and using agricultural chemicals.

Wholesaling may be viewed as at least two separable activities: wholesaling educational materials, and wholesaling educational programs. With respect to wholesaling materials, Extension has for some time made its materials (publications, films, slides, audio tapes, and so forth) available to others to use, asking only for credit to their source. To the extent that opportunities exist for expanding this wholesaling, the Extension Service will take advantage of them.

With respect to wholesaling programs, we find that joint or cooperative programming is more feasible and practical. This, of course, is fully in the tradition of the Extension Service. We regard community colleges as particularly valuable partners in the provision of services. They have a mission in adult and community education and often have facilities and equipment where the University cannot and should not duplicate. Memoranda of understanding have been developed and signed for all the community colleges of the state. In areas where community colleges do not exist, other educational agencies (Eastern Oregon State College, for example) are used for joint programming.

For some client groups, state and federal agencies can be and are "partners" in delivering educational programs. The State Department of Agriculture, the State Department of Forestry, and the Soil Conservation Service of the USDI, are some examples with which extensive joint programming has been carried out.

The Commission, in its discussions, recognized a hazard to wholesaling that deserves to be noted. To the extent that, in the process of wholesaling, the Extension Services loses its identity among those persons who ultimately receive the educational product, Extension also risks the possibility of a serious erosion
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of its support base. Thus, while Extension will continue to wholesale its materials and will continue to conduct jointly and cooperatively programs with other agencies, it must exercise care. It must assure that individuals receiving the educational service clearly recognize the role of the University and the need to continue to support its programming efforts.

RECOMMENDATION 10: Regular evaluation of programs should be conducted to determine the cost effectiveness of the program delivery method(s) being employed; and to determine whether a particular program is achieving its objectives.

The Extension Service fully agrees that regular evaluation of programs should be conducted not only to determine the quality of a program but its effectiveness and costs. Only through such evaluation can corrective action be taken to alleviate weaknesses and to provide appropriate information with respect to setting priorities for program continuation, expansion, and the inauguration of new programs.

One of the ways that Extension has used to make such evaluation is through the use of peer committees that are established both by discipline and for broad program areas. In the former situation the School of Agriculture consistently reviews, often with the help of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, the departmental programs in the respective areas and disciplines of the School of Agriculture. The Schools of Agriculture and Home Economics are evaluated and in this evaluation process the Extension program is included.

In other program areas, such as youth programs, special ad hoc evaluation committees composed of individuals both from the University and from external agencies are constituted. These evaluation panels look carefully at aspects of the program and render an appropriate report. From time to time also various program areas operated by the Extension Service are evaluated by other external agencies, and appropriate information is made available to the Extension Service management. An example of such an evaluation was that conducted in 1975 of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP), in the State of Oregon. We were one of several states chosen by the U. S. Department of Agriculture for an intensive review of the success of this program. The results of the evaluation were highly complimentary to the State of Oregon but also contained suggestions for improvements which were transmitted to the University.

There is another kind of evaluation of programs that has not been widely used in Extension. This kind of research is empirical and objective and is based in sociological and educational research methodology. It is also expensive. This last characteristic is the principal reason that it has not been widely used in Extension. When opportunities exist for such evaluation, Extension management is faced with the decision of using funds to conduct programs or shifting those funds from programs to evaluation. In most cases, Extension has opted for more programs delivered to its clients.

The entire area of evaluation is a critical one because it is the means by which we assess the success of our programs and identify areas of weakness. Moreover, as indicated previously, the limited resources which are likely to become available to the Extension Service and the shifting dynamics of client demand will make it necessary to reallocate resources. Thus, again, evaluation is important because in addition to determining the quality of a program and its effectiveness, there is evidence to indicate the relative costs of delivering a particular service. This, then, can be related to the priority which should be assigned to a particular program area.

RECOMMENDATION 11: University administration and the Board of Higher Education should seriously consider establishing a central administrative unit, appointing a principal administrative officer, and designating an individual in each major academic unit participating in the program to provide a line of administration for
the Extension function parallel to those for instruction and research. The principal officer would be directly responsible for the function to the president and would be a member of the president's immediate staff. The field staff would be directly managed from the central unit to facilitate delivery of program through that structure and the principal office would be responsible for assuring the continued strong working relationship between the field and campus-based staffs.

The University Executive Office has considered carefully the possibility of establishing a central administrative unit for the Extension Service responsible directly to the president. At present, the Extension director is responsible to the dean of the School of Agriculture. For the time being, we plan to retain the present arrangement. A major reason is that Joseph R. Cox, who was Extension director for three years, retired in mid-1976, and was succeeded in August 1976 by Henry Wadsworth. It did not seem wise to attempt a radical change in the organization when a new director was just acquainting himself with his responsibilities. After Director Wadsworth is more familiar with the situation, it will be appropriate to reconsider the decision.

If there were serious problems involved with this management organization, clearly it would be appropriate to consider changing. To the contrary, the report of the Commission itself and other evidence indicates that the current management system is working well.

RECOMMENDATION 12: Extension and the university should expand and intensify efforts to broaden the funding base, both in terms of hard funding for basic program and for special interest activities of Oregon citizens and industries. In such activities, Extension should be especially cautious to avoid proliferation of program beyond its technical capacity or the reality of education as its sole mission.

The University and Extension management agree that all appropriate efforts should be made to expand and broaden the funding base of the Extension Service.

With respect to federal expansion efforts, Oregon State University has been aggressive. We have called attention of federal agencies to the advantages of using the existing Extension Service delivery system to accomplish certain desired federal goals and objectives. The most obvious example of this in the recent past is a major proposal made in 1976 to the Energy Research and Development Administration to establish a pilot program in Oregon using the Extension Service to develop better understanding on the part of the public with respect to energy conservation and use. We are pursuing this relationship and, we hope, in the coming fiscal year that authorization and funding will be available for an intensive energy conservation education program. We believe that in such a program the Extension Service is the obvious vehicle both because of the technical expertise within the University and the extensive in-place delivery service system.

The management of Extension and the University believes that it will be difficult to provide substantial new resources for expanded programs from county funds. Indeed, in the last two years it has been critical in several counties in Oregon to maintain county funding and in two, Crook and Columbia, special elections have been required for the continuation of service. Fortunately, in both cases there was strong support from the clientele being served and funds were approved by the voters. Nonetheless, it is true that there is growing pressure on county government to provide all types of services. At the same time, there is growing resistance from voters to provide funds for such services from property taxes. Since this is the principal source of funds for most of the counties in Oregon, it is unlikely that, despite generally favorable reaction to the service provided, funds for an expanded program will become available from this source. Indeed, vigorous efforts will be required to maintain county funding in a number of the critical areas of the state where the 'taxpayers' revolt' has assumed critical proportions.
With respect to other sources, the Extension Service and the University generally have been alert to attempt to achieve this type of funding. Of particular importance is the incorporation into the Oregon State University Foundation of the 4-H Club Foundation. During the last year, with sponsorship of and funds from the OSU Foundation, the 4-H Club Foundation has been provided with staff support. It now has begun to generate significant resources both to develop the 4-H Club Center near Salem and to provide enrichment funds for the 4-H program generally.

Funds from private sources generally will be relatively modest in amount and difficult to obtain. Extension can and does impose fees, particularly for services it provides. In charging fees for more of its programs, however, Extension runs the risk of failing to discharge its obligations, particularly to low-income clientele. In fact, the affirmative action plan of the Extension Service, which has been approved by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, specifically indicates that for low-income persons the services will not require the payment of fees. One of the problems, therefore, is the issue of discrimination and the charging of fees to certain clientele on the basis of ability to pay and not to others. No doubt some of these problems can and will be dealt with appropriately in the future, but for the immediate period, it does not appear likely that significant new resources can be engendered by charging more or higher fees.

The admonition that Extension should be cautious to avoid the proliferation of programs beyond its technical capacity or the reality of education is one which Extension takes seriously. It will be even more important to make that distinction in the future as the gap widens between demand for programs and the resources available to provide those programs.

RECOMMENDATION 13: Extension should take initiative in generating dialogue with state and local governmental units and with other organizations and groups to identify areas of common interest and concern and to identify opportunities for coordinating educational activities and sharing of resources to meet common needs as appropriate.

The University and the Extension Service agree that it would be appropriate to maintain open communications with units of both state and local governments and with other organizations and groups. In fact, Extension has historically maintained such a communications network and has used it effectively in many instances. It is especially important, however, in a time of rapidly changing priorities in terms of educational programming, to assure that all organizations and governmental agencies are aware of the Extension Service's capabilities. In turn, the Extension Service must be aware early in the developmental phases of interests that would use the Extension dissemination system, in lieu of creating a duplicating organization.

To this end, close relationships have been maintained and increasingly are being developed with the Executive Office of the Governor and with the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs. These two agencies are in a crucial position to assist both the Extension Service and state and local agencies to recognize opportunities for collaborative ventures and avoid duplicative and competitive ones. Particularly the Office of Intergovernmental Affairs is the agency for reviewing all applications (without regard to source) that seek federal governmental sponsorship and funding of some phase of their activities. When these activities involve an educational program, the office should be sufficiently cognizant of the capabilities of the Extension Service to recognize that a joint venture might be more appropriate than a totally independent one and refer the application to the Extension Service for comment. Increasingly, as funds for educational programming become more critical, it is anticipated that there will be stronger motivation on the part of all parties to engage in various types of cooperative activities which render smaller the incremental costs to the agencies.
RECOMMENDATION 14: Extension and community colleges should agree specifically on program responsibilities of each. Of necessity such agreements will vary from location to location and with changing needs. High priority should be given to keeping these agreements up to date.

Extension and many of the community colleges conduct joint programs. Memoranda of agreement have been developed with each of the community colleges. These memoranda, which are reviewed periodically by both parties, are viewed by Extension as an important first step in building a sound, lasting partnership with community colleges to assure that community needs are met efficiently and without duplication.

The community college has the capability of significantly augmenting the resources that are available at Oregon State University. They also have the capability of becoming a competitive and duplicatory agency if care and proper coordination are not effected.

It is not yet clear what role the Educational Coordinating Commission will have on the total aspects of interinstitutional relationship and educational planning for the State of Oregon. Adult and community education have, however, been one of the foci for their attention. In this, they have recognized the important role which Oregon State University and its Extension Service play in providing informal and widely disseminated educational opportunity for citizens of the state.

RECOMMENDATION 15: The interaction and coordination between Extension and the community colleges to assure the best use of educational resources should be taken up as a matter of concern for the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission as well as OSU Extension, the Board of Higher Education and the individual community colleges.

This recommendation is primarily directed to the Educational Coordinating Commission and the Board of Higher Education and their respective staffs. It is hoped that the Educational Coordinating Commission will assume the planning responsibility for developing an appropriate scheme for formal relationship between the Oregon State University Extension Service and other appropriate educational agencies throughout the state. Admittedly, the community colleges are the single most critical element of these educational resources. In some situations in which community colleges are not functioning, other institutions of higher education such as Eastern Oregon State College and Oregon Institute of Technology have been and, we hope, will continue to be effective partners with the Extension Service.

The University is fully willing and prepared to cooperate with the Board's Office and with the staff of the Educational Coordinating Commission in formulating plans which might be developed and presented to the Board and to the Commission.

Response to the Thirteen Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Competencies in English Composition

(Considered by Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, April 29, 1977; present--Carpenter, Daniels, Harms, Wyss.)

Staff Report to the Committee

(The matters here discussed relate to the written report in the March 25 docket, pp. 85-96, entitled, "Development of Student Writing Proficiency - 13 Recommendations." Members of the Board may wish to review that material and perhaps bring it to the April 29 meeting. A fuller treatment was also given this topic in the docket (Tab 3) for the February 25 meeting of the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs.)
At the March meeting of the Board, the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs presented a report to the Board on the subject of the response of the Committee, the Board's Office, and the institutions of the State System to the thirteen recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Competencies in English Composition.

Mrs. Carpenter presented to the Board for the Committee the eight recommendations on page 417, moving that the Board adopt them as an appropriate response to the Thirteen Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee, also appended hereto on p. 418.

Because of the lateness of the hour, Mrs. Carpenter then left the meeting to catch the bus to Medford.

In the discussion which followed, Mr. Harms offered a substitute motion to the effect that the Board adopt the Committee's recommendations except for recommendations 5 and 7 and that these be held over for further discussion and consideration at the April 29 meeting of the Committee and/or Board. The Board adopted Mr. Harms' substitute motion.

Accordingly, staff recommendations 5 and 7 to the Committee were to be considered April 29.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Harms reported that the Board's visitation committee to Eastern Oregon State College had heard some very interesting discussion from the people at Eastern Oregon State College regarding their required writing proficiency exit examination. He said he was one of those who had expressed reservations about the recommendation of the Board's Committee which would eliminate what appeared to him to be the most essential feature of the 13 Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Competencies in English Composition namely, the recommendation that the institutions drop the required vertical sequence in English composition (Wr 121, 222, 323) and teach writing as a horizontal course sequence in the freshman year (Wr 121, 122, 123). He said he still was not convinced this was not the best way to go, but that he was persuaded that there is merit in allowing the institutions flexibility as to their approach to assuring that students achieve basic writing competency.

Mrs. Carpenter emphasized again the necessity for the Board's allowing institutions flexibility and noted that the Eastern Oregon State College development of a strong, unified,"self-motivated, very mature kind of system" for assuring writing competency was evidence of the wisdom of such a policy.

President Rice noted that half of his professional career had been spent as a professor of English, and in this capacity he had devoted a great deal of his energies to improvement of student writing competencies. He said to the extent that there is a solution to the problem of writing, it lies in the total societal demand for good writing. One must observe three "don'ts," he said. Don't have too many basic courses; don't have too much faith in any single method, such as the "holistic method;" and don't have too much faith in conferences and workshops.

