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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN THE 
CENTER FOR ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION BUILDING  
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON  

October 18, 1985  

Meeting #530  

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the Auditorium of the Center for Advanced Technology in Education Building (Condon School), University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.  

ROLL CALL  
The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m., October 18, 1985, by the President of the Board, Mr. Alvin R. Batiste, and on roll call the following answered present:  

Mr. Robert R. Adams  
Mr. Gene Chao  
Mr. F. David Crowell  
Mr. Richard F. Hensley 

Mrs. Janet S. Nelson  
Mr. James C. Petersen  
Miss Mildred A. Schwab  
Mr. Alvin R. Batiste  

Absent: Mrs. Flanagan was absent due to illness, Mr. Clark was absent due to family illness, and Mr. Alltucker was absent for business reasons.  

OTHERS PRESENT  

Centralized Activities--Chancellor William E. Davis; Secretary Wilma L. Foster; Lawrence C. Pierce, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Wil Post, Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Fiscal Policies; J. Richard Pizzo, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services; Holly Zanville, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor for Personnel Services; Ronald Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Personnel Services; Richard S. Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Planning Services; Jerome Lidz, Assistant Attorney General; Virginia Boushey, Assistant to Executive Vice Chancellor; Ross Hall, Controller; Art Manci, Director, Campus and Building Planning; Susan Weeks, Director, Planning Studies and Analytic Services; Tim Marsh, Information Director; Pat Wignes, Assistant Board Secretary.  

Oregon State University--President John V. Byrne; T. D. Parsons, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Bill Wilkins, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; H. Ronald Cameron, President, Faculty Senate.  

University of Oregon--President Paul Olum; Richard J. Hill, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President for Administration; Shirley L. Menaker, Dean, Graduate School; Pete Swan, Assistant to the President for Legal Affairs; John Moseley, Acting Vice President for Research; Bruce McKinlay, Director, Career Information System; Marjory Ramey, Director, Housing; Stephen F. Pruch, Academic and Research Computing; Jim Lemert, representing Association of Oregon Faculties.  

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Leonard Laster; J. T. McGill, Vice President; Stephen Bauer, Executive Assistant to the President for Campus Liaison.  

Portland State University--President J. C. Blumel; Roger Edginton, Vice President for Finance and Administration.  

Eastern Oregon State College--President David Gilbert; James W. Hottois, Dean of Academic Affairs.  

Oregon Institute of Technology--John H. Smith, Dean of Administration; William W. Smith, Dean of Academic Affairs.  
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Southern Oregon State College--President Natale A. Sicuro; Ernest E. Kittich, Dean of Academic Affairs; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration.

Western Oregon State College--President Richard Meyers; Bill Cowart, Provost; William Neifert, Dean of Administration.

Others--Sherry Oeser, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Barbara Mitchell, Deputy Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Jetta Siegel, Executive Secretary, Oregon Conference, American Association of University Professors; Sandra Stone, Assistant Executive Director in Nursing Education, Oregon State Board of Nursing.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on September 20, 1985, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Petersen, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

The Chancellor indicated that a tabulation of the grants and contracts received by the State System for services, facilities, and programs since the end of the Legislative Session showed that substantial progress had been made. The amounts reported have nearly equaled the $30.5 million provided by the state from the lottery funds. Once the state's contribution from lottery funds has been exceeded, any additional funds which impact the Oregon economy will represent a net gain to the state. He commented that while some of this money would have been received in any event, many of the donors were looking for a favorable climate where good things could happen. Good things have occurred as a result of the state's investment. In addition, the new course requirements have been reflected in the higher SAT scores of the students entering the institutions. More students also are entering with two years of a foreign language, even though this was not included in the course requirements for admission.

State System Progress

Fall Term Enrollments

The Chancellor said fall term enrollments in the State System institutions have increased by 2.2%. Projections three years ago indicated declining enrollments would continue for a period of time. However, this trend began to be reversed at the time the new admission requirements were implemented. There was some concern the requirements would restrict enrollment, but they appear to have had the opposite effect. In addition to larger enrollments, retention has improved. Further effort is still required to improve retention and insure that students have a good college experience.

The Chancellor said the information for the University of Oregon was incorrect due to late payment of fees by a number of students. The figure should now be an increase of 3.6%.

Mrs. Susan Weeks, Director of Planning Studies and Analytic Services, stated that retention was probably the most important issue. More detailed information will be available after the fourth week of classes, but the institutions report more continuing and returning students have registered than were expected. She commented briefly on some of the specific statistics in the report.

She also indicated that the trend usually is established by the end of the second week. There may be some activity between the second and fourth weeks, but no major changes are expected.

Mr. Hensley said that when the enrollment information was presented to the Committee on Instruction, the rather significant increase at the Portland Center for the Oregon Institute of Technology was mentioned. This increase is attributed to the effects of the funding received for the program and the fact that the program appears to be permanent and is accepted by the community.
The Chancellor congratulated the public school administrators and thanked them for their cooperation in meeting the new admission requirements. There were very few instances in which exceptions had to be granted or admission denied because students had not had an opportunity to meet the new course requirements.

The Chancellor said there had been media reports that the University of Oregon Foundation was requesting approval from the Economic Development Commission to be made eligible for the issuance of tax-exempt industrial bonds to put a dome on Autzen Stadium. Feasibility studies also are under way. He indicated that before there was any final action, the proposal would be brought to the Finance Committee and the Board. Any questions should be addressed to Vice President Dan Williams.

The Chancellor referred to comments in a Salem paper with respect to the State System's failure to provide certain affirmative action statistics pertaining to new hires. This information has been reported regularly in previous years after the October payroll period, at which time the statistics first become available for new academic personnel. By submitting the information prior to running the October payroll, the information would be incomplete.

It was indicated there had been no recent contact with the office requesting the information. It was understood all the time that the information would be provided after the October payroll.

Mr. Petersen said there should be some communication with the Governor's Office regarding the newspaper account. He said it had served no useful purpose and did substantial damage, particularly when the data is provided every year in a timely manner and would be sent again this year.

The Chancellor concluded his report by indicating there had been an excellent response to the materials distributed to high school seniors and that public opinion with respect to the State System of Higher Education reflected a growing public awareness and support for higher education in the state.

