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January 15, 1988

A regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was held in Room 338, Smith Center, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.

ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a.m., January 15, 1988, by the President of the Board, Mr. James C. Petersen, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert R. Adams
Mr. Michael W. Hermens
Mr. John W. Alltucker
Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.
Miss Kasey K. Brooks
Mrs. Arlene D. Schnitzer
Mr. Gene Chao
Mr. James C. Petersen
Mr. Mark S. Dodson

Absent: Director Hensley was absent for business reasons, and Director Nelson was absent for personal reasons.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities—Chancellor William E. Davis; Secretary Wilma Foster; W. T. Lemmon, Executive Vice Chancellor; Lawrence Pierce, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Wil Post, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; W. C. Neland, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Fiscal Policies; R. S. Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Information Systems Division; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Melinda Grier, Compliance Officer; Jim Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Roger Olsen, Director, OCATE; Steven Katz, Controller; Peter Hughes, Director, Internal Audit Division; Kay Jurran, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Ray Hoops, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Virginia Boushey, Assistant to Executive Vice Chancellor; James Payne, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Barbara Barrie, Personnel Officer; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications; Pat Wignes, Assistant Board Secretary.

Oregon State University—President John Byrne; Graham Spanier, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Ed Coate, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Stefan Bloomfield, Assistant to the President; Michael Maksud, Dean, College of Health and Physical Education; John Dunn, Professor; Thurston Doler, President, OSU Faculty Senate.
University of Oregon—President Paul Olum; Richard Hill, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President for Administration; Larry Large, Vice President for University Relations; Kathie Williams, Alumni Association; Sandra Nemeth, Business Agent, AFT Local #3544.

Oregon Health Sciences University—Interim President David Witter; James Walker, Interim Vice President; Henry Van Hassel, Dean, School of Dentistry; Ralph Tuomi, Assistant Vice President, Facilities Management; Lois Davis, Assistant to the President.

Portland State University—President Natale A. Sicuro; Roger Edgington, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Frank Martino, Provost; Oma Blankenship, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Representative.

Eastern Oregon State College—President David Gilbert; James Lundy, Dean of Administration; James Hottois, Dean of Academic Affairs.

Oregon Institute of Technology—President Larry Blake; Chris Eismann, Dean of Academic Affairs; John Smith, Dean of Administration.

Southern Oregon State College—Ernest Ettlich, Dean of Academic Affairs; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration; Robert McCoy, Professor.

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

Others—Tom McClellan, Budget Analyst, Executive Department; Harold Williams, Vice President, Pen-Nor, Inc.; Margaret R. Garza, Assistant Manager, Impact Business Consultants; Lina Garcia-Seabold, Minority Advocate, Governor’s Office; Raney Winston, President, Mako Construction Company; Charles Butler, Owner, Butler Metal Fabricators; Susan Morse, Executive Director, Oregon Student Lobby; Chad Dedham, President, National Business League Shirley Minor, Oregon Business League; Shirley Howard, Reporter, KOAP-FM; Darren Swift, Student, Portland State University; Jerry Fisher, Manager/ Public Affairs, Hewlett-Packard; Pam Morris and Doris Bowman, representing Oregon Education Association; Elizabeth H. Johnson, Commissioner, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission; T. K. Olson, Executive Director, Office of Educational Policy and Planning; Bob Mumford, Chairperson, Oregon Student Lobby; Todd Northman, President, Associated Students/ Portland State University.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on December 18, 1987, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, and Petersen. Director Schnitzer was absent from the meeting at this time.
Mr. Petersen indicated that Mrs. Elizabeth Johnson, a former member of the Board of Higher Education and the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission and presently a member of the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, was present at the meeting.

Mr. Petersen also recognized Dr. T. K. Olson, formerly director of the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, and invited him to comment.

Dr. Olson said that during his thirteen years with the Commission he hoped that there had been a growing appreciation by both of the roles and responsibilities of the Commission and the Board and their relationships with each other. He indicated he would be assisting in the transition period to the new Office of Educational Policy and Planning.

The Chancellor announced that Dr. Richard Hill, Provost at the University of Oregon and one of the most distinguished academicians in Oregon and the nation, would be completing his career as an administrator and returning to his first love of teaching and research as a professor in his chosen field. He said Dr. Hill has earned the esteem, respect, and affection of his colleagues both on the University campus and nationally.

The Chancellor thanked Dr. Hill on behalf of the Board and the State System of Higher Education.

The Chancellor said he had distributed to the Board and the institutional presidents a list of agenda items targeted for completion during the next few months. He indicated status reports would be presented during the remaining six months of his term as Chancellor.

The Chancellor announced plans for meetings with the presidents of the institutions. A pilot projection of budgetary needs for a single institution will be done with President Byrne and Oregon State University. It will serve as a guideline for meetings at the other institutions and for developing a budget. A series of meetings with all of the institutions will follow.

President Olum presented detailed information with respect to several new projects at the University of Oregon that resulted from major gifts, grants, and contracts.

In the College of Education, Professor Robert Horner, Director of the Specialized Training Program, has received a $4.5 million grant from the U. S. Department of Education to fund a collaborative investigation of treatment alternatives for the mentally retarded with severe behavior problems. During the five-year grant, investigators will seek ways to help mentally retarded people to function successfully with less supervision, perhaps to the extent they will not require care in mental health institutions.
A recent anonymous gift of $1 million has created the Frederick Charles Baker Scholarship and Chair in Design for the purpose of advancing the study of lighting and lighting design in architecture. The endowment will allow for the study of both natural and artificial light in buildings. It will fund another top professor in lighting in the school of architecture, scholarships for architecture students, visiting speakers, and additions to the library collections.

The Institute of Molecular Biology has received a $3.3 million grant to support cell research that could help provide clues to the control of diseases caused by genetic defects. The University of Oregon was one of only eleven institutions to receive grants from the Lucille P. Markey Charitable Trust and was the only institution not linked directly to a medical school.

A $500,000 endowment was received for the establishment of the Carlton Raymond and Wilbertha Riply Savage Endowed Visiting Professorship in International Relations and Peace. The donor, Carlton Savage, is a 1921 graduate of the University and a long-time public servant in the U. S. State Department who has devoted his life's work to the pursuit of peace. The Chair is designed to bring nationally-known experts to campus to work with students and faculty as they seek ways to achieve peace.

Two projects in the Department of Computer and Information Science show the relationships between higher education and industry and between basic and applied research that can grow from the University's basic research mission. The first project deals with software developments to make computers "user friendly." The second project is in the field of artificial intelligence through which an expert system allows a computer to analyze data in the same way as a human expert would.

President Olum said he found these developments exciting and appreciated the opportunity to report them to the Board.

President Blake explained that Oregon Institute of Technology would be presenting a proposal to the Board later in the spring which would make a significant change in the institution. He said for two decades the institution had considered the possibility of graduate programs in applied engineering but had not found there was a need. Most of its students attend graduate school at the rate of most colleges and universities. However, there is now a growing need for more sophistication at the graduate level. In studying the possibility of graduate education, the committee wanted to make certain it satisfied the needs of the student, of future employers, of the institution, of the State System, and the State of Oregon. The committee also wanted
to make certain there would be value added for the student who remained in school for a master’s degree in engineering technology. He said he believed the program to be proposed would demonstrate that it would meet these concerns and the important role of Oregon Institute of Technology in the economic development and prosperity of the state.

President Witter indicated his presentation would focus on the School of Dentistry and that he was accompanied by Dean Henry Van Hassel who would comment on the school. Mr. Witter also distributed several articles relating to activities at Oregon Health Sciences University.

