MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE
STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION HELD
DECEMBER 20, 1985

MINUTES APPROVED

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT
  Task Force on Mission of PSU 402
  Fall Term Enrollment Report 402
  Research Grants and Contracts 402
  OCATE Report 402

A Plan for Nursing Education in the OSSHE 403

Federal Funds Shortfall, 1985-1987, Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service 423

Gilbert Hall Addition (Chiles Business Center) Addendum to Land Lease, UO 426

Project Budget Increase for College Center Remodel, WOSC 427

Proposed Adoption of OAR 580-50-027, Affirmative Action Goals 428

Amendments to Administrative Rules, Divisions 11, 40, 41, 42, and 43; and Internal Management Directives, Sections 1, 6, and 7 To Effect Changes in Title and Function for the Executive Vice Chancellor and OHSU 430

Academic Progress of Student Athletes, 1985 Progress Report 448

SUMMARY OF FACILITIES DIVISION ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION
  Erb Memorial Union Bowling Alley Conversion, UO 453
  Classroom-Laboratory Building, OIT 453

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS 453

PRESIDENT'S REPORT
  Next Meeting Dates 453

ADJOURNMENT 453

Supplement A 454
STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN THE
DADS' ROOM, ERB MEMORIAL UNION
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

December 20, 1985

Meeting #532

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in the
Dads' Room, Erb Memorial Union, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 11:15 a.m., December 20, 1985, by the
President of the Board, Mr. Alvin R. Batiste, and on roll call the following
answered present:

Mr. Robert R. Adams
Mr. John W. Alltucker
Mr. Terrence A. Clark
Mr. F. David Crowell

Mr. Richard F. Hensley
Mrs. Janet S. Nelson
Miss Mildred A. Schwab
Mr. Alvin R. Batiste

Absent: Mr. Chao was absent for business reasons; Mrs. Flanagan was
absent due to illness; Mr. Petersen was absent for personal reasons.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities--Chancellor William E. Davis; Secretary Wilma L.
Foster; W. T. Lemman, Executive Vice Chancellor; Lawrence C. Pierce,
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs; Wil Post, Vice Chancellor for Public
Affairs; John Owen, Vice Chancellor for OCATE; W. C. Neland, Associate
Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; Holly Zanville, Assistant Vice Chancellor,
Academic Affairs; Kay Juran, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs;
J. Richard Pizzo, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Services; Jerry Casby,
Assistant Attorney General; Clarethel Kahananui, Retired, Vice Chancellor,
Academic Affairs; James Lockwood, Assistant to Vice Chancellor, Academic
Affairs/Public Affairs; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel
Services; Tom Berkey, Associate Budget Director; Wayne Kurlinski, Special
Assistant to the Chancellor; Karen McCumsey, Secretary to the Chancellor;
Debbie Cherry, Secretary, Public Affairs.

Oregon State University--President John V. Byrne; T. D. Parsons, Vice
President for Finance and Administration; H. Ronald Cameron, President,
OSU Faculty Senate; Robert O. McMahon, President-Elect, OSU Faculty
Senate; Robert E. Witters, Acting Director, Agricultural Experiment Station;
Dick Craig, Director, Agricultural Fiscal and Personnel; Keith Mobjley,
Assistant to the President; Orrin E. Smith, Director, Cooperative Extension.

University of Oregon--President Paul Olum; Richard J. Hill, Provost; Dan
Williams, Vice President for Administration; Shirley L. Menaker, Dean,
Graduate School; Morrette Rider, Dean, School of Music; Alison Baker,
Executive Assistant to the President; Barbara Mossberg, Associate Dean,
Graduate School; Allan M. Winkler, Professor; Paul S. Holbo, Vice Provost;
Curt Lind, Director, Continuing Education; Marjory Ramey, Housing Direc-
tor; Donald Moon Lee, Associate Director, Housing; B. E. Smith, Professor;
Wilmot Gilland, Dean, Architecture and Allied Arts; Bob James, Acting
Department Head, Fine and Applied Arts.

Oregon Health Sciences University--President Leonard Laster; J. T. McGill,
Vice President; Carol Lindeman, Dean, School of Nursing.

Portland State University--President J. C. Blumel; Margaret J. Dobson,
Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs; Roger Edgington, Vice President
for Finance and Administration.

Eastern Oregon State College--President David Gilbert; James W. Hottois,
Dean of Academic Affairs; Marcia Shoup, Director, School of Nursing.

Oregon Institute of Technology--President Larry Blake; John Smith, Dean
of Administration; William W. Smith, Dean of Academic Affairs; Marion
Dickens, Director of Nursing.
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Southern Oregon State College—Ernest Ettich, Dean of Academic Affairs; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration; Hannah Dean, Director, School of Nursing.

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

Others—T. K. Olson, Executive Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Barbara Mitchell, Deputy Director, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission; Sherry Oesser, Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Deborah Lincoln, Budget Analyst, Executive Department.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on November 22, 1985, and approved them as previously distributed. Those voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Clark, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Task Force on Mission of PSU

The Chancellor announced that the President of the Board had appointed a task force on the mission of Portland State University, particularly in graduate research. He said the task force was somewhat unique in that it combined former Board members from the Portland area who have extensive experience on the Board and current Board members from Portland and Coos Bay. The chairman of the task force is Mr. Loren Wiss, a former Board member. In addition, former Board member Louis Perry and current Board members Gene Chao, Janet Nelson, and Mildred Schwab were appointed to the task force. Other members from the community and the institution are: Lloyd Anderson, Executive Director of the Port of Portland; Matthew Prophet, Superintendent of the Portland Public Schools; Bernard Ross, Dean of the Graduate School of Social Work at Portland State University; and Jim Heath, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs at Portland State.

The Chancellor said the membership of the task force was not intended to represent constituencies of the community, faculty, student body, or any other group. The committee is a working committee composed of objective, fair-minded people who will invite testimony, meet with different groups, and make findings on their reports and recommendations for consideration by the Board. The task force is not a decision-making or policy-making body, but a fact-finding group which will organize the facts and make a report. The report is expected to be presented to the February 17 meeting of the Board.

Fall Term Enrollment Report

The Chancellor reported that fall term enrollments showed an overall increase of 2.2% throughout the State System, for a total of 49,675 students. The headcount enrollment has increased by 1.9% to 59,336 students. The significant point is that the projected enrollments in 1982 predicted a loss of enrollments during this period due to a decline of 6.3% in the number of students who graduate from high school. Instead of decreased enrollments, there has been an increase, even with the higher entrance requirements imposed this fall. In addition, the percentage of high school graduates from Oregon attending State System institutions is about 2% greater this year.

The Chancellor commented that he was particularly pleased with the enthusiastic response to the slide show tape and the brochures and publications. He noted that the brochures projected the State System as a total system and emphasized the uniqueness and quality of each of the institutions.

Research Grants and Contracts

The Chancellor indicated that research grants and contracts had reached a total of $32.5 million new dollars since June 1, 1985. This is about $2 million ahead of the amount appropriated by the Legislature from lottery funds.

OCATE Report

The Chancellor requested Dr. John Owen to describe developments with respect to OCATE. Dr. Owen indicated the Commission had been meeting regularly and individual Commission members had met with various members of the advisory group.
The courses to be offered through OCATE during the winter term include four high technology courses and two business courses. Details of the courses were described in a leaflet distributed to Board members and available to prospective students.

The OCATE mission statement will be presented to the Board later and will stress the role of OCATE as a coordinator and facilitator. Dr. Owen said OCATE is not intended to be a separate institution. Dr. Owen commented on the cooperation existing between the State System institutions and the private institutions.

The goal for spring term is to have six high technology courses and two more business courses. By the fall of 1986, it is expected that OCATE will have in operation a program that would make very sensible choices for master's degree programs in the high technology area.

The Chancellor commended Dr. Owen and Director Roger Olsen for the quality of the brochure and their efforts in organizing the program. Dr. Owen indicated that much of the success OCATE will have would be due to the efforts and enthusiasm of Mr. Olsen.

Mr. Hensley commented that one of the representatives from the independent sector on the joint planning committee had complimented the Board on this particular effort as a great step forward in the cooperation between the private and public sectors.

Executive Summary and Recommendations

In April 1985, the Board directed the staff to prepare a systemwide plan for baccalaureate nursing education and bring it to the Board in the fall of 1985. The Board wanted the staff, in cooperation with the System's academic nurses, to reexamine carefully the need for and preparation of baccalaureate nurses and recommend an effective means of meeting that need. The plan was to pay particular attention to the desires of many practicing nurses for baccalaureate training. The document entitled, "A Plan for Nursing Education in the Oregon State System of Higher Education," is on file in the Board's Office.

It is a propitious time to present a plan for improving nursing education in Oregon. The health care system in this country is undergoing unprecedented changes. Breakthroughs in medical research and technology are bringing new hope and longer lives to many Americans. At the same time Americans are experiencing a social transformation in medicine that is changing the ways people receive and pay for health care. Nurses are assuming new roles in this changing health care delivery system. In many cases they are being asked to know more and make a wider range of decisions. To fulfill these requirements, nurses will require a more professional educational program.

This plan presents a bold set of recommendations designed to upgrade the curricula and clinical experience of baccalaureate trained nurses, expand both the number of baccalaureate graduates and the locations at which the programs are available, and make optimal use of the total resources of the State System in providing nursing education.
Specifically, the plan proposed that the State System's nursing programs be changed during the next two biennia in the following ways:

1. **Increase the number of State System baccalaureate nursing graduates each year from approximately 170 graduates today to 250 graduates by 1991 in order to meet the state's need for baccalaureate prepared nurses.**

   The increase should be achieved as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Expected Graduate</th>
<th>Proposed Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Level</td>
<td>Expanded Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU-Portland</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU-EOSC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHSU-UO*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The OHSU-UO program should be phased in during the 1989-91 biennium if the demand for BSN nurses remains strong and new funds are available to properly staff the program.*

2. **Increase the number of clinical sites at which baccalaureate courses are offered.** This will enable practicing nurses who graduated from diploma and associate degree (ADN) programs to continue their educations without having to quit work. This will also expand the number of places where beginning nursing students are able to receive clinical experience.

3. **Modify State System baccalaureate nursing curricula to facilitate the matriculation of diploma and ADN nurses seeking baccalaureate education.** At a minimum, State System institutions should set a goal of 25% of admissions to the baccalaureate programs to qualified diploma and ADN applicants.

4. **Explore with community college officials the feasibility of developing two-year transfer programs leading directly to admission at the junior level into State System baccalaureate nursing programs.**

5. **Increase cooperation and coordination among State System nursing programs so that students and faculties have access to available resources and clinical facilities at other institutions that are not available at their own.** Students might attend another nursing program for a quarter or a year, or attend three- to four-week special courses at another site. Participation in these exchange programs may be optional, but the credit earned should be accepted at the student's home institution.

6. **Assign the Dean of the school of nursing at the Oregon Health Sciences University a stronger leadership role in the coordination of the State System's nursing education programs.** Specifically, the Dean should chair an interinstitutional committee on nursing education which would work with institutional officials and the Chancellor's Office on the cooperative planning of curricula, the accommodation of RN-BSN students in State System baccalaureate programs, the review of institutional program improvement requests, the exchange of faculty and students among State System programs, the placements of nursing students in clinical settings, the coordination of off-campus programs, and the relationships with private institutions and community colleges. The committee should include the directors of nursing education on all of the State System campuses including directors at EOSC and the UO if and when a satellite program is established there.

7. **Continue to examine the organizational relationship between the baccalaureate nursing programs at Southern Oregon State College and Oregon Institute of Technology on the one hand and the Oregon Health Sciences University**
on the other. The joint OHSU and EOSC program is one possible model that combines the resources of the nationally recognized school of nursing at the state's Health Sciences University with the knowledge and resources of a regional college. This arrangement offers eastern Oregon communities and students a fully accredited, on-site program in nursing education offered by OHSU in cooperation with EOSC through a department of nursing located on the EOSC campus.

8. Discontinue admitting students into Southern Oregon State College's associate degree program in nursing (ADN) after the fall term of 1986.

9. Assign the school of nursing at the Oregon Health Sciences University responsibility for providing graduate nursing education throughout the state. The Oregon Health Sciences University should work with other health professionals in Oregon in developing a plan to offer the master of science degree in nursing (MSN) at medical centers outside the Portland area. The program should only be provided when there are sufficient numbers of nurses willing to enroll at a particular site to make the program economical. A program offered on a rotating basis would make it possible for nurses throughout the state to have access to advanced nursing education. The program should utilize qualified nursing staff from other State System programs when it is feasible to do so.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Board's Committee on Instruction forward this plan to the full Board for approval. It was further recommended that the Board direct the staff to begin implementing the plan immediately.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Hensley stated that the Board previously had directed the staff to prepare a statewide plan for the baccalaureate nursing education program in the State System and to present it to the Board in the fall of 1985. He indicated that preliminary comments would be followed by comments from the presidents of the institutions, testimony from nursing professionals in Oregon, and any public testimony. The Committee would then discuss the staff recommendations. He requested Dr. Pierce to introduce the program and the report.

Dr. Pierce said he had requested Mrs. Clarethel Kahananui, former Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, to describe the report because she was intimately familiar with the content of the report and had done an excellent job of bringing all of the material together with the help of the nursing deans and directors, the institutional representatives within the State System, and other nursing professionals in Oregon.

Dr. Pierce said the health care system in the United States was changing very rapidly, and with it the role of the nurse in the delivery of health care. It is the Board's responsibility to review the programs offered in the State System, especially the professional programs, and to be certain they are responsive to changing technical conditions and market conditions in any particular field. The report is similar to studies made in connection with other programs. The report was requested by the Board in response to a number of comments about the changing health care system. The recommendations in the report are intended to adjust the State System's baccalaureate programs to meet these changing conditions and professional conditions in nursing.

Dr. Pierce emphasized that the report does not interfere with the responsibilities assigned to the State Board of Nursing's statewide master planning commission. The commission was established by the last Legislature to prepare a plan for studying issues regarding nursing licensure in the State of Oregon. The Commission is expected to present a plan for a study to the 1987 Legislature. The report presumably would be presented to the 1989 Legislature.
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Dr. Pierce said the State System was fully supportive of the work of the Commission and had two representatives serving on the commission. The chairman of the commission, Orcilia Forbes, helped to prepare the section of the State System report dealing with the relationship between that study and the commission's work. The report also has been discussed with the staff of the State Board of Nursing, and the Board has been kept informed of the developments of the report and the recommendations. The staff of the State System is working with the commission and the State Board of Nursing. While waiting for the results of their work, it is important to make sure the current nursing programs in the State System are providing the best possible nursing education in a cost-effective manner.