President Rice said concern about improvement of student writing competency is widespread and the Board ought to hold the institutions accountable for writing instruction. So far as the horizontal versus the vertical system, he said, each has advantages and disadvantages. Neither will work without total institutional commitment, and the Board is wise in not mandating one system or the other. He said total faculty commitment to improvement of student writing is not easy to get and the fact that the Board is concerned will have weight on the campuses.

Mr. Perry commented that he wished to support what had been said, noting that his organization had recently turned down a candidate for employment (a master of business administration student at one of the System institutions) because his writing sample was so poor.
President MacVicar said he was still concerned about the Board’s intent in Recommendation 7, whether this was an expression of a pious hope that the institutions would give preference in the distribution of institutional resources to those departments concerned with improvement of student writing competencies or was intended to direct the institutions that such preference was to be given. The institutions have problems with which they are struggling in the allocation of resources and cases can be made for improvement of instruction in other areas which are just as convincing as the case for improvement of instruction in writing, he continued. If the Board approves Recommendation 7, he said, he for one would take the Board seriously and would take travel funds from other segments of the institution, if necessary, and place them at the disposal of the departments and persons working in the area of writing. He said he would think the Board might encourage its institutions to assist their faculties to participate in activities leading to improvement of student writing competency without specifying allocation of travel funds and released time.

Mr. Harms said he understood the point being made by President MacVicar. However, he said, he would be reluctant to eliminate the recommendation entirely because this would indicate that the Board did not even wish to express a pious hope that its institutions would encourage their faculties to take special interest in the improvement of student writing competency.

Dr. Romney said in drafting the recommendation he had no intention of implying that the Board was expressing only a pious hope. Moreover, he said he would be greatly surprised if Oregon State University were not in the forefront of any activities looking toward improvement of instruction in writing, whatever the language adopted by the Board. Oregon State University schools and departments have shown a consistent concern with this problem and have been very active in all statewide efforts to improve student writing proficiency. Further, he said, it was not expected that faculty would engage in extended travel all over the country, but rather that a limited number would participate in state-level conferences, that a larger number would participate in regional conferences within the state, and the majority would be asked to participate in workshops on their own campuses. For most participants there would be no travel at all, he said.

Mr. Perry commented that if he were thoroughly convinced that there was an institutional commitment on the part of faculty members in all disciplines as to the importance of student writing proficiency, he would feel that Recommendation 7 was unnecessary. But, he said, such commitment is very difficult to achieve, as President Rice had noted.

Recommendation of the Committee. The Committee recommended that the Board approve Recommendations 5 and 7, as stated below.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Ater said he was unsure from the testimony whether Recommendation 7 was merely a pious hope or was intended as a mandate.

Mr. Harms said it was his understanding the Committee did not intend to provide any additional funding nor any mandate on this subject. However, the Committee recognized that the institutions would strive to implement the recommendations. The Committee agreed that the Board should encourage participation to the extent funds could be made available at the institutions.

Mr. Ater said the recommendations were very close to interfering in the management of the institutions rather than expressing a policy decision which should be made by the Board.
Mr. Wyss said it was his impression that the Committee favored discussion of this point by the full Board since it was a question which had been raised in previous discussion of writing proficiency.

President MacVicar said he and other institutional executives do take Board actions seriously and although the word "encourage" is not as forceful as "direct," it is a significant expression of the Board's intent. It is also true that if the Board were to remove the reference entirely, it might imply something which the Board might not choose to imply. President MacVicar said he had reached the conclusion that the language was perhaps not a directive nor intended to be coercive but was intended to encourage the involvement of faculty in departments of English, and perhaps other departments within the institutions, in interinstitutional activities that might be in the interests of improving instruction in the ability to communicate effectively.

Mr. Ater asked whether there was evidence that conferences and workshops were sufficiently more valuable than other methods to increase the effectiveness of faculty members. He said he was concerned about expressly encouraging these activities as opposed to others through Board action specifically mentioning such activities.

Dr. Romney said the Committee appointed two years ago to examine a number of issues relating to writing proficiency of students had made a careful examination of alternative approaches. Following this study of the situation, the Committee made 13 recommendations, including a recommendation relating to the cooperative approach to efforts to improve the quality of instruction for the improvement of writing proficiency in students. Workshops and conferences are a part of that cooperative approach and would be held throughout the state.

Mr. Harms said substituting the word "activities" for the words "state, regional, and local workshops and conferences" might better express the Board's intention. He also commented that he concurred with President MacVicar's expression of his understanding of the intent of the Committee recommendation to the Board.

Mr. Harms said a communication had been received from a group called The Conference on Language Attitudes and Composition from the Department of English at Portland State University. The communication expressed some reservations about the 13 recommendations. Mr. Harms said the report seemed to reach the conclusion that English composition and adequate writing cannot be taught at all. With respect to consideration of the communication, Mr. Harms said it had arrived very late since the matter of writing proficiency had been under consideration by the Committee and the Board for at least a year.

Dr. Romney commented that the persons in the group were speaking as individuals and did not speak for the Department of English at Portland State University. Extensive discussions were held on the 13 recommendations in the Department of English and a report was submitted on this subject to the Board's Office. There were some reservations expressed about dropping the vertical sequence and substituting the horizontal sequence, but in the main the departmental position was in agreement with efforts to proceed in accordance with the proposals of the ad hoc committee. Dr. Romney said the concerns expressed by the group would be discussed with the members of the group in the near future.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Ater said it was his understanding that many of the composition courses in the larger universities were taught by part-time faculty on various salary arrangements which might affect either their competence or morale, or both. He said he would appreciate receiving a factual analysis of the teaching of composition, particularly with respect to the use of part-time faculty. Dr. Romney assured the Board that such an analysis would be provided.
Staff Recommendations to the Committee

It was recommended:

1. That the Board direct its institutions to maintain, as an institutional objective, the development of student writing proficiency to a level appropriate to a college-educated individual.

2. That the Board continue to allow its institutions freedom to determine course, instructional, and proficiency requirements through which the institution proposes to assure the attainment of the foregoing objective.

3. That the Board direct that its institutions report periodically to the Board (as requested) as to the steps being taken by the institutions to achieve the foregoing objective.

4. That the Board commend the ad hoc committee on competencies in English composition for its efforts as recounted in the Committee report of June 4, 1976, "Thirteen Recommendations."

5. That the Board endorse as objectives toward which to strive, the recommendations of the ad hoc committee as set forth on page 418, with the following exceptions and qualifications:

   Recommendation 2 which provides "that the 'vertical' English sequence (W121, 222, 323) be discontinued at the State System institutions," runs counter to a long-standing Board policy which the Board's Office feels has merit. The policy is that the Board has allowed its institutions a large measure of freedom in establishing general education, English composition, and health and physical education requirements for graduation. Three State System institutions have vertical sequence requirements in English composition and desire to retain them.

   Recommendation 3 provides "That a standard three-term sequence (W121, 122, 123) be recognized by all Oregon colleges and universities." The Board's Office believes that State System institutions should accept in transfer toward graduation requirements, credit earned in this sequence. All do. But we do not feel that institutions should be required to adopt this sequence as a requirement for graduation.

   The Board's Office also recognizes that some of the ad hoc committee's recommendations, such as recommendation 8, which calls for each department to assure and certify that its students have achieved an adequate level of writing proficiency prior to graduation, will require experimentation and possibly modification. But they constitute a good basis for continuing interinstitutional efforts to assure student writing proficiency.

6. That the Board of Higher Education, in cooperation with the State Board of Education, establish a state advisory committee on writing proficiency; that the advisory committee be charged with fostering cooperative activities involving State System institutions, community colleges, independent colleges and universities, and public schools, aimed at increasing faculty efficiency and effectiveness in helping students develop writing skills.

7. That the State Board of Higher Education encourage its institutions to provide released time and travel funds for designated faculty to participate in state, regional, and local workshops and conferences designed to increase their effectiveness in the development of student writing skills.

8. That the Board's Office provide a part-time coordinator to work with the state advisory committee and the regional committees in planning, scheduling, and coordinating workshops, conferences, and other activities designed to assist college, university, and public school faculties to increase their effectiveness in development of student writing skills.
The Thirteen Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Competencies in English Composition

The ad hoc committee made thirteen recommendations designed, in the words of the committee to "constitute a single, feasible strategy for a mutual approach... to the total problem of literacy in Oregon's schools and colleges."

Recommendations 1 through 6 (below) are addressed (1) to the criteria governing waiver and credit earned through Advanced Placement, challenge, and examination, and (2) English composition and remedial English courses offered in Oregon colleges and universities.

1. That standard criteria and procedures be adopted for granting and transferring waiver and credit earned through Advanced Placement, challenge, and examination.

2. That the "vertical" English sequence (WR 121, 222, 323) be discontinued in the State System.

3. That a standard three-term sequence (WR 121, 122, 123) be recognized by all Oregon colleges and universities.

4. That basic prerequisites for admission to WR 121 be established.

5. That the Test of Standard Written English (TSWE) be adopted for measuring the basic prerequisites needed for entry into WR 121.

6. That there be developed a consistent statewide system for numbering of and granting credit for remedial courses.

Recommendations 7 and 8 are key recommendations for they assert the view that the responsibility for development of writing competencies rests with all levels of education, and with all faculties and all public school teachers, whatever the subject matter being taught.

7. That all teachers of all disciplines--kindergarten through graduate school--be enlisted in the development and maintenance of student writing skills.

8. That each department of all post-secondary institutions be asked to assure and to certify that its students have achieved an adequate level of writing proficiency prior to graduation.

Recommendations 9, 10 and 11 relate to action designed to assure development of student writing proficiencies in the public schools.

9. That standard English writing and communication be emphasized in grades 9-12.

10. That work in language, advanced composition, and the teaching of composition be emphasized in the preparation of teachers for the elementary and secondary grades.

11. That a statewide, continuing system of in-service professional development of elementary and secondary language arts teachers be developed.

Finally, recommendations 12 and 13 speak to the desirability of continuing collaboration of English composition faculties in Oregon's colleges and universities.

12. That active dialogue among English composition faculties of Oregon's colleges and universities be maintained.

13. That the ad hoc committee be established as a permanent, rotating, statewide body advisory to Oregon postsecondary institutions in the area of English composition.
Mr. Harms said the Amazon Community Tenants' Association had requested an opportunity to appear before the Board and that Mr. John Ralston would make the presentation.

Mr. Harms said personally he had some serious reservations about the propriety of this request being made to the Board because the matter under discussion was one of institutional prerogative. It was pointed out also that prior to the time the University of Oregon renders a report on the rent increase to the Board, an outside study will be completed by the firm of Haskins and Sells. University officials have requested that the report from the institution be deferred until June.

Mr. John Ralston, representing the Amazon Community Tenants' Association, said at the time of the open hearing on the proposed rent increase for married student housing at the University of Oregon, on May 17, 1977, Amazon Community Tenants presented carefully documented evidence and testimony to show that under normal responsible management no rent increase would be necessary at this time. Furthermore, it was alleged and since demonstrated that if a rent increase is now necessary, it has been made so by willful mismanagement of money and resources allocated for the operation of married student housing. Mr. Ralston said as a result of this mismanagement, rates for married student housing continue to climb, but services, and in many cases essential services, decline, deteriorate, or are denied. He said copies of that testimony and evidence had been distributed to Board members. Mr. Ralston then distributed and read into the record a memorandum, dated May 3, 1977, addressed to John D. Thorpe, Director of Married Student Housing. The memorandum was signed by Sally Smith, Assistant Director of Married Student Housing. A copy, provided by Mr. Ralston, is on file in the Board's Office.

Mr. Ralston said this memorandum from within the Housing Office management itself argues the essential points of the case against the proposed rent increase. He stressed the similarities between the preliminary budget report of the Amazon Community Tenants' Association and the memorandum.

Mr. Ralston expressed confidence that after a careful review of the assembled evidence, the Board would decline to approve any rent increase for married student housing and also would initiate a vigorous investigation into the conditions and circumstances which have made an increase seem necessary.

Mr. Ater said he agreed this was a matter for the University of Oregon to resolve and present evidence was that the matter would be examined during the coming month. However, Mr. Ater said the Board should be concerned with instances of mismanagement that might exist in the institutions and often the Board must depend on the constituencies of higher education to bring these matters to the attention of the Board. Mr. Ater said that what should and probably will happen is that an acceptable solution will be reached after further discussion at the University of Oregon.

Mr. Ralston responded that an effort had been made to work with the Housing Office and the University administration but the Board is the ultimate court of appeal when such efforts are unsuccessful.

Mr. Stewart said this is a perennial problem and one solution might be to liquidate the housing.

Rental Rates for University of Oregon Married Student Housing

It was recommended that the Board receive the following report and defer to a special meeting on June 24, 1977, the receipt of the formal report of institutional action to set rental rates for married student housing for the 1977-78 fiscal year at the University of Oregon, Eastern Oregon State College, Oregon State University, and Southern Oregon State College.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

The following policy was adopted by the Board at its meeting on March 27, 1973:

1. The rental rates for married student housing at each institution shall be established for each fiscal year by the institutional executive, with the approval of the Chancellor and reported to the Board by June 1 of the preceding fiscal year.

2. The rental rates so established shall be the minimum required to meet:
   a. Debt service requirements.
   b. Current maintenance costs.
   c. Establishment of maintenance reserves prudently required for major projects having a multi-year value.
   d. Establishment of such reserves as may be required to cover costs of ultimate demolition or other removal of the housing when it has outlived its usefulness.