Mr. Witter said the Dental School admits 65 students each year, of which 50 are typically Oregon residents. Ten come through the WICHE program and five are unrelated to that. There are about six applications for each available entering slot. The science grade point averages of the students entering the program are about 20% higher than the national average.

Mr. Witter commented that students for many years complained about the anatomy course and it was not unusual for 40% of them to encounter significant problems with that course. The course was restructured after the dean took the course himself. Now less than 5% of the students have any problems at all and there has been a substantial increase in the number of "A" grades.

Dean Van Hassel said he wanted to concentrate on excellence in education and report three of the good things that have happened to the Dental School in the last three years. The first was the a really significant grant received by the Dental School from the Oregon Dental Service Corporation. It provided $100,000 a year to the Dental School and an additional $50,000 annually to promote continuing education and research. The latter has been used to generate additional funds of more than $90,000 from alumni and friends since November. Contributions to the annual fund for the matching money were made by 91.2% of the faculty. The grant is guaranteed for three years with opportunities for extensions.

The Dental School received last year the highest of five accreditation possibilities and was accredited for ten full years.

Dean Van Hassel said a very significant grant has been received from the Pew Memorial Trust in Philadelphia. This group embarked on a series of granting processes to improve the commitment to excellence and strategic planning in American Education and its present efforts have been centered on dental education. Six dental schools were funded out of the 57 which applied. Only two of the six were fully funded for their plans for dental education and Oregon was one of those. He said this clearly established the fact that Oregon higher education dentistry is a center of excellence.
The funded plan would provide for a significant number of students to spend a fifth year in the office of practicing dentists learning to enhance their skills and management techniques. Each one would be required to spend 20% of the time as a volunteer providing free care to disadvantaged groups. No one else is doing that in this country.

Dr. Ernest Ettlich made the presentation for Southern Oregon State College on behalf of President Cox. He indicated the past 18 months had been the year of accreditation activities. Summaries of the responses from groups involved in the process plus a report on the institution's accreditation will be reported later by President Cox.

Dr. Ettlich then discussed the progress report on the conversion to the semester calendar. A coordinating committee was formed which produced a schedule for completing the major tasks related to the conversion process. It also set out goals for every program. The guidelines include a campus commitment to develop in each academic major a writing component beyond the freshman writing experience, a functional computer literacy component, and a senior capstone experience. The latter requirement has been an exciting one because the experiences vary greatly even as the majors vary. He then described the process of redefining all of the courses, program by program, into the semester context.

The Chancellor indicated he was particularly pleased with these reports. The dedication and commitment to the strategic planning for the implementation of the semester conversion is commendable. The Chancellor said it is a difficult process but one that is worthwhile because there should be substantial benefit from a total analysis of the curriculum department by department. He also commended the institutions on their efforts to identify quality and excellence.

He also commended the extraordinary efforts at the Dental School to acquire outside funding and support. One of the measures of success are objective reviews by outside people such as those on accrediting teams or those awarding grants.

Request for Authorization
To Initiate New Instructional Program Leading to MS Degree in Movement Studies for the Disabled, OSU

Staff Report to the Board
The Board's Office of Academic Affairs is forwarding a request from Oregon State University for the consideration of the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, and the Board. Oregon State University requests authorization to initiate a new instructional program leading to the Master of Science degree in Movement Studies for the Disabled.

The proposed program has been given the following objectives:

1. Prepare students who are cognizant of the motor and physical fitness needs of disabled individuals;
2. Prepare students who can design and implement appropriate movement experiences for disabled persons;

3. Provide opportunities for students to engage in research in the field of human movement with application toward disabled persons;

4. Prepare well qualified personnel who can improve the functional level of disabled persons;

5. Prepare individuals who can participate effectively as members of interdisciplinary teams providing services for disabled individuals;

6. Contribute to the literature in exercise science, motor behavior, and instructional strategies related to disabled populations; and

7. Provide opportunities for teachers, therapists, and allied health personnel to observe clinical experiences offered through the Oregon State University Special Physical and Motor Fitness Clinic.

In addition, the program also aims to provide intensive leadership training for those persons currently employed in this specialized area of study.

Resources to Offer the Program

Implementation of this program will not require additional faculty, facilities, equipment or library holdings. The budget provided with the proposal identified additional funding needed to support three graduate students during the first and second years of the program and funding needed for four graduate students during the third and fourth years of the program. Funding for these students will be provided through existing resources and extramural funds.

Program Review

This program request has been reviewed by the Academic Council and the Board's staff in Academic Affairs. In general, Oregon State University's proposed M.S. degree program in Movement Studies for the Disabled is supported by the other institutions. The program does overlap some of the program activity in physical and health education at the University of Oregon, Western Oregon State College, Oregon Health Sciences University, and Portland State University.

Although the Board has allocated graduate level training in physical education to the University of Oregon, it also authorized Oregon State University to offer graduate programs in physical
education as they related to the education programs offered by the Oregon State University School of Education. The review of this proposal has revealed some of the changes which have taken place in physical education as a discipline. The discipline has grown to include sports physiology, sports psychology, sports medicine, leisure studies, and movement studies. This program request has raised the more general issue of how graduate physical and health education has, is, and will be offered in the future.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

The Board’s staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon State University to initiate a new instructional program leading to a M.S. degree in Movement Studies for the Disabled, effective Fall 1988.

The staff also recommended that an interinstitutional committee be established by the Office of Academic Affairs to prepare a study of the training needs and opportunities in the areas of health and physical education in Oregon and to make recommendations to the Board regarding the future allocation of graduate physical education programs in the State System. The Committee should present its report to the Chancellor’s Office by July 1, 1988.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

Dr. James Payne presented the staff report and recommendation. Dr. Graham Spanier, Provost at Oregon State University, introduced Dr. Michael Maksud, Dean of the College of Health and Physical Education, and Dr. John Dunn, Associate Dean for Research and the principal faculty member working in the area. Dr. Spanier indicated there were additional materials available for distribution to the Committee.

Dr. Maksud reviewed these additional materials briefly, speaking to the development of the program, the expertise and reputation of the present offerings, success in attracting outside funding, interest in the program, and the demand for graduates from it.

In response to a question concerning the difference between the proposed program and programs in physical therapy, it was stated this discipline was a merger of special education and physical education. The possible impact on teacher education and certification requirements was mentioned.

The Committee also discussed the allocation of physical education programs, the granting of doctoral degrees in the department of education which seem to belong more properly in other departments, and the possible cooperation among institutions in this field.
Since a quorum of the Committee was not present, Mr. Alltucker said a report would be made to the Board without a recommended action.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Alltucker presented the report of the Committee. He stated that it was not the desire of the staff or anyone connected with the program to bring all of the people with these skills to a single campus but to use those skills wherever they may be found in the program. There was some discussion that students in the program might spend some time at another campus to take advantage of particular skills that might be available in another location. They would then get the degree from Oregon State University. At the request of Mr. Alltucker, Dr. Pierce reviewed the provisions of the program and the staff recommendation.

Mr. Petersen requested Dr. Spanier to comment on the plans for financing the proposed program. Dr. Spanier indicated the program was built on an existing undergraduate program with a very substantial program of coursework and a minor emphasis at the graduate level. It has substantial and continuing funding from federal government sources and from state sources. The only increment will be additional expansion for graduate assistantships to assist in the research program, and this would be funded from the outside grants received. There would be no internal allocations or reallocations within the institution.

Dean Maksud said the program was designed to train professionals who are operating either in public school settings or in other agencies and are concerned with the motor development of handicapped individuals. In response to a question from Mr. Petersen with respect to how this program differed from the special education curriculum in the teacher education programs, Dean Maksud said this program was in the motor development area. However, there has been significant interaction with special educators, particularly through Teaching research.