Mr. Batiste said that the position descriptions for the Chancellor and staff members in the Chancellor's Office had been distributed to Board members. He indicated that action would not be taken to approve the position descriptions at the meeting but requested Board members to review them and contact Mr. Petersen if they had comments or questions. The position descriptions will be presented to the Executive Committee again in November, together with any comments received, and then presented to the Board for approval.

Mr. Petersen said the Executive Committee had discussed also the evaluation of the Chancellor and was in the process of developing the evaluation criteria. Other states have been contacted with respect to the position description and the evaluation criteria for the Chancellor. Mr. Petersen will coordinate these efforts. It is anticipated the Chancellor will conduct a self-study in December, and the formal evaluation will be done during January.

Mr. Batiste said all of the participants in the equity/fairness workshop had received the evaluation sheet for the workshop. He said he believed the goals set for the workshop had been achieved.

Oregon State University requests authorization to offer a certificate program in Peace Studies, effective fall term 1985-86. The proposal, presented in its usual format is included in the document entitled, "Certificate Program in Peace Studies, OSU." A copy is on file in the Board's Office.
Requirements for the Program

The basic requirement for undergraduate certificates in the State System is "completion of requirements for a baccalaureate degree in a field of study in which the institution offers a major program of study." Certificates permit students to supplement their major with a planned concentration of courses providing expertise in a specialty field. Such a specialization may enhance a student's opportunity for employment or may provide guidance to students in selecting general education courses.

Certificate programs differ from double majors in that they require fewer credit hours and thus are more easily completed within the 186-192 credit hours usually required for the baccalaureate degree. Certificate programs are distinguished from minors primarily by their inter-disciplinary focus.

Oregon State University offers undergraduate certificate programs in Human Services, Latin American Affairs, Women Studies, Marine and Maritime Studies, Twentieth Century Studies, Gerontology, and Northwest Studies.

The objectives of the certificate program in Peace Studies, provisions for the administration of the program, and a description of the program are presented in detail in the full document, pp. 1-11. The Peace Studies program will require a minimum of 30 credit hours of course work. This requirement includes 12 hours of core courses and 18 hours of elective courses. The core courses and elective courses are listed in the program document on pp. 12-22 of the full report.

Resources to Offer the Program

The program will be offered by faculty regularly employed in the participating departments. No new faculty are required. The only cost of the program will be the faculty salary cost for the required core course, LS 199(P), The Study of Peace and the Causes of Conflict. There seem to be adequate faculty with an interest in Peace Studies, the library holdings are adequate, and there seems to be sufficient interest among students to warrant the addition of this certificate program.

Program Review

The program has been reviewed by the Board's staff, other higher education institutions in the state, and by the Academic Council. No significant objections to the program have been raised. The Academic Council at its March 15, 1985, meeting gave the program its enthusiastic support.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's staff recommended approval of the Peace Studies Certificate Program at Oregon State University, effective fall term 1985-86.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Dr. Pierce prefaced his introduction of the Peace Studies Certificate Program by stating that the members of the Academic Council have been requested to review at their institutions proposals for new programs which are pending or anticipated shortly. They are to determine their highest priorities in the context of the current situation at each institution. They have been asked to consider centers of excellence in terms of the programs they would like to develop to give their institutions a unique mission. They are to consider also the existing programs they would like to strengthen or expand.

Dr. Pierce said the institutions had been advised that generally the Chancellor and the Board were more interested in improving quality, and strengthening programs than increasing quantity.
Dr. Pierce then indicated that the request for the Peace Studies Certificate Program at Oregon State University had been under review for a period of time and had received favorable response in its review by the Academic Council. The proposed program would not require a change in the mission of the institution.

The staff recommendation for approval of the certificate program should be modified so that the program would be effective with the winter term of 1986, rather than with the fall term of 1985. This change would allow adequate time for review by the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission.

Dr. Bill Wilkins, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost at Oregon State University, said the original proposal for a peace studies program started about fifteen years ago but had not been completed within the institution. Interest in peace studies continued, and a somewhat different program emerged. Dr. Linus Pauling, an alumnus of Oregon State University and the recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, established a lectureship in world peace in memory of his wife. These lectures have been the focus for an interest in peace studies. Students have requested that peace studies be presented in an organized program of study. A faculty and student group was assigned the task of studying the problem and preparing a proposal. He said this proposal was the one presented to the Board for approval.

Mr. Adams suggested that family life courses in the College of Home Economics might be appropriate for the elective courses of the program. Dr. Wilkins responded that they would. He said the intent is to approach the study of peace as a basis for trying to understand what peace is, including conflict management and conflict resolution.

In response to questions, Dr. Wilkins said the completion of the certificate would be noted on the transcripts of the students completing the program. Many of the core courses at the lower-division level would be taken as part of the regular undergraduate program.

Dr. Pierce commented that the students would have declared majors in other fields. The certificate program is a means of organizing the electives toward a specialty in another area of study.

Mr. Adams inquired whether teachers associations or similar groups would have an interest in the program. Dr. Wilkins said various groups have shown an interest and he expected this would increase with an improvement in the information available about the program.

Representatives of both the University of Oregon and Portland State University stated that similar interests had been expressed on those campuses for concentrations of course work in this area of study.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation with the modification in the effective date from Fall 1985 to Winter 1986.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Dr. Wilkins said the Peace Studies Program would be centered in the College of Liberal Arts but would be a university-wide effort. He then reviewed the development of the program as described in the Committee discussion.

Dr. Wilkins said the program had been presented to the college faculty, the university faculty, the curriculum council, and the faculty senate. It received the unanimous endorsement of all of the faculty groups.

The certificate program provides an opportunity for students to organize work into a coherent plan in consultation with an advisor. The student completes a core program and then selects 18 hours from a large number of appropriate courses already available at the institution.
Mr. Hensley said the Committee was advised that the estimated costs for the program were $8,525.33. This money is not new money but comes from other budgetary sources. The proposed certificate is the only program within the State System, although other institutions have been considering programs of this type. He indicated the Committee recommended that the Board approve the request, effective January 1986.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Petersen, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Hensley reported that the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs had discussed the agenda for the coming year and had heard a report on the results of the CBEST in teacher education.

With respect to the Committee agenda, Mr. Hensley said the Committee was of the opinion the consideration of the mission of Portland State University, as required by the legislative budget note, should be presented to a meeting of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Petersen said the Finance Committee had a very full agenda for the year but it would be possible for his committee to meet prior to a meeting of the Committee of the Whole.