3. The rental rates will be established after a public hearing at the institution.

On May 24, the Chancellor's Office received the following communication from Vice President Hawk of the University of Oregon:

Several things have happened in the past few days which make it necessary for the University of Oregon to request that the Chancellor's Office delay in reporting to the Board the decisions of the University in setting housing rates for the next fiscal year for Amazon and other married student housing. Originally Mr. Barnhart submitted to you the following suggested rental rates to apply to our married student projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMAZON</th>
<th>WESTMORELAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedroom</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedroom</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be our wish now to make no presentation at the Board meeting on Friday but to request that the Board consider our recommendations at the adjourned session to be held in Ashland on June 24. It is my understanding that the decision to adjourn the Klamath Falls meeting will also be necessary to consider an item proposed by Oregon State University.

Mr. Al Lederer, project head for the Haskins & Sells team to review our rental structures for married student housing and make recommendations on their organization and management, has indicated that they cannot be ready for the May 27 Board meeting. Their report will be available to us some time in the first week of June, which should give us sufficient opportunity to evaluate their recommendations and involve all parties in discussion prior to making any final recommendations to President Boyd on the rent structure for next year.
I will be prepared to answer any questions which may be asked at the Klamath Falls Board meeting, but I will not make any statement at that meeting unless called upon. It is my intention at this moment to simply request the postponement. By a copy of this letter I am notifying ACT of my intentions.

The request seems reasonable and is similar to a request received favorably by the Board at its meeting in May of 1975.

Representatives of the Amazon tenants plan to be present at the May 27 meeting and have requested the opportunity to present information to the Board at that time. They are aware that the Board is not expected to take action on Amazon rental rates but believe that a presentation at this time is preferable for them, since several of the tenants affected will be unable to attend the June 24 meeting.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The Board's staff recommended that it be authorized to sell to The Commercial Bank of Silverton for $117,425 cash a lot and building located at the southwest corner of Main and Second Streets, Silverton, Oregon. Authorization to sell includes preparation by the Board's legal counsel of the necessary documents for signature by the Board President and Secretary.

The proceeds of the sale will be placed in the Charles H. Hoyt and Gladys Hoyt Memorial Fund, in accordance with Mr. Hoyt's will, for use by Oregon State University "...for the financial assistance of deserving and serious university students to further continue their education. Such may be by way of loans, grants, or other methods of providing assistance to such students."

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

In accordance with the last will and testament of Charles H. Hoyt, Oregon State University became the legatee of the premises including the building which was at the time the will was executed and continues to be leased to The Commercial Bank. The will provided that the bank would be given first opportunity to purchase the premises "at the proper price." The initial lease with the bank was entered into on October 21, 1960, by Charles H. and Gladys C. Hoyt. It covered the period January 1, 1961, through December 31, 1972, and provided for two, 5-year renewals of the lease as well as the opportunity to purchase which the bank could exercise at any time.

On June 22, 1971, Mr. C. B. Anderson, named executor of the C. H. Hoyt will, assigned the lease on the property to Oregon State University. The gift was reported to the Board on March 22, 1972, at which time the bequest was valued at $93,440.99.

On November 24, 1972, the Board's staff and the bank executed the first of the two, 5-year extensions of the lease agreement covering the period January 1, 1973, through December 31, 1977. In mid-December 1976, Mr. E. George Ottum, President, The Commercial Bank, informed Oregon State University officials that the bank's Board of Directors was interested in exercising its option to purchase the property.
The Board's staff directed Oregon State University officials to obtain an updated appraisal of the property. The appraised value was reported to the Board on March 25, 1977, and the Board authorized the Board's staff to proceed with negotiations with Oregon State University officials and The Commercial Bank.

On May 9, 1977, Oregon State University officials received from Mr. E. George Ottum, President, The Commercial Bank of Silverton, the offer to purchase the property. The offer letter included a suggested closing date of December 31, 1977, the expiration date of the first extension of the original lease. Since the terms of the lease do not exclude the possibility of an earlier closing date, the Board's staff has asked that Mr. Ottum consider an earlier closure. This request will be presented at the next meeting of the bank's Board of Directors.

The bank's offer exceeds the March 4, 1977, market value reported by the private appraiser retained by Oregon State University officials.

Vice President Harms announced that the meetings of the Board's Committees will be held on the campus of Southern Oregon State College, on Friday, June 24, 1977. The Board visitation committee will visit the campus prior to the meetings. There will be an adjourned Board meeting in connection with the Committee meetings. The next regular Board meeting will be held at Portland State University on July 29, 1977.

At the request of Mr. Harms, Mr. Ingalls read the following Certificate of Recognition honoring Dean Gordon W. Gilkey of Oregon State University:

Certificate of Recognition
Honoring
Dean G. W. Gilkey

May 27, 1977

The members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education wish to express their warm appreciation to Gordon W. Gilkey, who is retiring as Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at Oregon State University.

In a long and dedicated career of public service that has spanned thirty years at Oregon State, Dean Gilkey has distinguished himself and his institution as teacher, administrator and artist.

His deep sense of caring, his unyielding persistence to the ideals of his profession, and his intense loyalty to his institution and its students have been a major force in the development of broad learning opportunities on his campus.

Dean Gilkey's creative talents and contributions in the field of art have gained national and international recognition, and have won the respect and admiration of all who know him. He also has worked long and hard in the field of the humanities, and played significant roles in the establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, the Oregon Arts Commission, and four State System of Higher Education study centers abroad and student exchanges from the cooperating institutions.

Dean Gilkey has compiled an outstanding record of achievement, and the members of the Board wish to acknowledge the many contributions he has made, not only to his institution and to his state, but to society. We extend to him our sincerest wishes for many happy days ahead.

Upon motion by Mr. Ingalls, the Board adopted the Certificate of Recognition as read, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.
Certificate of Recognition

Honoring
John Lowe Watson

May 27, 1977

We, the members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, wish to take this opportunity to thank John Watson publicly for his thirty years of service to the State System of Higher Education.

John is "closing out the books" as Controller and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration. He has compiled an outstanding record in the esoteric world of accounting, with its payrolls and payouts, and such bewildering functions as exit conferences, kill lists, encumbrances, indirect costs and PDB's and OPE. He is also leaving behind the distinction of being the most prolific checkwriter in the history of the State System. While he may not be readily recognized by many people, his name is, having appeared on more than two and a quarter million checks, few of which bounced.

As a certified public accountant, John has managed the State System's intricate network of high finance with quiet diligence and dignity, and never missed a payroll along the way. He has gained the respect and confidence of all who know him, and the reputation of being a wise and prudent counselor in insurance investments.

John's concern, however, has not been confined to the world of calculators and computers; it has reached out to people. This concern led to the installation of the first ramp and the first reserved parking space for the handicapped on the Oregon State University campus.

John has been doubly blessed in life; he not only has excelled in his profession but in the equally difficult art of being a thoroughly decent human being. The members of the Board wish to acknowledge his outstanding achievements in both areas, and to extend to him and to his wife, Jeanice, our best wishes for the future.

Upon motion by Mr. Harms, the Board adopted the Certificate of Recognition as read, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Peves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.

Appointment of Nominating Committee

Mr. Harms appointed Miss McIntyre, Mr. Stewart, and Mr. Ingalls as members of the nominating committee for the election of officers of the Board during the coming year. Mr. Stewart was named as chairman of the committee with the request that a report be presented to the adjourned meeting of the Board in June.

Appreciation to OIT

Mr. Stewart expressed appreciation on behalf of the visitation committee to President Light and the staff at Oregon Institute of Technology for a very enjoyable visitation. Mr. Harms concurred.
Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Philip C. Patterson, project architect, Medford, the work of the prime contractor for the addition of six handball courts to McNeal Hall, the Physical Education Building at Southern Oregon State College, was accepted as of March 28, 1977. The work was inspected on behalf of the Board by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on September 28, 1976:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 3/28/77</th>
<th>Original Budget 9/28/76</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Jack Mathis General Contractor, Inc., Roseburg</td>
<td>$186,512</td>
<td>$178,622</td>
<td>$7,890 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>16,266</td>
<td>16,076</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>9,730</td>
<td>(6,798)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>(3,572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$205,710</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$(2,290)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes the rerouting of an existing drain line; the installation of nine additional beams at the Gallery, and the drilling of nine equally spaced eight-inch holes through the concrete slab into the underfloor duct; and the installation of finished hardwood floors in two courts, all within four approved change orders.

(2) The "savings" of $2,290 will be applied to the development of other approved portions of the Recreational Facilities project, including the baseball field.

The work of the contract provided approximately 7,070 square feet of gross area in a reinforced concrete structure containing six handball courts, a corridor, a mechanical room and a viewing gallery. The structure was erected at the north side of the existing Physical Education Building, Roy W. McNeal Hall.

Funds for the project were provided from self-liquidating bond borrowings issued under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or from other balances available for auxiliary enterprises as part of the total expenditure limitation of $455,000 for Recreational Facilities authorized by Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - SOSC Recreational Facilities (Handball Courts)

Architect - Philip C. Patterson, Medford

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 592, Oregon Laws 1973

Estimated total gross area - 7,070 square feet

Total project costs $205,710
Direct construction costs:

- Total: $186,512
- Average (per square foot): $26.38

Financing plan:

- Bond borrowings under provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution and/or balances available for auxiliary enterprises as follows:
  - Original allotment for Handball Courts: $200,000
  - Transfer from allotment of $75,000 for Baseball Field: $2,710
  - "Savings" from previous allotment for Track Improvements: $3,000
  - Total: $205,710

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of Oregon State University, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Gordon and Associates, Inc., Corvallis, for a flammable storage facility in the Oceanography and Earth Sciences Complex were accepted on behalf of the Board. Three bids were received for the work on April 26, 1977, ranging from a low of $17,870.59 to a high of $22,519.00.

Inasmuch as the low bid was within the funding resources available, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

- Direct construction costs - Ton Koopman, Salem: $17,870.59
- Professional services fees: $1,608.35
- Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs: $621.06
- Contingencies: $300.00
- Total: $20,400.00

The work of the contract includes the construction of a semi-underground concrete block building of approximately 212 square feet for the storage of flammable liquids used in the laboratories in the Earth Sciences complex, including the Oceanography buildings. The structure is being built just north of the Wilkinson Hall auditorium. It will be roofed with a reinforced concrete slab and revetted around the exterior with additional earth retained by a short concrete wall six feet away from the building. The roof is to be provided with a skylight capable of being blown out from the interior and all wiring is explosion proof.

The estimated expenditure requirements of $20,400 are being charged against the budget allocation of $1,650,000 for safety deficiency corrections, Phase I, at Oregon State University, funded as part of the program authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975.
Meeting #438-62
Board's priority - Part of No. 1 in 1975-1977 (Educational and General Plant)

Legislative authorization - Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975

Total project costs $ 20,400.00
Total direct construction costs $ 17,870.59
Scheduled completion - September 1977

Tentative financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $10,200.00
- Article XI-G bond proceeds 10,200.00
- Total $ 20,400.00

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of Oregon State University officials, including E. F. Gilstrap, Assistant to the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Stations and staff architect for the project, the work of the prime contractor for the new cereal building for the Hyslop Field Laboratory (located north of Corvallis at Granger) was accepted on behalf of the Board as of February 15, 1977, subject to the completion of items on the punchlist.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on September 28, 1976:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2/15/77</th>
<th>Original Budget 9/28/76</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs</td>
<td>$91,857</td>
<td>$88,157</td>
<td>$3,700 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berge Brothers Enterprises, Inc., Oregon City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station costs</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>(1,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,443</td>
<td>(4,443) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$93,957</td>
<td>$96,300</td>
<td>$(2,443)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes changing steel siding and roofing to have white baked-on enamel finish; replacing old sewer pipe; finishing west wall of existing seed cleaning room, all within three approved change orders.

(2) Unused balances will be used for other Agricultural Experiment Station projects.

The work of the contract provided a metal-covered one-story storage building containing a gross area of approximately 6,480 square feet. The building was erected on a concrete foundation and concrete slab and raised well above the existing grade level so as to preclude ground water from entering the building and contaminating the stored grain.

The project was financed from resources available to the Agricultural Experiment Stations from the 1975-1976 and 1976-1977 operating budgets.
RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

May 27, 1977

Project - OSU Hyslop Field Laboratory Cereal Building

Architect - Eugene F. Gilstrap, Staff Architect, Agricultural Experiment Stations, OSU

Board's priority - Not applicable

Legislative authorization - Actions of the State Emergency Board on May 28 and August 13, 1976

Gross area of building - 6,480 square feet (exclusive of covered court)

Total project costs: $93,857

Total direct construction costs, including site work and outside utilities: $91,857

Direct construction costs of building only: $85,100

Average (per square foot) - $13.13

Financing plan:
Operating budget resources available to the Agricultural Experiment Stations at Oregon State University during 1975-1977: $93,857

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and C. W. Timmer Associates, Inc., consulting engineers, Beaverton, the work of the prime contractor for electrical revisions within the Farm Crops Building and Langton Hall at Oregon State University were accepted on behalf of the Board as of March 17, 1977.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on November 19, 1976:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/17/77</td>
<td>11/19/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'C Electric, Inc., Stayton</td>
<td>$36,049</td>
<td>$35,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>4,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$41,800</td>
<td>$41,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Installing 3 electrical outlets in Farm Crops Room 4-13; deleting 3 locksets in Farm Crops Room 101 & 202 and SE exit door; installing additional light fixtures; adding 5 motor switches in Langton Hall to exhaust fans; all included within four approved change orders.
The work of the contract included the installation of a new electrical main panel, new branch panels, and the rewiring of the entire electrical system within the Fann Crops Building and the installation of corridor lighting, new disconnect switches and other minor revisions within Langton Hall.

