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STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD IN
ROOM 338, SMITH CENTER, PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
PORTLAND, OREGON

March 18, 1988

Meeting #561

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., March 18, 1988, by the Vice President of the Board, Mr. Richard F. Hensley, and on roll call the following answered present:

Mr. Robert R. Adams
Mr. John W. Alitucker
Miss Kasey K. Brooks
Mr. Gene Chao
Mr. Mark S. Dodson

Mr. Richard F. Hensley
Mr. Michael W. Hermens
Mr. George E. Richardson, Jr.
Mrs. Arlene D. Schnitzer

Absent: Directors Nelson and Petersen were out of the state.

OTHERS PRESENT

Centralized Activities—Chancellor William E. Davis; Secretary Wilma Foster; W. T. Lemman, 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; Richard Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Information Systems Division; Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Roger Olsen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Ocate; James Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; Holly Zarville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; J. Richard Pizzo, James Payne, and Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellors, Academic Affairs; Kay Juran, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Steven Katz, Controller; Kim Smith, Director, Technology Transfer Services; Virginia Boushey, Assistant to Executive Vice Chancellor; Barbara Barrie, Personnel Officer; Jim Sellers, Director of Communications; Kimberly Carnegie, Public Affairs Assistant; Pat Wignes, Assistant Board Secretary.

Oregon State University—President John Byrne; Graham Spanier, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Ed Coate, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Stefan Bloomfield, Assistant to the President.
University of Oregon—President Paul Olum; Dan Williams, Vice President for Administration; Larry Large, Vice President, University Relations; James E. Reinmuth, Acting Provost.

Oregon Health Sciences University—Robert Koler, Interim Vice President, Academic Administration; John Kendall, Dean, School of Medicine; Ralph Tuomi, Assistant Vice President, Facilities Management.

Portland State University—President Natale A. Sicuro; Frank Martino, Provost; Roger Edgington, Vice President, Finance and Administration.

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

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

Southern Oregon State College—President Joseph W. Cox; Ernest Ettlich, Dean of Academic Affairs; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration.

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

Others—Clifford Trow, State Senator, District #18; Mike Thorne, State Senator, District #29; Tom Mason, State Representative, District #11; Carl Hosticka, State Representative, District #40; T. K. Olson, Director, Office of Educational Policy and Planning; Ken Goddard, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Forensic Laboratory, Ashland; Representatives of the American Electronics Association, Oregon Council—Pat McCormick, Al Hahn, Gary Conkling.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on February 17, 1988, and approved them as previously distributed. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Alltucker, Brooks, Chao, Hensley, Hermens, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: None. Director Dodson was absent from the meeting at this time.

CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

Mr. Hensley requested the presidents to make their reports in the order designated on the agenda under the Chancellor’s report.

Reports from Presidents

President Olum reviewed the recently completed search for a new provost at the University of Oregon and the implications of that search for the institution. He stated everyone was very pleased and proud of the institution’s ability to attract a candidate of the stature of Norman Wessells.
There were serious doubts that it would be possible to attract first-rate candidates for provost who were willing to come to an institution when a change in the presidency was imminent. This proved to be wrong, and a modification in the original schedule resulted in the identification of many more qualified applicants.

President Olum said the candidates naturally were concerned about the events at the University of Oregon during the late fall and into the winter. Search committee members remained in constant contact with the active candidates, telling them openly about the situation and urging them to continue their candidacy. In the end, it was the strength and spirit of the faculty that convinced the finalists to consider taking the position in spite of the concerns they might have had. In responding to a question about why they would want the position, candidates had similar answers to the effect that the University had a spirit of participation, of openness and caring for the institution, and of intellectual freedom and excitement, that is not often found. The faculty has a very high reputation in virtually all academic fields. The University is clearly committed to excellence and to academic leadership that can help achieve and maintain excellence.

President Olum said the three finalists were all excellent candidates. The two not selected stated they were very disappointed at the decision. Dr. Olum said he was certain Dr. Wessells was the right choice for the University of Oregon. His philosophy of higher education, his record as an academic administrator, his own estimable academic credentials, and his open natural style all make him an exceptionally good match for the University of Oregon. His academic preparation at Yale and his teaching, research and administrative careers at Stanford are most impressive. He is an outstanding developmental biologist of national stature. Dr. Wessells concluded a public address to faculty and students with a strong statement of the importance of a solid general education for all undergraduates in a modern world facing severe social and environmental change. His own record verifies that his commitment to the highest quality undergraduate educational experience is paramount.

President Blake distributed a summary sheet from an American Society in Engineering Education conference featuring Oregon Institute of Technology and its role as a partner in local and state economic development. The main topics were research, assistance to business, partners with industry, and administrative leadership. President Blake briefly described the sub-topics in each category, noting some of the specialized services provided to business, individuals, or organizations through faculty involvement in various projects.
President Blake also delivered the keynote speech at a national conference sponsored by the Stanford Research Institute. The subject was competitiveness and the relationship between the university and economic development. Copies of the summary and the speech are on file in the Board’s Office.

President Blake then described specific projects or assistance done in cooperation with various industries. He concluded by saying that without changing the institution’s purpose and goals it had been possible to take new opportunities and have Oregon Institute of Technology develop fully as a partner in local and state economic development.

Mr. Hensley inquired how many of the 97% of the graduates finding positions had accepted jobs in Oregon. President Blake said about 50% of the overall group accepted positions in Oregon. In engineering, Oregon, Washington, and California each employ 30% of the graduates. Boeing takes two-thirds of those going to Washington. Most of the health graduates remain in Oregon.