Amendment to OAR 580-01-005, Procedural Rule for Changes and Additions to Administrative Rules; and OAR 580-01-020, Availability of Public Records

Staff Report to the Board

The Board's Administrative Rule OAR 580-01-005, Procedural Rule for Changes and Additions to Administrative Rules, specifies the requirements for public notices and the time and manner in which these public notices shall be published.

Modifications need to be made to the list of persons, organizations, and publications set forth in OAR 580-01-005 due to requests for additions and deletions to that list. One minor editorial modification is required to provide a more appropriate ORS citation.

It is also necessary to amend OAR 580-01-020, Availability of Public Records, to reflect increased costs for providing records previously specified in this rule and to include other materials not previously mentioned in the rule.

A public hearing was held on the proposed amendments on September 23, 1985, with Dr. Joe Sicotte as the designated hearing officer. Present at the hearing were: Dr. Sicotte; Board Secretary Wilma Foster; Ms. Jetta Siegel, AAUP representative; and Mr. Wil Doolittle and Mr. Bryan Murray, from KEZI-TV.

The public hearing was opened at the designated hour of 11:00 a.m. by Dr. Sicotte. He explained the proposed amendments and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed changes. There being no testimony, he declared the public hearing closed.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board adopt by roll call vote the following proposed amendments to OAR 580-01-005 and OAR 580-01-020:

Procedural Rule for Changes and Additions to Administrative Rules

580-01-005 (1) Prior to adoption, amendment, or repeal of any rule, except a temporary rule, when the Board does not plan to hold a public hearing, it shall give notice of the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal. The notice shall include a description of the proposed action in sufficient detail to inform people that their interests may be affected, the place at which data or views may be submitted in writing to the agency, a designation of the person to whom a request for public hearing must be submitted and the
time and place therefor, and the time, place and manner in which the proposed rule or amendment may be inspected or a copy obtained. The notice shall be published:

(a) In the Administrative Rules Bulletin referred to in ORS 183.360 at least fifteen (15) days prior to the effective date;

(b) By mailing a copy of the notice to persons on the Board mailing list established pursuant to ORS 183.335{(3)}{(7)};

(c) By mailing a copy of the notice to the following persons, organizations or publications:

(A) Board Members;
(B) Presidents, Department Institutions;
(C) United Press International;
(D) Associated Press;
(E) The Oregonian;
(F) [The Oregon Journal:] Statesman-Journal;
(G) [Eugene] The Register-Guard;
(H) Corvallis Gazette-Times;
(I) [Willamette Week:] Herald and News;
(J) Medford Mail Tribune;
(K) Department Student Newspapers;
(L) Daily Journal of Commerce;
(M) The Daily Tidings;
(N) [KOAC-KOAP-TV-Radio:] KXL;
(O) KOIN-TV; [Radio;]
(P) KGW-TV;
(Q) KATU-TV;
(R) [KVXI:] KEX Radio;
(S) KPTV;
(T) KVAL-TV;
(U) KEZI-TV;
(V) KMTR-TV;
(W) KEED-Radio;

(2) When a public hearing will be held by the Board on the proposed adoption, amendment, or repeal, the notice shall include a description of the proposed action in sufficient detail to inform individuals that their interests may be affected, the time and place of the public hearing, the time, place and manner in which the rule or amendment may be inspected or a copy obtained and a statement that the Board will conduct the hearing. The notice shall be publicized at least fifteen (15) days prior to the date of the public hearing in the manner set forth in subsections (1)(a), (b), and (c) above.

Availability of Public Records

580-01-020 The public may review all Board documents that are designated public records. These documents are on file in the Board's office during regular working hours. Copies of public records are available to the public upon request. The following charges will be made, payable in advance or when the materials are received:

(1) Administrative Rules of the Board of Higher Education, current notebook and revisions for a two-year period--$15;

(2) Copies of documents:
(a) 1-10 copies--$.20 per page;
(b) 11 or more copies--$.15 per page.

(3) Other materials such as computer tapes, microfilm and microfiche copies, audio tape cassettes, computer services, etc., shall be provided at a fee reasonably calculated to reimburse the Board for actual costs incurred in making records available to the public.
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Petersen expressed concern that the list of persons notified in OAR 580-01-005 was confined largely to a limited region west of the Cascades. It was indicated that efforts would be made to expand the media coverage particularly to regions in the eastern and coastal areas.

The Board then approved the staff recommendation and adopted the amendments to OAR 580-01-005 and 580-01-020 in separate roll call votes. On each vote the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Petersen, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None. The President of the Board then declared each rule duly adopted.

Staff Report to the Board

Options available to contractors under ORS 279.420 result in costs to the State System of Higher Education as accounts are established and monitored and transactions occur. ORS 279.420(2) authorizes public agencies to recover their costs associated with retainage deposited to interest-bearing accounts or securities deposited in lieu of cash retainage. The proposed rule will allow the State System to recover these costs for establishing and maintaining interest-bearing bank accounts. These accounts are held against satisfactory performance of capital construction projects. The proposed rule will establish fees for this purpose.

A public hearing has been scheduled for October 16, 1985, at 10:00 a.m., with Ms. Virginia Boushey as the designated hearing officer. A report of any testimony presented at the public hearing will be made to the Board at its October 18 meeting.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that following the report of any public testimony received at the hearing, the Board consider the adoption of the proposed OAR 580-40-007, Retainage Processing Charges. The proposed rule appears below:

Retainage Processing Charges

580-40-007 (1) The contractor for a construction contract may elect to have retainage deposited in an interest-bearing bank account, or to deposit securities in lieu of retainage. Contractors exercising one of these options will be charged for the cost of processing transactions related to that option.

(2) The following charges will be accrued and deducted from the final payment to the contractor:

(a) $25 for setting up initial records.

(b) $10 for each subsequent transaction regarding the retainage funds or securities. These transactions include but are not limited to: depositing and withdrawing funds, and reconciling the bank statement each quarter; receiving securities or safekeeping receipts for securities; preparing letters or statements to the institution, contractor or financial institution; and releasing funds or securities to the contractor.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Boushey reported that no one had appeared to give testimony at the public hearing, and the hearing was closed. In response to a comment from Mr. Hensley concerning testimony from contractors, Ms. Boushey said they generally were aware of the procedure, and there had been no comment from those groups.