Board members asked if there would be disadvantages in delaying the decision until the findings of the committee looking at the overall field of health and physical education. Dr. Pierce indicated the academic council thought that it would be beneficial to continue the momentum since no new resources are necessary. A delay would inhibit the ability to attract research funds and to deal with the students that are on the Oregon State University campus.

Dean Maksud commented that the next three-year cycle for review of grants was approaching this spring and having the program in place would substantially enhance the chances for continuing
funding for the program. Also, the program has been offered as a minor. The proposal is in response to both a professional need and a student interest. The entry level for professionals in this field is an academic major at the graduate level.

Mrs. Schnitzer asked several questions for clarification with respect to students, funding, and the overlap with existing programs.

Mr. Alltucker moved that the staff recommendation be approved, with the understanding that before mid-summer, the opportunities for cooperation between the different campuses would be reviewed.

The Board approved the motion by Mr. Alltucker, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Alltucker reported that the Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs had also heard reports on the status of the endowed chairs program and EDNET, the legislative directive concerning a commonality of course numbering with the community colleges, and some concerns with respect to the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission and the five-year teacher education program. He indicated the Task Force on the Regional Colleges was underway with particular emphasis on what would happen if they were called universities instead of colleges. In addition, the Committee received bylaws for the Oregon Tourism Institute. Board members were requested to review those with final action anticipated at the February Board meeting.

The status of the foreign language requirement was reported to the Committee with a suggestion that the implementation be delayed. Mr. Petersen indicated this item was on the agenda for the joint boards meeting in February.

Mr. Chao indicated the Committee on Finance, Administration, and Physical Plant had considered three report items in addition to the action items. The first was the preliminary 1989-1991 Capital Construction Request. Mr. Chao said he would be working with Mr. Lemman and Mr. Neland in developing a System priority list which considers remodeling as well as the handicapped access in terms of the priority order.

The second report dealt with the 1987-1989 budget estimates which show a shortfall of approximately $1.9 million. The $1 million corresponds roughly to the athletic waivers, and the institutions will be allowed to determine whether to continue the waivers and find the money or to discontinue them. This is not a precedent for the institutions to decide how much to finance athletics but
to meet the shortfall. At the time the waivers were granted, the presidents were advised they were subject to monies being available. The other $900,000 of the shortfall will be shared prorata as presented in the report.

The Committee received the audits of the athletic programs at the three universities. These will be reviewed at the next Committee meeting. Any comments on the audits should be transmitted to the Board Secretary prior to that time.

Staff Report to the Committee

As a result of discussions with the Committee on Finance, Administration and Physical Plant at its December 18, 1987, meeting, a proposed amended Oregon Administrative Rule 580-50-027 has been prepared. OAR 580-50-027 establishes goals for affirmative action in the Board’s contracting of public improvements.

A public hearing was held in Eugene on December 1, 1987, and additional comments were received between the close of the docket and today’s meeting.

Based on the public testimony, both at the public hearing and at the December 18 Committee meeting, comments from other interested parties and Committee members, and staff analysis of the responsiveness of the current program, substantial changes to the present Administrative Rule are proposed.

In addition to housekeeping changes required by the passage of House Bill 3364 by the 1987 Assembly, the major changes to the present rule include the following:

1. The point at which the Administrative Rule would come into force would be for projects with a base bid value greater than $50,000, instead of $500,000 as set out in the present rule. There will continue to be no upper limit.

2. Not less than 20% of the projects estimated to cost less than $50,000 would be bid through limited competition as provided in ORS 279.053. This section of the rule does provide for unlimited competition for such projects when the targeted bidders are fewer than two in number.

The Administrative Rule is otherwise essentially unchanged. The annual reporting requirement will be accomplished as a function of the Chancellor’s Report at the February meetings of the Board.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended to the Committee and Board the adoption on roll call vote of an amended Administrative Rule 580-50-027 as set out below.

Affirmative Action Goals

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

(a) [10%] Ten percent of the [estimated total contract] base bid dollars to be subcontracted to minority[-owned] and/or disadvantaged business enterprises or expended to purchase materials from minority[-owned] and/or disadvantaged business enterprises.

(b) [2%] Two percent of the [estimated total contract] base 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] rule, minority[-owned], disadvantaged, and women[-owned] business enterprises are those certified as such by the Executive Department [of Transportation]. Implementation of the goals established in this section shall be according to the requirements of Chapter 769, Oregon Laws 1985. The Executive Vice Chancellor designee shall decide, if necessary, whether good faith efforts have been made, pursuant to the criteria of ORS 279.059.

(3) Not less than twenty percent (20%) of all public improvement projects in a calendar year having an estimated base bid value less than §50,000 shall be subject to limited competitive bidding by minority, disadvantaged, and/or women business enterprises. In the event fewer than two bids are received on a project subject to limited competitive bidding, the Board reserves the right to open the competition to any qualified bidder.

(4) The Board will annually [will] evaluate System performance in meeting these goals. Staff shall make a report at the February meeting. Criteria to be used in evaluating System performance shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:
(a) For projects with a base bid value of $50,000 or more, evaluation of System performance will be based on [by calculating] the value of materials purchased from and sub-contracts awarded to minority[-owned], disadvantaged, and women[-owned] business enterprises as a percentage of the dollar value of all [capital-construction] public improvement contracts awarded [including those having a value of $500,000 or less].

(b) For projects with a base bid less than $50,000, evaluation will be based on the number of projects in which minority, disadvantaged, and women business enterprises participate.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Neland distributed a revised draft of the proposed rule which was prepared following discussions with interested persons, Board members Adams and Richardson, and two Assistant Attorneys General. He reviewed the modifications made since the December meeting, including the addition of a program of limited competitive bidding for not less than 2% of the projects valued at $50,000 or less. Mr. Neland said, in his judgment, the proposed amendments would be a very large and significant step, perhaps a step of leadership in public contracting in this state, relative to creating a maximum opportunity for the participation of minority, disadvantaged, and women business enterprises in the public improvement work of the Board.

Mr. Neland reported that much of the focus in the discussions related to the problems of attempting to conduct a minority business in the present climate. The problems fall under the general heading of credit and relate to the ability to bond at competitive rates, to obtain work-in-progress insurance, to finance interally work at competitive rates, and to get financing at all. These are areas which cannot be resolved directly by the Board but would require legislation or other action at the state level, perhaps through economic development resources.

Mr. Dodson inquired whether there were those in the general contractor community who felt the amendments went too far.

Mr. Neland responded that there were although he had letters in support of lowering the target. The concerns relate to limited competitive bidding and may no longer be appropriate because of the stringency of the certification process which would eliminate many of the unacceptable activities that have occurred in the past. He also indicated the attorneys believe the rule can be defended although there were some discussions with respect to the limited competitive bidding.
Mr. Chao said that even though past unacceptable practices may no longer be a problem, the staff and the Board should be vigilant to make sure they do not occur. He said he was concerned with the fiscal and control problems of having only two bidders as stated in the third paragraph. He said he would like some way of assuring that the State System would not be paying 40-50% more for a project.

Mr. Nelzand said he shared his concern but mentioned other factors which would operate as controls. In response to a request from Mr. Chao for reports on at least the first few bids, Mr. Nelzand said it would be possible to indicate for these projects, the value of the contract and the estimate leading to the bid. A periodic summary report could be made to show if any significant penalty resulted from implementing this rule.