Robert D. Koler, M.D., Vice President for Academic Administration at the Oregon Health Sciences University, introduced Dr. John Kendall, Dean of the School of Medicine, who presented a visual report illustrating some of the early years of the School of Medicine. During the slide presentation in recognition of the school’s centennial, Dr. Kendall said the curriculum had not undergone a major change since 1920 although it was reviewed carefully in 1970. The instruction is comprised of two years of basic science followed by two years of clinical sciences. It is necessary to blend the first two years with the last two years to make new humanistic positions. Gerontology will be another important element for the future curriculum, and it is presently under review as part of an effort to improve that sector in cooperation with the other two schools at the Health Sciences University. A second area of concern is rural health as older physicians retire and younger physicians are less attracted to the rural environment. It will also be important to prepare medical students to engage fully with the rest of the public in the health policy for the nation.

Mr. Hermens inquired about the activities in the rural health issue. Dr. Kendall explained there are several approaches. The family medicine department already has implemented rotation of its residents in the rural area. This is probably one of the most important efforts, because residents who understand the rural health care situation are more likely to be attracted to it. A similar thing could be done with perhaps 10% of the medical students in an area health education center through a federal grant.
President Cox reported that the past 18 months at Southern Oregon State College had been devoted to evaluation and assessment. During the previous week, the National League of Nursing granted a full eight-year accreditation for the new baccalaureate nursing program at Southern Oregon State College. He then introduced Mr. Ken Goddard, Director of the National Forensics Laboratory under construction on the campus by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. Goddard explained that the laboratory was the first crime laboratory in the United States to support law enforcement investigation of endangered species. The laboratory will identify wildlife parts and products to be used as evidence in cases pertaining to endangered species.

Mr. Goddard expressed confidence in the ability to attract the top forensics scientists simply because the laboratory is brand new and these people will be on the ground floor of a new profession. The hope also is to generate the first true wildlife forensic scientists out of Southern Oregon State College through a recruitment program which encourages young scientists to take the necessary courses and identifies those who will be able to handle the courtroom testimony aspects of the job.

Mr. Goddard indicated he planned to have all of the staff hired by the dedication date of October 1.

The Chancellor distributed background material showing the different types of organizational structures for higher education in the 50 states. He noted there was no consistency in the organization or in the titles of the executive officers or boards. A copy of the report is on file in the Board’s Office.

The Chancellor said representatives of the American Electronics Association had requested an opportunity to present the legislative priorities adopted by the Association for the next session of the Legislature. He commented that the group has been very strong supporters of the Board’s higher education programs and has testified numerous times in the Legislature in support of higher education. The Chancellor introduced Al Hahn, Pat McCormick, and Gary Conkling who were present as representatives of the Association.

Mr. Al Hahn, President of Support Technologies, Inc., of Tigard and current chairman of the American Electronics Association for the State of Oregon, said the Oregon Council of the Association included more than 100 companies representing nearly 90% of the electronics and software manufacturing industry in Oregon. The electronics industry is the second largest manufacturing employer in Oregon.
He commented that the American Electronics Association has been a strong ally with the State System in its efforts significantly to improve higher education in Oregon. He cited a consortium on high technology education which, over a three-year period, provided $1.5 million in gifts from the electronics industry to match a similar amount from the state. A paid lobbyist, hired in 1983, has enabled the Association to broaden its agenda, but higher education has been and continues to be its top priority. The Association is pleased to have had a role in helping to accomplish the considerable successes the State System has had since that time. He added that one of the Association's most satisfying experiences had been working with Chancellor Davis and he would be missed.

Mr. Hahn said the legislative agenda of the American Electronics Association in Oregon was developed over a year-long process. It includes proposals from issue-related subcommittees which are reviewed by the government affairs committee and then considered and approved by the Executive committee. Most of the legislative agenda for 1989 will be finalized in August. However, because of changes in management and the challenges of budget-making, it was determined it would be more timely for the Association to make its recommendations regarding higher education early. The executive committee approved the Association's higher education agenda on February 18. He requested Mr. Gary Conkling, chairman of the post-secondary education committee of the Association and public affairs director of Tektronix, to present the legislative agenda.

Mr. Conkling distributed a copy of the legislative agenda. It was comprised of four main areas: faculty salaries, programs, facilities, and policies. A copy of the agenda is on file in the Board's Office. The recommendations with respect to faculty salaries support pay increases in disciplines which are difficult to recruit and retain and the granting of pay increases on the basis of merit. The Association will undertake an independent review of faculty compensation comparisons with peer institutions as a primary tool in its representations on the faculty salary issue. The Association also supports appropriating $2.5 million in the next biennium to the Oregon Faculty Recruitment Fund created by the 1987 Legislature, with funds targeted for recruitment efforts in key technical disciplines.

Mr. Conkling said the Association supports completion of Centers of Excellence at three institutions. It supports state funding for administrative support of the Lintner Center for Advanced Education at Rock Creek as a model of market-driven continuing education delivered off-campus in communities throughout the state. It also supports creation of a formal partnership between the State System, the Oregon Graduate Center, and high technology industry through state funding of OACET, and state support of the Oregon Graduate Center's educational programs and state investments in research centered at the Oregon Graduate Center and involving state institutions and industry.
With respect to facilities, four areas of support were listed for telecommunications, capital construction, and research libraries.

The policy recommendation relates to funding off-campus, upper-division and graduate-level continuing education. Specific recommendations in this area are pending completion of a report resulting from a Budget Note in the last legislative session.

Mr. Hensley thanked the representatives of the Association for the presentation and for the Association's many contributions to higher education in the past.