Dr. Pierce said the report deals with State System nursing programs. The community college programs, the associate degree programs, are not discussed. The Board did direct the staff to consider ways of facilitating the movement of community college graduates into the State System baccalaureate programs. The report includes proposals which will benefit community college graduates by making it easier for the associate degree nurses to gain access to baccalaureate nursing programs. There are also suggestions for providing regular transfer programs into the nursing education. In discussions with some of the community college people, these suggestions for facilitating the matriculation of community college graduates into the State System programs have been received favorably. The recommendations in the report are offered in the spirit of cooperation, which Dr. Pierce said he believed was increasingly characterizing the relationship between the State System and the community colleges. The report is in no way intended to hurt the community college programs.

The Chancellor reported that he had talked with Representative Margaret Carter and wished to convey her concerns with respect to the nursing program report. Representative Carter said consideration of the nursing report or taking any action was circumventing the intent and desire of the Legislature and would result in a negative impact on other nursing programs. It was her opinion that it was presumptuous for the State System to be making this decision and it would leave the Legislature little leeway if the plan were implemented. She indicated that she personally felt insulted that neither she nor other legislators were consulted prior to the hearing or consideration of this problem.

The Chancellor indicated that Representative Carter had not received a copy of the report but that he had forwarded one to her and explained that he did not believe this was in conflict. He noted that there had been meetings with the nursing leadership.

The Chancellor said Representative Carter had repeatedly stated in the conversation that she wanted the action to be open and aboveboard. The Chancellor said he had assured her that it was his impression it had been. The matters had been discussed publicly at meetings, the goal was stated in the Strategic Plan, and every effort had been made to work cooperatively with all the people who were interested in the overall nursing program. The staff has very strong feelings in terms of cooperation within the state.

Representative Carter also expressed concern that the Board would take action and then request more funds from the Legislature. The Chancellor responded that programs traditionally have been approved first by the Board and then any necessary funds requested from the Legislature. However, at this time, no particular stipend is required by the proposals in the report. If it should be determined that more baccalaureate nurses should be educated, this would be part of the instructional request to be considered by the Legislature, or it would mean a reallocation of funds.
Mrs. Kahananui indicated that the present report was one of a series of reports prepared to inform the Board concerning the needs of the state in the preparation of nurses and the responsibility of the Department of Higher Education in meeting those needs. The Board, over the years, has taken bold action to modify, develop, and reorganize programs in order to be responsive to the changing needs of the state. Evidence is presented in the report with respect to the significant changes that are taking place in the market place which demand that the Board again look at the baccalaureate programs in nursing education. In preparing the report, it was discovered that the master's degree programs should be reviewed. They are concentrated in the Portland area at the present time. The Oregon Health Sciences University and the University of Portland each have master's degree programs preparing about 24 nurses each year. The University of Portland program is offered only in the summer and is a very successful program. It is somewhat unusual in that most summer programs do not last very long, but this one has done very well. Recommendations are included in the report in response to the urgent plea of employers to make graduate programs more accessible to employees throughout the state.

Mrs. Kahananui said the major shifts in health care that are taking place in Oregon and the nation were analyzed with the deans, their curriculum people, and the employers of the state. It was concluded that the schools of nursing needed to incorporate new instruction into their curricula, modify other instruction, support work, basic science, psychology, anthropology, and include new courses in ethics and cost control. Graduates need to have a broader range of clinical experience. Nurses are now going into the home and providing nursing care that formerly was provided in hospitals or long-term care facilities. The content and structure of the clinical experience must be changed; and this requires the employment of faculty with new expertise.

In reviewing the curricular changes, or changes in the clinical facilities and use, it was concluded that very small programs were not cost-effective. There are recommendations in the report with respect to the size of programs and to increasing the regional programs in order to justify the faculty and other resources necessary to educate graduates who meet the requirements of the current job market.

Mrs. Kahananui said persons qualified for the registered nurse examination and registration are prepared in three different educational programs. The two-year programs leading to the associate degree in nursing begin the nursing instruction almost immediately in the freshman year. The hospital programs, which were the original programs, consist of three years of hospital preparation. The baccalaureate programs usually are designed with one or two years of preparatory work with the nursing major following either on a two-year or three-year program.

Mr. Hensley inquired whether the programs at the two independent institutions led to a baccalaureate of nursing or a baccalaureate degree with nursing.

Mrs. Kahananui responded that they prepared students for a bachelor of science degree in nursing. She said the deans of both the University of Portland and the Linfield-Good Samaritan programs were present. These programs are organized with two years of preparatory work, including specified course work in the basic sciences and general education requirements, followed by three years of the upper-division nursing major. In the State System, the programs at the Oregon Health Sciences University and Oregon Institute of Technology have one year of preparatory work and three years of the nursing major. Southern Oregon State College offers an upper-division major for registered nurses only which leads to the bachelor of science in nursing degree. Other programs have a RN/BSN track which means that credits from either the diploma program or the associate degree program are evaluated and transferred, and then they are integrated into the baccalaureate degree program so that the student enters the senior year with the regular beginning nursing students. This integration is described in detail in the report. It consists of a transition year which involves some make-up work, some testing out, and some demonstration, but is not a full year of work.
Mrs. Kahananui then reviewed the supply and demand situation for baccalaureate nurses in Oregon. This has changed quite rapidly in the last several years. As the shortage of nurses was eliminated, employers began to specify that they either required or preferred to employ a nurse with the baccalaureate degree for some entry-level nursing positions. This is not true for all positions and varies from employer to employer, but there is considerable evidence that there is a shortage, throughout the country and in Oregon, of nurses with baccalaureate preparation to fill the positions where this level of training is desired or required. She cited a telephone survey done for one week by contacting nursing service directors of various hospitals in Oregon. The survey revealed over 200 positions open for which a baccalaureate nurse was preferred. All these positions will not be filled by persons with this level of training, nor would the staff recommendation presume to prepare enough baccalaureate nurses to permit everyone to restructure their staffs immediately as they might like to have them in the future. However, the State System should be able to make some beginning toward preparing graduates for employers who are trying to meet these changing needs for baccalaureate nurses. She indicated that perhaps previous reductions in the number of baccalaureate nurses prepared were perhaps too great. For that reason, proposals are made to assist in meeting some of the needs of the nursing care industry.

Mrs. Kahananui said that in the preparation of the report and recommendations, there had been a very careful review of the proposals made in the Legislature and in the State Board of Nursing for a study of the licensure requirements. She noted that she was a member of the statewide task force and had been serving on the education subcommittee of that task force which was writing the part of the plan dealing with the review of educational programs. She said she was serving on that subcommittee with Roger Bassett, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association; Robert Hamill, Assistant Superintendent for Public Instruction for Community College Services; and T. K. Olson, Executive Director of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission. She indicated they had worked well together and had completed the report. She said the group hoped that the entire task force would incorporate the report in the final proposal for a study of nursing education and licensure in Oregon. The focus of the report is to consider at what point in the educational and employment systems licensure is needed and what kind of licensure requirements there should be. There is presently an education requirement and a test requirement. The nursing community is divided over the question of whether the changes in nursing service are such that the State Board of Nursing should make changes in the licensure requirement.

Mrs. Kahananui said licensure was not the responsibility of the State Board of Higher Education. Its responsibility is to prepare graduates who can get licensed and who also can fill the jobs satisfactorily for which those graduates are sought. She said the staff was fully supportive of the studies responding to this question because they are of great public interest. It should be determined whether the licensure requirements should be changed or are perfectly satisfactory as they now exist. In the meantime, it is the obligation of higher education to prepare the best possible graduates, to make any necessary modifications in the curricula, and to locate programs to provide access and graduates to serve the needs of the people of Oregon.

Dr. Pierce then commented on several of the recommendations. He said the first recommendation called for increasing the number of baccalaureate graduates from the current level of 170 to 250 by 1991. The proposed number of graduates for each of the programs does not include an increase for the Oregon Health Sciences University but does increase the other regional nursing programs to 40, a level of activity that is believed to be a cost-effective level for each of those programs. He indicated the 40 graduates from these expanded programs were not a maximum. It would be possible
that, with the staffing that would be available for an optimal-sized program, some of the institutions could produce more than 40 graduates and some might produce somewhat less. However, the proposed level of activity would result in an efficient program. He also pointed out that the expansion of the satellite program on the University of Oregon campus would not occur until the 1989-1991 biennium and only after there was a demonstrated need for additional baccalaureate nurses and the additional funding to mount that program. It is an expansion that is very much contingent upon those two factors.

The second recommendation would expand the number of clinical sites in which nurses can receive courses by moving them out of the Portland area into other locations which have fine facilities but no program at this time. This will be of great assistance to practicing nurses who wish to upgrade their educations to the baccalaureate level.

Recommendations 3, 4, and 5 contain proposals to assist students in their work toward a baccalaureate degree through coordination of State System programs and the development of transfer programs from the community colleges.

Dr. Pierce said that Oregon Health Sciences University is an institution with a primary responsibility for health care programs in Oregon. It has the largest number of nursing faculty and resources available for nursing. Recommendation 6 would assign the Dean of the School of Nursing at the Oregon Health Sciences University some responsibilities for assisting in the coordination of the State System's programs. Recommendation 7 would call for continued examination of the cost benefits, advantages, and disadvantages of a closer administrative relationship between the regional programs and the Oregon Health Sciences University.

Dr. Pierce explained that the data show that there are too many associate degree nurses in the state and an inadequate number of baccalaureate nurses. For that reason, it was recommended that the associate degree program at Southern Oregon State College be discontinued so that the resources utilized in that program could be redeployed to increase the number of baccalaureate graduates from the Southern Oregon State College program. He indicated that the twelve associate degree programs in the community colleges were more than adequately meeting the need for associate degree programs.

The final recommendation would suggest that the Oregon Health Sciences University would be assigned leadership for developing a plan to provide master's degree graduate training in nursing in areas outside the Portland area. This would involve both a management plan and a financial plan necessary to expand these programs. The plan would be presented to the Committee on Instruction and to the Board for consideration before it was implemented.

President Laster said that there are attributes of education which should be preserved against the shifting winds of trends and fads. Especially in the health sciences these include such things as a commitment to technical expertise, to compassion and humanity, to life-long learning, and to the acquisition of new knowledge. These attributes of the health sciences will be present three decades from now. Nevertheless, the changing demands of the health care professions, and the way they are exercised, does force serious considerations of change upon those concerned with health care education. President Laster then described how these changes have affected the nursing profession.

The length of stay of a patient in a hospital has been reduced drastically, and the nursing intensity thus has increased beyond all previous experience. Patients in the hospital are far sicker and require far more complex care than in the recent past because of the shift to ambulatory care when that is possible. Consolidations in hospitals have resulted in a single ward with an admixture of problems, and a single nurse must have expertise in a wider variety of problems. The involvement of nurses in providing nursing care in other settings has increased. All of these factors make it advisable for the Board to examine the need for changes in the educational setting.
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President Laster then cited some of the outstanding achievements and qualities of the school of nursing at the Oregon Health Sciences University. He said the school has a history of collegiality in trying to meet responsibilities in other parts of the State System and the state. He indicated the institution shared the goals implicit in the report and concurred that it was time to assess changes.

President Laster said the coordination of the state's contributions was a prudent step. To the degree that the recommendations suggested that one of the schools take a lead role in this coordination, the Health Sciences University would be sensitive to the fact that it should not be a domineering role in any way. Its role would be consistent with past performance as one among equals working together for the good of the state. He said the institution was prepared to serve the wishes of the Board in trying to enhance the teamwork that is required to meet the needs of the future while avoiding perceived or actual expansions of territoriality, either within the State System or into sister institutions, such as the community colleges. The Oregon Health Sciences University is prepared to work together with a sensitivity to the attitudes of the other institutions and to their feelings.

President Laster said everyone was aware the resources of the state were limited and pointed out that the demands that are generated for increased activity may generate the need for increased resources. It will be necessary, as this process develops, to present arguments and proposals for resource changes with a sensitivity to these realities.

President Laster concluded by saying that there is an opportunity to raise the level of quality at all of the participating institutions and to apply meaningful statesmanship to a setting which otherwise might lend itself to high emotionalism and cacophony. He predicted that this was a challenge which everyone would meet in high style and with skill and ability.

Dean Lindeman indicated she had not prepared a formal statement but supported the proposals in the document. She said it was an excellent document and would be helpful to other states who were struggling with the same issues.

The Chancellor asked Dean Lindeman how many states nationally have a coordinated statewide baccalaureate program such as the one contemplated in the report. She replied that she could not be specific because she had not done a survey. The closest state is the State of Montana which has one school of nursing with five campuses. She indicated she received calls from states that are considering some similar arrangement. The economic times seem to be bringing many states to the realization that they must organize differently than they have in the past.

Mr. Batiste asked Dean Lindeman how she would envision the master's program outside of the Oregon Health Sciences University and what changes there would be in the master's program as a result of the changes in the baccalaureate program.

Dean Lindeman said the present master's program consists of 45 credits, which is a reduction of the 68 credits required previously. A master's program offered at sites other than the Oregon Health Sciences University would be of the 45-credit variety. In commenting on the changes in the requirements, Dean Lindeman said students entering the baccalaureate program are different today than they were fifteen years ago. Their general education introduces them to content and experiences which they did not have then. Students enter with a different type and amount of knowledge, and the educational program must change so that the baccalaureate program continues to be a growth experience. She said she would expect the baccalaureate program in nursing to have approximately 186 credits and the master's program approximately 45 credits.

Mr. Batiste said he was concerned that some of these changes would create a major coordination problem and be very costly.
Mrs. Nelson said there had been criticism with regard to the program at the Oregon Health Sciences University with respect to the number of clinical hours offered in the baccalaureate program. She asked whether Dean Lindeman anticipated that any reorganization would provide a more appropriate balance of clinical experience and classroom theory.

Dean Lindeman said she knew of no other program in the state which offered as much clinical experience as the Oregon Health Sciences University did in its undergraduate program. One of the special things about the program is its relationship with University Hospital because of the willingness of its staff to assist in the educational process. Students are able to be in the hospital units at almost any hour of the day or evening during any day of the week. This enables them to participate throughout the entire time a patient is hospitalized. A student in the junior year spends an average of 32 hours per week in the clinical setting.