The total expenditure requirements of $41,800 are being charged against the budget allocation of $1,650,000 for safety deficiency corrections, Phase I, at Oregon State University, funded as part of the program authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I, (Fann Crops Building and Langton Hall Electrical Revisions)

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

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975

Total project costs $41,800

Total direct construction costs $36,049

Financing plan:
- General Fund appropriation $20,900
- Article XI-G bond proceeds 20,900
- Total $41,800

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Portland, project architects, the work of the two prime contractors for the remodeling work in the Main Science Building at the University of Oregon was accepted on behalf of the Board as of March 16, 1977, subject to the completion of items on the architects' punchlist for Basic Bid "A." The work was inspected on behalf of the Board by the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.

A revised semifinal project budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on July 20, 1976:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Revised Budget 3/16/77</th>
<th>Original Budget 7/20/76</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Bid &quot;A&quot; - A. E. Stafford, Eugene</td>
<td>$258,506</td>
<td>$247,634</td>
<td>$10,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Bid &quot;B&quot; - Howard Nelson Construction Co., Eugene</td>
<td>17,957</td>
<td>16,640</td>
<td>1,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>$276,463</td>
<td>$264,274</td>
<td>$12,189 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>27,646</td>
<td>26,427</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>24,391</td>
<td>16,656</td>
<td>7,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings and equipment</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>36,143 (2)</td>
<td>(36,143) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$355,000</td>
<td>$(5,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Includes the addition of parquet flooring; filling concrete floor slabs to eliminate depressions; addition of a floor drain and hot water hose bibb in Room 204A; modifications to cabinets to fit new uses; the remodeling of Room 204F (not previously included in contract); the sealing of reconditioned countertops; modifications to various sinks and their fittings; provisions for plaster resurfacing on walls in specific areas; relocation of electrical outlets; the addition of a floor drain and hot water hose bibb in Room 335B; provisions for new waste and primer in Room 336; addition of corridor numerals; painting of corridor metal raceways; and other minor modifications included within five approved change orders (three on Basic Bid "A" and two on Basic Bid "B").

Included $15,000 for possible reinstatement of items previously deferred.

The budget "savings" were applied to other units of work authorized within the expenditure limitation for Various Campus Buildings Remodel, UO.

The work of the two contracts altered and renovated approximately 9,700 square feet of space in the north end of the second and third floors in the Main Science Building. The space was converted into various research and teaching laboratories, offices, animal colony spaces, etc., for use by the Biopsychology Group of the Psychology Department. Both new and renovated cabinet work and fixtures as well as mechanical and electrical revisions were included.

Of the total project budget, $320,000 is being charged against the expenditure limitation of $1,430,000 for various remodeling projects at the University of Oregon, funded and authorized within Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975. The remaining $30,000, which is applicable to work covered in Basic Bid "B" and related items, is being provided from capital outlay building use credits available to the institution from instructional and research contracts and grants.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - UO Main Science Remodel

Architects - Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, Portland

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 331, Oregon Laws 1975

Total project costs
Total direct construction costs
Approximate area remodeled - 9,700 square feet
Average cost per square foot - $28.50

Tentative financing plan:
General Fund appropriation $160,000
Article XI-G bond proceeds 160,000
Capital outlay building use credits 30,000
Total $350,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Meeting #438-66

Staff Report to the Board

Report of
Inspection of
Safety Deficiency
Corrections,
Weniger Hall Fume Collection System, OSU

Acceptance of
Upon the recommendation of institutional officials and Morrison, Funatake & Safety Deficiency Associates, Inc., consulting engineers, Portland, the work of the prime contractor for improvements to the fume collection system within Weniger Hall at Oregon State University was accepted on behalf of the Board as of April 13, 1977.

Hall Fume Collection System

A revised semifinal budget is shown below in comparison with the budget reported to the Board on May 25, 1976:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Budget 4/13/77</th>
<th>Original Budget 5/25/76</th>
<th>Increase or (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs - Armquist Sheet Metal, Salem</td>
<td>$55,269</td>
<td>$59,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>4,974</td>
<td>5,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>13,057</td>
<td>6,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$73,300</td>
<td>$73,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes steam cleaning fifteen clogged heating coils and a fume hood; removing old plaster and resurfacing walls and a ceiling; installing stainless steel collar in a fume hood; replacing perchloric acid system in Room Nos. 216 and 229; and reducing the allowances provided in the contract for fan replacements inasmuch as several fans could be retained in use; all within five approved change orders.

(2) Includes funds reserved for replacement of fans during the summer by the Physical Plant Department.

The work of the contract revised the fume hood exhaust system ductwork, adjusted and cleaned existing exhaust fans, and installed new fans as their condition was determined to warrant. Cost allowances were provided in the contract for new fans as required.

The total budget expenditure of $73,300 is being charged against the allocation of $1,650,000 for safety deficiency corrections, Phase I, at Oregon State University, funded as part of the program authorized by Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975.

RECAPITULATION UPON INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

Project - OSU Safety Deficiency Corrections, Phase I, (Weniger Hall Fume Collection System)

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

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

Legislative authorization - Chapter 48, Oregon Laws 1975

Total project costs $ 73,300

Total direct construction costs $ 55,269

Financing plan:

General Fund appropriation $36,650

Article XI-G bond proceeds 36,650

Total $ 73,300
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, the Board's staff has acknowledged the acceptance of the final drawings and specifications prepared by Architect Richard Danielson, Eugene, for a proposed addition to the Pine Mountain Observatory to accommodate the new 32-inch diameter telescope now being built for the institution by Sigma Research, Inc., in Richland, Washington. The new instrument will be the largest optical telescope in the northwestern United States and will provide additional research capability for astronomers and students at the University. It will have four times the light gathering power of the present 15-inch telescope and nearly twice the power of the 24-inch instrument. The site is about 30 miles southeast of Bend, at 6,300 feet--an elevation about 2,000 feet above the floor of Oregon's high desert.

Funds for the acquisition of the telescope, the building addition and other improvements at the Pine Mountain Observatory were authorized by the State Emergency Board on January 9, 1976. It is estimated that the direct construction costs of the concrete block structure will be approximately $36,781, averaging about $43.06 for the gross area of 854 square feet. These figures exclude the expenditure requirements of $18,500 for the prefabricated dome which has been purchased and will be delivered when the building is ready for its installation. They also exclude amounts budgeted for professional services fees, equipment (such as $104,000 for the new telescope), contingencies, etc. The total expenditure requirements for the improvements and certain salary costs are expected to be about $180,500. Of this total, an allocation of $107,500 was made from the Emergency Fund appropriation, $43,000 was provided from the contingency reserve for the Department of Higher Education (appropriated to the Emergency Board by Chapter 558, Oregon Laws 1975), and the remaining $30,000 is being made available from institutional resources.

Bids for the construction are now being solicited and are expected to be received in Eugene on May 24. Tentative approval of the plans has been obtained from the U. S. Forest Service, from whom the site is being leased, but final authorization to proceed will be requested from that agency if satisfactory construction bids are received.

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 Health Sciences Center, the final drawings and specifications which had been prepared with the assistance of Zimmer/Gunsul/Frasca Partnership, Architects, Portland, for remodeling work within the basement of the Dental School Building were accepted on behalf of the Board.

Six bids were received for the project on April 19, 1977, ranging from a low of $193,349 to a high of $228,229. Inasmuch as the lowest basic bid was within the funding resources available, a contract award was made and the following tentative budget was approved for the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct construction costs -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Building Contractors, Inc., Beaverton</td>
<td>$193,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional services fees</td>
<td>$19,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction supervision and miscellaneous costs</td>
<td>$12,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>$15,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$241,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The work of the contract includes alterations to an area of approximately 5,503 square feet which will provide offices, operatory, laboratory and conference rooms for the Department of Continuing Education, as well as the construction of a new grade-level entrance to this area. Efforts will be made to conserve the amount budgeted for contingencies to the extent possible so that one or more of the additive alternates can be exercised during the construction period. One of the alternates would provide for the addition of an oxygen and nitrous oxide system and another would modify the interior finish to include a wood strip ceiling.

The estimated expenditure requirements of $241,000 are being provided from gifts and grants principally through the Oregon Foundation for Dental Research and Development with the assistance of the Alumni Association of the School of Dentistry.

RECAPITULATION UPON RECEIPT OF BIDS AND CONTRACT AWARD

Project - UOHS Dental School Continuing Education Department Alterations
Architects - Zimmer/Gunsul/Frasca Partnership, Portland
Board's priority - Not applicable
Legislative authorization - Emergency Board action on November 19, 1976
Total project costs $ 241,000
Approximate area to be remodeled - 5,503 square feet
Total direct construction costs
   Average cost per square foot - $35.13
   $ 193,349
Scheduled completion - August 1977
Tentative financing plan:
   Oliver Garret quasi-endowment gift account $ 45,000
   Other gifts, principally through the Oregon Foundation for Dental Research and Development
   Total 196,000
   $ 241,000

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of Portland State University, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 70.146, arrangements have been made with Allen L. Greene, A.I.A., Portland, for architectural services relating to portions of the rehabilitation of the nine residential buildings leased to Portland Student Services, Inc., authorized previously by the Board and the State Emergency Board in the total amount of $500,000. Compensation to the architect shall be based upon time and materials not to exceed $14,000.

Contractual arrangements have also been made with Burgstahler, Holmes, Carlson, consulting engineers, Portland, for assistance (principally structural engineering) in connection with the total rehabilitation project. This firm previously had rendered a report to Portland Student Services, Inc., outlining various conditions within the buildings requiring correction. Payment for their professional services and expenses shall not exceed $6,000 without prior written authorization from the Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning.
Funds required for these architectural and engineering services are being provided from proceeds from the sale of self-liquidating bonds under the provisions of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Staff Report to the Board

Upon the recommendation of officials of Portland State University, and in accordance with the provisions of AR 70.146, arrangements have been made with Philip Thompson, Portland, for architectural services relating to the design and contract administration of the proposed remodeling of the Smith Memorial Center for which legislative authorization is being requested in 1977-1979. Of the total estimated project cost of $610,000, it is expected that the direct construction costs would be approximately $373,560.

Compensation to the architect shall be based upon time and materials within a maximum limitation of 10% of the direct construction costs. Funds for the planning are being provided from excess sinking fund reserves available from commingled student building fees.

The professional services agreement stipulates that the architect shall keep an associate, Igor Sazevich, current with the general progress of the planning and construction supervision so that in the event of the disability or incapacity of the architect, Mr. Sazevich will, upon written notification from the Board's Office, assume the rights and responsibilities of the architect as outlined in the agreement.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, April 29, 1977; present--Ingalls, McIntyre, McLaurin, Stewart.)

Staff Report to the Committee

This document has been prepared to provide a status report of the administrative data processing-related activities of the Department of Higher Education from the perspective of actions by the Legislature, the Board of Higher Education and the Department. No recommendations for Board action are made in this report. The document outline is as follows:

I. Background
II. Functions of the Office of Educational Systems
III. 1975-1977 Objectives and Accomplishments
IV. 1977-1979 Plans and Objectives
V. Summary

Some of the material contained herein is historical; it is included for continuity.

I. BACKGROUND

The Department has utilized computers and related data processing equipment for administrative and academic program needs since the late 1950's. Computing activities have grown substantially and, coupled with the utilization of data communications techniques and improved technology, have evolved into an Oregon higher education computer network. This network enables the Department to make more effective use of campus and central computer capabilities than otherwise would be possible.
Studies of network concepts were initiated in the Department in the late 1960's. They continued under legislative directives into the early 1970's. A Department network plan, approved by the Board of Higher Education, was approved "in concept" by the Legislature in February 1974.

Use of computing capabilities has continued to expand in support of all Department programs. One measure of usage is the annual expenditure for computing activities. In 1971-72 the total was approximately 3.4 million dollars; the estimate for 1976-77 is 9.1 million dollars. Although the latter figure represents only about 2% of the total Department budget, computing activities affect every program and individual within the Department.

The three areas of application of computer use are:

A. Administration

The primary emphasis in this area has been the Financial Management System (FMS) and related applications. This application base is expanding to include personnel and budget administration and, most recently, Student Information Systems (SIS).

B. Academic

The primary use in this area has been as problem-solving tools for both instruction and research. Recently, greater emphasis has been placed on the study of computers and on using computers as an instructional aid.

C. Health Sciences

This area of utilization includes both direct and indirect patient care and related activities plus instruction, hospital administration and research.

II. FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

The administrative control and authority over the Department's computer resources is a management function of the Chancellor's Office. The Office of Educational Systems was established to carry out this function. In addition to a Vice Chancellor who reports to the Chancellor, the function is supported by a central administrative staff.

The effective coordination of the Department's computer resources depends heavily on institutional involvement. The primary group in the committee structure designed to assure continuing involvement is the Computer Policy Council, established pursuant to action of the Board of Higher Education in its meeting on July 24, 1972. It includes a representative of each institution (appointed on recommendation of the President). The Council is advisory to the Vice Chancellor of Educational Systems. Its charge is policy development.

The Computer Policy Council is assisted in its activities by user task groups and subgroups. Activities of three major subgroups are described below:

- The Administrative Systems Group reviews administrative applications, recommends the extent to which development and implementation of such systems can be shared, and recommends to the Council the order of priority for development and implementation.

- The Academic Systems Group has the same functions with respect to major academic systems as the Administrative Systems Group. The more distributive functions of the academic network require that the Academic Systems Group hold meetings for the instruction and research users at regular intervals, respond to user requests and problems, and seek users' views independent of common applications.
The Campus Computing Representatives group meets to discuss automated data processing equipment acquisitions, operational matters concerning computing service, data processing planning and budgets, and Department of Higher Education proposal requests.