The Chancellor said these were excellent recommendations and they would be considered carefully as the State System formulated its own budget request and priorities. An objective study of faculty salary comparisons by an independent group will be especially helpful because it is one of the most critical problems.

The policy of the Board of Higher Education (OAR 580-43-006 through 580-43-026 and IMD 6.205 through 6.255) has as its objective the expeditious transfer of inventions and discoveries from the classroom and laboratory to the marketplace for the benefit of humanity. The most frequently used mechanism of technology transfer is patent licensing, whereby the college or university seeks a patent for the invention or discovery made by the faculty or staff inventor and then licenses the patent to industry in return for a percentage of sales, usually referred to as a royalty. New inventions or discoveries in the marketplace contribute to economic competitiveness of industry and create new jobs. Such cooperative arrangements with industry also create interesting professional opportunities for the faculty and staff.

**Royalty Income 1986-87**

For fiscal year 1986-87, State System institutions received about $575,000 in royalties from licensing new inventions or discoveries. After patent and other associated expenses have been deducted, these royalties were distributed to the inventor, the inventor's department, and the inventor's institution, with roughly one-third to each, according to Board and applicable institutional policy. This level of total royalty income compares favorably with successful licensing programs at similar educational institutions across the nation. Such distribution is intended to stimulate and reward creative efforts among the faculty and staff as well as provide funding for additional research.
Patent Activity to Date

By 1986-87, the State System owned 28 U.S. patents and 21 foreign patents. An indicator that the patent licensing activities of the State System institutions is growing is that there are increasing numbers of pending U.S. patent applications, now 37, and foreign patent applications, currently 33. These pending patent applications represent technology that will begin to pay royalties within five to ten years since there is always a time lag between discovery and successful commercialization. The four universities reported increased numbers of invention disclosures, indicating growing visibility of these opportunities, and greater interest in discovering and disclosing technology on behalf of the faculty and staff.

Greater Emphasis on Technology Transfer

In early 1987, the Board’s Office employed a Director of Technology Transfer Services, Kim Smith, to give greater impetus to the policies and procedures of the State System relative to technology transfer and to pursue techniques and methods designed to encourage and to stimulate patenting and licensing activities. Mr. Smith had served as manager of the technology transfer activities at Oregon State University before joining the Board’s staff.

Each university now has a staff member who has responsibility for patenting and licensing activities. It is expected that the colleges and Oregon Institute of Technology will concentrate these activities in a particular office as the need arises. The campus offices collect, inventory, and evaluate invention disclosures and negotiate arrangements with industry for the implementation of the technology in the commercial sector. The institutional patent representatives receive advice and assistance with licensing agreements and research contracts containing patent provisions from the Board’s staff Director of Technology Transfer Services.

Recent Significant Research and Discovery

Of greatest interest to industry has been technology in the field of recombinant DNA, or biotechnology, especially as it relates to medicine and agriculture. Also of interest have been various specialty fields in forestry, molecular biology, and engineering. State System institutions performed about $190 million in basic and applied research last year, of which 5% to 7% was sponsored by industry. It is anticipated that the percentage of industry-sponsored research will increase as industries become more aware of the value of strong research ties with the Oregon State System of Higher Education’s colleges and universities.
Industry is necessarily interested in sponsoring the research of scientists working on the cutting-edge of their disciplines, research with potential commercial application. This points to a heightened need to attract and retain through competitive salaries and benefits superior scientists and researchers at State System institutions.

Recent Licensing Activity

Several recent licenses with industry are worthy of mention because they indicate the diversity of recent patent licensing agreements.

The University of Oregon recently signed a license with a Japanese firm to market and sell in the Orient an artificial intelligence software program which was developed in the University's Department of Computer and Information Sciences. The University is now looking for a domestic licensee for the software developed by Dr. Stephen Fickas.

Last year, Oregon State University licensed a Hood River, Oregon, company to market and sell a wine-making bacterium especially adapted for use in Oregon's cooler climate. The bacterium had been isolated and characterized by Drs. William E. Sandine and Barney Watson of Oregon State University's Department of Microbiology and Department of Food Science, respectively.

Last year, the University of Oregon and the Oregon Health Sciences University jointly licensed a Massachusetts company the rights to a pharmaceutical which will diminish possible brain injury resulting from stroke. The company also sponsors research in the inventors' laboratories at Oregon Health Sciences University (Drs. Eckard Weber and Mark Sonders) and the University of Oregon (Dr. John F.W. Keana), thus providing exciting research opportunities for the faculty and staff.

Oregon State University and the Oregon Health Sciences University jointly licensed a Beaverton biotechnology company rights in an antifungal compound which could be a treatment for malaria or AIDS-related illnesses. The compound was discovered by Dr. Aldolph Ferro at Oregon State University, and Drs. John Fitchen and Michael Riscoe at the Oregon Health Sciences University. Oregon Health Sciences University is now discussing with the company the licensing of DNA probes relative to paternity testing. There have been several arrangements in the field of human medicine involving a college or university collaborating with the Oregon Health Sciences University.
To date, about 32 licenses with industry have been negotiated by institutions in the State System. The State System ensures that these agreements do not unreasonably interfere with the researcher's right to publish.

**Future Direction**

During the upcoming year, the State System will be looking at additional ways to increase the awareness of its faculty and staff to technology transfer opportunities, and to encourage State System institutions to implement policies and procedures for evaluating invention disclosures, and identifying potential licensees. The State System also will be examining the potential for greater involvement with the Oregon Resource and Technology Development Corporation (ORTDC) in the commercialization of inventions and discoveries arising at State System institutions.