Mr. Crowell asked whether it would be appropriate to allow the contractors to provide the staff with a single document indicating that funds were in a trust fund of some sort and thus eliminate the individual charges.
Mr. Ross Hall, Controller, stated that the statutes establish the procedures. Three options are available: (1) the Department of Higher Education can withhold it; (2) the contractor can place securities in a financial institution and provide to the Department of Higher Education a safekeeping receipt from the financial institution verifying that sufficient securities are on hand to cover the retainage; and (3) the retainage can be deducted from the contract payment by the Department of Higher Education and forwarded to a financial institution for deposit in the name of the Department and the contractor.

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, and on roll call vote adopted OAR 580-40-007, Retainage Processing Fee. The following voted in favor: Director Adams, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Petersen, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.

Resolution Re Classified Information for U.S. Department of Defense, OSU

Staff Report to the Board

The Industrial Security Manual issued by the U.S. Department of Defense requires that owners, officers, and executive personnel of corporations and regents or trustees of colleges and universities whose employees have access to classified material in the course of working on Department of Defense contracts delegate to others the authority for fulfilling the requirements of the Industrial Security Manual and exclude themselves from access to classified information.

The resolution recommended to be adopted is that required by the Manual and is, except for changes in the date, names of Board members, and the title of three vice presidents, identical to that which has been adopted annually by the Board.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board adopt the following resolution regarding access to classified information related to the Department of Defense material:

Resolution

At a meeting of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education on October 18, 1985, with a quorum present, it was voted:

That those persons occupying the following positions for Oregon State University shall be known as the Managerial Group as described in the Industrial Security Manual for Safeguarding Classified Information:

President
Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Vice-President for Research and Graduate Studies
Vice-President for Finance and Administration
Director of Business Affairs
Security Officer

That the chief executive and the members of the Managerial Group have been processed or will be processed for a personnel clearance for access to classified information, to the level of the facility clearance granted to this institution as provided for in the aforementioned Industrial Security Manual.

That the said Managerial Group is hereby delegated all of the Board's duties and responsibilities pertaining to the protection of classified information under contracts of the Department of Defense or User Agencies of Its Industrial Security Program awarded to Oregon State University.
That the following named officers and members of Oregon State Board of Higher Education shall not require, shall not have, and can be effectively excluded from access to all classified information in the possession of Oregon State University and do not occupy positions that would enable them to affect adversely the policies and practices of Oregon State University in the performance of contracts for the Department of Defense or User Agencies for its Industrial Security Program awarded to Oregon State University.

**Officers and Board Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvin R. Batiste</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James C. Petersen</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriett J. Flanagan</td>
<td>Member, Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Alltucker</td>
<td>Member, Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Adams</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Chao</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrence A. Clark</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. David Crowell</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard F. Hensley</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet S. Nelson</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred A. Schwab</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William E. Davis</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilma L. Foster</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Discussion and Action**

Upon motion by Director Petersen and second by Director Schwab, the Board approved the staff recommendation and adopted the above resolution on roll call vote. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Petersen, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.

**1987-1989 Capital Construction Priorities & Calendar**

The calendar for preparation of the 1987-1989 Biennial Budget requires that tentative institutional priorities for capital construction be presented to the Committee and the Board at the March 1986 meeting. It is further anticipated that the Committee and the Board will review the Chancellor's recommended priority list at the June meeting and that final Board action will occur at the July meeting.

Although institutions have been advised that capital construction requests will need to be submitted before the end of the calendar year in order to meet the Board's schedule for review, institutions need to be advised of the Board's general priorities for capital construction.

Chancellor Davis recommended that priority consideration be given to the following four categories:

1. Projects for instruction and research.
2. Projects in direct support of instruction and research.
3. Projects which renovate and renew existing facilities.
4. Projects which address basic infrastructure deficiencies.

The four categories are not necessarily listed in priority order but simply set forth the types of projects which will receive priority consideration.

Projects for instruction and research include projects which address measurable deficiencies or quantifiable needs in the facilities required for instruction and for research.
Projects in direct support of instruction or research would include facilities such as libraries, computer centers, and similar programs for which quantifiable needs can be demonstrated.

Projects which renovate and renew existing buildings include projects which enable existing buildings to be modernized to current facilities' requirements, by improving ventilation, electrical service, acoustics, partitioning, installing ceiling systems, accessibility, occupant safety, and similar improvements. Projects included here must be carefully separated from those of deferred maintenance or capital repair. As a general rule, projects which increase the capital value of a building should appear in this category; projects which maintain the previous capital value would be considered capital repair or deferred maintenance, which will be the subject of a separate request.

Projects which address infrastructure deficiencies would include projects which complete, improve, or enhance campus-wide or building systems. Examples would be incomplete heating/cooling loops and return systems; unseparated storm and sanitary sewer systems; liquid-cooled transformers containing PCB's; sub-standard roadways and walks; and similar systems deficiencies. The distinction from capital repair or deferred maintenance would be applicable in this category.

All other projects which institutions identify also will be considered, but in lower priority than the categories set out above. Among projects which are proposed to be considered in lower priorities are those related to museums, art galleries, performing arts centers, and spectator facilities.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

It was recommended that the Committee adopt the proposed priority for capital construction projects.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

Mr. Petersen explained that the proposed action called for the approval of the philosophical priorities for the capital construction projects for the 1987-1989 biennium. The staff recommendation does not call for approval of specific projects but sets forth four guidelines for the development of the 1987-1989 capital construction request.

In presenting the report, Mr. Art Mancl, Director of Campus and Building Planning, said the priorities differed somewhat from those in previous years. Instruction and research projects were always in high priority, and this is reflected in the first two priorities. However, the renovation of existing facilities and the correction of basic deficiencies represents a difference from previous capital construction presentations. He noted that the four categories were not necessarily in priority order.

Mr. Petersen said the last paragraph of the staff report listed several examples of projects -- museums, art galleries, performing arts centers, and spectator facilities -- which would have a lower priority than other types of projects cited in the report.

Mr. Mancl said that because of the limited funds available for construction, he would expect that projects would be considered differently than they would have been in other years. The fact that a project was once on the capital construction priority list would not mean necessarily that it would automatically move up to a higher priority for the succeeding biennium.