Mr. Harold Williams, Vice President of Pen-Nor, Inc., said the minority community also was concerned that prices not be inflated. The legitimate minority contractors do not want their tax dollars misused with inflated prices. They want to be able to get into the marketplace and play by rules across the board. These amendments have set the stage to make this possible. He said the minority contractors must and will perform according to the rules in the industry with respect to the funds and budget of the state and higher education.

Mr. Williams also stated the 20% participation in the rule would ensure that contractors would go to all parts of the state now that there is an opportunity to compete statewide. If necessary, the minority community will join forces and combine resources to make sure that all can compete for a job and participate. This process allows them to enter the marketplace and show that they can truly perform. He also commented on a particular firm that is obtaining contracts as a minority supplier but is not actually a minority firm. He asked whether some change in the language might be made to bring that concern to the forefront.

Mr. Chao suggested that it would be preferable to communicate this information to the persons responsible for certifying the minority status. He also requested Mr. Nelzand to mention this as a concern of the Board.

Mr. Adams commented that the issue of inflation of bids would be a concern whenever there was a small number of bidders involved in a project, not just those designated in this rule.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation as presented and adopt the revised rule distributed to the Committee. Committee members expressed appreciation for the comment by Mr. Williams that the minority contractors were willing to work to make the rule succeed.
Mr. Petersen indicated the rule came at a very opportune time because the Board had received legislative approval for projects amounting to over $60 million.

Mr. Neland pointed out it would be necessary to modify a number of procedures and develop some additional strategies. Staffing changes may be required to address a significant increase in the workload. The rule will be implemented through a supplemental general condition in the project manual and will be effective with all projects bid on or after February 29, 1988.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Adams presented the report and recommendation of the Committee. Mr. Williams was invited to make further comments to the full Board.

Mr. Williams said the members of the minority community and those in the contracting industry thanked the Board and its staff for a positive effort ensuring that they would get on the mainstage of the contracting industry as it relates to higher education and its contracting efforts. He said this was the first time during his four-year efforts that something as aggressive as this has happened in the contracting industry and benefitted minorities as a whole. He said the Board perhaps did not realize the impact of this action and what it meant to the minority contractors to ensure they could get involved and contribute to the state as business persons. He said they applauded and thanked the Board for its efforts.

Mr. Alltucker asked if there had been any discussion of the legal definition of a disadvantaged business. Ms. Lina Garcia-Seabold responded that it was a federal definition which relates to the size of a particular business in accordance with the Small Business Administration’s definition of a small business. A disadvantaged business would also have to be minority owned. It is a criteria of certification as a function of her office.

Mr. Alltucker mentioned the existence of sham companies which listed a minority person as president but the minority person was getting no experience whatsoever in running the company. Oregon is now aggressively and properly saying that not only must the company be owned by a minority person but also managed by that minority person on a day-to-day basis. As a result, many of the companies formerly available and legal for use in fulfilling the minority requirements will not be available, nor will a good faith effort to obtain minority participation be satisfactory in the future.

Mr. Neland said the good faith effort is in the statute which the proposed rule embraces. There will be no change in certified
firms. All those certified through the Oregon Department of Transportation have been in the January listing certified by the Executive Department. A firm will remain certified as long as it complies with the requirements of the law. A sincere, valid good faith effort will be evaluated and rewarded if it is, in all its essentials, a good faith effort.

Other Board members commented that the development of this rule had been a long and arduous task and that it was time to implement the proposed provisions.

The Board approved the staff recommendation and adopted on roll call vote the proposed amendments to OAR 580-50-027, Affirmative Action Goals. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None. Director Alltucker abstained.

Staff Report to the Committee

Chapter 828, Oregon Laws 1985, created the Higher Education Capital Construction Fund to receive and expend funds from the Oregon Lottery in support of four buildings appropriated by the 1985 Legislative Assembly. The creation of the Fund anticipated the investment of Lottery proceeds pending their disbursement for design, construction, furnishing and occupancy of the authorized buildings. Inasmuch as the Lottery funds would be allocated to the Fund over an approximate three-year period, it was expected that interest earnings could provide interim cash flow relief.

With all four of the projects anticipated in 1985 now under construction contract, and with two — Portland State University's School of Business Administration and Oregon Institute of Technology's Classroom/laboratory building nearing completion — it has not been and will not be necessary to use the earnings for cash flow. As a result, earnings through December 31, 1987, have accumulated to over $1,670,235, and it is our expectation that these earnings will reach approximately $2 million by June 30, 1988.

Chapter 832, Oregon Laws 1985, in Section 4 of the Act, permits the Department of Higher Education to expend funds in excess of the $33,600,000 of expenditure limitation for the four building projects established in that chapter, providing the State Emergency Board gives its authorization.

In anticipation of earnings accruing to $2 million, the staff has prepared a plan for expenditure of the earnings, and, with the approval of the Committee and the Board, will seek approval of the State Emergency Board at its January 28-29, 1988, meeting for an increase in the limitation and authorization to enter into contracts.
The proposed plan of expenditures contains three general categories. The first, with a value of $660,000, concerns additional limitation required to complete fully the projects authorized by the 1985 Assembly. Included in these is $150,000 to assist Oregon State University with completion of the final related alterations included in its Electrical and Computer Engineering building project; the second is $450,000 to assist the University of Oregon with completion of Science Building IV-A, the second and final of a divided Lottery project; and the third is $60,000 to assist Oregon Institute of Technology with site improvements related to the classroom/laboratory building.

The second priority of expenditures includes unanticipated emergency capital repairs or projects for which traditional funding sources do not appear adequate, and for which we would probably seek Emergency Fund allocations were this source not available. A total of $840,000 would be expended for these purposes. They include $150,000 to assist Oregon State University with a failed roof substructure over the Langton Hall swimming pool; $100,000 to assist the University of Oregon with safety deficiencies in the Robinson Theater; $500,000 to assist Oregon Institute of Technology with re-roofing Cornett Hall, one of the System's largest roofs; and $90,000 to assist Southern Oregon State College with refurbishing its deteriorating running track and related runways to avoid a total rebuilding of those facilities.

These two priorities require $1.5 million which will be in hand when interest is credited for October-December of 1987.

The final element involves $275,000 to assist Eastern Oregon State College with construction of a replacement facility to house the ROTC rifle range and the Outdoor program stores, which will be displaced when site clearance begins on the new classroom/laboratory building authorized for Eastern Oregon State College by the 1987 Legislative Assembly.

All projects in the above categories can be categorized as emergencies, in the sense they should not be delayed until conclusion of the 1989 Legislative session.

The expenditure plan calls for the final $225,000 to be expended on removal of barriers to access for the physically impaired. The Committee will recall the 1979 accessibility program concerned only program accessibility, and did not attempt to make all buildings or spaces within buildings fully accessible. The improvements contemplated in this request would generally be improvements beyond those included within the 1979 program accessibility plan finally fully funded in 1987. If interest earnings ultimately exceed $2 million, or if savings accrue from the other projects in this plan, it is the staff expectation these funds would also be directed to accessibility improvements.
The thrust of the expenditure plan has been to remain totally within the realm of capital construction/improvements/capital maintenance, to avoid recurring expenses, and to focus on the most urgent problems as they have been identified. Other unanticipated needs have arisen at other institutions but have generally been addressed by alternative funding strategies.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended the Committee and Board approve the plan of expenditures for Lottery earnings and authorize the staff to seek the authorization of the State Emergency Board to proceed with expenditures within an anticipated resource of $660,000.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Neland indicated that subsequent to the preparation of the original docket item, negotiations with the Executive Department had led to a substantial reduction in the scope of the request. These changes have been incorporated in a revised staff report as shown above.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mrs. Schnitzer presented the report and recommendation from the Committee.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

Petition by Professor James G. Ashbaugh, PSU

Staff Report to the Board

On May 22, 1987, Professor Ashbaugh filed a grievance against Dean William Paudler. Professor Ashbaugh complains that Dean Paudler treated him "unfairly or inequitably," as described in Section II, A of Portland State University’s grievance procedure, when Dean Paudler recommended that Professor Ashbaugh receive no merit increase for 1987-88. Although Dean Paudler’s recommendation was contrary to the recommendation of the Geography Department, it was adopted by Provost Martino and President Sicuro. On November 13, 1987, Professor Ashbaugh requested that the Board review President Sicuro’s decision denying his grievance.