Furthermore, the State System is following very closely, and collaborating with, the activities now being planned by the Governor's Science Council, all for the purpose of examining ways the colleges and universities can contribute toward greater Oregon economic development through its research activities.

Dr. Richard Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration and Information Systems Division, presented the above report and indicated he or Mr. Smith would respond to questions.

There was a brief discussion of the distribution of patenting and licensing activity and the costs relative to the return. It was stated the institutions appear to be at different levels of development. Efforts are being made to advance the development and increase income at all institutions. Also in response to a question, Mr. Smith indicated that since 1980 a federal statute has given universities rights to inventions made in the course of federally-sponsored research.

At the request of President Olum, the Chancellor recommended that Dr. Norman K. Wessells be appointed Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost at the University of Oregon, at an annual salary rate of $90,000. The appointment is to be effective on July 1, 1988, or as soon thereafter as Dr. Wessells can begin.

The Board approved the recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Brooks, Chao, Hensley, Hermes, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: None. Directors Alltucker and Dodson were absent from the meeting at this time.
Staff Report to the Committee

It will be proposed that the admission requirements currently in effect for 1988-89 be continued for the 1989-90 academic year. There are, however, several related admission issues on which the committee should be apprised.

First, freshman academic performance improved again in the 1986-87 academic year. There appears to be a correlation between the improvement in academic performance and the year the subject requirements for admission were first implemented in 1985-86. The freshman grade average has improved from 2.47 in 1984-85 to 2.51 in 1985-86 to 2.56 in 1986-87. Also, there was a continued upward shift of enrollment to higher-level freshman math courses and the freshman academic performance of minority students generally improved.

Second, despite the general improvement in freshman math performance, there still is concern about the 26% (40-45% at some campuses) of new freshmen in 1986-87 who enrolled in the lowest level of freshman math - Intermediate Algebra - and that 33% of them received a D, F, or N (in addition about 10% withdrew or received an incomplete).

During the next year, the staff will specifically evaluate the math preparation of those freshmen placed in Intermediate Algebra, consider how the math subject requirement for admission might be strengthened, and how the State System could assist the high schools in improving the readiness of entering freshmen for college-level math. The staff will report to the committee during the upcoming academic year on the results of the math performance and requirement evaluation.

Third, the issue of whether or not to require a foreign language for admission at some or all State System institutions will be discussed by the Joint Boards Committee on Foreign Language.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board's staff recommended that the admission requirements currently in effect for 1988-89 be continued for the 1989-90 academic year.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services, presented the information in the staff report. He indicated there were proposed amendments to the staff recommendation which had resulted from discussion in the Academic Council.
Dr. Pierce and Mr. Christensen discussed the adequacy of high school preparation in mathematics and placement and performance in college-level mathematics. They noted below-average performance of many students in mathematics courses even with the three-year requirement of high school mathematics courses. The pattern of poor performance is not confined to any one particular part of the state and often has nothing to do with the size or location of the school. The problem is not restricted to Oregon. At the national level as well, a proportion of students graduating from high school have not mastered mathematics. The State System will be working with the Oregon Mathematics Education Council in an effort to determine exactly what the problem is and what factors may be influencing performance.

Mr. Alltucker asked whether the teacher education people in the State System's schools of education were involved in these discussions and studies.

Dr. Pierce responded they were involved through the Oregon Mathematics Education Council, the association of mathematics professionals which helped design the mathematics curriculum for the high schools. Two proposals have been made. One would require the three years of mathematics to be taken exclusively during the high school years so that the courses would be closer to the time the student would be taking college-level courses. The second recommendation would specify that the three years be Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II. In discussions with the Mathematics Education Council, it became apparent there were significant administrative problems to all three proposals. There were objections to each, and the State System was asked to determine why the students were not doing well in college mathematics. Then the high schools would consider appropriate curriculum changes based on the evidence.

The Chancellor commented that another view might be what level of mathematics was really necessary to graduate from college because many degree programs require no mathematics. The issue is really a general level of competency in mathematics for the average student who is not a major in mathematics or science.

President Cox said Arizona had faced similar problems which led to statewide cooperative discussions between public school and college personnel. After five years under the cooperative modified curriculum at both levels, there began to be an improvement in scores and a drop in the remediation requirements. He indicated the effort did not happen easily and nothing was changed until professionals at both levels decided to work on the problem together.
Dr. Pierce indicated Oregon was using a very similar model with the two segments sharing information.

Mr. Alltucker suggested that teacher evaluation might prove to be a key issue in the performance of their students. Dr. Pierce pointed out that teacher evaluation was a very controversial issue. However, academic performance reports of students are sent to the high schools. If all of the students entering State System institutions from a given school do very poorly, this would indicate a problem in the school’s mathematics program. There is some evidence of schools looking at that material and reforming their programs.

Mr. Christensen reported the University of Oregon had proposed amendments to the staff recommendation to eliminate the summer session alternative admission option at that institution and to increase the GED score required for admission from 49 to 58. In discussions in the Academic Council, it was decided to request permission for the other institutions in the State System to have a period of four weeks from the date of the present meeting to consider whether they wish to make any change in either the summer session alternative or the required GED scores.

Mr. Christensen then reported on the minority tuition awards. The program was quite successful in increasing the minority enrollment. For 1988-89, there are approximately 450 applicants for the 146 slots available, and the quality of the candidates is significantly superior to the candidate pool available last year. The academic progress of last year’s students was satisfactory. Because the program started late last year, some students perhaps had difficulty fall term, but the institutions believe progress is being made in providing the support and direction students need.