Mr. Petersen then asked whether any of the museums, performing arts centers, art galleries, or spectator facilities which might currently be on the list would have a different priority as a result of the four categories stated in the report.
Mr. Mancl said he did not believe that there were any which would be affected. However, the statement would suggest that an institution might be more successful in getting facilities of this nature if it sought outside support for the project.

Mr. Petersen said he had requested and received a report of capital construction projects at each campus over the last decade. He said it was evident from the list that the richer became richer and the poorer became poorer with respect to capital construction. He said priorities should be based on need and the criteria established. However, the 1987-1989 capital construction priorities should be prepared with a sensitivity to the history of capital construction during the last decade.

Mr. Mancl said these priorities indicated a concern with good use of existing facilities so that they are suitable for current uses.

Mr. Chao said there was one guideline that should supersede all of those presented in the report -- the project's relationship to the mission of the institution. In light of the pressures on funding, Mr. Chao proposed that the guidelines state that all projects must be critical to and in support of the institutional mission statements.

Mr. Crowell inquired whether there had been a similar set of criteria for the current biennium.

Mr. Mancl indicated there always had been a list of statements of things that were considered critical in assigning priorities. He said the proposal before the Committee asked the Board to specify guidelines and particularly to indicate a position with respect to the third and fourth guidelines.

President Meyers asked whether it was the intent of Mr. Chao's suggestion that funding be allowed on the basis of a project's proximity to the mission statement for the institution.

Mr. Petersen said it was his understanding all projects must be critical to and in support of the mission statement. Mr. Chao said that it would be difficult to be more specific but that priorities would be given first to those projects which supported the mission of the institution.

Mr. Mancl pointed out that the political situation may affect the capital construction program and the political situation changes with each biennium.

Mr. Petersen commented that if all of the capital construction projects were built on political sensitivity, the Board would not be meeting the guideline stated by Mr. Chao and the history reflected in the projects of the last decade would continue. There are political issues, but the prime guideline should be that a project is critical to and in support of the mission of the institution.

Mr. Petersen said he would like to add a statement to the recommendation to the Board that sensitivity to previous construction history also would be a consideration. In addition, he requested that the last paragraph be modified to allow consideration of projects mentioned in that paragraph, if they are critical to the institutional mission.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Petersen said the Finance Committee had modified the staff recommendation and recommended that the Board direct that priority consideration be given to the following:

A. Projects which support and are critical to institutional missions.
B. Categories of priority considerations--
1. Projects for instruction and research.
2. Projects in direct support of instruction and research.
3. Projects which renovate and renew existing facilities.
4. Projects which address basic infrastructure deficiencies.

The Committee also proposed a revised statement for the last paragraph above the staff recommendation to the Committee so that the paragraph would read as follows: "All projects which institutions identify will be considered in relation to institutional missions. Among proposed projects which may be considered in lower priorities are those related to museums, art galleries, performing arts centers, and spectator facilities."

The Committee recommended the following statement for consideration by the Board: "Sensitivity to previous construction history will be considered in priority considerations."

Mr. Petersen explained that the Committee believed that the projects in the last paragraph should be funded by private capital. This would not eliminate the possibility of erecting a museum, but it would not be considered a high priority in relation to the other needs related to the execution of the mission.

Mr. Hensley said he was a little unsure of the intent of the Committee's proposal and referred to the private funding for the Schneider Art Museum at Southern Oregon State College.

Mr. Petersen said the Committee's proposal would in no way discriminate against projects of this nature from private funds. Mr. Chao added that if a museum or similar project were critical to the mission of an institution, that fact would override the nature of the project and place it in a higher priority.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and modifications as presented. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Petersen, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

At the March 1985 meeting of the State Board of Higher Education, approval was given to the proposal made by the University of Oregon for the creation of the Riverfront Research Park, to be developed on institutional property located on the north side of Franklin Boulevard. The Board authorized the Vice Chancellor for Administration to enter into a lease on the property with a nonprofit corporation which was to have been created specifically for the purposes of the project. Ten specific conditions were to be included as provisions in the lease as well as others deemed by the Vice Chancellor for Administration as necessary or advantageous to furthering the interests of the Board.

In the time since March 15, 1985, University officials have worked with institutional committees and local governmental agencies to bring the project further toward fruition. During this time, it became apparent that an intergovernmental agreement between the University of Oregon and the City of Eugene would be a more efficient and appropriate way to proceed with the development of the research park. Members of the nonprofit Riverfront Research Park, Inc., have supported this decision and have assisted in the development of proposed Land Transfer Conditions and meeting requirements of local government agencies.

Chapter 190 of Oregon Revised Statutes gives express permission for two or more governmental bodies or agencies, including both state and local governments, to accomplish a common goal through the mechanism of intergovernmental agreements. The statute sets forth certain requirements which must be met. The mechanism allows each party to the agreement to reserve powers they consider essential to their interests while allowing the parties to contribute to the project in all ways deemed appropriate.
For example, the University of Oregon is currently a party to an intergovernmental agreement for the purposes of promoting museum activities in the region with Lane Community College, the City of Eugene, Lane County, and the Lane Educational Service District. Intergovernmental agreements are commonly implemented through intergovernmental commissions. In the case of the museum agreement, the Museum Commission was established, and has been working successfully in the promotion of museum activities, including the construction of the WISTEC building in Alton Baker Park, Eugene.

Development of the Riverfront Research Park

The City of Eugene and the University of Oregon are currently working out a draft of an intergovernmental agreement to facilitate the development of the Riverfront Research Park. This agreement would reserve to the University its power to establish and enforce the conditions set forth by the State Board of Higher Education and by the President of the University. It would reserve to the City of Eugene its powers as an Urban Renewal Agency, its land use powers, and its powers of public improvements and financing.

The agreement would establish a commission—the Riverfront Research Park Commission. The powers and duties of this commission would be to undertake the negotiations with the Master Developer, oversee the administration of the agreement, and make recommendations to the parties with respect to their reserved powers. Thus the commission would be the focal point of the parties' cooperative effort to achieve the development of the research park.

The members of the commission would be appointed by the University and by the City of Eugene. For example, the commission might have seven members—three appointed by the University, three by the City, and the seventh jointly by the parties. The commission would be staffed by the University and by the City. Costs of staffing the commission could be paid from the proceeds of the tax increment district which the City is establishing.