In June, the Board adopted a new faculty grievance procedure, OAF 580-21-050, which requires the Board to review any appeal of a President’s decision in a faculty grievance. Until the Board has
adopted specific procedures for that review, the staff recommends
that the Board continue using the procedures outlined in its
former review procedure, QAR 580-21-390. Because Professor
Ashbaugh is on leave winter and spring terms, he has requested
that any report back to the Board be submitted after he returns
to Portland, at the Board's July meeting or later.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that the Board direct the Chancellor or his
designee to review Professor Ashbaugh's appeal in the method
provided under OR 580-21-390, and that the report to the Board
not occur until after Professor Ashbaugh returns to Portland June

If the Board accepts the staff recommendation the following
motion would be in order:

That the Board accepts the review of Professor James G. Ash-
baugh's appeal and directs the Chancellor, or his designee, to
investigate under the procedure and in the manner described in
QAR 580-21-390. The Board further directs the Chancellor to
report the results of that investigation after Professor Ashbaugh
has returned to Portland in June 1988. At that time, the Board
will determine, what, if any, further action the Board should
take.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation as presented, with
the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker,
Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Governor recommended and the Legislative Assembly approved
an appropriation designed to permit all state employees, including
faculty employees of the Department of Higher Education, to re-
ceive an increase of 2% in each of the two years of the 1987-
1989 Biennium. The rate increase going into the next biennium
would thus be nominally 4%.

The Executive Department, in reaching agreement with various
unions representing classified employees of the state, used the
cash provided by the 2% plus 2% increase to offer salary raises
at dates other than at the beginning of each fiscal year. This
permitted, for example, implementing increases of 2% on July 1,
1987, and a 4% increase on January 1, 1989. The "rollup" or rate
increase at the beginning of the next biennium will be approxi-
mately 6%.
The Department of Higher Education implemented salary adjustments of 2% effective July 1, 1987, and approved an additional increase of 2% effective July 1, 1988, for faculty increases, including those represented for collective bargaining purposes. (The faculty at Southern Oregon State College has not yet settled its bargaining agreement.) Faculty members will thus be disadvantaged with respect to other state employees going into the next biennium. Conversations with officials of the Executive Department revealed a willingness to extend to the Department of Higher Education the authority to increase the percentage of salary adjustments so that its employees, too, will have budget support for a salary increase of 6% over the rate which prevailed before the 1987-88 increase.

This result can be obtained by postponing the 2% increase now scheduled for July 1, 1988, and giving a 4% increase midyear, i.e., on January 1, 1989, for twelve-month employees and February 1, 1989, for nine-month employees (each half way into their respective contract year). No additional cash will be required or received by employees over the course of the biennium.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize a change in its previously-approved salary increase of 2% on July 1, 1988, to permit the award of a 4% salary increase at the midpoint of each faculty member’s 1988-89 contract.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

In response to questions during the discussion, Mr. Lemman said he had not discussed specifically with Mr. Jon Yunker the plan to implement the increase early for those who would be retiring in the near future. However, it would affect only a very few persons. The postponement of the increase in order to provide a 6% adjustment at the end of the biennium rather than a 4% increase is consistent with the Governor’s position and that of Budget and Management. It is not unprecedented to postpone the effective date of an increase in order to compress the cash and escalate the rate, but it would result in a larger base for the next biennium.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Dodson presented the report and recommendation from the Committee.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hemens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.
Staff Report to the Board

A summary progress report on the "Academic Progress of Student Athletes" is presented below. The full report will be mailed to Board members, institution presidents, Academic Council, Administrative Council, and directors of athletics. The full report is on file in the Board's office.

Background

In March 1983, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education established a policy for intercollegiate athletics which, among other things, requires 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 academic progress portion 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 also 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 Administrative and Information Systems Services (AISSS), Office of Administration, which is responsible for the study design and compilation of institutional data.

This is the fourth progress report on the six-year study of academic progress of athletes. The first complete report covering the academic progress of a "cohort" group of student athletes for the full six years will be published in 1989-90. Currently, only four years of data are available on the earliest 1983-84 study cohort.

Purpose

The study aims to answer the following questions:

- 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 intercollegiate athletics or individual sport programs; it focuses only on athletes as students. Every study of student academic progress 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 College, Southern Oregon State College, Eastern Oregon State College, and Oregon Institute of Technology are included in the study. The study focuses on the role and impact of the athletic activity itself in the context of academic progress, not on whether the student athletes receive no, partial, or full athletic grants-in-aid, or federal or state financial aid based on need.

It should also be noted that no comparisons will be made among institutions. Major variations exist, of course, within the State System on the emphasis and type of intercollegiate athletic program. University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University provide many athletic scholarships under NCAA guidelines, but not all student athletes at those institutions receive grant-in-aid scholarship assistance. The regional colleges and Oregon Institute of Technology operate primarily under NAIA rules and generally do not provide grant-in-aid assistance except under financial aid programs available to all students who can qualify. Therefore, a comparison, for example, of Oregon State University’s intercollegiate athletics programs with those of Eastern Oregon State College would be 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. To date, the Board has received three reports, 1983-84, 1984-85, and 1985-86. This current report is for 1986-87.

In the successive three 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 new to the sport, but already enrolled at the institution. The group will have entered the sport for the first time during that reported
academic year. An academic-year cohort will be added annually until data on the total of six consecutive cohorts, 1983-84 through 1988-89, have been collected and reported. The late-summer data collection date includes data from the previous academic year, fall through summer.

Each cohort is selected from the team rosters as of the completion of the fourth week of the sport. In sports spanning more than one term (e.g. basketball), a student athlete is included in the study if the name appears on the sport eligibility roster at the fourth week of the sport in the first term or on the roster at any time in any of the subsequent terms of that sport during that academic year.

Institutions are asked to provide a "snapshot" report of each student athlete's academic status as of the end of the summer of the immediately preceding 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 each of the 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.

Number of Sports and New Student Athletes

The numbers of intercollegiate sports and new student athletes in each cohort are displayed in Table 1. The number of sports offered at each institution ranges from 7 at Oregon Institute of Technology to 19 at Oregon State University.

The number of new students participating in intercollegiate athletics has varied from a low of 988 in 1983-84 to a high of 1,249 in 1985-86. During 1986-87, the number was 1,028.

Freshman Retention in the First Four Years

Table 2 displays retention rates for freshman student athletes and all first-time freshmen after 3 academic terms, for each entering freshman class 1984-85 through 1986-87. For all institutions except OIT, the rates of retention for student athletes are higher than those for all first-time freshmen. At EOSC, retention rates for athletes were lower in 1985-86 but increased dramatically in 1986-87.

Table 3 displays retention rates to date only for student athletes entering as freshmen, for the academic years covered by the study. Comparison figures for all full-time students are not yet available.
Retention rates after 2 years range from over 80% at OSU to 58% at EOSC. EOSC officials have reported that the 2-year retention rate for the 1986-87 study cohort at EOSC is expected to be higher.