In summary, the functions of the Office of Educational Systems include development of plans, reports, and documentation for the Chancellor, the Computer Policy Council, and the State Board of Higher Education; coordination and control of activities as dictated by Department policy including planning, implementation and performance review of academic and administrative systems; coordination with college and university administrators and faculty for the development of academic and administrative systems; coordination with other Department offices including coordination with the Office of Administration relative to data processing and budget matters, and with the Office of Academic Affairs relative to computer services supporting the programs of that Office; and coordination of Department activities with other State agencies and offices.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS OBJECTIVES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR 1975-1977

This and the following sections represent a summary of the progress of the administrative data processing components of the current network plan. It includes the major effort of the past two years to establish an administrative data processing network and to create managerial guidelines, therefore insuring the effective and efficient service necessary to support administrative information needs of the Department.

A. Objective

Establish a central administrative network capability for administrative systems.

Accomplishment

The network plan proposed a centralized data processing facility in Corvallis to serve the general administrative data processing needs of the institutions. Two major actions were necessary to establish this facility: (1) the installation of a new computer which would support the remote processing needs of the institutions and (2) the development of a management and accounting philosophy for serving a department-wide customer base on a self-sustaining basis.

The Data Services Center started the transition to a self-sustaining basis July 1, 1973. This has helped to insure that all customers of the facility are charged for services on an equitable basis. In addition, a customer services office within the Center was established to further insure fair and equal treatment of all customers and institutions using the facility.

After an extensive (about one year) selection process, a new central network computer was delivered July 1975. The conversion effort, of about one year, resulted in the conversion of the existing administrative data processing systems (the Financial Management System and others) to the new computer, and the training of the Center staff to work with and operate the new computer.

During the conversion period, changes and modifications to the existing administrative systems suggested by the Controller's Office and the institutions were generally held in abeyance (unless critical) until conversion was completed. Based on current staff assignments, completed
service requests are projected to be on a targeted 60-day completion schedule by August 1977. Improvements in system maintenance will continue to be made as a more formal computer system maintenance procedure is developed in conjunction with the users of administrative systems and the Center.

In addition to installation of the new computer in Corvallis, remote job processing computer terminal capability has been placed at:

Portland State University
University of Oregon
Oregon State University
Eastern Oregon State College
Oregon Institute of Technology
Southern Oregon State College

These terminal devices allow the institutions to access the central computer for meeting a number of their administrative needs. It is anticipated that terminals will be installed at Oregon College of Education and the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center in the 1977-1979 biennium.

B. Objective

Development of new and enhanced administrative applications to meet institutional needs.

Accomplishment

To determine institutional administrative needs and to identify the ongoing administrative computer system development efforts, 150 interviews were conducted with presidents and administrators in 1971. The purposes of these interviews were to determine the functions and objectives of each administrative area, to derive the information (files, data, etc.) needs of the area, to identify the problems of information about the needs for future (planned) operational goals for each administrative area. The results of these interviews indicated a lack of, and consequently a high priority for, an integrated system approach to processing student information. The Student Information System project was initiated in 1973. It is further discussed under Objective D., page 437.

Also as a result of these interviews, a second priority was identified that reflected an expansion of the business and accounting systems of the Department. As part of the ongoing systems planning process following the computer selection and conversion process, the institutions were asked to reaffirm their needs and priorities for areas of administrative data processing systems development. The Administrative Systems Group reviewed institutional needs and adopted a prioritized list at the November 1976 meeting. The list was subsequently reviewed and supported by the Computer Policy Council. The list encompasses the administrative areas of institutional need for the development of "common" (one administrative system serving all institutions) data processing systems:

1. Personnel Management
2. Accounts Receivable
3. Budget Control
4. Encumbrance System Improvements
5. Accounts Payable System Improvements
6. Inventory (Property) Management
7. Physical Plant Accounting/Scheduling
8. Cost Accounting for Service Departments
Before development (computer programming) can commence on any of the above applications systems, a feasibility study and cost/benefit analysis will be made. After internal review, these analyses (as per Executive Department policy) will be forwarded for review and approval to the Data Systems Division, Executive Department; the Joint Legislative Data Processing Committee; and finally, the Emergency Board.

Following approval, development and implementation of the proposed new systems will be carried out by the Department of Higher Education using carefully developed methodology designed to structure the new systems and enhancements to conform to administrative needs, as expressed by the institutional users.

C. Objective

Improve management reporting capabilities for the institutions and Board’s Office.

Accomplishment

This objective is in support of the primary goal of meeting overall information needs of the respective administrative areas. However, it is concerned with the more immediate and specialized information reporting requirements of management as differentiated from the more procedural and clerical oriented administrative applications that are commonly recognized. Integration of information from a number of administrative areas to reflect detail in aggregate is an example of this type of special management reporting.

To help achieve the objective of improved management at both the institution and the Board’s Office level, a number of data processing tools have been reviewed during the past eight months. These tools, called "file management systems," produce reports for management "on demand" (one-time reports) or on a continuing basis. The tools will give institutional administration a flexibility of management information reporting that is sensitive to management style and program needs.

It is anticipated that such tools and associated services from the Data Services Center will be fully operational by Fall Term 1977. This service will be supported by trained campus representatives and will utilize the remote processing network of terminals linked to the Data Services Center.

D. Objective

Initiate the Phase II contract for Student Information Systems.

Accomplishment

As mentioned earlier, a high priority was determined in 1971 for the development of a student information system. This kind of system includes processing functions for admissions, demographic information of students, a pre-registration methodology, student and classroom scheduling, billing of students, financial aid awards, grade and transcript reporting, and alumni and development fund activities.

To initiate the development of this system with an outside contractor, the Deans and Vice Presidents for Administration reviewed the recommended project and forwarded it to the Computer Policy Council for further review and action in June 1972. After consideration of alternatives, the Computer Policy Council voted to contract with an outside vendor,
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Systems and Computer Technology Corporation (SCT), for development of student information systems. SCT was selected after a series of interviews and reference analysis of vendors with student information system experience.

During Board review, the Finance Committee recommended that only resources for vendor costs be allocated. Any additional costs for system implementation and operation were to be supported within current base budget resources at participating institutions.

A contract was signed with SCT on August 1, 1973, for $268,800. This level of effort (Phase I) called for system specification and implementation at Portland State University and Southern Oregon State College. In addition, the contract indicated system specification to be performed at the University of Oregon, Oregon College of Education, and Eastern Oregon State College. On August 1, 1975, an additional contract (Phase II) was signed for $182,250. It covers the remaining system implementation at Oregon Institute of Technology, Oregon College of Education and Eastern Oregon State College.

As was indicated, the project was divided into two phases. Phase I which began on August 1, 1973, and terminated Fall Term 1975, saw the completion of system implementation at Portland State University and Southern Oregon State College, and the specification tasks at Oregon Institute of Technology, Oregon College of Education and Eastern Oregon State College.

The target computer for the SIS systems operation was the IBM 360/40 at the Data Services Center. During Portland State University system implementation, this computer was being replaced with the new computer, HIS 66/40. Thus, the SIS system for Portland State University had to be initially implemented on the IBM 370/158 computer in Salem at the Motor Vehicle Division. The Portland State University SIS system was then converted by SCT to the HIS 66/40 by July 1976. The Southern Oregon State College SIS system was implemented on the HIS 66/40 Fall Term 1975.

Phase II of the project saw a number of changes in implementation strategy. For the remaining schools--Oregon Institute of Technology, Oregon College of Education and Eastern Oregon State College--a slower implementation approach was advised. This includes a concept of more system testing and a selection module approach that allows the institutions to implement parts of the system so that the impact of total system implementation is not borne in one term. The objective in Phase II is to have the remaining institutions' operating parts (if not all) of the systems completed by Winter Term 1978. The responsibility of making adjustments in staff, resources, etc., for meeting this objective is being left to the institutions. The current schedule for the remaining institutions is as follows:

| Eastern Oregon State College | Spring 1977 |
| Oregon Institute of Technology | Fall 1977 |
| Oregon College of Education | Winter 1978 |
| University of Oregon | To be determined |

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS PLAN AND OBJECTIVES 1977-79

As has been indicated in this document, there is and will continue to be a reoccurring need for better management tools and, consequently, administrative data processing. These tools help administrators in achieving better and more effective allocation of institutional resources. The Office of Educational Systems is to supply the administrative systems and tools to meet these needs, using current technology.
Basically, administrative systems are understood as processes that deal with data and information. These data and information can either represent routine or reoccurring processes (systems) or data and information that is needed on-demand for special cases. The tools the Office coordinates and develops to meet the needs of institutional administration are tools such as production systems, special inquiry and reporting systems, and data element and data base concepts for data and information organization and retrieval.

Using these tools to satisfy the continuing pressure for improved capabilities and cost effective use of administrative systems, the Office has established the following general objectives for the 1977-79 biennium:

- Improve the use of shared administrative systems for the Department: This will include consideration of privacy and security of information.
- Upgrade hardware facilities to complement support of efficient administrative applications: A replacement of equipment to provide faster and more responsive service for the institutions is a continuing necessity, as technological improvements are made.
- Develop and improve upon existing administrative applications for Department-wide use: To reach this objective, performance audits on a number of existing administrative systems will insure a continuing emphasis on efficiency of administrative system tools to meet the desired needs.
- Update the current network computing plan as it pertains to administrative systems: As a part of long-range planning, new concepts for improved system efficiencies will be analyzed for inclusion in the updated plan (e.g., the distribution of computer hardware for more effective processing of administrative data and information).

V. SUMMARY

The emphasis in the administrative data processing area for the last two years has been to implement the components of the "Computer Network Plan 1974-1980" and to build a sound foundation for a balanced approach to systems development and maintenance. To achieve this goal, the Office of Educational Systems has focused on improved service, common guidelines for planning and development, and tools to provide convenient access to information for management reporting for institutions and Board's Offices. In the future, continued support of administrative needs will be necessary to reflect the efficiencies introduced through technology.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In response to a question from Ms. McIntyre concerning the computer installation at Portland State University, Dr. Krueger explained the procedure used in the acquisition of equipment. The computer equipment acquisition had been approved by the appropriate parties, including acceptance by the institution. Similar computers have been installed at Oregon Institute of Technology and Southern Oregon State College and are performing satisfactorily.

Dr. Krueger stated that computer equipment is designed to identify errors in transmission. Precautions are also taken to protect privacy and security of sensitive information.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.
Residence Hall and Food Service Charges

(Considered by Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, April 29, 1977; present--Ingalls, McIntyre, McLaurin, Stewart.)

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Committee report to the Board that its review of the estimates of occupancy and expenditures in 1977-78 in the residence halls of the State System institutions are consistent with the Board's policy of keeping rates at the minimum consistent with sound business practice.

Discussion at Meeting of Committee (April 29, 1977)

Mr. Holmer said that following the March Board meeting, communications had been received which indicated the need for further examination of assumptions used in the preparation of the residence hall and food service charges which were recommended. Salary adjustments are also under consideration by the Legislature and will have an impact on the rates. Consequently, Mr. Holmer recommended that no action be taken by the Committee at the present time, pending presentation of revised information to the June Committee meeting.

The Committee concurred in the deferral of action on the residence hall and food service charges.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Capital Construction Financing

(Considered by Committee of the Whole, April 29, 1977; present--Carpenter, Daniels, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, McLaurin, Stewart, Wyss, Perry.)

Staff Report to the Committee

In accordance with arrangements which Chancellor Lieuallen has discussed with President Perry, it is expected that an opportunity will be given to Mr. Robert S. Harris, Dean of the School of Architecture and Allied Arts and Chairman of the Campus Planning Committee of the University of Oregon, to discuss with members of the Board, convened as a Committee of the Whole, preceding other Committee meetings on April 29 an outline which he has titled "The Case for Change in Capital Construction Financing." An earlier draft of this outline was reviewed with several members of the Board during a recent visitation and tour of campus facilities in Eugene, but time available then did not allow more than a very brief summary of the ideas being presented. The purpose of the proposal is to describe and obtain support for an increased level of funding for higher education capital construction and rehabilitation in the years ahead.

As a supplement to Dean Harris' material, in order to provide background material which may be of assistance to members of the Board, the following excerpts from the 1977-1979 capital construction notebooks furnished to the Executive Department and the Legislative Fiscal Office (for the Ways and Means Committee) appear as Supplement B to these minutes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Nos.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-1 through A-4</td>
<td>Summary Introductory Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-1</td>
<td>Summary (by Institution) of Board's Revised Requests and Governor's Revised Recommendations for Capital Construction and Land Acquisition during 1977-1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Construction and Land Acquisition Program for 1977-1979: Comparison of Board's Revised Requests and Governor's Revised Budget Recommendations

Listing of Institutional Requests and Governor's Budget Recommendations for Capital Construction and Land Acquisition to be Financed from State Funds and/or Gifts and Grants during 1979-1981 and 1981-1983

Listing of Institutional Requests and Governor's Budget Recommendations for Capital Construction and Land Acquisition to be Financed from Self-Liquidating Bond Borrowings and/or Balances Available for Auxiliary Enterprises during 1979-1981 and 1981-1983

These materials reflect the changes in project cost estimates approved by the Board through March 25, 1977 (such as to limit the request in 1977-1979 for the OSU Veterinary Hospital Clinic Building to planning funds only, and to adjust the estimated expenditure requirements for the OIT Student Union Addition and Remodel and the SOSC Drama Laboratory). They also reflect the modifications in the Governor's budget recommendations announced on March 9, 1977, as part of the proposal to make further increases in Basic School Support. This latter adjustment included the deferral of utility improvement projects at Oregon Institute of Technology, the University of Oregon and Southern Oregon State College, the omission of funding for land acquisition and the substitution of Article XI-G bond proceeds in lieu of a General Fund appropriation for one-half of the remaining expenditures for educational and general plant items.