Once the commission, with the help of the staff, had negotiated an agreement with a developer, it would recommend approval of this agreement to the University and to the City. The University would approve this agreement only if it fulfilled the conditions established by the State Board and by the University. However, in a practical sense, if the commission were operating properly, care would have already been taken to assure that the agreement recommended fulfilled these requirements. A similar situation would exist with respect to approval by the City. Once the parties had both approved an agreement recommended to them by the commission, the agreement would be signed by representatives of the parties and the developer and would be in force. If the agreement called for the lease of an increment of property, signing of the agreement would result in a lease of that increment from the Oregon State System of Higher Education to the developer.

Anticipated Actions

If the Board authorizes the University to enter into the intergovernmental agreement with the City of Eugene, the following actions are anticipated:

1. The University and the City would present a draft of the proposed agreement to the Executive Vice Chancellor for his approval. With this approval, the agreement would be signed and the commission established.

2. Members would be appointed to the commission, following the procedure established in the agreement. The University and the City would appoint staff to the commission.

3. The commission, with the approval of the City and the University, would select a Master Developer.
4. The commission, with the assistance of staff, would negotiate a 
pre-development agreement with the Master Developer. This agreement 
would give the developer a period of time, probably six months, in 
which to develop and present a Master Development Plan and to undertake 
a market survey for the Park.

5. The commission, the City, and the University would consider this 
Plan, and presumably approve it, perhaps with modifications. Based 
upon this plan, a Development Agreement would be negotiated, which 
would likely result in the release of the first increment of land for 
development.

It is expected that all of the above actions will be accomplished over the 
coming nine months, and construction can be undertaken in the Research 
Park by the summer of 1986.

The following Land Transfer Conditions are to be met in addition to those 
set forth in the Board's action in March 1985:

I. Property to be Transferred

A. The Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE) shall be 
asked to incrementally transfer* up to 71 acres of state-owned 
property between Franklin Boulevard and the Willamette River to 
the developer(s) subject to conditions described herein, and the 
conditions established by OSSHE at its meeting of March 15, 1985.

B. Land shall be transferred to the developer(s) by OSSHE in 
increments in accordance with a phased Master Development Plan 
as described in III below. A review of the project will be carried 
out near completion of each increment, and prior to the release of 
the next increment.

II. Selection of Developer(s)

A. The City of Eugene (City) and the University of Oregon (University) 
shall jointly select developer(s) for the Project.

B. The participation of the University in the selection of developer(s) 
shall be made as directed by the President.

C. In the event it becomes necessary or desirable to change developer(s), 
such changes shall be made jointly by the City and the University.

III. Preparation of a Master Development Plan

A. The developer(s) shall prepare or cause to be prepared a Master 
Development Plan for the Project, in cooperation with the City 
and the University. The Plan shall separate the project area into 
four or more logical increments for development purposes.

B. This Master Development Plan shall be approved by the University 
as directed by the President prior to implementation.

C. The project shall not be implemented until the Master Development 
Plan has been approved by the City and the University.

*Transfer is taken to mean either a long term lease, or sale with reversion 
of the property to the University in 75-98 years.
IV. University Advisory Groups

The University shall establish two standing University Advisory Groups to advise the President in the implementation of the Project, and in the review of the Project, specifically as to its progress and conformance to these Land Transfer Conditions, and to the Master Development Plan.

A. Design Advisory Group

(1) Advise in the preparation and review of the Master Development Plan and increments thereof.

(2) Advise in the review of architectural and design issues at the beginning and near the completion of each increment of the Project.

(3) The Design Advisory Group shall consist of at least five members of the University faculty and two outside members, to be appointed by the President.

B. Research Advisory Group

(1) Assist in the identification of research activities for location in the Project, and advise on the relations of potential occupants to University activities.

(2) Assist in recruitment of firms considering the establishment of facilities in the project.

(3) Assist in the review of the Project near the completion of each increment for its achievement of the objectives of the Project described in paragraphs V and VI below.

(4) The Research Advisory Group shall consist of at least seven members of the University research faculty. It shall be appointed by the President of the University of Oregon. The Presidents of Oregon State University, the Oregon Health Sciences University, and Portland State University shall have the right to recommend additional members to this group and, if so recommended, at least one such member from each university that wishes representation shall be appointed.

V. University-Related Research Activities

The Riverfront Research Park shall be limited to research and other activities related to the research and academic interests of institutions of the State System, and such ancillary and service uses primarily intended to serve the day-to-day needs of employees working in the Riverfront Park area. It is recognized that these activities change with time, as will the activities of occupants of the Project. It is therefore particularly important for the achievement of this objective that there be involvement of the research communities of the universities in the initial recruitment process, and that continuing interactions between University and industrial researchers be fostered.
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VI. Permitted Activities

Primary uses located in the Riverfront Research Park development should be limited to those activities which would benefit from proximity to the University and which would contribute to the University's missions. Criteria for making this determination should include the extent to which the proposed activity enhances the educational opportunities provided by the University, contributes to information transfer objectives of the University, the extent to which it provides opportunities for meaningful and productive interaction among research and administrative personnel in the University and in the organizations locating in the research park, or the extent to which the firm is or is likely to become a source of sponsored research.

A. No research or development is permitted whose specific purpose or primary consequence is to destroy or injure human life.

B. No research or development is permitted which is directed toward the design, development or production of weapons.

C. Housing, service, retail, manufacturing, and office uses are permitted only to the extent that they are supportive of the primary goal as described in paragraphs V and VI above.

VII. Design Standards

A. Design standards shall be established in the Master Development Plan. This plan shall be approved by the City and the University prior to the implementation of the project.

B. Rather than attempt to quantify such criteria as density standards, open space, building height, set-backs, architectural style, street access and the like in this land transfer, the process of approval for the Master Development Plan shall include consideration within the context of the entire Development Plan of all areas of concern addressed by the University Campus Planning Committee in its "Initial Recommendations to the President," dated July 18, 1985, and by the City in its Riverfront Park Study as adopted by the City Council on September 9, 1985.

C. The Master Development Plan shall specifically address the questions of ratios of building space to land and protection and enhancement of the quality of the environment.

VIII. Pollution and Toxic Wastes

The trend in hazardous waste management in the United States is moving toward reduction in the quantity of hazardous materials used in research and industry and the promotion of reuse and recycling of materials used or generated. It is the policy of the University of Oregon Riverfront Research Park to minimize the use and generation of hazardous substances at the site, and to promote maximum reuse and recycling prior to collection and disposal.