Retention rates after 3 years range from 79% at OSU to figures in the 44-48% range at PSU, EOSC, and OIT. The figure of 31% for the 1983-84 cohort at EOSC varies so greatly from EOSC's figure of 62% for the 1984-85 cohort that it raises concerns about its reliability.

Retention rates for the 1983-84 cohort after 4 years (including student athletes who are still enrolled and those who graduated) range from 21.9% at EOSC to 64.5% at OSU.

It should be noted that these freshman retention rates do not include numbers of students who transferred to another institution, whether within the Oregon State System or outside OHSHE. Also, retention rates of transfer students will not be analyzed until the end of the full six-year study period. Comparison retention and graduation data for both freshman cohorts and transfer cohorts will be presented in the 1989-90 report.

All Student Athletes Who Left the Institution

Of the 499 student athletes in the 1983-84 cohort (including freshmen, transfers, and other undergraduates) who were no longer at the institution in summer 1987, 337 (67.5%) had left in good academic standing.

Of the 354 in the 1984-85 cohort who were no longer at the institution in summer 1987, 233 (65.8%) had left in good academic standing.

Of the 372 in the 1985-86 cohort who were no longer at the institution in summer 1987, 238 (64.0%) had left in good academic standing.

Of the 123 in the 1986-87 cohort who were no longer at the institution, 72 (58.5%) had left in good academic standing.

It is to be expected that with each succeeding year, a greater proportion of those who had left the institution would have left in good academic standing, since a larger proportion would have left to transfer to other institutions.

Other Factors Affecting Student Athlete Retention

In addition to the usual factors contributing to student attrition and retention, there appear to be some unique circumstances
surrounding intercollegiate athletics which influence the retention of student athletes. Turnover among coaching staff, especially head coaches, appears to make a substantial difference in the numbers of students participating in a sport and remaining at the institution. A change in football coach, for example—especially at a small college with no athletic scholarships—may lower the retention of student athletes at the end of the academic year and the participation of new athletes the following year. Such a change may have less effect at a university where the continuing student athletes receive athletic scholarships. The impact of such personnel changes may be temporary, however, and both sports participation and student retention should return to normal once the situation has stabilized.

Changes in recruiting practices may also affect the data shown in this report. Any change in the numbers and academic preparation of new students prior to initial enrollment will affect the proportion who remain, graduate, or leave the institution relative to previous cohorts.

Limitations of the Study

As is the case of in most other retention studies, it is not possible to identify those who leave their original institution and complete their education at another institution. Those students are not and should not be treated as dropouts. In this study, they are identified only as "no longer at the institution." The College Board estimates that while 35-40% of freshmen entering college will graduate from the same college in four years, another 10-20% will graduate from another college within the same four years.

This study also does not account for student athletes who might routinely be absent during spring term, but who register again for the fall and winter terms. So long as they retain an overall 2.0 grade point average and receive passing grades in the number of credit hours between seasons of competition required by the athletic conference, they are eligible to participate the next sport season. However, these students would be counted as "no longer at the institution" as of the summer data collection date, since "snapshot" data are collected once during the summer.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.
Table 1

Number of Sports and New Student Athletes, by Institution Study Cohorts 1983-84 through 1986-87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Sports</th>
<th>1983-84</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>1985-86</th>
<th>1986-87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon State College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This table shows numbers of students new to the sport. They may be first-time freshmen, transfer students, or continuing students but new to the sport. It does not include student athletes continuing their participation in the sport from a previous season.
### Table 2

Retirement of Full-Time First-Time Freshmen* After 3 Academic Terms: Freshman Student Athletes Compared to All First-Time Freshmen 1984-85 through 1986-87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1984-85</th>
<th>1985-86</th>
<th>1986-87</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon State College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All First-Time Freshmen</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Full-time first-time freshmen are defined as those newly admitted from high school and enrolled in 12 or more credit hours in the fall term they entered.

** Data not available due to error in the cohort sample size in previous reports.

** SOURCES:** (1) 4th Week Fall and End-of-Term Spring Student Data (S02) files. (2) Data on student athletes submitted by institutions for reports on the academic progress of athletes.
Table 3

Percentage of Former-Time Freemason Student Athletes Retained at the Institution during the Four Years Following Initiation

Study Cohort: 1989-90 through 1993-94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding.
SUMMARY OF FACILITIES 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 Services

Fish Disease Laboratory, OSU

An Agreement was negotiated with TBG Architects & Planners/PC, Eugene, for architectural services not to exceed $63,180. Financing will be provided from federal funds.

Accessibility for Handicapped, UO

An Agreement was negotiated with Dennis Hellesvig, Architect, Eugene, for architectural services not to exceed $13,400. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.

Heating Plant Feasibility Studies, UO

An Agreement was negotiated with COFAB, Consultants, Eugene, for consulting services not to exceed $3,000. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Consulting Surveying Services, PSU

An Agreement was negotiated with Westlake Consultants, Inc., Consultants, Tigard, for consulting services not to exceed $4,200. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Ondine Building State Lab, PSU

An Agreement was negotiated with PAE Consulting Engineers, Inc., Portland, Engineers, for engineering services not to exceed $4,600. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Award of Construction Contracts

Science Buildings Reroofing Project, SOSC

On November 25, 1987, Washington Roofing Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $63,840. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.

Hayward Field Improvements-Phase II(a), UO

On December 10, 1987, Eugene Sand & Gravel, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $46,957. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Science IVA, UO

On December 1, 1987, Hyland & Sons, Inc., was awarded a contract for the Science Facilities Additions & Alterations (Science IVA) Project in the amount of $2,847,000. Financing will be provided from federal funds.

Center For New Ventures, OHSU

On November 30, 1987, SACO General Contractors was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $66,955. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.
Acceptance of Projects

Organ Recital Room, Music Hall 011, SOSC

This project is complete and was accepted on April 1, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $36,768.50. Financing was provided by Southern Oregon State College Foundation and Gift Funds.

Accessibility for Handicapped (Computer Center), UO

This project is complete and was accepted on December 12, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $89,755. Financing was provided from state funds.

Erb Memorial Union Asbestos Abatement, UO

This project is complete and was accepted on October 26, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $6,625. Financing was provided from Building Reserve Funds.

Law Center Building ECMs BPA/IBP, UO

This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $137,673. Financing was provided from funds made available by the institution and reimbursement from Bonneville Power Administration.

Law Center ECMs USDOE/ ICP, UO

This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $123,947. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution and a matching grant from the U. S. Department of Energy.

OMB (Dock Facility & Improvements), UO

This project is complete and was accepted on December 15, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $243,879. Financing was provided from federal funds.

McArthur Court ECMs BPA/IBP, UO

This project is complete and was accepted on November 25, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $30,516. Financing was provided from funds available by the institution and reimbursement from Bonneville Power Administration.

Science III ECMs BPA/IBP, UO

This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $35,045. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution and reimbursement from Bonneville Power Administration.

Westmoreland Family Housing Exterior Stair Renovation, Phase III, UO

This project is complete and was accepted on November 30, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $58,272. Financing was provided from the housing reserve funds.

Institute of Advanced Biomedical Research Furnishings & Installation, OHSU

The portion of Lots B, D & E, of this contract was completed and accepted on November 23, 1987. The estimated total project cost for this portion remains at $116,296.18. Financing was provided from federal funds.
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Modular Office Building System #1, OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on October 20, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $143,911. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

UHS, Classroom 14B62 Upgrade, OSHU

This project is complete and was accepted on October 30, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $21,381. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

Science Building II Penthouse Additions & Alterations, PSU

This project is complete and was accepted on April 30, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $74,840. Financing was provided from Capital Repair Allocation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Location of Chancellor's Office

Mr. Petersen appointed the following Board members to an ad hoc committee to examine the question of the location of the Chancellor's Office: Robert W. Adams, chairman; John Alltucker; and Arlene Schnitzer.