Mr. Hensley inquired whether the proposed number of graduates in each institution represented a minimum number with an opportunity for each school to expand based on the need within its region.

Dean Lindeman said one of the reasons the number for Portland remained the same was that in order to have a good program, there must be adequate clinical facilities to support the number of students in that program. One of the restraining factors, particularly in some of the rural settings, is the opportunity for truly adequate, rich clinical experiences. For example, the limit set in the program at La Grande was based on a very intensive analysis of the clinical facilities there. The proposed expansion for La Grande would assume there would be additional clinical sites in the area of Pendleton, and possibly Baker or Treasure Valley. There is a concern with access to experiences for pediatric nursing, and this will be one of the constraining factors in any area where nursing students are being educated. A second concern would be demand. She said the taxpayers of Oregon should get the opportunity for their children to enter the state's programs, so the demand from Oregonians for access to them would be another factor.

The Chancellor said it was his understanding of the proposal that there would be flexibility for students from the various programs to receive clinical experience at another location in order to have opportunities which might not be available at every location.

Mr. Hensley asked if the preferences expressed for baccalaureate nurses in the telephone survey were due to the fact that they could be hired at the same salary as associate degree nurses. Dean Lindeman said they were preferred because they do a better job. The fact that they both start at the same salaries is another inducement. However, there have been repeated comments from employers that there is a difference in their ability to perform on the job.

Mr. Hensley then inquired whether Dean Lindeman had developed any management plan in terms of the operation of the rotating master's program. She said she had not. While it is somewhat new to Oregon, it is not new in other western states where there are placebound nurses who need graduate education. She commented that there might not be enough people for a critical mass of students in a given area on a permanent basis. However, a rotating program can be made available so that those who wish can complete their master's degrees. With respect to getting faculty and staff for a rotating program, Dean Lindeman said there are a number of somewhat non-traditional ways of teaching some of the courses, and she referred to several possibilities.

Mr. Hensley then asked how long it would take to develop a management plan for review by the Committee. Dean Lindeman said it could be done relatively quickly because information is available from others which could be used and assembled into a plan for Oregon.
Mr. Hensley said it would be important for the Committee to review the costs for a rotating master's program as part of the management plan for the degree. If additional costs were to be incurred, the Committee and the Board would need to consider that in connection with the program.

In response to a question from Mr. Clark, Dean Lindeman indicated there was sufficient demand from students wishing to enter the baccalaureate program so that the institution was able to be selective in admissions. Qualified individuals are still available who are not admitted.

Mr. Clark then asked if there was also a sufficient demand for nurses who wanted to upgrade their training to the bachelor of science in nursing so that it would be possible to be selective in admitting the proposed goal of a 25% quota from that group of individuals.

Dean Lindeman said there was a demand but it was a much more difficult student body to predict. Many of the individuals in this group have family obligations or other factors which differ from the traditional student body. She said the 25% goal may be reached or it may not. She said she would see it as a goal that would be pursued. If there were not enough qualified applicants, the goal would not be obligatory.

Mr. Clark then referred to the preferences expressed for baccalaureate nurses. He asked why the salaries for baccalaureate and associate degree nurses were the same if employers preferred the former.

Dean Lindeman said some of the hospitals were beginning to implement a salary differential or would be willing to do so. However, some of the biggest salary differentials between baccalaureate and associate degree nurses occur in the advancement opportunities. Most hospitals in Oregon are requiring a baccalaureate degree for the position of head nurse. There are additional monetary benefits for that kind of a position. She said after five years, in those hospitals where longevity is not the only factor in salary decisions and where they actually make some decisions based on performance, people with different levels of training are earning different salaries.

Mr. Clark inquired whether there was any difference in the scores received on the licensure examination by nurses with the different levels of training. Dean Lindeman indicated the examination was designed to test for minimum competencies. In Oregon, students from good programs, at both the baccalaureate and associate degree level, do equally well.

President Gilbert said six years ago the Oregon Health Sciences University and Eastern Oregon State College entered into a relationship in order to meet the needs of that region. He said Eastern Oregon State College was very proud to be a partner in pioneering this new model of instructional delivery. Its excellent success has led to similar relationships with Oregon State University and two community colleges. He said he could not think of a single negative, and the institution is looking forward to a new relationship in which Eastern can support both the Health Sciences University and the two eastern Oregon community colleges in responding to continuing needs of the region.

Mr. Hensley inquired whether the 40 proposed graduates in the recommendation stated in the report was a realistic figure. President Gilbert said as it had been explained to him it was. However, the program is completely the Oregon Health Sciences University's program, housed and coordinated at Eastern Oregon State College. He suggested that Dean Lindeman or Director Marcia Shoup might be able to comment more specifically.

In further discussion, it was indicated there had been preliminary discussions with Blue Mountain and Treasure Valley with respect to coordination of the expanded program. All of the details have not been completed. There may be some commuting involved and some use of new technologies and innovative ways of teaching the curriculum. The number of proposed graduates is regarded as a realistic figure.
Mr. Hensley asked what percentage of the graduates were staying in the eastern Oregon region. Mrs. Shoup indicated that approximately 70% of the graduates remain east of the mountain range in Oregon. Students who leave the area tend to go to small communities and some have entered the armed forces. In response to another question, she said there was a need for the master's program in the area and graduates could obtain positions.

President Blake introduced Dr. Marion Dickens, the new director of nursing at Oregon Institute of Technology.

He said the institution has gone through three of the four phases of the structure of nursing with an associate degree program, a two-plus-two program, and now a generic program. All of the nursing graduates are placed each year, mostly in the rural areas.

President Blake indicated his support for the document but expressed two reservations. He said the report covers baccalaureate needs only, and it should not be construed in any way as dictating the needs of the associate degree programs or the relationships with the community colleges, which are excellent at the present time. He said one of the strengths of the report is that it appears to document very carefully future needs, not only in numbers but in changes and in quality.

President Blake said he supported fully Recommendation 9 because there are placebound people who desperately need the master's degree programs. He said the coordination referred to in Recommendation 6 was especially necessary in nursing education. He noted that Dean Lindeman would chair a coordinating council and that all of the institutions have elements that can benefit the rest of the State System. Coordination will develop all of the programs and provide a high quality response to the needs of the state.

President Blake said that Oregon Institute of Technology would applaud the effort to look at any management structure but he was not convinced that the EOSC-OHSU model was a better alternative for the existing high quality program which has been at Oregon Institute of Technology for many years. He said there is evidence that it might be more expensive and less cost-effective than the coordinated management with the nursing program staying resident at Oregon Institute of Technology and responsive to that institution.

Mr. Hensley asked President Blake if he were confident that Recommendation 6 could work without too many politics. President Blake replied that he thought it could because the coordination exists now in an informal manner. To formalize that cooperation is excellent because it demonstrates to the state the cost-effective management of programs.

Mr. Batiste referred to Recommendation 4 on exploring with community college officials the feasibility of developing two-year transfer programs leading directly to admission to the junior level. He noted that there would be significant changes in the baccalaureate program if curriculum changes go through as projected. He asked whether President Blake would see this as forcing the community colleges to increase their offerings in their transfer programs.

President Blake said he did not because that would assume that the State System was going to change with the times and the community colleges were not. They also have consistently changed their programs. The community colleges probably will continue to conclude their programs with the associate degree in nursing for some time but will continue to change their programs as needed to keep pace with the changes in the nursing profession. He suggested the inclusion of a community college representative on the inter-institutional committee proposed in Recommendation 6 so that the community colleges would be fully aware of the changes that occur.
The Chancellor said the demands in nursing are changing rapidly. The State System will change its curriculum to keep current with the changes in nursing, regardless of whether the community colleges make changes or whether the State System keeps its present organization or approves the coordinated program.

Mr. Batiste commented that this would depend on whether funding was received for these changes.

The Chancellor said the difference in funding is the amount required to go from 170 to 240 students. The institution concerned with that expansion has to present that as a budget request to the Board. If the Board does not want to make that expansion, it will not approve the funding. The master's program proposed in the report is a technique and process which appear to be extremely cost-effective and highly efficient. If the State System were to offer the master's program, that would be a decision point for the Board to consider at the same time as other new programs are considered and as specific funding is requested. It is unlikely that there is any professional discipline which could be expanded from 170 to 240 students at the same cost, but those decisions will be made at the appropriate points.

Mr. Batiste said he was talking about more than just a number change. There are programmatic changes and expensive facilities involved.

Mrs. Nelson said she would be in favor of President Blake's suggestion to include a community college person on the interinstitutional coordinating committee because there is a great need for articulation between the two-year and four-year programs.

Dr. Ernest Etlich introduced Dr. Hannah Dean, the new dean of the School of Nursing at Southern Oregon State College.

Dr. Etlich said the plan for nursing education before the Committee was an important step forward in attempting to meet three needs. There is a need for coordination and cooperation with the State System programs of nursing and the outside agencies as well, especially the community colleges, the private colleges, and the health care community. There is a second need to maintain the integrity of the institutions and this is addressed well. There is also a need for diversity to reflect the complex nature of the nursing profession in Oregon, because nurses are being required to work across the full range of health care in Oregon. Increasingly, the baccalaureate nurse is required to balance diverse demands for patient care and administration and to do that within widely varying settings. No one program can meet the breadth of that practice, and that is why diversity is so vital.

Dr. Etlich said the nine recommendations appear deceptively simple until they are put together and considered in terms of the impact on programs. Then they become a set of very complex challenges ranging from budgeting to curriculum design. He said the report was an excellent proposal and the staff was to be commended.

Dr. Etlich said Southern Oregon State College had a concern with respect to the productivity level identified in Recommendation 1. Southern Oregon State College has existing programs in both Coos Bay and Roseburg which produce about ten graduates per year. It is believed that these students should not be deducted from the 40 that would be in the campus program, but should be added to it. With the move to a generic program, 40 in the campus program would be reasonable.

In Recommendation 8, Southern Oregon State College would not be opposed to discontinuing the associate degree program but would request that the date be one year later to permit the necessary coordination for a smooth transfer to the new program. That change would leave the Rogue Valley with only one year in which students are not graduated from a nursing program and sitting for licensure. There would be one year instead of two without any production of new registered nurses.
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Southern Oregon State College is very supportive of Recommendation 9. Master's education in nursing is needed in the Rogue Valley, but Southern Oregon State College is not in a position to offer it independently. Therefore, it is absolutely essential to work with the Oregon Health Sciences University in making graduate education available.

Mr. Batiste inquired who would be providing the associate degree program in the Rogue Valley once the program at Southern Oregon State College was discontinued. Dr. Ettlich responded that there had been an extension of the Umpqua program offered on the Rogue Community College campus periodically during the past several years. He said he would expect that program to become permanent. However, with the recommendations coming from the nursing profession and with the demands from the health care facilities for baccalaureate people, Dr. Ettlich said he would expect the emphasis would be more toward the two-year transfer programs mentioned in Recommendation 4. Southern Oregon State College will be working with all of the community colleges in the region in developing a smooth transition into the baccalaureate program. He said he understood there was a recommendation before both of the national nursing groups to have a technical level of nursing offered after two years. He said he would not be surprised to see the LPN program at Rogue upgraded to meet that new technical level.

In response to questions from Mr. Batiste concerning federal funding of programs, Dr. Ettlich said Southern Oregon State College had received a federal grant that was designed to help with the startup costs of establishing the extension programs in cooperation with other groups. The funding gradually phases on the assumption that the normal state funding would substitute for the federal funds as enrollments are present. The funding level is presently under $200,000, and it will phase out in two years. The funds come to the program rather than the students, so there is no requirement for the students to remain in the region for a period of time.

Mr. Hensley asked for further clarification of the problem with respect to discontinuing the associate degree program in 1986 as opposed to 1987. This has been done more rapidly in other programs which the Board has reviewed.

Dr. Ettlich said the Board consideration of adding or dropping programs normally has been preceded by extensive faculty work in developing all of the elements involved in the transition. This has not taken place in this instance.

Dr. Pierce said that from the data in the report, there was evidence of an oversupply of associate degree nurses. There appeared to be no reason to continue to produce associate degree nurses beyond the date the program was advertised in the catalog for next year. It is proposed that the resources in that program be applied as quickly as possible to the design of the new program, even though it might mean a shortage of graduates for one or two years.

Mr. Batiste questioned the relevance of the reference to the oversupply of associate degree nurses in Clark County to the supply situation in southern Oregon. Dr. Pierce said the Clark College graduates in Vancouver take the statewide nursing licensure examination in Oregon and would be available for positions anywhere in Oregon.

Mr. Crowell inquired whether students would be left halfway through a program that was discontinued. Dr. Ettlich said all students in the program would be able to complete the program. An effort will be made to transfer all students into the four-year program as quickly as possible because it is expected to be the stronger program.

It was agreed that it would be possible to modify the recommendation to indicate that the discontinuance of the program would be not later than the fall of 1987.

Ms. Evon Wilson, Coordinator of the nursing program at Linn-Benton Community College and Legislative Chair of the Oregon Council of Associate Degree Nursing Programs, indicated she was presenting testimony on behalf of the
nursing program at the college and also speaking for the OCAP Executive Board. She stated that the Oregon Council of Associate Degree Nursing Programs was an organization of nursing faculty in the thirteen associate degree nursing programs in Oregon. Twelve of these are in community colleges, and most of the faculty hold master's degrees.

She indicated that OCAP was supportive of baccalaureate nursing education in Oregon and the spirit of cooperation in nursing education. She said community colleges have established a solid role in providing nursing education at the entry level and now provide many of the transfer courses for all of the health profession courses. She indicated she would address three issues.

The first issue is the conflict between the recommendations in the report before the Committee and the legislative mandate to the Board of Nursing's master planning commission on nursing education in Oregon. A second issue is the two-plus-two concept of the nursing education curriculum, and the third issue is the fiscal concerns.

There is a conflict between the proposal and the master planning commission because the Legislature has placed a hold on the Board of Nursing for changing entry level in nursing education. The report suggests that changes be made in areas that the commission is proposing to study -- needs assessment, regional needs, additional sites required, and the necessary clinical sites. The recommendations call for expansion of three nursing programs, the creation of an additional program at the University of Oregon, and the phasing out of another. These recommendations have a definite impact on nursing education in Oregon.

Ms. Wilson said that OCAP was very concerned with the possible closure of the lower-division two-plus-two program at Southern Oregon State College because it was the only bachelor of science in nursing program in Oregon that directly articulated with associate degree nursing graduates. Associate degree graduates from that lower-division program and most of the community colleges can enter directly the upper-division nursing courses at Southern Oregon State College.