A. All occupants shall be required to obey rigorously federal, state, and local regulations regarding emissions, toxic wastes, and other potentially harmful materials.

B. Any activity involving the use of hazardous biological substances shall be required to conform with the NIH Guidelines (Federal Projects, Vol. 45, No. 20, Tuesday, January 29, 1980) as if those guidelines were regulatory.

C. Particular care shall be taken to avoid any pollution of the river.
IX. Review

A. The progress of the Project shall be reviewed near the completion of each increment of the Project. This review shall be held at the request of the developer(s), City or the University.

B. The review shall consider the conformity of the Project to the land transfer conditions and the Master Development Plan. It shall be conducted jointly by the City and the University. The University shall involve the Design Advisory Group and the Research Advisory Group in the review, as well as other parties who may be designated by the President.

C. No further increment of the Project shall be made available for development until both the City and the University notify the developer(s) that the review has been favorable. Upon such favorable notification, the developer(s) may request release of the subsequent increment of the Project, which may not be unreasonably withheld.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board authorize the University of Oregon, upon review and approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor, to enter into an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Eugene, the terms of which are to be with and ultimately to implement the Land Transfer Conditions outlined above and the conditions set forth in the Board's action of March 15, 1985.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

President Olum reviewed briefly the project as presented in the staff report. He described some of the advantages of the intergovernmental agreement over the previous proposal and the disadvantages of the earlier plan.

Mr. Petersen referred to a statement on the selection of the master developer which indicated that the commission would choose the master developer. This would appear to conflict with another statement, and Mr. Petersen asked who would select the master developer.

President Olum said the City of Eugene and the University of Oregon would make the selection jointly. Both will be represented on the commission. The intergovernmental commission will do the negotiating with developers and make a recommendation, but the city and the university will have to approve the choice.

Following further discussion, it was agreed that the language of the documents would state clearly that the intergovernmental commission would recommend a master developer to the city and the university for approval.

Mr. Petersen said he understood the corporation was already in existence and had a board. He inquired as to the relationship between the board and the commission.

President Olum said the commission would be completely independent of the board and would replace it. It would be desirable for the board to continue in an advisory capacity because of the expertise available in its membership.

Mr. Petersen asked whether appointments to the commission would be fixed-term appointments to allow for turnover in the membership. President Olum indicated the appointments would be fixed-term and made by the city and the university. The present draft of the intergovernmental agreement assumes two-year, fixed-term appointments.

Mr. Petersen asked whether the university was satisfied with the types of research which would be conducted in the research park.
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President Olum said the university was satisfied at the moment that those things should be part of the land transfer conditions. The agreement is that any master plan or agreements that are negotiated will include those limitations. The one developer with whom there have been extensive conversations has indicated the conditions are quite acceptable to him and it is entirely possible to build such a research park with these limitations.

Mr. Chao suggested that an upper limit on the number of members in the design advisory group would be appropriate. President Olum said it would be necessary to have a moderately large committee to cover the different fields and to include persons from the other universities. However, the committee should not be so large that it would be difficult to accomplish its purposes. It was indicated also that there would be other minor changes in the agreement and it would be brought to the Board for approval.

There was further discussion of the design advisory group membership, and it was agreed that there should be a clarification of the references to membership so that they reflected the recommendation for five members from the university and two outside members.

Mr. Petersen recommended that a statement be included to insure some turnover but at the same time to allow the president flexibility for continuity of membership.

Mr. Chao asked whether there would be any instructional activities in the park. It was indicated there might be some workshops and seminars but that there was no plan to put classrooms in the research park.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented. Mr. Petersen noted the additional report presented to the Committee by the University of Oregon in explanation of the project and the recommendation.

Mr. Petersen said this was a very exciting project and he believed it was a landmark for the university to have such a good working relationship with the city in promoting this research park.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Petersen reviewed the presentation to the Committee and the Committee's discussion. He said the Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented.

Mr. Hensley asked the Board's attorneys if they had reviewed the proposal from the standpoint of the Board's liability and contractual commitments.

Mr. Lidz said the proposed land transfer conditions had been reviewed. However, there has been no opportunity as yet to discuss it except to advise the Executive Vice Chancellor that the attorneys found no major problems with it.

Mr. Petersen pointed out that after the final details were developed, the Board would be approving them. He said the intergovernmental commission has been reviewed by the Attorney General's office from the beginning and it was considered an appropriate way to organize the project.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Petersen, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.
SUMMARY OF FACILITIES DIVISION ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

Staff Report to the Board

A summary of activities within the Office of Administration’s Facilities Division is presented below:

Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

This project is included in the 1985-1987 capital construction request. Jeppsen, Miller & Tobias, Corvallis, will provide necessary architectural services at a cost not to exceed $76,245. Financing will be provided from Lottery Funds.

McArthur Court, UO

Breedlove-McConnell Engineers, Inc., Portland, will provide the necessary engineering services at a cost not to exceed $5,000. Financing will be provided through funding resources available to the institution.

Medical Research Building, Neurology Alterations, OHSU

Peterson Kolberg & Associates, P.C., Wilsonville, will provide necessary architectural services at a cost not to exceed $17,650. Financing will be provided through funding resources available to the institution.

Consulting Services, UO

L. R. Squier Associates Inc., Lake Oswego, will provide necessary geotechnical consulting services at a cost not to exceed $18,170. Financing will be provided through funding resources available to the institution.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Reaffirmation of Policies Regarding Grant & Contract Management

The members of the Committee and the Board have expressed concern from time to time that funds for research are solicited through institution corporate affiliates and that such procedures may result in committing the Board or institutions to conduct research without the necessary controls being present or that indirect cost allowances may not be forthcoming to institutional accounts.

The Board has several Administrative Rules and Internal Management Directives governing relations with affiliated organizations. The most relevant to this issue is OAR 580-42-015, Institutional Responsibility, which is quoted below:

580-42-015 Requests for gift, grant, or contract funds may be initiated by an institution, division, or statewide service, acting for the Board, subject to the following considerations:

1. A request obligating the Board to increase an allocation of state appropriations or seek additional state funds were the gift, grant, or contract to be discontinued is subject to Board approval before the request is submitted to the granting agency.

2. A request contemplating purchase of land or construction of a building, structure, or other improvement requiring a total outlay of $10,000 or more, regardless of the source of funds, is subject to approval by the Office of Facilities Planning before the request is submitted to the granting agency.