Mr. Adams announced that the committee would be meeting in the near future and would welcome information and comments from anyone with regard to the study.

Mr. Alltucker distributed a draft of a statement with respect to the characteristics and responsibilities of Board directors. He said Board members would be involved over the next few months in searches for a president and chancellor. Many of the qualities and skills that are necessary for Board members are also required for persons in those categories.

Minority Student Enrollment Initiative

Mr. Richardson said the fall term of the current school year had just been completed and he would be interested in a study tracking the success of students enrolled under the minority student enrollment initiative. This would enable the Board to make some decisions concerning the type of retention or support program necessary to ensure success of the program.

Dr. Pierce indicated the study was under way. He indicated last year's program was very successful with 163 people entering the institutions under that plan. There was a very successful conference of minority students in the Portland area with almost 300 in attendance.

The Chancellor said all of the recipients of the minority scholarships would be invited to a conference in March in which the Governor would participate. In addition to recognizing and monitoring the progress of this group, it is intended to seek their input to perfect the operation in terms of recruitment, support services, and problems encountered in order to strengthen and reinforce the program.
Mr. Richardson then asked when the information on these students would be available to Board members. Dr. Pierce indicated the academic performance report is on the first-year performance of students who entered in the fall and would not be available until next fall. However, he said it would be possible to do a special report on the students in the minority enrollment initiative with respect to their performance during the fall term.

Mr. Richardson said he would like to have that report because the program will only be successful if the students remain. Interim reports might reveal whether some of these students are being lost.

Mr. Petersen stated that he and Mr. Hensley had been working with the Chancellor in the development of Ad Hoc Committees on Board-Institutional Relations. The objective was the appointment of visitation committees assigned to each institution. The committees will meet at least twice each fiscal year with faculty and student representatives of each institution for the purpose of discussing and improving relationships between the Board and the respective academic communities. The campus representatives, consisting of no more than 15 members, shall be determined by appropriate internal process. The president of the institution shall appoint a campus administrator to serve as coordinator for the meetings. The results of the meetings will be reported to the entire Board at the next regularly-scheduled Board meeting following the meeting with institutional representatives.

Mr. Petersen indicated the universities would have three Board members on the committee and the regional colleges and Oregon Institute of Technology would have two. Mr. Petersen made the following committee appointments to remain in effect until they are reassigned by the Board president:

- Eastern Oregon State College—Petersen, chairman; Hermens
- Western Oregon State College—Schnitzer, chairman; Brooks
- Southern Oregon State College—Nelson, chairman; Adams
- Oregon Institute of Technology—Adams, chairman; Alltucker
- Oregon Health Sciences University—Dodson, chairman; Chao; Schnitzer
- Portland State University—Richardson, chairman; Brooks; Chao
- Oregon State University—Alltucker, chairman; Hermens, Richardson
- University of Oregon—Hensley, chairman; Dodson; Nelson.

Mr. Petersen reported that he and Mr. Hensley had met with the Governor. It was a congenial meeting in which they heard first-hand the Governor's ideas and goals in specific areas, mainly the budget process and the appointment of Mr. Paul Bragdon as the new
education advisor to the Governor. One of the main thrusts of the Governor will be meetings with every agency head prior to the development of the budget in order to have a firsthand understanding of each institution and agency. Individual meetings have been scheduled with the presidents of each institution to learn what they are doing well and what they are not doing so well.

The Governor indicated that Mr. Bragdon would not be a shadow Chancellor and he would expect the Board to operate under its statutory authority in developing policy and planning proposals. The Chancellor's role will retain the same authority as in the past. This question was asked specifically because candidates in the recruitment of a new Chancellor will want to know what relationship will exist. Mr. Fred Miller will continue to deal with most of the issues related to the Board that he has dealt with in the past. Mr. Bragdon is to be kept informed as to the activities of the Board.

The Governor was requested to identify new appointments to the Board as soon as possible so the new members will have an opportunity to become involved in the policy and budget development and the selection of the new Chancellor.

Mr. Petersen reported that Board members had received copies of a letter from Chancellor Davis resigning from his position as Chancellor. He indicated it would be appropriate for the Board to act in an official capacity either to accept or reject his resignation.

Mr. Richardson said he would move reluctantly to accept the resignation, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Dodson. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: Director Petersen.

Mr. Petersen explained that he had been a member of the Board in 1981 when it carefully analyzed the State System's needs in relationship to the qualifications a new Chancellor should have. It was a lengthy and definitive report, one which identified many areas the Board believed important to the future of higher education in Oregon. Mr. Petersen said Chancellor Davis subsequently was employed and he believed had met everyone of the qualifications and needs. He has demonstrated, produced, and fulfilled every one of those expectations and needs and gone even farther.

Mr. Petersen said Chancellor Davis had brought other qualities which were not easily quantified. He was a graceful and dignified man who put in hard and diligent work, going well beyond the extra mile in performing duties. Chancellor Davis is a man of creativity and initiative. He has attracted a talented staff and has helped the Board to attract a very talented corps of presidents who are second to none.
Mr. Petersen said his negative vote was simply a note of regret voiced in the context of the time. Higher education and Oregon owe Chancellor Davis more than many realize or even understand. Oregon’s loss will certainly be someone else’s gain. He then requested Mr. Chao to read the following resolution honoring Chancellor Davis:

RESOLUTION HONORING

CHANCELLOR WILLIAM E. DAVIS

William E. Davis came to the Oregon State System of Higher Education in 1982 at a time of economic recession, interinstitutional competition and documented needs for higher faculty salaries, catch-up maintenance, and capital construction.

The State System was being criticized for low academic standards, was suffering from rotting roofs and other evidence of maintenance deferred too long, and was charging the highest tuition rates in the West.

As chancellor, Davis immediately began building support among members of the State Board, in Salem, on State System campuses and across Oregon to meet the needs of public higher education.

As a result, Oregon higher education now can boast strengthened admissions standards, higher relative rankings for faculty salaries, tuition freezes three of the past five years, progress in meeting maintenance needs, greater equity in interinstitutional budgeting and the hiring of strong presidents on the campuses.

In fact, state appropriations to higher education have increased more than 70 percent since Davis became chancellor even as enrollments, expected to decline, instead increased. And only recently we have seen authorization of the largest higher educational capital construction budget in the state’s history; a 47 percent increase in income from gifts, grants and contracts; introduction of an aggressive affirmative action plan to double minority enrollments; and an increase in cooperative programs, which illustrates that Oregon’s institutions truly constitute a system.

Therefore, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education accepts the resignation of William E. Davis, effective June 30, 1988, with great appreciation, with genuine sadness, and with our heartiest wishes both to him and to Polly for opportunities that will please and reward them while also further enhancing American higher education.
The Board adopted the above resolution, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

**Chancellor Search Process**

Report and Recommendation of the President to the Board

There have been but two Chancellors of Higher Education in the last quarter century. The most recent search for a Chancellor commenced in 1981 and resulted in the appointment of Dr. William Davis effective July 1, 1982.

I have reviewed the documents from the 1981-82 search which are summarized below.

The Search Committee consisted of:

- Five members of the Board of Higher Education
- Two Presidents (one university and one college)
- One faculty member
- One student
- One ex-officio search coordinator

Appointments were made by Board President Harms and the Board also employed a consultant firm to assist in analyzing needs identifying potential candidates, assisting in the search process and checking credentials and references of the finalists.