The statement that nurses are assuming new roles in the changing health care delivery system implies that nurses need increased knowledge and theoretical base. Ms. Wilson said the two-plus-two curriculum is designed to provide the nursing student the additional time and format in the structuring of nursing courses to develop and obtain increased nursing content. If basic nursing education were offered at the lower-division level in the community colleges, then the schools of nursing within higher education could use the upper-division nursing credits to expand and broaden the nursing theories knowledge base and technical skills. She indicated community colleges had been very successful in educating registered nurses for employment and that they pass the licensure examinations with high scores. She stated the nurses in the community college setting do not wish to repeat their basic fundamental nursing courses and want the two-plus-two concept of education.

Ms. Wilson said the cost of expanding baccalaureate programs has not been addressed in the report. The existence of regionalized community college programs would seem to offer an opportunity for sharing facilities and staff.

Ms. Wilson said it was the recommendation of the Oregon Council of Associate Degree Nursing Programs that no action be taken by the Committee on the recommendations in the plan for nursing education within the State System of Higher Education until the data from the report of the master planning commission on nursing education can be analyzed and coordinated.

Mr. Hensley asked Ms. Wilson if she had any objections to the goal of 25% of admissions to baccalaureate programs from qualified diploma and associate degree nurses. She indicated the nurses she represented supported that recommendation but were uncomfortable with the fact there had been no planning or dialogue with the directors of community college programs or their staffs.
Mr. Chao asked when the data would be available since Ms. Wilson had recommended that the Board defer approval pending completion of the commission's study.

Ms. Wilson said she believed it would be 1989. The Chancellor said the plan for the study was to be presented to the next Legislature and the study probably would be presented to the 1989 Legislature.

Mr. Batiste requested Ms. Wilson to explain the rationale for requesting the delay and asked whether it was based on problems with the curriculum or coordination effort or insufficient input from the community colleges.

She responded that there had not been a master plan for all of nursing education or for care given in the nursing area. The Board of Nursing attempted to create a master planning plan, but the effort was unsuccessful. The master planning commission mandated by the Legislature was the result of the inability to bring together and coordinate curriculum.

Mr. Hensley said there are indications that the associate degree program will be greatly over-supplied in the next ten to fifteen years. If the demand decreases, it would be expected there would be a decrease in the enrollments in these programs at the community college level.

Ms. Wilson concurred and said that community colleges have been noted for responding to community, state, and national needs. She said the change should be a coordinated effort and not one group making changes without advice or coordination from the others. In response to a question, she indicated the language in Recommendation 4 was not sufficiently strong.

Mrs. Nelson said it would seem somewhat irresponsible for the Board to wait four years for the master planning commission to finish its study.

Ms. Wilson said the mandate was from the Board of Nursing to coordinate and report to the Legislature. It would seem appropriate for a statewide planning group to include all parties involved. However, it was indicated that all parties are represented in the master planning group.

The Chancellor said the State System proposal was concerned with the baccalaureate and master's degrees and the discontinuation of an associate degree program. It does not involve the licensure question, which was the reason for the legislative action.

The Chancellor asked why there would be an adverse effect on the community college programs if the State System made a determination on the projected need for baccalaureate degrees in nursing. There has been no indication the statistics used by the State System in making the recommendation were wrong. He said the staff was convinced there was a need to move in the directions indicated and to take action some time before 1989. He asked whether Ms. Wilson was suggesting that the Board withhold any action or determination until a complete master plan was developed, even though the baccalaureate responsibility naturally accrues to the State System because it is the only group of institutions, other than the private institutions, offering the baccalaureate programs. He inquired further how this determination could have an adverse effect on either the community colleges or the nursing profession.

Ms. Wilson said she was not saying that it would affect the institutions adversely but that the entire group should be involved in a statewide plan for nursing education.

The Chancellor then asked why this involvement should occur for the State System's programs since the State System was not involved in curriculum determinations on associate degree programs at the community colleges. Ms. Wilson said the State System was not involved in those determinations, but the Board of Nursing was.
The Chancellor said the recommendations in the report before the Committee did not affect licensure and were not in conflict with the Board of Nursing. He said he failed to see where the proposals would have an adverse effect on community colleges, the associate degree programs, or the nursing profession.

There was a brief discussion of a possible strengthening of the language in Recommendation 4 in terms of providing articulation between the community college and State System programs, particularly to eliminate any unnecessary duplication of courses that might exist. Dr. Pierce said the intent of Recommendation 3 had been to cover that issue.

The Chancellor said the problem in terms of immediate admission to the junior level was in the completion of all of the science prerequisites required for the baccalaureate degree in nursing. Some of these are not completed for the associate degree in nursing. Consequently, if a student wants immediate entry into the junior level in a State System institution, those courses should be taken during the first two years. These requirements will be examined to determine which are really essential.

Ms. Wilson said the nursing program directors who advise students on continuing for the baccalaureate degree do not object to the science requirements. There is a problem with students not getting credit for fundamental nursing skills.

Mr. Roger Bassett, Executive Director of the Oregon Community College Association, said the coordination of baccalaureate programs was certainly within the jurisdiction of the State System, but the report is being presented within the setting of a larger issue. There is under debate in Oregon the question of whether the baccalaureate degree should be the degree for entry into nursing by which a student qualifies to take the registered nurse examination. If that decision were made, it would preempt the associate degree nurses from the same opportunity. That issue was debated in the last Legislative Session, and the result was the master planning commission previously mentioned. The timeline for that report is woefully inadequate for the purposes of the State System. However, the State System report becomes part of the information to fuel that larger debate.

Mr. Bassett said that with that perspective, he would address the three points made earlier by Dr. Pierce. The increasing complexity of the health care setting does increase the complexity of nursing, but not necessarily for everyone entering. It would be a viable approach to consider the relationship between associate degree programs and entry into the profession and a shift of baccalaureate programs from entry levels to a concentration on the complexities as a better basis for planning than a shift to baccalaureate as the sole point of entry.

Secondly, with respect to the relationship of the report before the Committee to the master planning study, Mr. Bassett said it was the view of the community college presidents and board members he represented that the timetable should not delay the Board of Higher Education in pursuing its responsibilities for planning baccalaureate programs. However, the Board should be aware that it is presenting the report into a setting under which the fundamental point of relying on baccalaureate degrees for entry is under debate. He said he had no recommendations for change in the report.

Mr. Bassett said Dr. Pierce had indicated there was a conscious decision in the report to concentrate on baccalaureate degree programs, except as those programs are related to community college programs in pre-nursing which are the first two years of a baccalaureate program. He said the community colleges were very appreciative of the efforts to pursue agreements with community colleges for the transfer of associate degree program students into baccalaureate degree programs in all areas, not just in nursing. He noted that pre-nursing is only a secondary purpose of the community college associate degree nursing programs. The primary purpose is to prepare nurses to take the licensure examination, to succeed well on that examination, and to perform well in the nursing setting.
Mr. Bassett said he had concluded from the executive summary in the report that there is an implicit assumption of moving toward a future where the baccalaureate will be the degree of entry into the profession, and on that basis, it can be argued that associate degrees will eventually be eliminated. However, if the associate degree programs are viewed as the entry level, then the complexities would be more appropriately addressed in the upper-division and master's degree programs of the State System, and a different conclusion is reached.

Mr. Bassett said he had noted the intent of the Board's staff to take the report to the master planning commission. He said this was quite appropriate and an important step. He asked that the Committee and the Board remember that the responsibility for preparing registered nurses in Oregon was not currently the exclusive responsibility of baccalaureate degree programs. The master planning commission's charge and the legislative interest behind it were to reconcile the needs for nursing in Oregon to the nursing education resources available. The community colleges have pledged to cooperate in that effort. The effort will be successful only if it looks at nursing in Oregon as a whole and looks at all nursing education resources in the state as available to serve the need. This point makes the distinction between the excellent recommendations in the Board's report with regard to how the community college programs in their pre-nursing role should relate to the baccalaureate degree programs.

Mr. Bassett said the point that is missed is that the primary responsibility of community colleges is to provide people for entry directly into the profession. They are doing that well, and it has yet to be shown that the performance or demands of the health care settings suggest that responsibility will not continue.

Mr. Bassett said he was not presenting a request for change in the recommendations or for delay of the report, but he was a requesting that the Board note with the report that it was entering a broader debate.

Dr. Pierce said it was not assumed in the report that there would be any change in the entry-level licensure situation because that was a determination to be made by the master planning commission. Given the current demand situation, there is a need to expand the number of nurses trained at the baccalaureate level in order to meet the current and projected demand. Secondly, if the report and recommendations are approved, there is no way in which the State System and the baccalaureate programs in Oregon could meet the needs for nurses in Oregon. The associate degree programs would be expected to continue in the foreseeable future. He said it was concluded that the State System should upgrade and expand the number of baccalaureate nurses simply to meet the current level of demand at that level of training. Dr. Pierce said he did not believe the conclusions and actions suggested in the report would be affected if the master planning commission report stated that the associate degree would be the appropriate entry level in nursing.

Mr. Adams inquired whether there would be any problem with the community colleges in furnishing the preparatory work for the two-plus-two program and also the associate degree.

Mr. Bassett responded that they were doing that now, and the report was perhaps inviting them to do better and have a better relationship. He said he would not anticipate a dramatic change in the number of students. He said he would hope that all of this would lead to a dynamic relationship between a ladder of preparation with associate degrees in one place and baccalaureate degrees in another, with entry levels in one place and specialties or supervision in another. Opportunities would be available for nurses so motivated to move back and forth on their way up that ladder of training, and educators would enhance rather than hinder the process. He commented that if there should be a large shift of students in the planning, either the community colleges or the State System would have to make appropriate resource adjustments, but he did not see anything in the recommendations which would be likely to create a resource crisis.
Mr. Chao pointed out that nothing in the report would preclude the associate degree nurse as the entry level to the profession. He said society would make that decision based on societal needs.

There was a brief discussion of whether the report could be clarified so that the intent would not be misunderstood in terms of a recognition that associate degree programs produce entry level nurses.

Mr. Bassett said he believed that the Board's intent had been clarified by the discussion and he did not believe changes were needed.

Mr. Hensley said it would appear that Mr. Bassett was willing to accept Recommendation 3 on good faith that the Board would develop a method of articulating to the baccalaureate degree program. Mr. Hensley said he thought the Board was making that commitment by stating in Recommendations 3 and 4 that there would be a coordinated effort in this direction.

Ms. Wilson indicated the nursing groups would welcome that effort.

Mr. Hensley thanked the participants for their comments and said they had made a very strong point for a coordinated effort which he would expect to be a key element in the Board's planning and adoption of a program.

Dr. Pierce stated that the deans of the schools of nursing at the University of Portland and Good Samaritan had been present, but it had been necessary for them to leave. Copies of their prepared statements were left for distribution as part of the record. The statements were generally supportive. They are included as Supplement A to these minutes.

Mr. Batiste said anything the Board did should be on a very tentative basis. It is a good idea to move forward with a plan and develop a program based upon that plan to present to the Legislature. He said it would be premature to insist on preparing a plan and a budget for 1987. He said the report was a good start to indicate the Board's priorities, how it viewed the problem, and the best approach to the issues. He said no program should be based entirely on the preferences of any industry for restructuring staff. The Board should be considering societal needs. Mr. Batiste said the changes in curriculum were very good and very adequate. He said it was the Board's responsibility to meet the educational needs of the state and he had no disagreement with the projections and changes in curriculum, nor with the question of access. Mr. Batiste said he was very uncomfortable on the question of cost.

Mr. Batiste said he would view this as a very tentative plan to be coordinated with the overall planning. He suggested that the State System plan its activities in terms of this concept but that it not approach the Legislature for budget increases to implement the plan. The report should then go to the proper planning groups to become a part of the state plan. Mr. Batiste said the additional number of students did not concern him but he was concerned with the implication of change without working out all the details with the community colleges and with the implication of an expanded curriculum without adding any dollar amounts.

Mr. Chao said the Board's intent was to serve the needs of the people and do the best possible job for the state and its citizens. He said the Board certainly did not want any of its programs to be viewed as irrevocable to other segments of society. He said he had been unable to find anything in the report that indicated the views of others were excluded and he hoped it would not be interpreted in that way.

The Chancellor pointed out that the documents from Linfield and Good Samaritan expressed the intention of these institutions for maintaining their own determination of programs and autonomy. They also expressed a willingness to collaborate. The Chancellor said it was certainly within the purview of the Board to determine the baccalaureate programs in nursing, the organizational structure
to offer these programs, and how they will be coordinated to prevent duplication or the unnecessary expenditure of funds. Many of the changes do not cost money. The expenditure required for those which do need additional funding would be presented as a part of the program change at the appropriate time.

The Chancellor said that deferral of requests or consideration of specific development of nursing for the 1987 Legislature would mean that the Board also had adopted a 1989 target for requesting funds and essentially would defer any change until 1990 or later.

The staff recommendation is based on a well-reasoned program within the Board's area of responsibility. The State System is no different from other institutions which have the autonomy to determine their own programs. The report expressed a willingness to collaborate and cooperate with other institutions so that the programs are mutually supportive. There is no comment in terms of licensure or the entry level as they pertain to the Board of Nursing. The proposal is simply an attempt to determine the best way to organize the baccalaureate programs and to discontinue the associate degree programs, leaving those to the community colleges, if that is their goal. In addition, every effort will be made to work with the community colleges in the articulation of the pre-nursing programs. The Chancellor stated that he thought the proposal was a strong recommendation for a plan for nursing education in the State System.

Mr. Adams proposed changing the words "continue to examine" in Recommendation 7 to the word "strengthen."

Mrs. Nelson referred to the letters from the University of Portland and Linfield-Good Samaritan and stated that there appeared to be a communication problem which the Board should attempt to resolve.

Mr. Hensley stated that there had been close cooperation in the case of the engineering report and he believed that cooperation was developing with the private institutions.

Mrs. Kahananui described the close cooperation which has existed for some time with the programs at the University of Portland and the Oregon Health Sciences University. She said she believed the purpose of the two deans in presenting the letters for the record was to state formally, in writing, that they were independent institutions which controlled their own destinies. The cooperation which exists already, formal or informal, does not mitigate their responsibilities to govern their own curricula.

Mr. Batiste inquired whether there was any mechanism by which the private institutions could be informed during the development of the proposed curriculum changes.