3. When all or a major portion of project performance requires the services of institutional personnel or use of its property or if project funding includes indirect cost allowances, funding is to be requested in the name of the Board.
Subsection (3) appears to be directly on the point. Inasmuch as this policy has been duly adopted by the Board as an Administrative Rule, it represents a legal requirement which institutions are obliged to follow. As a practical matter, it should be recognized that occasionally the affiliate organizations may serve a useful role in obtaining grant or contract funds and that the staff recommends that they be used to the extent the substantive requirements of the rules are met. It should also be noted that occasionally grants do come to affiliate organizations for research activities. Under such circumstances, the transfer of such funds from the organization to the institution should be accomplished and expenditures made in accordance with other relative Administrative Rules and Internal Management Directives.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

Inasmuch as the Administrative Rules appear not to require modification, the staff recommended that the Committee reemphasize its policies as reflected in the Rules and the Internal Management Directives.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Petersen explained that the Board learned at its retreat that in some cases it was losing the opportunity for capturing indirect costs in the execution and implementation of grants. He said there is Board policy with respect to this matter and the purpose of the presentation to the Committee was to reaffirm that policy, to make the institutions aware of it, and to seek ways to see that the policy is properly executed.

Mr. Perry reviewed the pertinent Administrative Rules. He said the Board would not want to eliminate the possibility of availing itself of the service and funding available through the foundations by foreclosing these opportunities completely. However, it is important that Board policies be observed.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation to reaffirm existing policies.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Chao, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Petersen, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.

Workshop for New Administrators

The Chancellor said at the time of the Board's retreat following its September meeting, the Board directed the staff to meet with the presidents and develop a management training orientation workshop for new administrators in the State System. The workshop will be held prior to the start of fall term for faculty and staff who have become directors, department chairmen, deans, vice presidents, and presidents.

The Chancellor said he believed this was one of the first programs of this nature in the country.

Report Card on Strategic Plan

Also at the retreat, a report card was distributed on the accomplishments with respect to the recommendations in the Strategic Plan. Copies of the report were distributed. The Chancellor indicated an "A" grade meant that the recommendation had been implemented and was working effectively; "B" meant the recommendation had been implemented but further action was required; "C" meant the recommendation had been implemented but was working ineffectively; and "I" meant that the recommendation was still in the process of being implemented.

The Chancellor commented that some of the recommendations never would be achieved but were goals to be reached as fully as possible.
Mrs. Nelson reported she had attended the Joint Committee on Teacher Education. The agenda for the year was established. A key element of the agenda for the year will be working with the legislative joint committee on education to share information collected by the Joint Committee on Teacher Education. Mrs. Nelson said the legislative committee on education was headed by Vera Katz and John Kitzhaber. She distributed copies of a letter indicating the four items upon which the committee would focus its attention. Mrs. Nelson suggested that if Board members had questions or comments, they communicate with the committee members.

Mrs. Nelson said reports were presented at the meeting on the projects which are under way at the present time. A major portion of the meeting was devoted to the discussion of a new study on the reserve pool. This pool consists of persons who hold current Oregon certificates enabling them to teach in the public schools but are not teaching this year. The purpose of the study is to determine the endorsements these people have, whether they have less than full-time teaching jobs, why they are not employed in the teaching field, and what they are doing.

Mrs. Nelson commended Dr. Holly Zanville, the staff person on the committee, for her presentations and the clarification of issues under discussion. Mrs. Nelson said the next meeting of the Joint Committee on Teacher Education would be a joint meeting with the High School/College Connection Committee in early December.

Mr. Chao reported that there had been three meetings of the Governor's Commission on High Technology, which was established to advise the Board. The commission has dealt with statements of purpose and missions and has gone through at least the first consideration of a statement of purpose. Mr. Chao said he expected to have a draft of the statement for consideration at a meeting of the Special Committee on OCATE at the time of the November Board meeting.

Mr. Hensley commented that he had met with Mr. Earl Wantland, who is chairing the commission. Mr. Wantland was very enthusiastic about the responses of the members. Mr. Hensley said the Board was very fortunate to have these outstanding executives involved in giving their time to this program.

Mr. Crowell reported that he had attended the State System's recruiting effort at Corvallis High School. He said the movie was very well received and had the complete attention of the students.

Mr. Hensley reported that he had represented the Board recently at the signing of a partnership agreement between Oregon Institute of Technology and the Muroran Institute of Technology, in the province of Hokkaido, Japan. Dignitaries from Japan, the Governor's Office, the city, the county, and the Board were present for the signing of the agreement.

The partnership will permit the two institutions to exchange students, faculty, and curriculum. Following the signing of the agreement, the president of the Muroran Institute presented slides showing the facilities of his institution. The school is approximately the same size as Oregon Institute of Technology and is basically an engineering school. It has 12 different departments in engineering.

Mr. Batiste indicated he had represented Mrs. Flanagan at a meeting of the Oregon International Council on the China Connection. The Consul General and a member of his staff were present from San Francisco, as well as representatives from business and public and private higher education. They said that China is involved in a huge educational reform and needs assistance. The State System already has two programs involving students from the People's Republic of China. There is great interest on the part of the Chinese government in expanding education, trade, and other activities in Oregon and with the State System.
Mr. Batiste commented that the Governor and other delegations which have visited China have encouraged relationships with that country that will have long-term benefits for the State of Oregon.

Mr. Batiste said he had attended the meeting of the High School/College Connection at which time reports were received on the impact of the course requirements. The committee was very pleased with the progress that was being made. In addition, there was a report on the curriculum development activities discussed last year. It is anticipated these programs will be fully implemented within the next two years.

Mr. Batiste said one program involving the State System was aimed at improving the lower-division curriculum.

With respect to evaluation, it was agreed the reports from Mr. Pizzo's office would be used as a guide.

Mr. Batiste said the committee would like to discuss with the Board the matter of the foreign language requirement.

Mr. Batiste reported that Mrs. Flanagan had been appointed to the Commission on Nursing and had accepted the appointment. This appointment has been confirmed by the Board of Nursing.

The 1986 Board meeting schedule was distributed. Mr. Batiste indicated it had been discussed at the retreat. There were no objections to the proposed meeting schedule, and Mr. Batiste declared it approved.

The Board meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Alvin R. Batiste, President
Wilma L. Foster, Secretary