Assisted by the consultant firm, the committee also developed its own procedures, conducted an analysis of priority needs of the State System of Higher Education and related those needs to qualifications desired in a Chancellor. The committee kept the full board informed through reports at the regular monthly meetings.

The Search Coordinator served in a professional capacity in facilitating and expediting the work of the committee and served as a liaison between the committee, the consultants, the President of the Board, the institutions of the System, and other persons and agencies as appropriate. The coordinator worked closely with and under the direction of the committee chair and with the committee as a whole.

Eight official meetings of the committee were held (October 1981 through January 1982). The original pool of 147 candidates was developed through a process of advertising, nominations, and recruiting. Of the 147, 40 were applicants and 107 were nominees representing 46 states and the District of Columbia. Fifty-one of these were CEOs, president/chancellor or equivalent; 21 were
second level or above (vice president, provost, or vice chancellor); 21 were formerly of the above two categories, and 10 were academic deans. Fifty-three others represented a wide variety of occupations including political figures, attorneys, professors, department heads, a cabinet member and a few of unknown occupation.

The pool was quickly reduced to 71 and later "screened" down to 26 candidates. All but two responded affirmatively and the committee began indepth evaluations of the 24 remaining. This was eventually reduced to eight candidates to be invited to Oregon for interviews with the committee. These interviews took place in the space of six days. After these interviews, five finalists were recommended (unranked) to the Board for interviews.

At this point, the search committee considered its assignment completed with the search coordinator carrying on by coordinating arrangements for the finalists return visits to Oregon under the direction of Board President Hams.

In February, four finalists (one withdrew) returned to Oregon for Board interviews and three-day visits. A variety of institutions (not all) were visited and meetings with key legislative leaders, the Governor, and others were arranged. The appointment of William Davis was announced on March 12, 1982.

The process began on October 9, 1981, with the first search committee meeting and ended with the final Board interview on February 22, 1982, a period of five months.

The above information was condensed from the report written by the search coordinator at the conclusion of the search.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the previous successful search process, it is my recommendation that the same policy and process be continued with the following exceptions:

1. The committee structure be revised as follows—

Five members of the Board of Higher Education
Three Presidents
One faculty member
One institution administrator
One student
One ex-officio search coordinator;

and

2. That no consultant firm be employed.
Implicit in this process are the current Board Policies on Affirmative Action which would be applied to both the composition of the search committee as well as the recruitment of candidates and the deliberations of the committee.

Mr. Petersen said he had requested the presidents of the institutions to submit nominees from which he would select faculty and student representatives. He also explained that he had not recommended the employment of a consultant firm because the Board now has considerable experience in the search process. This was not the case at the time of the search for Chancellor Davis. Chancellor Lieuallen had been in the position for 20 years. Therefore, it was deemed important to get an outside view of exactly what the State System was and where it was headed. The consultants spent considerable time interviewing a number of persons in the development of a needs analysis.

Mr. Alltucker said one of the advantages in using outside consultants in the previous search was having someone who knew and had contact with sources for identifying prospective candidates.

Mr. Petersen said he would expect to use the model Mr. Dodson used in the presidential search at the Oregon Health Sciences University, which identifies a few knowledgeable person and employ them for short, one-day consultations.

In response to a request for clarification from Mr. Lemman, Mr. Petersen said his reference to a faculty member and a staff member was intended to be one faculty member and one administrator other than a president.

Mr. Todd Northman, President of the Associated Students of Portland State University and a member of the Oregon Student Lobby, expressed concern that the number of faculty members and presidents on the Chancellor’s Search Committee had been increased and the student membership was only one.

Mr. Petersen said his reasoning had been that there were two student members on the Board who actually would be involved in the final selection, but there were no faculty members on the Board.

Mr. Bob Mumford, Chairperson of the Oregon Student Lobby, said he would prefer to have two faculty members on the committee rather than an administrator and a faculty member. He said faculty are affected directly by decisions of such magnitude and administrators are represented adequately with the three presidents.
Mr. Petersen said his rationale here was that the Chancellor's search was entirely different from a presidential search committee for the chief executive officer of an institution. In this search, the Board is seeking a chief executive officer for the State System who reports directly to the Board. This person would be a higher level administrator who would not have daily contact with students or faculty but would have regular contact with the Board and the presidents.

Mr. Mumford said he then would urge the Board to establish an advisory board of five faculty and five students at each institution with the possibility of submitting a recommendation to the selection committee. He stated it was important to have input from a larger group of those who would be directly affected by the decision.

Mr. Petersen said his response would be the same as his earlier reply but he would pass to the chairman of the search committee the recommendation with regard to the advisory committee.

Miss Brooks and Mr. Hermens inquired whether student Board members were precluded from sitting on a search committee and, if appointed, would they be appointed in a Board member or student member capacity.

Mr. Petersen responded that they could be appointed to a search committee and that a Board member, student or otherwise, is a Board member. With respect to the recommendation, a student refers to a student who is not a Board member.

Miss Brooks commented that then there would be the possibility of having two students on the committee.

Dr. Thurston Doler, President of the Oregon State University Faculty Senate, urged the Board to reconsider the recommendation to limit faculty participation on the search committee to one faculty member. The person selected will have a major impact on the lives of faculty members for several years. The committee should have the benefit of faculty on the committee who understand the entire spectrum of the university function.

Mrs. Schnitzer said she agreed in principle with the recommendation concerning the consulting firm but thought the specifying that no consulting firm should be employed might be unduly binding and restrictive. This is particularly true since the search committee has not met yet and discussed the issue, even though the end result might be the same. She said she was also inclined to believe that three presidents and one institutional administrator really focused in on the same approach and two faculty members should be included.
Mr. Chao moved that the recommendation be amended under point two so that there is no explicit requirement that a consultant firm be employed. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion.

The Board approved the amendment, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

Dr. Robert McCoy, President of the Association of Oregon Faculties and a faculty member at Southern Oregon State College, concurred in Dr. Doler’s request to increase the faculty members on the search committee to two. He mentioned the cooperation of the past several years between faculty groups, the Chancellor’s Office, and the Board. The inclusion of the additional faculty member would be an indication that the Board was involving the faculty even more.

Mr. Chao moved to amend the proposal to include two faculty members and retain the administrator other than a president as well. Mr. Dodson concurred and seconded the motion.

Mr. Petersen said, upon approval of the amendment, the committee would be comprised of five Board members, three presidents, two faculty members, one administrator other than a president, one student, and the ex-officio search coordinator.

The Board approved the amendment, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

The Board then adopted the recommendation as amended to reflect the revised Committee structure and the previous change to statement two to indicate that there was no explicit requirement that a consulting firm be employed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hermens, Richardson, Schnitzer, and Petersen. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Petersen asked that nominations for the committee positions be submitted promptly.

Mr. Petersen announced that the next regular Board meeting would be held on Wednesday, February 17, 1988. This is a change from the original date in order to coincide with a meeting sponsored by Governor Goldschmidt for appointed members of boards and commissions which is scheduled for the afternoon of February 16.

There will be a joint meeting with the Board of Education on February 16 prior to the Governor’s meeting.
At the March meeting, Dr. Clifford Trow has arranged to invite Board members to a discussion of undergraduate education. Further details will be provided later. Mr. Petersen mentioned the interviews with finalists for the presidency of the Oregon Health Sciences University might occur also in connection with the March Board meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS
The Secretary reported the receipt of three letters basically opposed to the conversion to the semester system. Mr. Petersen instructed the Secretary to distribute copies to Board members.

ADJOURNMENT
The Board meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m. and had lunch in the Cascade Room of Smith Center. No business discussion occurred during luncheon and some media representatives were in attendance.

James C. Petersen, President
Wilma L. Foster, Secretary