Mrs. Kahananui stated that there was no intent of imposing a single baccalaureate degree program on all of the baccalaureate degree institutions, even those in the State System. She said the intent was to develop and increase opportunities to share resources and to coordinate so that students can move back and forth. She then described some of the transfer possibilities and the requirements for completing preparatory programs for admission to the various institutions.

Mr. Hensley said Recommendation 6 covered this issue with the declaration of coordination of off-campus programs and the relationships with private institutions and community colleges.

Mr. Hensley said there had been two recommendations for changes in the wording. The first would change the first three words in Recommendation 7 to the word "strengthen." The second would modify Recommendation 3 to change the time stated for discontinuing the program to "not later than the fall term of 1987."

Mr. Chao moved the adoption of the staff recommendations with the indicated changes.
Mr. Batiste inquired whether the immediate implementation of the plan as called for in the staff recommendation would mean that a program would be developed for Board approval.

Mr. Hensley said that it would because new program changes would be incorporated in the budget preparation for each institution.

Dr. Pierce said an interinstitutional committee would be established to meet on a regular basis to deal with the coordination of these programs. Individual course changes might not come before the Board each time, but any new program would come to the Board. In addition, it was requested that a management/financial plan for the rotating master's degree program would be brought to the Board for review.

The Chancellor emphasized that the projections were a reflection of current markets and would be reviewed and altered regularly as the situation might change or new evidence might become available.

Dr. Pierce added that as the interinstitutional committee considers a number of these issues, it should supply information to the master planning commission of the Board of Nursing to facilitate its study. As the recommendations of that group are developed, the interinstitutional committee, the staff, and the Board should consider how those can be incorporated into the baccalaureate programs of the State System.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hensley presented the Committee report and recommendation. He noted that it was definitely to be understood that the plan proposed for baccalaureate degree nursing was not to be in conflict with the Board of Nursing study dictated by HB 2928. There is no conflict at all. In addition, as this plan is implemented, the portions related to budgeting and program change would come before the Board periodically.

The Chancellor said he wished to assure those who might be concerned that if new evidence were developed, or if the facts pertaining to the projections of needs in nursing change, that this plan could be modified. The plan will be under regular review and modified as circumstances might demand. He said the State System was very concerned with working closely with the community colleges, both in terms of those students who have received the RN certificate and have an associate degree in nursing and those who have taken the pre-nursing courses and fulfilled the prerequisites to move into the two-plus-two or junior level year.

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

Mr. Hensley said he believed it would be appropriate for the Board to respond to all of the participants who came from the public sector to testify at the previous evening's meeting. He suggested that they be thanked for their contributions and assured them that this particular plan would be a cooperative effort and that the Board recognized their missions with respect to their programs.

The Chancellor indicated the letters would be prepared.
**Staff Report to the Committee**

**Introduction**

The method of budgeting provided by the Executive Department assumes that Other Funds income will change proportionately to the change in General Fund resources. The budget for the Agricultural Experiment Station is funded 65% from the General Fund and 35% from Other Funds (Federal, sales, fees, etc.). The budget for the Cooperative Extension Service is funded 49% from the General Fund and 51% from Other Funds (Federal and county). The Federal budgets for the AES and CES were completed in October 1985, and Federal funds are not increasing beyond the 1984-85 level. Thus, normal inflationary increases funded by the state General Fund are unfunded by the Federal Government, resulting in the need to curtail or eliminate research programs and services. The Federal funds shortfall is $385,352 for the Agricultural Experiment Station and $827,096 for the Cooperative Extension Service in 1985-1987.

**Effects**

- **Agricultural Experiment Station**

If a reduction of $385,352 in research is required, it will have the following effects on efforts to respond to Oregon's agricultural economic development and recovery at this very critical period:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect Description</th>
<th>1985-86</th>
<th>1986-87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Curtailment of weed control research designed to improve Oregon’s crop</td>
<td>$ 5,369</td>
<td>$ 5,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reduction in forage research on campus and at the Klamath Experiment Station</td>
<td>34,495</td>
<td>61,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that supports a large hay-growing industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curtailment in economic research dealing with Oregon’s natural resources will</td>
<td>8,565</td>
<td>17,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diminish our ability to provide timely information on the best allocation of our</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources to maximize returns to the state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Significant reduction in toxicological analytical services that provide</td>
<td>17,107</td>
<td>39,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information to researchers and to state agencies which deal with toxic wastes and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses of toxic chemicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reduction in statewide research programs in dairy and beef cattle, sheep,</td>
<td>20,517</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swine, and Eastern and Western Oregon range management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Curtailment of research on horticultural crops in Hood River, Pendleton,</td>
<td>25,662</td>
<td>25,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermiston, Ontario, and Redmond Experiment Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reduction of potato and/or cereal re-</td>
<td>22,150</td>
<td>22,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search programs at Pendleton, Hermiston, Ontario, and Redmond Experiment Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Elimination of structural engineering research related to farm buildings and other structures that are used in on- and off-farm circumstances -- $12,097

9. Reduce soil chemistry research that monitors the effects of adding agricultural chemicals to our soils and determines potential short- and long-term effects on crop growth and ground water for human and agricultural use -- $14,747

10. Elimination of agricultural survey research program that identifies the economic and environmental impact of agricultural development -- $30,363

Totals $133,865 $251,487

Cooperative Extension Service

If a reduction of $827,096 is required, the effect on services offered by the Cooperative Extension Service will be as follows:

1. July 1985-December 1985. During the first six months of this fiscal year, the Extension Service has instituted a severe "belt-tightening." Although this action has temporarily reduced expenditures, it has severely reduced program delivery in several county and specialist programs. The results are:

- Reduction in on-campus units' support budgets $18,772
  (This has reduced specialist support.)

- Delayed filling of campus positions
  - Weed Science Specialist (6 months) $15,300
  - Forage Specialist (6 months) $18,720
  - Dairy Specialist (6 months) $18,000

- Delayed filling of county agent positions
  - Yamhill (Ag) (3 months) $12,657
  - Morrow (Ag) (3 months) $7,275
  - Klamath (H&C) (2 months) $3,639
  - Lane (4-H) (3 months) $9,794
  - Wallowa (4-H/H&C) (6 months) $11,750
  - Crook (Ag) (3 months) $8,500
  - Harney (4-H/H&C) (3 months) $7,446
  - Deschutes (Ag) (3 months) $3,794

  Total $141,647

Savings of approximately this amount will be on hand as of December 31, 1985 and replacement funds are not being requested.

2. January 1986-July 1986. If restoration of funds is not obtained, the following permanent actions will be necessary to meet the $141,647 shortfall:

- Continue 2% reduction of campus units. (This will severely curtail activities of campus specialists.) $55,347

- Defer hiring Agricultural Specialist Program Coordinator for remainder of year $17,000

- Defer hiring Weed Specialist for remainder of year $15,300
December 20, 1985

- Defer hiring the following county positions:
  - Tillamook (Ag) $27,000
  - Multnomah (4-H/Youth) $27,000

  Total $54,000

3. July 1986-June 1987. To meet the $543,801 projected shortfall, the following actions will be necessary:

- Eliminate the following campus positions from known or anticipated vacancies:
  - Weed Specialist $38,000
  - Agricultural Specialist Program Coordinator 38,000
  - Market News Specialist 38,000

  Subtotal $114,000

- Eliminate the following county positions from known or anticipated vacancies:
  - Multnomah County (4-H/Youth) $27,000
  - Grant County (Ag/4-H) 27,000
  - Washington County (Community Resource Development) 27,000
  - District Dairy Agent 27,000

  Subtotal $108,000

- Ten additional campus and county positions and support will need to be eliminated. These will be identified from vacancies which occur during this next year or a request will be made for financial exigency to allow termination of existing tenured or tenure-track faculty $321,801

  Total $543,801

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the Board of Higher Education authorize the staff to prepare a report for the State Emergency Board on the effects of the shortfall in Federal funds on research and service programs of the Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service. In addition, it was recommended that the staff be authorized to request from the Emergency Board General Fund support to offset the Federal fund shortfall of $385,352 at the Agricultural Experiment Station and $685,448 at the Cooperative Extension Service. It was further recommended that the Board review later in the year a plan now in preparation at Oregon State University which will outline possible reorganization of the Cooperative Extension Service, designed to ameliorate the effects of possible continued decreases in Federal funding.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Chao asked what would happen if the request were not made to the Emergency Board, and Mr. Lemman responded that the reductions would take place. There would be a curtailment of research in ten different areas around the state and the Cooperative Extension Service would be required to maintain or create additional vacancies in personnel and reduce the budgets of the campus units by 2%. Mr. Chao indicated he had really been seeking information from President Byrne on the magnitude of the management problem.
President Byrne said there were two issues. The first involved the Experiment Station and would consist of a reduction in programs. There would be a direct impact on the results of the research. The situation with Extension is somewhat different because the Extension Service operates with funding from the State of Oregon, the Department of Agriculture, and from the counties. Some of the counties are finding it difficult to fund their portion of the program, and this has prompted an examination of the ways in which Extension Service is provided. With the shortage of federal funding, it becomes more imperative to look at the total reorganization as a way of providing some of the extension services, but in a different mode. Consideration is being given to extension districts as opposed to county units. Whether the funding situation is a short-term or long-term problem, prudence dictates that it be treated as a long-term problem in order to be prepared to make long-term adjustments.

Miss Schwab suggested the possibility of shifting other funds to these purposes if these activities were sufficiently important and the request were denied. President Byrne indicated some shifting would be done, but program reduction would still be necessary.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Alltucker presented the Committee report and recommendation.

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

Staff Report to the Board

On September 20, 1985, the Board authorized execution of a Land Lease in favor of the University of Oregon Foundation for the purpose of erecting an addition to Gilbert Hall at no expense to the Board. The University of Oregon Foundation plans to secure a bank loan to fund the construction of the addition which will be repaid with a $1.5 million dollar grant from the Chiles Foundation which is payable over 5 years.

In order for the loan to be given at a low interest rate, the interest on the loan must be excludable from the lender's gross income. In order to qualify for the exclusion, the Agreement for Land Lease must comply with certain requirements of the Internal Revenue Code. The proposed Addendum to the Agreement for Land Lease clarifies ownership of the property and improvements thereon, indicates that 100% of the proceeds of the loan will be used for construction of the facility, and that the Foundation will continue to be responsible for completion of construction of the facility on the lease premises.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the President and Secretary of the Board be authorized to execute the Addendum to Agreement for Land Lease.

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, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Clark, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.
Staff Report to the Board

On April 19, 1985, the Board approved a request from Western Oregon State College to amend its 1985-1987 Capital Construction project from $275,000 to $500,000 to expand the scope of the project from a remodel of the main level of the College Center to provide additional space for the Bookstore to add excavation and preparation of space at the basement level for a recreational facility for Western Oregon's students.

The 1985 Oregon Legislature accepted the Board's amended project and included $500,000 for the project in Chapter 640, Oregon Laws 1985.

As the project has evolved through architectural design, College officials have been made aware of a serious estimating error early in the project, and that a truer estimate of actual project costs will be $620,000. College officials and Board's staff have reviewed possible reductions in the scope of the project to remain within the expenditure limitation of $500,000; however, to achieve such a required reduction in scope would decimate the project. Therefore, Western Oregon State College officials have requested authorization to seek approval of the State Emergency Board to increase the expenditure limitation from $500,000 to $620,000 to permit the project to go forward as conceived and designed.

Funding for this project will be taken from excess building fee sinking fund reserves, rather than from Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds as initially contemplated. A project valued at $280,000 for Southern Oregon State College will be similarly financed.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board authorize the Board's staff to submit a request to the January 16-17, 1986, meeting of the State Emergency Board seeking an increase in expenditure limitation for the College Center Remodel, Western Oregon State College, from $500,000 to $620,000, (Section 2(6), Chapter 640, Oregon Laws 1985), with the funds to be taken from excess building fee sinking fund reserves.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Crowell asked why the financing had been changed from bonding to building fees. Mr. Yeland indicated this had been done in negotiations with the Legislative Fiscal Office on two projects. The purpose was to avoid increases in bonded indebtedness when there appeared to be more than adequate reserves to handle the projects on a cash basis rather than through bonds.

Mr. Lemman said a presentation was scheduled on sinking fund reserves, their use, and the Board's experience and policy with respect to sinking funds. The policy now requires that there be a reserve equal to two years of debt service for each issue of bonds. There is also a policy that income is to be estimated conservatively. Mr. Lemman said he was uncertain why the use of building fees was not proposed originally.

Mr. Alltucker said it was his recollection that the balance in the sinking fund had been reviewed after this request had been submitted.

In response to questions, it was explained that the original plan approved by the Board was an expansion over the patio area. The Board subsequently approved the excavation underneath. This increased the cost from $275,000 to $500,000, and that decision was made prior to getting legislative approval. The recreational space was added below the bookstore by excavation. It presumably was to be accomplished at relatively low cost. The expansion took place, and the increase is required because of an error in the estimate of the cost when the scope of the project was expanded.
Mr. Chao said he was troubled to have errors in estimates of more than 5% and this was significantly more than 5%. He asked what could be done to be certain that this would not happen again.

Mr. Lemman said architects are requested to make estimates based on a detailed calculation. In this particular instance, the staff was told that the architects used an external estimating service and that the estimating service they ordinarily used was not available. This secondary source simply proved to be inadequate. He said ordinarily there was no basis for the staff to make a determination on the accuracy of the estimates so it is necessary simply to query the architects to make certain they have given the cost estimates serious consideration. In this case, the estimating error was simply outrageous.

Mr. Chao said he would suggest language to the effect that the architects were being held to the cost estimate regardless of how the estimate is prepared. If not, they should know that they would be unlikely to be considered for future projects. Mr. Neland indicated that when a project comes in substantially over the estimate, it is the responsibility of the architect to redesign at no cost to the state.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Alltucker presented the Committee discussion and recommendation, noting the concerns expressed with regard to the estimating error.

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

President Meyers said he wished to make it clear for the record that the architects on the project made the estimating error.

Proposed Adoption of OAR 580-50-027, Affirmative Action Goals

At the November 22, 1985, meeting of the Board, the Board's staff presented tentative administrative rule language establishing affirmative action goals aimed at increasing the participation of minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises in State System capital construction projects. The Board voted to amend the language to establish the method of measuring the System's success ratio. That amendment is now a part of the proposed rule.

A public hearing was held on December 4, 1985, to receive testimony and comment from interested persons. Ms. Virginia Boushey was the designated hearings officer. She opened the public hearing at the designated hour and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed rule. There being no response, she declared the public hearing closed.