THE CASE FOR CHANGE IN CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION FINANCING

Prepared for discussion, April, 1977
Robert S. Haris, Chairman
Campus Planning Committee
University of Oregon

CONTEXT

Effective implementation of educational programs requires not only able faculty, staff, and administration, but also supportive physical settings. Educational programs and their support systems are not separable. They require concurrent and coordinated attention.

The campuses of the Oregon State System of Higher Education are not adequately supportive and require substantial attention. Major new construction has not kept pace with the growth of the institutions as their enrollments increased and their programs became more numerous and complex. Current construction requests from OSSHE institutions for educational and general use facilities exceed $200 million of State funds or the equivalent of 12 biennial appropriations at traditional levels of funding (until the year 2002). Educational facilities are a quarter of a century off the pace of program development. Such a lag not only has had negative consequences on the effectiveness of current programs, but also seriously hampers further change. Merging and transforming instructional programs is especially inhibited if office and classroom accommodations cannot also be modified and transformed.

There is also no current established program of funding for rehabilitation and for adjustments to maintain the supportiveness of the campuses as programs change in character or in quality. During the period of growth within the OSSHE attention was given primarily to new structures and little to the improvement of existing ones. Inflation and the general under-funding of campus needs has meant that even the new structures have often been less than appropriately supportive of the programs they serve. And by now, 20% of the educational and general plant is over 50 years old and 40% is over 25 years old. Such buildings require considerable renovation to both protect health and safety and to properly accommodate greatly changed modes of instruction. As welcome as recent legislative appropriations for rehabilitation have been, they represent only a small fraction of what is needed.

As the OSSHE comes to steady- or declining-state in enrollments it is timely and appropriate to re-evaluate the funding systems, including funding for capital construction. The present system of project review and funding is suited for the planning and consideration of a handful of large new structures each biennium. However, as the number of projects of varying size has increased and the complexity of the capital construction program has greatly increased the basic procedures for review and prioritization also require change. The basic system of funding should be revised in recognition of the continuing needs of a dynamic steady-state system rather than for the unusual needs of the period of institutional growth.
EFFECTS OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM

There is such an extensive backlog of new construction and remodeling projects required for educational and general use purposes that even the highest priorities of individual institutions are left unsupported at the close of legislative sessions. These needs are seldom actually "current" as most have been initially identified as long as a decade before and have been deferred through 3-5 biennia.

As the planning system has attempted to become more orderly and consistent, the implementation system remains unpredictable. Basic programs for utility improvements, for rehabilitation, and for new program support are confused and upset by the lack of continuity in funding. The current system of capital construction program planning, based on uncertain funding principles and possibilities, discourages responsible collegiality at both campus and system-wide levels.

The budget proposed by Governor Straub for 1977-79 would support only one third of the request from the SBHE, and only 8% of the total current need. Such a disparity between need and support encourages development of requests on the basis of "second-guessing" and political strategy rather than on straight-forward and careful planning.

OSSHE 1977-83 Capital Construction Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEW CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>REMODELING</th>
<th>ADDITIONS + REMODELING</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977-79</td>
<td>14,390,000</td>
<td>18,190,000</td>
<td>12,110,000</td>
<td>$44,690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-81</td>
<td>29,380,000</td>
<td>23,820,000</td>
<td>27,680,000</td>
<td>$80,880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-83</td>
<td>37,630,000</td>
<td>17,345,000</td>
<td>20,845,000</td>
<td>$75,820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$81,400,000</td>
<td>$59,355,000</td>
<td>$60,635,000</td>
<td>$201,390,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total list of "current" requests equals one quarter of the replacement value of the system's campuses, equal to the value of the entire UO campus. The remodeling requests represent just over one-eighth of the total replacement value of the educational and general plant.

Much of the new construction listed for 1979-83 would be listed for 1977-79 except that 77-79 list is already large. Yet the succeeding lists are even larger. The projects are currently needed but the "logic" of the lists is confused by years of under-funding.
Figure 1  O.S.S.H.E. ENROLLMENTS RELATED TO SPACE

No direct correlation should be expected between enrollments and space since program characteristics also affect space requirements. Some programs are more affected by enrollment growth than are others. Some campus facilities are essentially unaffected by enrollment changes.

Still, the figure illustrates a significant difference both in rates of growth and in total change in enrollments and in space. While enrollments may stabilize or even decline moderately in the future, their growth since 1951 has been nearly twice as great (460%) as the growth of educational and general use campus facilities (240%).

The figure only implies the extensive remodeling and rehabilitation needs of the campuses as it shows that 40% of the space available now is over 25 years old and 20% is over 50 years old.
PROPOSED O.S.S.H.E. CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Balanced funding ought to be provided for:

1. A continuing program of rehabilitation and remodeling to maintain support of changing programs and purposes.
2. Major projects, including those required to accommodate prior growth of the system.

A recurring legislative allocation for rehabilitation and other adjustment would insure maintenance of the validity of the existing $800 million replacement value of the state system campuses. Such an allocation, based perhaps on a percentage of the value of the campuses (CORAA suggested 1-2%) could be carefully monitored according to general policies and guidelines. The funds would allow timely renovations to be made in direct support of program adjustments and instructional innovations. In Figure 2, such funding is shown at 1% or $6 million per biennium based on existing valuations. The figure illustrates how this program of recurring campus adjustments might well become the major source of campus support for the long term of stable or moderately declining enrollments.

Funding for major projects is also essential to close the gap between current facilities and current needs. Genuinely current needs stand far back in line behind projects of long-standing importance. The log-jam frustrates program planning and development and the institutions' abilities to be responsive to current educational objectives. Funding should be provided especially for the backlog of major projects so that a schedule can be developed to assure their orderly implementation over a number of biennia.

A proposal is illustrated in Figure 2 including the percentage-based funding for remodeling and a deliberate program over 8 biennia to clear the list of pending major projects. In the first biennium it is proposed that $20 million of Article XI-G bonds be matched by general fund allocations to make a significant start on closing the gap ($34 million for gap-closing + $6 million for remodeling). During the next seven biennia $12 million is proposed for gap-closing so that the total for the eight biennia period would be $118 million for major projects and $48 million for remodeling. For all purposes the general fund allocations required over this period would be only moderately higher than Governor Straub initially has proposed for 1977-79. If the major effort proposed for 1979-81 were supported by the general fund alone rather than with bonds, the State would save approximately $23 million in interest costs and the biennial allocations would be at the same levels as proposed for 1977-79.

Finally, an important by-product of this sustained program would be a substantial stimulus to the building industry and to the economy of Oregon over a long enough period to be of sustaining benefit. Figure 2 does not show either the savings against inflation nor the income from construction activity in the form of tax revenues. The figure does illustrate the probable reduction in the level of general fund expenditures after the period of intensive support.
Figure 2  PROPOSED O.S.S.H.E. CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biennium</th>
<th>Existing Debt Service</th>
<th>New XI-G Bonds (approx.)</th>
<th>New Debt Construction</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977-79 orig.</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-79 rev.</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-81</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14 + 6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-83</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12 + 6</td>
<td>29.85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-85</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.3 + 3.3</td>
<td>12 + 6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-87</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.3 + 3.3</td>
<td>12 + 6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-89</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.2 + 3.3</td>
<td>12 + 6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-91</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.2 + 3.0</td>
<td>12 + 6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-93</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.2 + 3.0</td>
<td>12 + 6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-95</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.2 + 3.0</td>
<td>12 + 6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-97</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.2 + 3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-99</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.2 + 3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-01</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.2 + 3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-03</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1 + 3.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-05</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1 + 2.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-07</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion at Meeting of the Committee of the Whole (April 29, 1977)

Mr. Robert S. Harris, Dean of the School of Architecture and Allied Arts at the University of Oregon, said the case for change in capital construction financing is based on two absolutely fundamental elements. The first element is that the buildings and spaces already available must be used as effectively as possible. The valuation of those buildings is about $800,000,000 of which approximately $600,000,000 is education and general plant. There is presently no regular program of funding to maintain the validity of that investment. Also there is no fundamental system for making sure that the adjustments are made regularly to the existing physical plant so that it continues to be supportive of the educational programs which should be provided. The second fundamental element of a system of capital construction financing that is now necessary is a deliberate program to close the gap that occurred earlier when the growth of enrollments greatly exceeded the appropriation for capital construction.

If the Board were to adjust its policies and programs in relation to these two fundamental elements, the most noticeable change would be in the request that went to the Governor and to the Legislature. The request perhaps would be in a new format to deal clearly with renovation, remodeling, and maintaining the validity of the campuses in one part, and with major projects in another section. Dean Harris said he believed this would result in a more orderly and predictable system of funding to match the present logical and predictable system of planning.

Dean Harris explained the data in the report and its relationship to the fundamental elements previously mentioned. He then described his proposal. He said it was a modest proposal not requiring any new system of funding in terms of the source of resources and not requiring a very great increase in the levels of funding, but rather a modification of the type of funding and a small increase in amounts appropriated. The proposal involves seeking an allocation of a specific percentage of the total capital investment each year for the purpose of remodeling and maintaining the validity of the overall investment. The percentage recommended in the proposal is 1% and would amount to approximately $6,000,000 for the biennium in constant dollars. However, an inflation factor probably should be included.

Mr. Perry asked whether the proposed figure would be sufficient since normal depreciation for business buildings is 40 years. Dean Harris said he was primarily interested in some program to protect the existing investment and use it more effectively.

A second part of the program is a proposal to use Article XI-G bonds plus a continuing appropriation over an 8-biennia period to close the gap for needed construction and renovation.

It was pointed out that the levels of expenditure would be only moderately higher than current levels of expenditure. Although it was recognized the present Legislature could not make commitments for future legislatures, approval of the suggested plan, with similar commitments in later biennia, would meet some of the most urgent needs of the State System for capital construction on an orderly basis.

Mr. Wyss asked Dean Harris if the major thrust to his presentation was a belief that priorities should shift from new construction to remodeling and maintenance in the budgets of the next two or three biennia until the principle of including remodeling and maintenance was established.

Dean Harris said a more balanced approach between new construction and remodeling and maintenance is required. In fact, in the past several biennia, funding has been secured for remodeling of various campus buildings. This is a relatively new item in the capital construction requests and it should continue. However, new
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Construction is also necessary and many times a project involves both remodeling and new construction. Balance is the critical element, both to correct safety deficiencies and other matters of that nature and also to adjust the tools that are used so that they match the educational programs. Buildings are the equipment supporting the educational programs and must change as the educational programs are altered.

Mr. Hunderup emphasized that there is a desperate situation with respect to capital construction as a result of underfunding over the last several biennia. This is very demoralizing to campus planning committees which make extensive efforts to outline very precisely their requirements for capital construction and then get very little.

Substantial sums of money will be required to comply with the regulations just signed which will impose upon all institutions a requirement to make all State System facilities accessible to the physically handicapped without exception within a three-year period. The correction of safety deficiencies was started in the present biennium. Modification to some of the mechanical systems on the campuses will be necessary to meet the obligation to minimize the consumption of electricity and other fuels. At the same time, there appears to be a reluctance in state government to allocate additional funds for capital construction. In fact, it is more likely that capital construction expenditures will be reduced. It is essential, Mr. Hunderup said, to make legislators aware of the need for greater support to avoid depreciation of the existing plant to a point which is not useful or purposeful for the instructional, research and extension programs of the State System institutions. In addition, some new construction is needed.

In summary, Dean Harris said it would be an error to identify individually the priority needs each biennium and to think that this would resolve the overall problem. It must be understood that when a building is constructed, there is also incurred a continuing obligation to maintain and further develop it.

In response to a question concerning the cost to comply with the requirement to provide accessibility for the physically handicapped, it was indicated that it will be several million dollars. It was also stated that some of the older buildings will be easier to make accessible than those built in the last ten years. Board policy in recent years stated that unless a building had four or more stories, an elevator would not be installed. Shafts for future installations of elevators were not even included in the new buildings. The new regulations will not allow a second story without an elevator.

Mr. Perry expressed appreciation to Dean Harris for his presentation. Prior to the adjournment of the meeting of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Perry also thanked President Briggs and his staff for the very pleasant and informative sessions during the Board's visitation and meetings.

President Briggs said the faculty, staff and students and the citizens of La Grande and eastern Oregon welcomed the opportunity to present to the Board the programs, opportunities and needs of the institution and the region.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Repayment of Funds Advanced by the Department of Housing and Urban Development

Under Section 704 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, the federal government provided assistance in financing the acquisition of sites needed for the future construction of public works facilities. The amount of the grant was to be determined by the aggregate amount of reasonable interest charges on loans or financial obligations incurred to finance the advance acquisition of land needed for the future construction of public works or facilities and to pay the cost of relocation payments to persons and organizations displaced from land whose purchase was assisted under this program.
At its June 1966 meeting, the Board approved Department participation in the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development's Advance Acquisition of Land Program.

The Board approved the actual contract at its April 1968, meeting, and the agreement was subsequently signed and implemented. Under the signed agreement, reimbursements were to be made up to the lesser of a specified amount or the actual aggregate amount of interest charges during a period of either:

1. Five years from the date when the loans were made; or
2. The period of time between the date of the loans and the date construction was begun on the public work or facility for which the acquired land was planned to be utilized, whichever is less.

For two years after the signing of the agreement, 78 properties were acquired using federal reimbursements for interest and relocation payments. In the five years following these purchases, the Department of Higher Education construction plans changed and 53 of these properties were not developed as originally planned. Many of the properties were envisioned as sites for dormitories. Other planned uses included expanded classroom space, parking lots and athletic fields thought necessary in a period of growth but not absolutely required in an era of stable enrollments. Nevertheless, 25 properties have been developed in compliance with the terms of the agreement.