In response to a question concerning the goal, Mr. Christensen indicated the goal had been to have 290 students enrolled by the fall of 1989. This would bring the participation rate for the three minority groups to the general population level and rate and would represent a 100% increase in two years. It appears the goal will be achieved in two years rather than three years.

Mr. Hensley then inquired about the dropout rate for these students and whether it was similar to that of the general student population.

Mr. Christensen stated the retention rate from fall to winter term had been very good. It is anticipated that with the extra support and attention given these students, their retention rate will be above average.
The Chancellor then asked about the cause of the low grade point average for these minority students at Portland State University and whether it was due to a lack of follow-up or the original screening process. Mr. Christensen said he believed it was a combination of both. Steps are being taken to correct the situation, including a review of detailed information on all of these students. The applicants for 1988-89 are much stronger academically than the group last year.

Mr. Hensley commented that the presidents of the institutions had been discussing the budget request for next year and asked how a possible budget freeze would impact enrollments. He said it was his understanding applications were up at several institutions and inquired whether the proposed admission requirements would be a way to put a cap on enrollment in the event of a budget freeze.

The Chancellor said the State System was already in the bottom group in terms of expenditure per student. If the State System were to continue to educate the same number of students with less money, there would be a negative impact on quality. The presidents concurred that the only way to cut costs significantly is to reduce access. Over a period of time, the reduction in access permits a reduction in faculty. Simply cutting a program would not save any money if the same number of students simply transferred to majors in other programs. Student/faculty ratios are already high. Consequently, if there were to be a freeze in funding, there should be a freeze in enrollment at the present levels, plus a planned reduction in the number of students who are admitted. It then becomes necessary to consider the question of admission policy — are the first who apply admitted, is tuition raised so that admission is restricted on the basis of those who can afford to pay, or is admission controlled by being more selective on an academic basis. The presidents preferred the latter option.

The Chancellor said raising the grade point average by .25 at the University of Oregon in the past had not discouraged students from applying but did limit the number who might be selected. Those admitted would be chosen from the persons who were best prepared and had demonstrated the highest class potential through their previous performance and academic achievement.

Throughout the State System, the Chancellor said alternate entry levels should be provided through different admission standards by different institutions. In addition, alternate admission provisions should be maintained, such as discretionary admissions, or by testing or transfer.
The basic decision the Board must make in conjunction with the legislature is how many students are to be educated and at what quality level of education. There are no simplistic cost-cutting measures that will not have a negative impact on the institutions.

Mr. Hensley then asked Presidents Byrne, Cox, and Olum whether this subject had been discussed in their conversations with the Governor. He said it was his understanding the message received in at least two of those meetings had been that no additional monies would be available.

President Byrne said his discussion with the Governor focused on the fact that a reduction in costs probably would require a reduction in the number of students educated in order to maintain or enhance educational quality. The mechanisms for controlling enrollment were not discussed. The issue of duplication was mentioned in a general context of appropriate duplication and areas in which unnecessary duplication could be avoided. The focus on unnecessary duplication was more at the graduate level than the undergraduate level.

Mr. Hensley then inquired whether enrollment caps, if they were established, should be placed in graduate or undergraduate work. President Byrne responded they would be more appropriate at the undergraduate level because graduate programs frequently involve external funding, either directly or indirectly through grants and contracts.

President Olum concurred the enrollment limits should be at the undergraduate level. He added that graduate students apply directly to a department so they can be admitted in departments which have room and limited in those which are full. The University of Oregon will not increase enrollment because space is not available even without the problem of fiscal constraints.

President Cox agreed it would be preferable to limit students than to dilute quality. His conversations with the Governor included consideration of the additional factor that there was no community college alternative in the seven counties of southern Oregon from which 70% of Southern Oregon State College's instate students come.

With respect to program elimination as a means of reducing costs, the presidents agreed it would not be effective nor would it have immediate results because of responsibilities for students who were enrolled.
President Olum commented that in some instances students were having difficulty getting into their chosen majors when they reached the junior level. Students will become aware that a very high academic standing will be required in certain programs and eventually fewer will apply if they are aware it will be difficult to get into their chosen major.

The importance of faculty salaries to the quality of education was stressed. It was stated the citizens of Oregon must decide what level of higher education they wish to provide. Funding for continuing faculty development and professional growth may also be as important as salary remuneration.

Mr. Alltucker and Mr. Hensley said it was important to demonstrate to the Governor, the Legislature, and the citizens of Oregon that the State System can produce quality education if money is available. It is also important to illustrate what has been done with limited resources.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation with the proposed amendments to permit the University of Oregon to eliminate the summer session pre-freshman program alternative and to increase the GED score from 49 to 58. The Committee also recommended that the other institutions be granted four weeks to consider these two changes and to eliminate these alternatives if they also chose to do so.

Board Discussion and Action

Dr. Pierce presented the Committee report and recommendation of the Committee.

Mr. Hensley referred to the reports of the meetings the presidents have had with Governor Goldschmidt, particularly as they related to requirements the Board may be facing with limited resources. These reports may be reviewed further at a later time, perhaps in a meeting of the Committee of the Whole.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Brooks, Chao, Hensley, Hermens, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: None. Directors Alltucker and Dodson were absent from the meeting at this time.
Staff Report to the Committee

The Board's Office of Academic Affairs is forwarding a program authorization 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 the Agricultural and Resource Economics major and minor programs in the Oregon State University/Eastern Oregon State College cooperative agriculture program at Eastern Oregon State College. The full report is on file in the Board's Office.

The proposed programs are broad fields of study including the economics of natural resource use and rural development. The primary purpose of the programs will be to provide greater flexibility to students wanting to pursue degrees in Agricultural Business Management and Agricultural and Resource Economics.