Two institutions have voiced concern over the effect of this rule. These institutions are located in small communities with limited numbers of minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises. The concern is that local subcontractors and suppliers may be disadvantaged by the application of this rule.
Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board adopt the proposed OAR 580-50-027, Affirmative Action Goals, by roll call vote. The proposed administrative rule appears below:

Affirmative Action Goals

580-50-027 (1) The successful bidder in a capital construction project approved by the Board of Higher Education and having an estimated value in excess of $500,000 shall make good faith efforts to subcontract to, or obtain materials to be used in performing the contract from, minority and women business enterprises in conformance with the following goals:

(a) 10% of the estimated total contract bid dollars to be subcontracted to minority-owned business enterprises or expended to purchase materials from minority-owned business enterprises.

(b) 2% of the estimated total contract bid dollars to be subcontracted to women-owned business enterprises or expended to purchase materials from women-owned business enterprises.

(2) For purposes of this section, minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises are those certified as such by the Department of Transportation. Implementation of the goals established in this section shall be according to the requirements of Chapter 789, Oregon Laws 1985.

(3) The Board annually will evaluate System performance in meeting these goals by calculating the value of materials purchased from and subcontracts awarded to minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises as a percentage of the dollar value of all capital construction contracts awarded, including those having a value of $500,000 or less.

Board Discussion and Action

In presenting the report, Mr. Neland indicated that in discussions with the two institutions which had expressed concern over the effect of this rule, it was agreed that it would not necessarily follow that local contractors and suppliers might be disadvantaged by the application of the rule because of low certification of minority and women business enterprises in their communities. He said it was his understanding they did not wish to pursue modifying the rule at this time.

Mr. Neland said that correspondence had been received also from Ms. Rebecca Crocker of the Hispanic Political Action Committee, Mid-Willamette Valley Chapter. He said basically she endorsed the action but would lower the floor at which the rule would become operative from $500,000 to $100,000. In addition, she commented regarding other areas of purchasing and procurement which probably were not appropriate to this issue since they were through delegated authority from the Department of General Services. He noted that the Board had Constitutional authority to be an improvement contractor.

Mr. Neland said the $500,000 level had been established because a substantial amount of business was done with minority business enterprises as direct contractors on smaller projects. They might even be disadvantaged by lowering the floor, because other contractors would become aggressively competitive in securing them as subcontractors rather than as direct bidders. He said the staff continued to recommend that the $500,000 amount be retained in the proposed rule until there was more evidence that a great disadvantage is being created.

Mr. Alltucker explained that he would vote against the staff recommendation because it had been his experience that setting a quota led to chicanery and even almost illegal acts in order to comply with the quotas. He said he would prefer to focus on the intent and simply define what was meant by good faith effort. He said he believed it was wrong for the Board or any other public agency to set targets that were impractical and could not be met.
Mr. Neland said the proposal was not specifying quotas but spoke of achieving goals. The good faith effort is defined in law.

In response to a question, Mr. Neland indicated he did not have any measure of what had happened in this regard over the past few years. However, that statistic would be maintained if the rule were adopted. He also described the process for determining that a contractor had met the requirements. He indicated the proposal was not intended to change making contract awards to the low bidder. It was establishing a commitment to make the contract award to the lowest qualified bidder. The rule would add another qualification to the bonding and other requirements made of all bidders.

The Board approved the staff recommendation and adopted the proposed rule on roll call vote. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Clark, Hensley, Nelson, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: Directors Alltucker and Crowell.

Amendments to Administrative Rules, Divisions 11, 40, 41, 42, and 43; and Internal Management Directives, Sections 1, 6, and 7 To Effect Changes in Title and Function for the Executive Vice Chancellor and OHSU

Staff Report to the Board

At the July Board meeting, the Board voted to change the title of the Vice Chancellor for Administration to Executive Vice Chancellor to reflect more accurately the expanded duties and responsibilities assigned to Vice Chancellor W. T. Lemman. With this change, the responsibility for facilities planning was assigned to the Executive Vice Chancellor and the Office of Facilities Planning became a division (the Facilities Division) of the Office of Administration. Amendments to the Board's Administrative Rules and Internal Management Directives were prepared to reflect these changes in title and function. At the same time, amendments were prepared to Division 40 to reflect a change in title for the Oregon Health Sciences University.

A public hearing was held on December 4, 1985, to receive comment and testimony on the proposed administrative rule amendments. Ms. Virginia Boushey was the designated hearing officer. She opened the public hearing at the designated hour and asked if anyone wished to be heard for or against the proposed amendments. There being no response, she declared the public hearing closed.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board adopt on roll call vote the following proposed amendments to Oregon Administrative Rules, Divisions 11, 40, 41, 42, and 43, and Internal Management Directives, Sections 1, 6, and 7, as shown on the following pages:
Charging of Administrative and Physical Plant Costs to Auxiliary Enterprises
580-11-045(1) Board's Office and institutional accounting and administrative costs are apportioned among the auxiliary enterprises in accordance with Executive Department and Board's Office policy directive. The basis for apportioning institutional accounting and administrative costs is determined by the institution with report to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration].

(2) In recognition of use of student centers, housing, food service buildings, recreational buildings, and intercollegiate athletic facilities for the instructional and public service programs, institutions may fund from education and general services resources a proportionate share of the physical plant costs of operating and maintaining these auxiliary enterprises. Such funding is generally apportioned according to use and space except that education and general services resources normally shall not be used to support such revenue-producing areas as food service, bookstore, barber shop, game room, housing, and other similar areas which should be self-supporting. The basis for apportioning institutional physical plant operation and maintenance costs shall be determined by the institution with report to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration].

Delegation and Assignment of Responsibility
580-40-005 The Board delegates general supervision of fiscal and administrative activities to the Chancellor and the staff. Major changes in organization or procedures in such activities shall be reported to the Board's Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant for approval. The Board directs the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] to execute Board policy in all areas of fiscal and administrative services. Among these are:

(1) Designing, installing, supervising, and auditing of fiscal and accounting policies and procedures in the Department;
(2) Designing budget systems and procedures describing Department goals, program proposals to achieve these goals, and the level and type of financial support necessary to implement approved programs during prescribed time periods. The Office of Administration is also responsible for budget execution review to assure conformance with the adopted budget;
(3) Establishing policies and procedures for administration of gift, grant, and contract funds;
(4) Custody, control, and management of the investment of Department funds;
(5) Coordinated administration of policies relating to procurement, receipt, and management of tangible personal property of the Department;
(6) Development of an analytic program, founded on recognized institutional research techniques, providing input to the Department's budget preparation and program evaluation efforts;
(7) Development of a program to analyze Department administrative policies and practices and recommend specific actions to improve services and minimize costs;
(8) Sign claims on behalf of the Board for payment by the Executive Department; sign payrolls; and sign checks on bank accounts with the State Treasurer or commercial banks.

Institutional Authority to Establish Fees and Charges
580-40-010 (1) The Board of Higher Education delegates to each President the authority and responsibility to establish as necessary, but ordinarily not more often than annually, fees for certain services and materials provided or coordinated by the institution. The fees are supplemental to required instruction fee, building fee, health service fee, incidental fee, and other charges determined and established by the Board. The additional services and materials for which fees and charges may be established include student family, cooperative and miscellaneous housing; instruction related services; motor vehicle and bicycle parking; hospital, medical, surgical, oral health, and clinic services; short courses and workshops; fines for violation of campus regulations; special music, counseling, and testing services; and off-campus facilities and services arranged by the institution.

-431-
(2) For services and materials other than student family, cooperative, and miscellaneous housing, the fees and charges shall be established at levels which assure recovery of the cost of providing the services and materials, including that portion of the operating costs required by legislative action on the Department budget, and in accordance with criteria stated in the Administrative Rules.

(3) The rates for student family, cooperative, and miscellaneous housing shall be the amount necessary to meet, for that type of housing, the operating costs, required assessments, debt service, and the requirements of the Board's building repair reserve and equipment replacement reserve policies. For each type of housing, the rates charged for individual units may reflect differences in the age, quality, location, level of service provided, and other factors affecting the relative economic value of the unit.

(4) Residents of each of the three types of housing shall contribute, by means of applicable rental rates, toward the total debt service of that type of housing.

(5) Provision for debt service related to each of the three types of housing is the responsibility of the institution at which the housing is located.

(6) For housing units scheduled for demolition, the institution shall provide a means for timely accumulation of reserves or for the acquisition of other funds sufficient to cover the costs of razing and removal. For this purpose, each of the three types of housing shall be provided for separately.

(7) Fees and charges and amendments thereto which the President has Board-delegated authority to establish shall be adopted only after approval by the President in the manner required by the Administrative Procedure Act (ORS Chapter 183). Copies of all fee schedules, charges, and amendments shall be presented to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] for filing in the Chancellor's Office.

Hospital Charges
580-40-015
(1) Rate schedules for hospital services shall be established and maintained by the Oregon Health Sciences University. The schedules must be approved by the Hospital Director and the President and filed with the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration].

(2) Rates shall be established to meet the financial requirements of the hospital according to recognized hospital standards and to meet the commitments of the operating budget.

(3) Costs and rates shall be computed in a manner consistent with generally accepted accounting principles for hospitals and the requirements of third party sponsors.

(4) Rates shall be filed and maintained in accordance with the rules and procedures established by the Oregon State Health Planning and Development Agency under ORS 442.410.

(5) Inpatients shall pay or make arrangements for payment of services on admission or as soon thereafter as is feasible. Outpatients shall pay or make arrangements to pay for services before completion of the last visit.

Medical, Surgical, Oral Health, and Medical and Dental Clinic Professional Service Fee Schedules
580-40-020
(1) Medical, surgical, oral health and medical and dental clinical professional service fees billed by faculty members and clinics at the [University of] Oregon Health Sciences University [Center] must be approved by clinical departments concerned, the appropriate Dean, and the President and filed with the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration].

(2) Fees may be adjusted to reflect changing costs, but a schedule of fees must be maintained for at least ninety days following adoption.

Traffic Regulations, Parking Fees, and Enforcement Fines
580-40-025
(1) The Board delegates to each President the authority and responsibility to enact such rules and fines as deemed necessary and desirable to provide for policing, controlling, regulating, and enforcing traffic and parking or motor vehicles and bicycles on property owned by or under the control of the Board.

(2) Parking fees shall be charged at any institution where Article XI-F(1) bond proceeds have been used to finance the cost of acquiring parking sites or to make improvements thereto. Parking fees shall also be charged even though borrowed funds were not obtained if the operating and maintenance cost is $5 or more per parking space per year.
(3) When fees are to be assessed to users of automotive parking facilities, the rate of charge and income to be produced shall be in such an amount which, with interest income, will provide sufficient funds to cover all operating and maintenance costs and also meet bond debt service and reserve requirements where applicable.

(4) Institutional accounts are not to be charged for parking space furnished to employees for personally-owned automobiles. A charge may be made against a department, however, where parking space is furnished to a person with a privately-owned vehicle who is rendering service for the benefit of the department with no compensation, such as volunteer doctors at the [University of] Oregon Health Sciences University [Center].

(5) Institutions shall adopt rules concerning the operation and parking of bicycles on property owned by or under the control of the Board. The rules shall clearly state where bicycle parking will be permitted and where it will not be allowed. Penalties for violations may be proposed.

(6) All traffic and parking rules approved by the President must be filed with the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] no later than September 1 of each year.

(7) Rules must remain in effect for at least one full calendar year following adoption unless prior approval is obtained from the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration].

Vehicular Safety, Operation, and Maintenance Policy

580-40-030 (1) The Board of Higher Education is committed to taking every practical step which will result in institutions providing safe, vehicular transportation for faculty, staff, and students traveling on institution-approved business.

(2) No person convicted within the past three years of a major traffic offense as defined in ORS 484.010 shall be permitted to drive vehicles owned by or loaned to the state for institution-approved business, or to drive a private vehicle, if carrying passengers on institution business.

(3) Before using vehicles loaned to the state, the institution shall register them with, and confirm that they are covered by insurance approved by, the Office of Administration.

(4) Travel on institution business in private vehicles owned or used by employee/driver or student/driver shall be authorized only in accordance with Executive Department rules and upon condition that the driver waive any and all liability which may accrue to the Board of Higher Education because of the driver's failure to abide by vehicular safety, operation, and maintenance rules required under this rule.

(5) Except for rules provided above, the Board recognizes that it is impractical to anticipate the transportation needs, driving and weather conditions, and safety equipment requirements appropriate to each institution. Therefore, the Board of Higher Education delegates to each institution the authority and responsibility for establishing additional rules and procedures governing vehicular safety, operation, and maintenance. Institution-adopted rules shall apply to all vehicles used for institution business, whether owned by or loaned to the state, and to private vehicles owned or used by the employee/driver or student/driver, if carrying passengers on institution business.

(6)(a) Institution rules shall require that vehicles have operable safety belts for every person to be transported; an emergency reflector kit; flares; an ice scraper; an operable flashlight; service station credit cards except in private vehicles owned or used by employee/driver or student/driver; a first aid kit; accident-reporting blanks; and instructions for handling emergencies. Exceptions to emergency reflector kits, flares, flashlights, service station credit cards, and first aid kits could apply to vehicles used only within the campus boundaries or for short trips to locations adjacent to the campus.

(b) Institution rules shall also include appropriate provisions for each of the following: vehicular safety inspections; additional required safety equipment; appropriate maintenance; driver license review; physical qualifications, training, institution certification, and performance review of each driver; equipment clearance checks; filing of a trip itinerary; groups traveling long distances in a single car or in a caravan, including emergency equipment such as civilian band radios and trauma kits; tire chains or other approved traction devices when required by route or destination; provision
for relief drivers during long trips; cancellation of lectures, classes, athletic contests, field trips, and other extra-curricular activities when vehicle [ef] or weather conditions create unacceptable risk to the health and safety of vehicle passengers; notification of designated institution authorities who will be responsible for contacting relatives of travelers in event of an injury accident; and additional classes of persons beyond those included in section (2) of this rule, who should not be permitted to drive vehicles for institution-approved business.

(7) Each institution shall file with the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration] within sixty days of the close of each fiscal year a report reviewing the effectiveness of travel rules and summarizing vehicular accidents, injuries, and other relevant information.

(8) Institution rules and amendments thereto shall be adopted only after approval of the institution President and the Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration].