In summary, grant funds received and earned at each of the three participating institutions are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Parcels</th>
<th>Parcels Developed</th>
<th>Grant Funds Received</th>
<th>Grant Funds Earned</th>
<th>Funds Owed to DHUD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$66,065</td>
<td>$18,363</td>
<td>$47,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>101,227</td>
<td>32,122</td>
<td>69,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>144,979</td>
<td>3,912</td>
<td>141,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>312,271</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,397</strong></td>
<td><strong>257,874</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funds paid for the acquisition of land not utilized as planned by December 31, 1975, must be returned without interest to DHUD according to the agreement. The Board is to furnish DHUD with a line item audit of moneys paid and earned under this agreement. This audit was recently requested by the Regional Office of DHUD and the Controller's Division has complied. The figures above have been derived from this full accounting.

Pursuant to the audit, a check for $250,000 has been issued for reimbursement to DHUD for the unearned grant funds. The remaining $7,874 will be repaid upon DHUD's acceptance of the audit. These moneys had been held in plant funds reserves pending the final settlement of the terms of the agreement.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

**Condition of Board's Special and Plant Rehabilitation Reserves**

As of May 27, 1977, for Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1977

I. Board's Unallocated Reserve

(No funds reserved in allocation plans for fiscal year 1976-77.)
II. Board’s Reserve for Plant Rehabilitation

Balance as of March 25, 1977

$126,250

Less: Amounts approved by the Chancellor:

- To plan sewer connection Institute of Marine Biology, UO: $5,000
- To connect new scrubber to Boiler #1, UO: $6,000
- To install vinyl tile in nine offices of Science II, UO: $1,800
- To install temperature control instrumentation, Various Buildings, OSU: $10,000
- To install waterflow restrictors in shower heads in Langton Hall, OSU: $9,800
- To replace tile parapet with asphalt shingles East Hall, PSU: $5,000
- To clean, tuckpoint and silicon the exterior of the Health and Physical Education Building, PSU: $10,000
- Millar Library chiller repair (partial cost: remainder to be financed from institutional funds), PSU: $2,450
- To replace part of gymnasium floor in the Physical Education Building, OIT: $25,000
- To reroof Quinn Coliseum, EOSC: $25,000
- KOAP-TV to construct sound baffle, OEPBS: $1,200
- To drill a new well at the Animal Farm, UO/HSC: $25,000

Total Estimated balance as of May 27, 1977: $126,250

III. Computer Systems Development

Balance as of March 25, 1977: $--

Estimated balance as of May 27, 1977: $--

Board Discussion and Action

The Board received the report as presented.

Adjournment and Reconvening Date

The Board adjourned the meeting at 11:20 A.M., until June 24, 1977, at a time to be announced, with the following voting in favor: Directors Ater, Daniels, Feves, Harms, Ingalls, McIntyre, Stewart, and Wyss. Those voting no: None.
SUPPLEMENT A - A PROPOSAL FOR NURSING EDUCATION IN OREGON 1977-1986

SUPPLEMENT A

A PROPOSAL FOR
NURSING EDUCATION IN OREGON
1977-1986

General Recommendations

1. The nature, size, number and location of nursing programs within the state should reflect long-range projections of supply and demand for nursing personnel and services.

2. The basic preparation for the practice of professional nursing should be the baccalaureate degree obtained through a generic baccalaureate program.

3. Programs for nurses or in nursing that differ from the generally accepted requirements for the BSN or ADN should not be encouraged or approved. All programs should be located in approved schools of nursing.

Graduate Nursing Education Recommendations

1. The first priority for nursing education should be expansion of graduate education.

2. Enrollment ceilings at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center should be raised to allow for growth of graduate education.

3. Graduate education at the master’s level should relate to clinical specialty areas such as geriatric nursing and to areas of practice such as primary care.

4. Nurse Practitioner programs should be expanded and upgraded from certificate programs to the master’s program.

5. The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center School of Nursing should offer a quality program leading to a doctoral degree in nursing.

6. The University of Oregon Health Sciences Center should provide graduate courses in the nursing major outside the Portland area.

Undergraduate Nursing Education Recommendations

1. Priority should be given to increased opportunities for registered nurses prepared in ADN or diploma programs to obtain a
baccalaureate degree in nursing. These educational opportunities should reflect the problems of the adult learner, including such factors as being place-bound and working full or part time while enrolled in the educational program.

2. A moratorium should be declared on ADN programs. Further proliferation or growth until reasonable admission ceilings reflecting state and local needs can be established should be discouraged.

3. The distribution of nursing personnel and services should influence the placement of any new nursing programs.

4. Existing baccalaureate education programs should only be modified to reflect regional needs within the state and needs of special groups such as registered nurses seeking a BSN.

5. Affirmative action commitments in all nursing programs should be strengthened.

Specific Regional Recommendations

1. Eastern Oregon: A generic baccalaureate program should be available in this region of the state.

2. Central Oregon: An outreach of an existing baccalaureate nursing program should be developed to enable place-bound nurses to further their education. This is necessary for Central Oregon's nurses to adequately meet the health care responsibilities they must and are currently assuming.

3. Southern Oregon: Expansion of the upper division of the nursing major at Southern Oregon State College is recommended to meet the needs in Southern and Central Oregon. Consideration should be given to shifting emphasis from the ADN to the BSN program.

4. Mid-Willamette: There should be increased opportunities for RN's in this region to obtain baccalaureate and graduate degrees in nursing.

5. Portland Area: A moratorium should be declared on the expansion of existing undergraduate programs. Any program development at the undergraduate level should provide increased opportunities for RN's seeking the BSN degree. Graduate education should be increased in size and scope including the development of a doctoral program in nursing.
SUPPLEMENT B

SUMMARY INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT FOR OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S

The six-year capital construction program of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, as incorporated within the Governor's budget recommendations, includes tabular summaries of the requested facilities and land purchases for each of the next three biennia, a Capital Construction Form 16 which contains a narrative for each project included in the 1977-1979 program, and a summary statement of the various policies upon which the program has been formulated. The data are arranged to indicate separately the portions of the capital outlay requests which relate to the educational and general plant, to be financed from state tax funds and offsets such as federal funds, and the items which constitute additional facilities for auxiliary enterprises to be financed from non-tax funds, such as self-liquidating bond borrowings under the authority of Article XI-F(l) of the Oregon Constitution, balances from auxiliary enterprises operations, gifts and com mingled student building fees.

The listing of proposed capital construction projects and land purchases may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board's Requests (Rev. 3/25/77)</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Educational and General Plant</th>
<th>Auxiliary Enterprises</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td>Gifts, Grants, Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1979</td>
<td>$44,690,000</td>
<td>$2,905,000</td>
<td>$7,215,000</td>
<td>$54,810,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1981</td>
<td>80,880,000*</td>
<td>20,700,000*</td>
<td>13,700,000</td>
<td>115,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1983</td>
<td>75,020,000</td>
<td>2,860,000</td>
<td>4,390,000</td>
<td>83,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$201,390,000</td>
<td>$26,465,000</td>
<td>$25,305,000</td>
<td>$253,160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revised to include estimated expenditure requirements (net of planning costs of $700,000) for constructing and equipping the proposed OSU Veterinary Hospital Clinic Building and related utility extensions deferred from 1977-1979 requests.

Governor's Recommendations (Rev. 3/9/77)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Educational and General Plant</th>
<th>Auxiliary Enterprises</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Gifts, Grants, Etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-1979</td>
<td>$15,785,000</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
<td>$4,820,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-1981</td>
<td>13,226,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,910,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1983</td>
<td>11,059,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,492,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$40,070,200</td>
<td>$1,725,000</td>
<td>$11,222,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The requests for the 1977-1979 biennium reflect the deferral of many construction projects even though there is adequate statistical and other justification for them. The magnitude of the program for the six-year period indicates clearly that there has been a growing backlog of projects which the level of funding in recent biennia has been unable to accommodate.

Many of the projects which are being requested reflect the need to update facilities to bring them into compliance with federal, state and local requirements for health, safety, air quality, etc., as well as to provide accommodations for the physically handicapped. Others reflect the need for a regular rehabilitation program that would focus on a portion of higher education's facilities each biennium to maintain the state's capital investment, which now has a current replacement value in excess of $800 million, and to support current educational requirements.

The program gives effect to the Board's capital construction policies, including the applicable space utilization objectives and building planning standards, as well as enrollment limitations and the most current enrollment projections. These policy statements are printed immediately following this Summary Introductory Statement. Enrollment data prepared by the Board's Division of Administrative and Analytic Services are included also.
Detailed space utilization studies for the Fall Term 1975 at each institution have been completed and have been published. Copies thereof have been sent to the Educational Coordinating Commission, the Executive Department and the Legislative Fiscal Office. As a result of the completion of several new and remodeling projects for classrooms, laboratories and offices and as a result also of the general leveling off of enrollment growth, some relief has been obtained overall in the scheduled use of institutional facilities. For example, the completion of the new classroom, laboratory and office building at Oregon State University has alleviated critical conditions of instructional space that resulted in rates of utilization substantially in excess of the Board's objectives.

As reflected in a number of the Board's requests, the greatest unmet facility need at a number of the institutions is for space that will accommodate specialized instruction, such as was accomplished by the remodeling of portions of Lincoln Hall at Portland State University and through the construction of the Fine Arts Building at Oregon College of Education. The proposed new projects, all of which are for existing academic programs, include some discrete buildings, though wherever feasible the requests propose additions and remodeling. Some of these projects are related to the needs of deficiency correction program and are proposed to make the most effective use of resources. The Gilbert Hall Addition at Oregon State University, which would house laboratories for the teaching of undergraduate chemistry, would permit the correction of ventilation-exhaust system deficiencies within the existing building at considerably lower cost than if the addition to the building were not made. The proposed addition will also allow reinstatement of some lower division laboratory courses in chemistry which have not been offered due to the lack of facilities. Although the proposed Preclinical Technique Dental Laboratory Remodel project at the University of Oregon Health Sciences Center has the primary objective of providing adequate teaching facilities, it would also solve an existing gypsum dust problem.

The highest priority position in the listing of educational and general plant projects, as well as for auxiliary enterprises, has been given to the second phase of a three-phase Safety Deficiency Correction Program that was begun following authorization by the 1975 Legislature. The program was formulated in response to provisions of the Oregon Safe Employment Act, which requires the employer to furnish employment and a place of employment which are safe and healthful for employees, and was the result of the combined efforts of the State Fire Marshal's office, the Workmen's Compensation Board, the Department of Commerce and other jurisdictional agencies working as a team with members of the Board's staff and institutional personnel.

Two of the projects that are requested in 1977-1979 would add specialized instructional space for education. Although there has been a reduction in the numbers of students enrolled in undergraduate courses for preservice instruction in the field of education, this has been more than offset by the need for inservice instruction and specialized training for school support personnel. The need for such space at the University of Oregon and Portland State University is critical.

As noted, some of the Board's recommendations for 1977-1979 relate to very specialized spaces. One of these is the planning for the proposed Veterinary Hospital and Clinic Building at Oregon State University to accommodate Oregon's share in the tri-state agreement with Idaho and Washington for instruction in the veterinary medicine program. These arrangements were supported by the 1975 Legislature. Because of delays in obtaining commitments for federal grants for the construction of these facilities, the Board's requests and the Governor's budget recommendations for this project are limited to planning funds only. A second specialized facility project in the Board's requests is a Drama Laboratory to house the instructional program in theater at Southern Oregon State College. Another is the library at Oregon Institute of Technology. Because of the growth of the library volumes and increased requirements for library services, there is no longer room for an adequate number of reader
stations within the present library. It will be recalled that the initial space allocated for the library in the building shared with the Commons was based upon an enrollment of 800 students, as contrasted with present enrollment of more than two and a half times that number, including many registered in baccalaureate degree programs.

Carefully selected energy conservation expenditures have the possibilities of short pay-off periods. The proposed Energy Conservation and Instrumentation and Monitoring project at Oregon State University would make it possible to collect data that would facilitate the best choices. The Utility and Energy Conservation Improvements (Plant Interconnection and Metering) at Southern Oregon State College would also aid in the acquisition of energy consumption data which would be useful in long-range planning, as well as permit energy savings immediately.

The owners of the studio and office building in which the Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Services leases space in Portland have indicated a desire to sell. They have granted an option to the State for the acquisition of the property. Inasmuch as the facility has proven to be very suitable operationally, it is proposed that the purchase be consummated and that certain remodeling, such as the installation of an elevator, be accomplished. The land which would be acquired with the building would provide an adequate parking area.

The listing of auxiliary enterprise projects, following the first priority item for the Safety Deficiency Correction Program mentioned above, includes appropriate shares of the cost of utility improvements at several institutions and a service building at Eastern Oregon State College, student union facilities for Oregon Institute of Technology, remodeling of student union facilities at Portland State University and Oregon State University, a parking structure at Portland State University and recreation facilities for Southern Oregon State College, as well as land purchases.

Because of debt retirements, some unused bonding capacity and the proposed timing of projects, it does not appear necessary to seek an increase in the present statutory limitation of $90,500,000 for self-liquidating bond borrowings under the provisions of Article XI-F (1) of the Oregon Constitution, or to modify the maximum amount of the student building fee ($12.50 per student per term).

Inflation continues to affect construction costs, but the rate of increase appears to be somewhat lower than that experienced in the last few years. Based upon various indices published in professional journals, an adjustment of ten percent has been made for the period from July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977. Thereafter, an annual increase of ten percent (or a semi-annual adjustment of five percent) to the projected bid date is being anticipated. These increases are not being compounded. Some adjustments of the cost estimates likely will be required as architectural/engineering planning is undertaken or progresses for individual projects.