The ABM program requires a 6-12 credit hour internship (AREC410), as well as a technical minor in another agricultural discipline (i.e., in Crop Science or Rangeland Resources at Eastern Oregon State College). Many of the older students and community college transfers do not need the additional work experience provided by the required internship. Also, many of these students would prefer to take courses in several different areas to complement their existing knowledge rather than be required to complete a specific minor program. Thus, the AREC degree, which does not have these two requirements, would provide greater flexibility to allow these students to structure their program to better meet their needs and goals.

Resources To Offer the Program

The addition of these programs to the Oregon State University-Eastern Oregon State College cooperative agriculture program at Eastern Oregon State College will not require any additional funding. All resources needed to implement the programs are in place. No existing resources will need to be reallocated.

Program Review

The proposed programs have been reviewed by the Board's staff, the Academic Council, and representatives of Oregon's independent colleges and universities. The programs would support Oregon State University's mission to provide agricultural programs throughout the state. The proposed programs were given strong support within the review process.

In their review of the proposal, the Board's staff focused on the effect these programs would have on Oregon State University's efforts to strengthen the Agricultural Business Management (ABM)
program at Eastern Oregon State College. There are currently 70 students majoring in Agricultural Resource Economics (AREC) and 43 students majoring in ABM on the Oregon State University campus. There are 52 students majoring in ABM on the Eastern Oregon State College campus. Six of the ABM students at Eastern Oregon State College plan to change their major to AREC if the proposed program is approved. When approved in 1984, the ABM program was projected to grow from 60 to 140 majors. It is projected that the introduction of the AREC programs will slightly reduce the number of ABM majors at Eastern Oregon State College.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board’s staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon State University to initiate major and minor programs in Agricultural and Resource Economics in the Oregon State University-Eastern Oregon State College cooperative agriculture program at Eastern Oregon State College, effective Fall Term, 1988-89.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Hensley requested a further explanation of the spreadsheet in the proposal which indicated no estimated costs.

Dr. James Payne, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Curricular Affairs, explained the program would be utilizing courses already available. The library resources are in place in terms of the texts and journal materials. No new support staff or added facilities will be required. He also explained the program was offered at Oregon State University and would be extended to Eastern Oregon State College.

Committee members asked several questions about the details of the program with respect to accessibility, student transfer between institutions, financial accounting, and the institution granting the degree.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hermens presented the Committee report and recommendation.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Brooks, Chao, Hensley, Hermens, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: None. Directors Alltucker and Dodson were absent from the meeting at this time.
Proposal To
Rename Depart-
ment of
Resource
Management to
Department of
Forest Recrea-
tion Resources,
OSU

Staff Report to the Committee

The Board’s Office of Academic Affairs is forwarding a request from Oregon State University for the consideration of the Com-
mittee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs, and
the Board. Oregon State University request authorization to re-
name the Department of Resource Recreation Management to the
Department of Forest Recreation Resources. The renaming will
enable the College of Forestry at Oregon State University to pre-
sent more accurately the department’s program offerings, mission,
and location.

Policy and procedures adopted by the Board on November 25, 1975,
and amended March 15, 1985, authorized institutions of the State
System to change the name of a college, school, department, divi-
sion, center, institute, or similar agency when prior approval
had been granted by the Board. Oregon State University’s pre-
sentation of their request appeared in the full report on file in
the Board’s Office.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The Board’s staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon
State University to rename the Department of Resource Recreation
Management to the Department of Forest Recreation Resources,
effective Fall Term, 1988-89.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recom-
mandation as presented.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hermens presented the Committee report and recommendation.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the fol-
lowing voting in favor: Directors Adams, Brooks, Chao, Hensley,
Hermens, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: None.
Directors Alltucker and Dodson were absent from the meeting at
this time.

Request to
Award Honorary
Doctorates, OSU

Staff Report to the Committee

In accordance with Board policy, Oregon State University is re-
questing the Board of Higher Education’s authorization to award
honorary doctorates at its June 1988 commencement to Dr. Norman
Borlaug, Dr. M. S. Swaminathan, and Dr. Kenneth Clark. Oregon
State University’s request and short biographical sketches of the
three individuals being honored were included in the full report
on file in the Board’s Office.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended approval of Oregon State University's request to award honorary doctorates to Drs. Borlaug, Clark, Swaminathan.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

At the request of Mr. Hensley, Dr. Graham Spanier described the procedure used to select individuals as recipients of the honorary doctorate.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Hermens presented the Committee report and recommendation.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Brooks, Chao, Hensley, Hermens, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: None. Directors Alltucker and Dodson were absent from the meeting at this time.

Request for Ratification of Grant Application for Proposed Establishment of KSOR Auxiliary Facility at Roseburg, SOGC

Staff Report to the Committee

In order to meet a deadline of January 20, 1988, an application was filed by Southern Oregon State College with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) within the U.S. Department of Commerce for grant assistance of $95,302 to cover three-fourths of the estimated total cost of $127,070 to establish a satellite public radio station in Roseburg for station KSOR, and to add a control room to the main station facilities in Ashland on the Southern Oregon State College campus. The balance of $31,760 of project costs, as well as $12,000 of non-eligible costs, will be provided by the KSOR Listeners' Guild. The Listeners' Guild has confirmed its obligation by letter, which is a part of the grant application.

Funding the proposal will enable KSOR to bring a public radio program generation capability to the 36,000 Oregon citizens living in Roseburg and environs.