Receivables
580-41-010 (1) Business offices of the Department of Higher Education shall be diligent in the collection of accounts and notes receivables. The procedures followed shall be in conformity with the requirements of federal and state law and regulation. The procedures shall be formally adopted by an institution after public hearing under the Administrative Procedures Act, with prior notice to the Controller and Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration].

(2) Deletion of the reference to specific sanctions permits the institutions to adapt to changes in law or judicial interpretation as well as to institutional differences. The Office of Administration will assist the institutions by suggesting a model institutional rule, after consultation with the institutions.

Delegation
580-42-010 (1) Institutions are authorized to apply for and accept, on behalf of the Board, gifts or grants and to negotiate contracts that will not result in:

(a) Enrollments in excess of those on which budgets have been based;
(b) Commitment of funds beyond those available in budgets approved by the Board, or the normal continuation thereof;
(c) Creating a commitment for the institution or the state to continue support of a program funded through gifts, grants, or contracts, in the event such funds are discontinued;
(d) Development or support of activities inconsistent with the approved mission of the department and/or institution;
(e) Launching of new curricular programs which have not received prior Board approval;
(f) Purchase of land or improvements thereof requiring an outlay of $10,000 or more;
(g) Establishing or significantly expanding a clientele for services of an essentially non-research or non-instructional nature.

(2) The Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration] or a designee is authorized to approve application for and acceptance of other gifts, grants, or contracts.

Institutional Responsibility
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 where 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] Division 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.

Institutional Responsibilities

580-43-016 To manage inventions, technological improvements, and educational and professional materials developed by employees, institutions shall:

(1) Apply Board-adopted policies and procedures;
(2) Encourage employee activities which lead to new knowledge;
(3) Actively seek applications for new knowledge developed by employees;
(4) Anticipate and comply with conditions in contracts, grants, and agreements with sponsoring agencies;
(5) Recommend to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] or designee contractual agreements, patent applications, and equitable sharing of net royalty income.
1.202 Legal Counsel

The Assistant Attorney General assigned to the Department shall be responsible to the Chancellor. The Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] shall be responsible for coordinating provision of legal services in the Department.

6.001 Assignment of Responsibility

Subject to review and modification by the Chancellor or the Board, the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] shall be responsible for:

(1) ...
(2) ...
(3) ...
(4) ...

6.004 Cash Funds

All funds made available to the Department or any of its units, whatever their source, shall be entered in the accounting records and disbursed in accordance with procedures established by the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration]. Gifts to an institution should be deposited in the State Treasury, unless the donor intended the gift to be made to an affiliated organization.

6.005 Cash Receipts

Cash receipts shall be deposited promptly in accordance with requirements established by the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration].

6.006 Working Funds

Revolving Funds and Petty Cash Funds may be authorized by the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration], as necessary, for Department activities. Prior approval for deposit of such funds in commercial banks must be obtained from the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration].

6.008 Disbursements

The Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] shall establish procedures to assure that Department funds are paid out only for lawful purposes and in accordance with Board policies.
6.050 Institutional Responsibility

In accordance with instructions from the Executive Vice Chancellor or a designee, the institutions, divisions, and statewide services shall provide detailed descriptions of their biennial plans and programs and the resources required for them.

6.054 Annual Operating Budget Planning

(1) Consistent with legislative appropriations and Executive Department allotments, the Executive Vice Chancellor shall develop plans for the annual operating budget pursuant to Board policy and the Chancellor's instructions.

(2) Institutions, divisions, and statewide services shall provide such assistance in developing the annual operating budget as the Executive Vice Chancellor deems necessary.

6.100 Grants and Contracts

(1) The Executive Vice Chancellor or a designee is authorized to enter into contractual agreements not required by statute to be acted on by the Board. The Executive Vice Chancellor or a designee may authorize institutional personnel to enter into grants, contracts, or agreements not involving unresolved policy questions.

(2) ...

(3) In exceptional circumstances, less than full indirect cost rates may be approved by the institution's president or designee. The institution shall submit annually to the Executive Vice Chancellor or designee a report of all grants and contracts for which the institution received less than the full indirect cost rate or the maximum allowed by the granting or contracting agency.

6.102 Authority to Enter into Personal Services Contracts

(1) The Executive Vice Chancellor and his designee are authorized to enter into personal service contracts on behalf of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education and the institutions. The Executive Vice Chancellor or his designee may delegate authority to institutions to enter into certain categories of personal services contracts.

(2) When the Executive Vice Chancellor or designee has delegated selective contracting authority to the institutions, those institutions may enter into personal service contracts.

(3) ...

(4) ...
6.103 Justification of Personal Services Contracts

(1) Each institution shall maintain a contract file containing a complete record of the development and administration of the contract.

(2) ...

(a) ...

(b) ...

(c) ...

(3) ...

6.105 Assignment of Responsibility

(1) Except for arrangements pursuant to Section 6.140(5), the Executive Vice Chancellor is authorized to purchase, sell or exchange securities for the Board. Prior approval of the Board President or the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant is required for any transaction undertaken by the Executive Vice Chancellor involving amounts in excess of $20,000, except that approval is not required for purchases of securities of the United States, its agencies, or Certificates of Deposit of Oregon banks.

(2) The Executive Vice Chancellor may transfer, endorse, sell, assign, set over, and deliver stocks, bonds, debentures, notes, evidences of indebtedness, or other securities standing in the name of or owned by the Board, and may make, execute, and deliver any instruments necessary to effectuate such authority.

(3) The Executive Vice Chancellor may designate staff members to act on specifically identified transactions or limited responsibilities referred to above.

6.110 Voting Stock Ownership

(1) Except as otherwise provided by law, by direction of the Board or the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant, the Executive Vice Chancellor is authorized to vote stock ownership in accordance with the recommendations of corporate management. In the absence of such recommendation or if deemed prudent to deviate from management recommendations, the Executive Vice Chancellor shall consult with the Board President or the Chairman of the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant before voting the affected stocks.

(2) The Executive Vice Chancellor may seek the assistance and counsel of such persons as deemed advisable.
6.115 Custody of Board Securities

(1) Custody of the Board’s securities is placed with the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] or a designee, and authority is granted to make arrangements for their safekeeping.

(2) The Executive Vice Chancellor or a designee is authorized and empowered to obtain, deposit, and release securities from banks to protect funds for the Department.

6.120 Understanding with the Oregon Investment Council—Repealed May 28, 1982

6.125 Delegation of Investment Authority

Subject to such conditions as may be imposed, and compatible with statutes and Administrative Rules, the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] may delegate to the Controller responsibility for assuring effective investments of the Higher Education Bond Building Fund, the Higher Education Bond Sinking Funds and the Current Donation Fund.

6.130 Reports on Investments

(1) The Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] shall report to the Board not less than semi-annually on corporate stock investment status and transactions. The report shall, among other matters, provide information regarding the market and book values of the stocks, the current dividend rate, purchases and sales, and gains and losses.

(2) The Executive Vice Chancellor shall report to the Board at least annually on all investments of all funds, with such recommendations as are appropriate.

6.125 Endowment Fund Investments—Repealed May 28, 1982

6.140 Endowment Fund Investments

(1) The investment objective is to secure return from dividends, interest, and market value change sufficient to provide endowment fund participants with annual income equal to a percentage established annually by the Executive Vice[-] Chancellor [for Administration] of the 5-year moving average of the market value of the endowment funds and to maintain the purchasing power of the funds as nearly as prudent investment permits. The change in the Oregon personal income index applied to the market value of the funds is used to measure the maintenance of purchasing power.

(2) ...

(3) ...

(4) ...

(5) The Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] is authorized to arrange through the Oregon investment Council for the management of the investment of the Board’s endowment funds.

(6) ...
6.141 Accounting

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

6.150 Assignment of Responsibility--Personal Property

The Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] or a designee shall develop and coordinate procedures used by the institutions and other administrative units for:

(1) ...

(2) ...

(3) ...

(4) ...

(5) ...

6.170 Responsibility for Review, Retention and Disposition of Real Property

(1) The Executive Vice Chancellor or a designee is authorized to coordinate, in consultation with the institutions, the review, retention, and disposition of real property within or outside Board-approved projected campus boundaries.

(2) Review, retention, and disposition includes developing criteria for use in determining whether to retain or dispose of real property; establishing specific operating policies; coordinating the property evaluation process; obtaining clearance from appropriate state and local agencies to sell property and to retain or relinquish certain rights to property; recommending to the Board approval to dispose of property, including terms of sale; and complying with state statutes when obtaining appraisals, publishing notices of sale, accepting bids, executing exchanges, and issuing deeds.

[(a) The Vice-Chancellor for Facilities Planning or a designee is authorized to coordinate, in consultation with the institutions, the review of real property within Board-approved projected campus boundaries.]

[(b) The Vice-Chancellor for Administration or a designee is authorized to coordinate, in consultation with the institutions, the review, retention, and disposition of real property outside projected campus boundaries.]
(3) [2] Recommendations to the Executive [a] Vice Chancellor to dispose of real property must originate with an institution president or the Chancellor.

6.175 Guidelines for Real Property Retention and Disposition Decisions

(1) ...

(2) As part of the periodic review and updating of long-range campus development plans for the institution, recommendations will be presented to the Board by the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Facilities-Planning] to confirm or modify the projected campus boundaries.

(3) The Executive Vice Chancellor[s-for-Facilities-Planning-and Administration] may [jointly] select a three member advisory committee to assist [them-and] the institutions in establishing criteria for evaluating real property holdings. The advisory committee shall include persons qualified by professional education and experience to serve in this capacity.

(4) ...

(5) ...

(6) At the completion of each fiscal year, the Executive Vice Chancellor[s-for-Administration-and-Facilities-Planning] shall present a summary report to the Board on the disposition of real property and on significant changes in the designation of property not used for the educational and research mission of the institution.

6.215 Rights to Inventions, Technological Improvements, Educational and Professional Materials

(1) ...

(2) ...

(3) ...

(4) ...

(5) If it is determined that inventions or materials developed are not related to work or to an assigned project and that development involved no or minimal use of institutional funds or facilities, or that the material developed is incidental to the individual's work assignment, or that the institution and Board have no right, vested interest, or claim in an invention, and the institution decides to forego the licensing or patenting of an invention or the publishing and copyrighting of the material, the president or designee may recommend to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration] or a designee that the Board's interest and rights be waived, and that a statement be issued which waives any institution or Board claim....

(6) ...
6.220 Research and Development of Inventions and Materials with Outside Organizations

(1) ...

(2) ...

(3) In cases where it appears in the interest of the Board, institution, inventor, and sponsor, and upon the recommendation of the president or designated administrator, the Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration] or designee may grant rights to the sponsor, including the right to acquire a proprietary interest in and to any invention or patent developed during the sponsored research project.

(4) ...

6.235 Administration of Policies and Procedures

(1) The Board delegates to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration] or designee authority to work with each president or designated administrator to obtain licensing, production, and publishing agreements and patents, develop and approve forms used in administering licensing and patent policies, and execute all types of agreements, waivers, releases, and net royalty distribution agreements.

(2) ...

(3) ...

(4) ...

(a) ...

(b) ...

(c) ...

(d) ...

(e) ...

(5) When institutional facilities are utilized on a reimbursable basis to develop educational or professional materials or to conduct research on an invention, an agreement shall be prepared and recommended by the president or designee to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration] or designee. Such agreement shall be executed in advance of use of the facilities and shall set forth the understanding regarding the use of facilities, ownership rights, and financial arrangements.
6.240 Determination of Equities

In determining equities relating to ownership rights in an invention or material, institutional personnel and the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] or designee shall follow these guidelines:

(1) ...

(2) ...

(3) In the event an agreement cannot be reached regarding the amount of equity of each party and subsequent distribution of net royalty income, the president shall recommend resolution to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration], after having taken affirmative steps to assure thorough consideration of the equities of all parties.

6.245 Commercialization of Inventions

(1) ...

(2) ...

(3) When feasible, the president or designated administrator shall recommend that the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] grant non-exclusive, royalty-bearing licenses to all qualified organizations. Exclusive licenses may be recommended if it is determined that such a license is required in the best interest of the public, Board, institution and inventor in order to encourage marketing and eventual public use of the invention.

(4) ...

(5) When it is deemed appropriate to grant an exclusive license, the length of exclusivity shall be limited to that time deemed necessary to provide the licensee with the necessary incentive and opportunity to market the product and recover developmental costs, usually not more than five years from the date of first commercialization of the invention, or the issuance of a patent, whichever comes first, and a non-exclusive license for the life of the patent. Exclusive licenses may include the right of the licensee to sub-license others. Exceptions to the length of exclusivity, when justified and recommended by the institution, may be approved by the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] and the Chancellor.

(6) ...

(a) ...

(b) ...
6.250 Distribution of Royalties

(1) The Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] or designee, upon the recommendation of the president, shall act on behalf of the Board to conclude agreements to share net royalty income accruing to the Board from licensing and patent agreements, and from the sale, lease, or licensing of materials outside the institution.

(2) Agreements involving the sharing of net royalty income shall be initiated in writing at the institution and recommended by the president or designee to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] or designee for review and approval. In determining disposition of income, due consideration shall be given to the equity of all parties in the light of all circumstances surrounding the development of the invention or material.

(3) The Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] or designee shall require deduction from gross royalty income, prior to any distribution, all institutional expenses and reasonable costs incurred in developing the invention or material, expenses incurred in enforcing or defending any patent, copyright litigation, licensing, interference, and marketing costs attributable to the invention or material, as well as any other expenses deemed necessary to recoup. Gross royalty income minus all such costs and expenses constitutes net royalty income.

(4) ...

(5) ...

(6) ...

(7) ...

6.255 Copyright Registration Procedures

In establishing copyright registration procedures, institutional personnel and the Executive Vice Chancellor [for Administration] or designee shall follow these guidelines:

(1) ...

(2) ...

(3) ...

(4) ...
6.320 Budgeting for Auxiliary Enterprise Activities

(1) Annually, at a time determined by the Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration], each institution shall propose housing or parking activities budgets conservatively anticipating income from user fees and other sources to provide for all operating expenses and for the establishment and maintenance of required reserves, including the repayment of any outstanding obligations and the elimination of operating overdrafts.

(2) Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, the Controller, with the assistance of the Executive Vice Chancellor or a designee [for-Facilities Planning], shall present for Board review and approval a budget plan for the utilization of building fee resources, including debt service on all other auxiliary enterprise facilities.