Preliminary planning has been completed for the OSU Gilbert Hall Addition and Remodel, the UOHS C Preclinical Technique Dental Laboratories Remodel, the SOSC Drama Laboratory (Theater), the OCE Massake Hall Rededication and Remodel, the OIT Student Union Addition and Remodel, and the OSU Memorial Union Remodel. Studies of the Veterinary Hospital and Clinic Building have been done by the staff at Oregon State University. The planning of other projects is underway, either by the staffs of the institutions to further define projects, or with the assistance of independent professional consultants. The preliminary planning costs are being financed from allotments from the Board's reserve for architectural/engineering planning and/or from balances available for auxiliary enterprises.

Although efforts were made to define the various space requirements and cost estimates for the capital outlay program as carefully and accurately as possible, based upon data currently available, it is probable that some modifications will be required following further architectural and engineering planning, the availability of additional enrollment data, etc. Major emphasis and study by the Board's staff is being given.
Summary Introductory Statement (Continued)

to the requests for the 1977-1979 capital construction program.
However, consistent with the statutory requirements that the Executive Department provide the Legislature with projections of capital needs for at least a six-year period, institutional requests for construction projects during 1979-1981 and 1981-1983 have been itemized and are attached.

Office of Facilities Planning
December 10, 1976
Revised March 25, 1977

A-4
OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

SUMMARY (BY INSTITUTION) OF BOARD'S REVISED REQUESTS AND GOVERNOR'S REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION DURING 1977-1979
(Cost Estimates in Thousands of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Board's Revised Requests</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendations (Rev. 3/9/77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational &amp; General Plant</td>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Projects</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,385*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon Health Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Educational &amp; Public Broadcasting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>645*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>$47,395*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>$47,395*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes estimated gifts and grants:
- SOSC: $ - | $225 | $225 | $ - | $225 | $225
- UD: 2,830 | - | 2,830 | 1,725 | - | 1,725
- OEPBS: 75 | - | 75 | - | - | -
- Totals: $2,505 | $225 | $3,130 | $1,725 | $225 | $1,950

#Projects involving both the Educational and General Plant and Auxiliary Enterprises have been counted under the Educational and General Plant category only, but dollar amounts have been reflected under the respective categories.

The number of projects shown above exceeds the number reflected in the priority listings because the Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase II for all eight institutions is identified as one project in the priority listings.

Office of Facilities Planning
December 10, 1976
Revised March 25, 1977
### Oregon State Board of Higher Education

**Capital Construction and Land Acquisition Program for 1977-1979**

**Comparison of Board's Revised Requests and Governor's Revised Budget Recommendations**

(Cost Estimates in Thousands of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Board's Revised Requests</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendations (Rev. 3/9/77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Cumulative</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EOSC (incl. $135,000 for Physical Plant Shops)</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OSU (incl. $2,181,558 for Gilbert Hall)</td>
<td>2,955</td>
<td>2,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>250*</td>
<td>250*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>3,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,875</td>
<td>7,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Gilbert Hall Addition and Renovation</td>
<td>5,020#</td>
<td>12,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OOHSC</td>
<td>Preclinical Technique Dental Laboratories Remodel</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>13,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>College of Education Addition and Alterations Phase I</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>15,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Professional Schools Building Phase I (Education)</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>19,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Veterinary Hospital Clinic Building, including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utility Extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>OEPBS</td>
<td>KOAP-FM &amp; KOAP-TV Building Acquisition and Remodel</td>
<td>700#</td>
<td>19,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Energy Conservation Instrumentation and Monitoring (5 Buildings)</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>20,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Utility and Energy Conservation Improvements (Heating Plant Interconnection and Metering)</td>
<td>800#</td>
<td>21,275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Oregon State Board of Higher Education, Capital Construction and Land Acquisition Program for 1977-1979

Comparison of the Board's Revised Requests and the Governor's Revised Budget Recommendations (Cost Estimates in Thousands of Dollars), Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Board's Revised Requests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Drama Laboratory (Theater)</td>
<td>$2,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Water Chiller and Heating Water Well)</td>
<td>$290*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Library Building</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>Physical Plant Services Building</td>
<td>$210#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$200#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Various Buildings Remodel</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>Maaske Hall Rededication and Renovation</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UOHCSC</td>
<td>University Hospital South Addition and Remodel (Planning Only)</td>
<td>$585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>School of Architecture &amp; Allied Arts Addition and Alterations Phase I</td>
<td>$845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Withycombe Hall Remodel</td>
<td>$2,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Various Campus Facility Improvements</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>Perimeter Road</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>OEPBS</td>
<td>TV Translator Network: Eugene, Drain, Sutherlin, Roseburg, Gualdale</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Electrical Phase II)</td>
<td>$310#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Heating System)</td>
<td>$215#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>UOHCSC</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Steam Service Phase II)</td>
<td>$2,960#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>UOHCSC</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Water and Electric Services Phase II)</td>
<td>$950#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>UOHCSC</td>
<td>Clinical Laboratory &amp; Outpatient Clinic Improvements</td>
<td>$2,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Utility and Energy Conservation Improvement (Chilling)</td>
<td>$510#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Professional Schools Building Phase II (Business Administration)</td>
<td>$3,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals: $44,690 | $15,785

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Board's Revised Request Project Amount</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendations (Rev. 3/9/77) Project Amount</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational and General Plant - Gifts and Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Various Campus Facility Improvements</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>OEPBS</td>
<td>TV Translator Network: Eugene, Drain, Sutherlin, Roseburg, Glendale</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Centennial Projects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Museum of Art Addition &amp; Alterations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Millrace Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centennial Mall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student-Faculty Conference Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Off-Campus University Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child Care and Development Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totals - Educational and General Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase II</td>
<td>$100*</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100*</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Utility and Energy Conservation Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Heating Plant Interconnection and Metering)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Water Chiller and Heating Water Well)</td>
<td>345*</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>345*</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Water Chiller and Heating Water Well)</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Student Union Addition and Remodel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Board's Revised Requests</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendations (Rev. 3/9/77)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Amount</td>
<td>Cumulative Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>Physical Plant Services Building</td>
<td>$40*</td>
<td>$3,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>215*</td>
<td>3,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Parking Structure III</td>
<td>1,200*</td>
<td>4,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Smith Memorial Center Remodel</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>5,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Memorial Union Remodel</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>5,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Electrical Phase II)</td>
<td>210*</td>
<td>6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Heating System)</td>
<td>140*</td>
<td>6,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UOHSC</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Steam Service Phase II)</td>
<td>215*</td>
<td>6,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>UOHSC</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Water and Electric Services Phase II)</td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>6,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Utility and Energy Conservation Improvement (Chilling)</td>
<td>220*</td>
<td>6,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities (Tennis Courts)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>Recreation Facilities (Baseball Field Phase II)</td>
<td>315#</td>
<td>7,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTALS**

- $7,215
- **$54,810**
- **$4,820**

---

* Partial cost; portions financed within the Educational and General Plant and from Auxiliary Enterprises.

** Excludes portions of the cost estimates included within Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase II (Priority No. 1).

@ Planning funds only.

' Construction conditional upon authorization for PSU Professional Schools Building Phase I which is expected to occupy a site now used for surface parking.

## Includes $225,000 of estimated gift funds.

### Excludes interfund transfer of approximately $100,000 required for rededication of library area from educational and general use to auxiliary enterprises.

---

Office of Facilities Planning
December 10, 1976
Revised March 25, 1977
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### EASTERN OREGON STATE COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Educational and General Plant Projects</th>
<th>Institutional Requests</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase III</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physical Education Activity Area Improvements; Street Extension</td>
<td>$695.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Campus Improvements (Landscaping, including Bicentennial Gardens)</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Science Greenhouse</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Creative and Performing Arts Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Library Addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Administration Building Remodel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$470.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals - Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>$985.00</td>
<td>$6,365.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OREGON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Educational and General Plant Projects</th>
<th>Institutional Requests</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase III</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physical Plant Building Addition</td>
<td>$340.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physical Education Activity Area Improvements</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Library Addition, including Media Center</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Physical Education Building Addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals - Oregon College of Education</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$4,190.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Educational and General Plant Projects</th>
<th>Institutional Requests</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase III</td>
<td>$680.00</td>
<td>$680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Veterinary Hospital Clinic Building, including Utility Extensions</td>
<td>$2,520.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Radiation Center Addition (Instructional Facilities)</td>
<td>$1,515.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education Hall Remodel</td>
<td>$1,365.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fine Arts Instruction Center</td>
<td>$6,230.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Utility Improvements (Sanitary/Storm Sewer Phase I)</td>
<td>$190.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kidder Hall Remodel</td>
<td>$455.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dairy Center Feed Barn</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Institutional Requests and Governor's Recommendations for Capital Construction and Land Acquisition to be Financed from State Funds and/or Gifts and Grants During 1979-1981 and 1981-1983, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$320*</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$185*</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$455*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$6,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$245*</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals - Oregon State University</td>
<td>$15,555</td>
<td>$14,305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,080</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,020</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$235*</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,090</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,435</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals - Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td>$4,685</td>
<td>$8,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Educational and General Plant Projects

**Oregon State University, continued**

- Utility Improvements (Electrical System Revision Completion) - 320*
- Performing Arts Center - 185*
- S. W. 35th Street Improvements Assessment - 900
- Milne Computer Center Addition - 985
- Utility Improvements (Sanitary/Storm Revision Phase II) - 455*
- Engineering Buildings Addition and Remodel Phase I - 4,775
- Agricultural Science Building - 6,945
- Utility Improvements (Various) - 245*

**Southern Oregon State College**

- Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase III - 275
- Susanne Homes Hall Rededication and Remodel (Art Department) - 2,080
- Siskiyou Commons Rededication, Addition and Remodel (Administrative Services) - 2,020
- Life Science Laboratory (Greenhouse), including Land - 255
- Physical Education Activity Area Improvements - 235*
- Churchill Hall Remodel (Business Department) - 2,305
- Taylor, Central and Library Buildings Remodel - 1,090
- Health Science Building (Nursing) - 1,260
- Physical Plant Building - 3,435

**Totals**

- Oregon State University: $15,555
- Southern Oregon State College: $4,685

---

### Notes

- * indicates estimated costs.
- Totals are rounded for simplicity.

---

**Meeting #438**

May 27, 1977
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Educational and General Plant Projects</th>
<th>Institutional Requests</th>
<th>Governor's Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase III</td>
<td>$1,485</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>College of Education Addition and Alterations Phase II</td>
<td>3,085</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School of Architecture &amp; Allied Arts Addition and Alterations Phase II</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>School of Music Renewations Phase II</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Various Campus Facility Improvements</td>
<td>2,865*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Utility Improvements, including Energy Conservation Modifications</td>
<td>565*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Science Building, Third Addition, Remodel (Biology Teaching Laboratories)</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marine Biology Station Improvements (Charleston)</td>
<td>85*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Health, Physical Education &amp; Recreation Improvements (Playing Fields)</td>
<td>1,000*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Esslinger Hall Addition (Swimming Pool)</td>
<td>225*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Health, Physical Education &amp; Recreation Improvements (East 15th Avenue Tennis Courts Cover)</td>
<td>205*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Franklin Boulevard Crossing</td>
<td>260*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Villard Hall Addition and Alterations (Broadcasting Theater)</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bikeway and Visitor Information Systems</td>
<td>50*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>College of Education Addition Phase III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School of Architecture &amp; Allied Arts Addition and Alterations Phase III</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Various Campus Facility Improvements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hendricks Hall Alterations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marine Biology Station Improvements (Charleston)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,070*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Biology Teaching Building</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Esslinger Hall/McArthur Court Locker Room Addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Esslinger Hall Addition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals - University of Oregon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$16,425</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,850</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Figures marked with an asterisk (*) include cost data from multiple sources.

---

Meeting #33-100

May 27, 1977

#### Educational and General Plant Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>University Hospital South Addition and Remodel</td>
<td>$13,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campus Services Building Addition and Remodel</td>
<td>2,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Basic Sciences Building Addition and Mackenzie Hall Remodel</td>
<td>(Schematic Planning only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clinical Laboratory Building Improvements</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hospitals and Clinics Pneumatic Tube System</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University Hospital North Remodel (Emergency Service)</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Various Campus Buildings Remodel</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hospital Dental Service Alterations</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clinic Building Addition (Independent Learning Facility)</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Campus Directional Control System Phase I</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Utility Improvements Phase III</td>
<td>955*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Child Development and Rehabilitation Center Improvements (Mechanical Systems)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Medical Research Building Alterations (Animal Quarters Ventilation)</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase III</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gaines Hall Demolition</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Totals - University of Oregon Health Sciences Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$23,800</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The total for 1981-1983 is $1,225.*
**Listing of Institutional Requests and Governor's Budget Recommendations for Capital Construction and Land Acquisition to be Financed from State Funds and/or Gifts and Grants During 1979-1981 and 1981-1983, Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Portland State University: Safety Deficiency Correction Program Phase III</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Millar Library Addition</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Various Buildings Remodel</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Science Building III</td>
<td>4,665</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Physical Education Building II</td>
<td>4,090</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3,740</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Professional Schools Building Phase III</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Various Buildings Remodel</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals - Portland State University</td>
<td><strong>$16,240</strong></td>
<td>$3,930</td>
<td><strong>$75</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td><strong>$80</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td><strong>$80</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Classroom-Laboratory Building</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cornell Hall Remodel</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Physical Education Building Remodel (Swimming Pool)</td>
<td>$215*</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical Education Improvements (Tennis Courts)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$135*</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campus Improvements (Landscaping, Sidewalks, Stairs and Outside Lighting)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Totals - Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td><strong>$3,920</strong></td>
<td>$775</td>
<td><strong>$80</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oregon Educational and Public Broadcasting Service</td>
<td>$115@</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southern Oregon TV Transmitter and Microwave Interconnection; Translator</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FM Radio and TV Microwave Interconnection; Portland, Salem, Corvallis, Eugene</td>
<td>$75@</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * indicates an estimated amount.