The application contained the standard caveat that it was subject to approval by the Board of Higher Education and the State Emergency Board.
Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended to the Committee and the Board that ratification be given for an application by Southern Oregon State College on behalf of public radio station KSOR, for $95,302 of federal assistance through the National Telecommunications and Information Administration; and that staff be authorized, in the event the federal assistance is awarded to SOS/C/KSOR, to seek approval of the State Emergency Board to receive and expend funds necessary to complete the improvements described in the staff report.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

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

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Adams presented the Committee report and recommendation.

In response to a question, Mr. Bolstad indicated the improvements probably would provide a stronger signal in the greater Roseburg area.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation as presented, with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: None. Director Alltucker was absent from the meeting at this time.

Staff Report to the Committee

Bond funds are needed to proceed with the construction of four projects previously approved by the Board. The proceeds will be used for the purchase of land at Western Oregon State College, rehabilitation of the hospital and improvement of utilities at the Oregon Health Sciences University, and construction of an athletic facility at the University of Oregon. The bonds will be State of Oregon, State Board of Higher Education Building Bonds, Series 1988A, with a par value of $9,320,000.

Authorization for the sale is granted by Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon; Chapter 640, Oregon Laws 1985; Chapters 866 and 595, Oregon Laws 1987; and applicable provisions of Oregon Revised Statutes, Chapters 286, 288, and 351.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board authorize the sale of the Series 1988A bond issue through the approval of the appropriate resolution, which follows:
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE STATE OF OREGON (the "State") deems it necessary, pursuant to law, including Article XI-F(1) of the Constitution of the State of Oregon, Chapter 640, Oregon Laws 1985, Chapter 866 and Chapter 595, Oregon Laws 1987, and applicable provisions of Oregon Revised Statutes Chapters 286, 288 and 351, to sell State Board of Higher Education General Obligation Building Bonds, 1988 Series A, of the State of Oregon, in the principal amount of $9,320,000 to provide for the acquisition of land and for the planning, constructing, altering, repairing, furnishing and equipping of buildings and facilities of the Department of Higher Education (the "Projects"), and for payment of costs incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds; and

WHEREAS, THE STATE, as required by ORS 351.160, has determined conservatively that said bonds issued under authority of Article XI-F(1) of the Oregon Constitution will be wholly self-liquidating from revenues to accrue from the operation of the Projects and other facilities or from gifts, grants or building fees, or from other unobligated revenues as shall be allocated by the State; and

WHEREAS, THE STATE is authorized and directed by ORS 351.170 to establish for projects financed from Article XI-F(1) bonds such rates, charges and fees for use of such buildings, structures or projects, including revenue-producing buildings and structures already constructed, as, in the judgment of the State, shall provide the required revenues to make the new buildings, structures, or projects self-liquidating and self-supporting, and as shall provide the funds with which to amortize the principal of and pay the interest on bonds issued to finance such buildings, structures or projects; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE STATE OF OREGON AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Issue. For the above purposes, the State of Oregon shall issue its State Board of Higher Education General Obligation Building Bonds, 1988 Series A, in the amount of Nine Million Three Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars ($9,320,000), to be dated May 1, 1988, to be in denominations of Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000) or integral multiples thereof, to bear interest payable on May 1 and November 1 of each year until maturity or prior redemption, commencing November 1, 1988, and to mature serially on May 1 of each year as follows:
### Section 2. Optional Designation of Term Bonds and Mandatory Redemption. Bidders may designate one or more term bonds. Term Bonds must consist of two or more consecutive maturities, and must mature on the maturity date of the last of the consecutive maturities in an amount equal to the sum of the consecutive maturities. Term bonds shall be subject to mandatory redemption at par and by lot, in the amounts and on the dates of the consecutive maturities shown in the preceding section. If no term bonds are designated in the successful bid, the bonds will mature serially on the schedule indicated above.

### Section 3. Optional Redemption. The bonds maturing on or after May 1, 1998, are subject to redemption prior to maturity at the option of the State in whole on any date and in part on any interest payment date on or after May 1, 1998, at a price of par plus accrued interest to the date fixed for redemption.

### Section 4. Extraordinary Redemption. The bonds are subject to extraordinary redemption at par plus accrued interest, on May 1, 1991, solely from, and to the extent of, any proceeds of the bonds which remain unexpended on that date.

### Section 5. Notice of Redemption.

(a) Unless waived by any holder of bonds to be redeemed, official notice of any such redemption shall be given by the State's paying agent and registrar (the "Registrar") on behalf of the State by mailing a copy of an official redemption notice by registered or certified mail at least 30 days and not more than 60 days prior to the date fixed for redemption to the registered owner of the bond or bonds to be redeemed at the address shown on the Bond Register or at such other address as is furnished in writing by such registered owner to the Registrar.
(b) In the case where the Depository Trust Company ("DTC") is acting as securities depository for the bonds and less than all bonds of a maturity are to be redeemed, the Registrar shall notify DTC not more than 45 days prior to the date fixed for redemption of the maturity to be redeemed. DTC shall determine by lot the principal of the maturity of bonds to be redeemed of each DTC participant's interest in such maturity to be redeemed.

(c) All official notices of redemption shall be dated and shall state:

(i) the redemption date,

(ii) the redemption price,

(iii) if less than all outstanding bonds are to be redeemed, the identification (and, in the case of partial redemption, the respective principal amounts) of the bonds to be redeemed,

(iv) that on the redemption date the redemption price will become due and payable upon each such bond or portion thereof called for redemption, and that interest thereon shall cease to accrue from and after said date, and

(v) the place where such bonds are to be surrendered for payment of the redemption price, which place of payment shall be the principal corporate trust office of the Registrar.