6.325 Other Uses of Auxiliary Enterprise and Other Self-Liquidating Debt Service Funds

(1) Authority is delegated to the Executive Vice Chancellor or a designee [for-Administration-and-the-Vice-Chancellor-for-Facilities-Planning], following consultation with the officials of the institution, to transfer excess Article XI-F(1) debt service funds to other funds and accounts for the following purposes:

(a) ...

(b) ...

(c) ...

(d) ...

(e) ...

(2) Plans for the usage during the following fiscal year of excess building fee debt service funds for purposes stated in IMD 6.325(1) shall be submitted to the Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration] by June 1 so that priorities may be established and approval granted for the use of the funds. Building repair and capital improvement projects costing over $5,000 must also be reviewed and approved in advance by the Executive Vice Chancellor or a designee [for-Facilities-Planning].

6.431 Contracts With Affiliated Organizations

(1) An institution may contract with an affiliated organization to provide services, including personnel and office space. The contract shall be executed by the institution-authorized contract officer, president or authorized officer or trustee of the corporate affiliate, and Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Administration] or designee. The Board's legal counsel shall approve the contract as to form.

(2) ...
7.130 Approval of Plans, Specifications and Contracts

(1) The Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Facilities-Planning] is authorized to:

(a) ...

(b) ...

(c) ...

(2) ...

7.140 Acceptance of Buildings

Subject to any specified qualifications the Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Facilities-Planning] or designees may inspect and accept construction work for and on behalf of the Board.

7.145 Plant Rehabilitation

The Chancellor may allocate funds from the Board's reserve for physical plant rehabilitation and minor capital outlay. The Executive Vice Chancellor [for-Facilities-Planning] or designee is assigned the responsibility of recommending such allocations to the Chancellor with appropriate report to the Board at the meeting following such action, subject to the following conditions:

(1) ...

(2) ...

(a) ...

(b) ...

(c) ...

7.150 Duties of Vice-Chancellor for Facilities Planning

[Under the direction of the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor for Facilities Planning shall be responsible for the work of the Board's Office of Facilities Planning and is designated as the appropriate Board official to perform the following services subject to applicable statutes, Board rules and directives.]

(1) Negotiate and execute professional services agreements for architectural and engineering services, including supplements to such agreements.

(2) Review and approve subsequent phases of planning for projects for which the schematic design phase of planning has been approved by the Board.
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(3) Approve or deny requests of construction contractors for pre-qualification for bidding.

(4) Solicit and open bids for construction, rehabilitation, demolition, repair and maintenance, furnishings, etc.

(5) Prepare and execute contracts for construction, rehabilitation, demolition, repair and maintenance, furnishings, etc., including change orders; provide notices of contract award or of the rejection of bids.

(6) Inspect and accept the work of contractors for construction, rehabilitation, demolition, repair and maintenance, furnishings, etc.

(7) Prepare and execute applications for federal grant assistance or loans relating to facilities planning, construction, land acquisitions, etc., and submit payment requests and reports relating thereto.

(8) Acquire lands within the approved projected campus boundaries, including appraisals and other matters relating to acquisition of real property.

(9) Perform such other services relating to acquisition of land and the planning and construction of facilities as may be required.

(10) Provide surveillance of physical plant operations.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation and adopted the proposed amendments to the Administrative Rules and Internal Management Directives as presented. On roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Clark, Crowell, Hensley, Nelson, Schwab, and Batiste. Those voting no: None.
Staff Report to the Board

In March 1983, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education established a policy for intercollegiate athletics requiring State System institutions to monitor the academic progress of student athletes (section 8.031 of the Board's Internal Management Directives). The major goal of the policy is to assure normal academic progress for student athletes, with degree attainment expected approximately five years after initial registration. Institution presidents are required to establish policies and procedures aimed at accomplishing this goal.

More specifically, institution policies must require: minimum academic term credit hour loads of twelve hours in degree-related courses during seasons of competition; compliance with normal progress rules established by the institution; development and use of continuing academic monitoring systems for student athletes; and an annual report to the Board on the progress of student athletes toward degree attainment. The annual reporting function is coordinated through the Division of Management and Planning Services (MAPS), which has responsibility for the study design and compilation of institutional data.

This constitutes the second of what will be a series of annual reports to the Board on the academic progress of student athletes.

Pilot Study 1983-84

During the summer and fall of 1984, MAPS staff developed a pilot study of 1983-84 student athletes, which was reported to the Board at its December 14, 1984, meeting. As a result of that pilot study, a number of conceptual and technical problems were identified in the study design. These problems were resolved through individual consultation with institution staff, and through lengthy discussion in a meeting held during February 1985. These discussions helped to define data elements more precisely and to streamline the format for collecting data over six years.

Purpose of the Six-Year Study (1983-84 - 1988-89)

Although further refinements will be made in future reports, the basic design of the study has now been established. The study aims to answer the following questions:

- How many students participate in intercollegiate athletics each year?
- What proportion of student athletes obtain bachelor's degrees within four, five, or six years?
- What proportion of student athletes leave the sport but remain enrolled at the institution? Of those, what proportion left the sport in good academic standing as defined by their institution? What proportion left not in good standing?
- What proportion of student athletes are no longer enrolled at the institution at the end of each academic year, and at the end of four, five, or six years? Of those, what proportion left the institution in good academic standing as defined by their institution? What proportion left not in good standing?
- Do the study results vary among the sports at any given institution?

It should be emphasized that this study is not an evaluation of sport programs; it focuses only on athletes as students. As in any study of student academic progress, this study will reflect a diversity of academic abilities and levels of motivation. Both scholarship and non-scholarship intercollegiate athletic programs at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University, Western Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State...
College, Eastern Oregon State College, and Oregon Institute of Technology are included in the study. To the extent that non-scholarship programs can be distinguished from scholarship programs simply by identifying the name of the sport, those distinctions can be made. However, the study focuses only on the role of the athletic activity itself in the context of academic progress, not on the arrangement by which the activity is undertaken.

It should also be noted that no comparisons will be made among institutions. Major variations exist within the State System in the type of intercollegiate athletic programs. University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University provide athletic scholarships under NCAA guidelines. The regional colleges and Oregon Institute of Technology operate primarily under NAIA rules and do not provide financial aid except under financial aid support available to all students who can qualify. Therefore, a comparison of, say Oregon State University's intercollegiate athletics programs with those of Eastern Oregon State College would be unfair to both and certainly meaningless. Any conclusions which might be drawn would be invalid.

Study Design

Each year of the six-year longitudinal study of the academic progress of athletes, the Board will receive a progress report. In successive years, each study group or "cohort" added to the study will consist of student athletes who are first-time freshmen, new transfers, and other undergraduates already enrolled at the institution. The group will have entered the sport for the first time during that academic year. An academic-year cohort will be added annually until data on a total of six consecutive cohorts have been collected and reported. The late-summer data collection date will include data from the previous academic year, fall through summer. A clearer description of the process is shown in Table 1.

Each cohort is selected from the team rosters as of the last day of competition in each sport. Institutions are asked to provide a "snapshot" report of the students' status as of end of the summer of that academic year. The academic status categories include student athletes: still in the sport; no longer in the sport but still at the institution; graduated by the end of summer; and no longer at the institution. The "snapshot" is updated each summer for six consecutive summers. It should be emphasized that the same individuals are tracked throughout the six-year period. Once a cohort has been established, its membership does not change.

Study Limitations

A major limitation in the use of this study is the lack of similar data on all undergraduates with which to compare the data on student athletes. It is difficult to put in proper perspective a graduation rate for student athletes without knowing the graduation rate of all students in a given institution. It is the intention of MAPS staff to obtain comparison figures on all undergraduates prior to the completion of the six-year study of student athletes.

Second, this study, like most student retention studies, must deal with the problem of identifying students who transfer from their original institution to another institution. In this study, these students would be designated "no longer at the institution," with the implication that they had dropped out. In fact, however, many of them may have completed their degrees at another institution.

Third, since "snapshot" data are collected once a year in the summer, the study does not allow a distinction to be made between a student who had participated in the sport that year and then left the institution, and a student who was enrolled early in the year but left the institution before participating in the sport. The number of students in the latter category is unknown because their names are never recorded on a team roster. It may be that the distinction is not an important one. Nevertheless, the problem caused some concern among a few of the institution staff collecting the data, and will be addressed in the next report.
Fourth, a related problem concerns student athletes who might routinely be absent during spring term but who register again for the fall and winter terms. These students would be counted as no longer at the institution as of the summer data collection date. There are no estimates of how widespread this problem might be, but it is believed that the number may be significant. The problem will be addressed in the next report.

Finally, using the last day of competition as the point from which to draw the cohort presents a problem for sports that span two terms, such as basketball. In such sports, it is possible to have a student who participated fully in the sport during the first term, but became academically ineligible to participate in the second term. The team roster on the last day of competition would exclude such a student. With participation in at least half of the sport season, this student should probably be included in the study. A modification in the selection criteria to accommodate two-term sports will be made before the next report.

Progress Report for 1985

The current report contains data on the 1983-84 and 1984-85 cohorts as of late-summer 1985. Although data are reported on the number of intercollegiate sports and number of participating students at each institution, data pertaining to academic progress will become more meaningful at the end of the six-year study period. Any conclusions drawn at this point are premature and invalid.

The total number of intercollegiate athletics programs range from 7 at Southern Oregon State College and Oregon Institute of Technology to 19 at Oregon State University (see Table 2). In 1983-84, a total of 965 State System students were new to these sports. In 1984-85, the number was 966. It should be noted that these figures do not include numbers of student athletes continuing their participation in the sport from a previous season.

The detailed data for each institution will be mailed to Board members and presidents of the institutions. The data will be available for distribution to others at the Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented
Table 1

OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Academic Progress of Student Athletes
Schedule for Data Collected by Academic Year Cohort
Summer 1985 through Summer 1991

|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
Table 2
Number of Sports and New Student Athletes by Institution
1983-84 and 1984-85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Sports</th>
<th>New Student Athletes (Study Cohort)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>203  204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>156  187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>157  96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon State College</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>169  159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83   91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>98   109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>99   120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>965  966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This table shows numbers of students new to the sport. It does not include student athletes continuing their participation in the sport from a previous season.
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
Lutes/Sanetel/Architects, PC, Eugene, will provide the necessary architectural services for this project at a cost not to exceed $13,400. Funding for these services will be provided through Excess Sinking Fund Reserves from Commingled Student Building Fees.

Erb Memorial Union Bowling Alley Conversion, UO

Classroom-Laboratory Building, OIT
SRG Partnership, P.C., Portland, will provide the necessary architectural services for this project at a cost not to exceed $408,900. Funding for these services will be from proceeds of the Lottery.

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

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS
It was indicated that the reports of the various special committees had been covered in connection with other items during the Board meeting. The committees will continue to meet and will be bringing further reports to the Board in the next few weeks.

Mr. Batiste said he had attended the meetings of the Joint Committee on Teacher Education and the Joint High School/College Connection Committee. He indicated that serious consideration should be given to the fact that these joint committees were not committees established in perpetuity. There was a tendency in both cases to go beyond the agreed-upon goals or programs. He suggested that consideration of the extension of the charges for joint committees should be a top priority at the next joint meeting of the three boards because the annual joint board meeting is the only place where the extension of the charges can be made. He said board members have a responsibility as members of the committees, when the charge exceeds that which has been agreed upon by all of the boards, to bring those charges back to the respective boards for action.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT
Mr. Batiste announced that the next meeting of the Board would be held on January 17, 1986, on the campus of Portland State University. The meeting will be preceded by meetings of the Board's Committees.

Next Meeting Dates

ADJOURNMENT
The Board meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Alvin R. Batiste, President
Wilma L. Foster, Secretary
December 19, 1985

Committee on Instruction, Research
and Public Service Programs
Oregon State Board of Higher Education
Department of Higher Education
P.O. Box 3175
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dear Committee Members:

We, the faculty of the Linfield-Good Samaritan School of Nursing, commend the thorough analysis presented in the Plan for Nursing Education in the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

We wish, however, to clarify our position on the following issues:

1. The plan for Nursing Education is a guideline, not a mandate, for our independent institution. Enrollment numbers projected for our institution reflect minimum numbers, not limits.

2. The plan for Nursing Education should not impede students in state college, universities or community colleges from transferring to private institutions should they so desire.

3. The autonomy of the independent institution must be maintained, but we are willing to continue to work in collaboration and cooperation with the statewide system.

Sincerely,

Pamela Harris
Pamela Harris, R.N., Ph.D.
Dean, Linfield-Good Samaritan School of Nursing
and Director, Linfield College, Portland Campus
December 19, 1985

TO: Committee on Instruction, Research and Public Service Programs

FROM: Patricia L. Chadwick, Ed.D., R.N.
Dean, School of Nursing
University of Portland

RE: The report "A Plan for Nursing Education in the Oregon State System of Higher Education"

The recommendations of the report "A Plan for Nursing Education in the Oregon State System of Higher Education," are not in opposition with the short or long range plan for baccalaureate nursing education at the University of Portland School of Nursing. Furthermore, the report clarifies the University of Portland School of Nursing as an educational program within an independent private institution of higher education, governed by a Board of Regents, not the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

While the recommendations are not in opposition to the goals of the University of Portland School of Nursing, if the plan is accepted by the Board, it will be imperative for the "Interinstitutional Committee on Nursing Education" to establish a relationship with the private institution to assure "complementary planning" for baccalaureate graduate nursing education in Oregon.

It is conceivable, because of the scope of the statewide plan, that unless a process for communication is assured between the public and private institutions, as well as within the public institutions, nursing education in Oregon could become totally controlled by the Oregon Health Sciences University. This would be an injustice, as the prospective Oregon nursing student should have the option to select admission to nursing educational programs in either a private or public institution, thereby not limiting nursing education in Oregon to the public institution. In addition, the admission of the nursing student from the two-year community college directly into the junior level of the baccalaureate nursing program must not be controlled by the state system baccalaureate nursing programs.

To sum, the recommendations of the report "A Plan for Nursing Education in the Oregon State System of Higher Education" are not in opposition to the plans for baccalaureate and graduate nursing educational programs at the University of Portland School of Nursing. However, to assure the option for nursing educational programs in the private and public institutions of higher education, "complementary planning" between the two sections is imperative. If this can be achieved, we are reasonably assured that the recommendations, properly implemented, have the potential to "provide Oregon with state-supported baccalaureate programs of nursing education, which together with the programs of the University of Portland and Linfield-Good Samaritan, will give Oregon a supply of baccalaureate educated nurses needed to fill positions deemed by the health care industry to require this level of preparation, and to provide students and the health care industry with access to baccalaureate nursing programs."
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