Prior to any redemption date, the State shall deposit with the Registrar an amount of money sufficient to pay the redemption price of all the bonds or portions of bonds which are to be redeemed on that date.

(d) Official notice of redemption having been given as aforesaid, the bonds or portions of bonds so to be redeemed shall, on the redemption date, become due and payable at the redemption price therein specified, and from and after such date (unless the State shall default in the payment of the redemption price) such bonds or portions of bonds shall cease to bear interest. Upon surrender of such bonds for redemption in accordance with said notice, such bonds shall be paid by the Registrar at the redemption price. Installments of interest due on or prior to the redemption date shall be payable as herein provided for payment of interest. Upon surrender for any partial redemption of any bond, there shall be prepared for the registered owner a new bond or bonds of the same maturity in the amount of the unpaid principal. All bonds which have been redeemed shall be cancelled and destroyed by the Registrar and shall not be reissued.
(e) In addition to the foregoing notice, further notice shall be given by the Registrar as set out below, but no defect in said further notice nor any failure to give all or any portion of such further notice shall in any manner defeat the effectiveness of a call for redemption if notice thereof is given as above prescribed.

(i) Each further notice of redemption given hereunder shall contain the information required above for an official notice of redemption plus (A) the CUSIP numbers of all bonds being redeemed; (B) the date of issue of the bonds as originally issued; (C) the rate of interest borne by each bond being redeemed; (D) the maturity date of each bond being redeemed; and (E) any other descriptive information needed to identify accurately the bonds being redeemed.

(ii) Each such further notice shall be published one time in The Bond Buyer of New York, New York or, if such publication is impractical or unlikely to reach a substantial number of the holders of the bonds, in some other financial newspaper or journal which regularly carries notices of redemption of other obligations similar to the bonds, such publication to be made at least 30 days prior to the date fixed for redemption.

(iii) Upon the payment of the redemption price of bonds being redeemed, each check or other transfer of funds issued for such purpose shall bear the CUSIP number identifying, by issue and maturity, the bonds being redeemed with the proceeds of such check or other transfer.

Section 6. Security. The full faith and credit of the State are pledged to the successive owners of each of the bonds for the punctual payment of such obligations, when due. The State shall levy annually, as provided by law, a direct ad valorem tax upon all of the taxable property within the State in sufficient amount, after taking into consideration discounts taken and delinquencies that may occur in the payment of such taxes and all other monies reasonably available for the payment of debt service on the bonds, to pay the bonds promptly as they mature, and that the State covenants with the owners of its bonds to levy such a tax annually during each year that any of the bonds, or bonds issued to refund them, are outstanding.

Section 7. Form of Registered Bonds. The State may issue the bonds as one or more typewritten, temporary bonds which shall be exchangeable for definitive bonds when definitive bonds are available. The bonds shall be in substantially the following form:
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
STATE OF OREGON
STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
GENERAL OBLIGATION BUILDING BOND
1988 SERIES A

MATURITY DATE
INTEREST RATE PER ANNUM
REGISTERED HOLDER
PRINCIPAL SUM

DATED DATE
CUSIP
DOLLARS

THE STATE OF OREGON (the "State"), for value received, acknowledges itself indebted and hereby promises to pay to the registered holder named above, or registered assigns, the principal amount on the above maturity date together with interest thereon from the date hereof at the rate per annum indicated above. Interest is payable semiannually on the first day of May and the first day of November in each year until maturity or prior redemption, commencing November 1, 1988. Interest upon this bond is payable through the fiscal agency of the State of Oregon in the City and State of New York (the "Registrar") by check or draft; checks or drafts will be mailed on the interest payment date (or the next business day if the interest payment date is not a business day) to the name and address of the registered owner as they appear on the bond register as of the fifteenth day of the month prior to the interest payment date. Bond principal is payable upon presentation and surrender of this bond to the Registrar.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS OF THIS BOND APPEAR ON THE REVERSE SIDE; THESE PROVISIONS HAVE THE SAME EFFECT AS IF THEY WERE PRINTED HEREIN.

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED, RECITED, AND DECLARED that all conditions, acts, and things required to exist, to happen, and to be performed precedent to and in the issuance of this bond have existed, have happened, and have been performed in due time, form, and manner as required by the Constitution and Statutes of the State of Oregon; that the issue of which this bond is a part, and all other obligations of such State, are within every debt limitation and other limit prescribed by such Constitution and Statutes; and that the State shall provide for the levying annually of a direct ad valorem tax upon all the property within the State so taxable for its purposes, in an amount sufficient with other available funds, to pay the interest on and the principal of the bonds of such issue as such obligations become due and payable.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the State of Oregon has caused this bond to be signed by facsimile signatures of its Governor and its
Secretary of State, and its State Treasurer, and sealed with a printed facsimile seal of the State, as of this first day of May, 1988.

(facsimile)  
Governor

(facsimile)  
Secretary of State

(facsimile)  
State Treasurer

(SEAL)

THIS BOND SHALL NOT BE VALID UNLESS PROPERLY AUTHENTICATED BY THE REGISTRAR IN THE SPACE INDICATED BELOW.

DATED:

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHENTICATION

This is one of the State of Oregon's State Board of Higher Education General Obligation Building Bonds, 1988 Series A, issued pursuant to the Resolution described herein.

THE CHASE MANHATTAN BANK, N.A., as Registrar

By ____________________________  
Authorized Officer

Note to Printer: The following language should be used for OR bonds:

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the State of Oregon has caused this bond to be signed by facsimile signatures of its Governor and its Secretary of State, and authenticated and executed by the manual signature of its State Treasurer or Deputy, and sealed with a printed facsimile seal of the State, as of this first day of May, 1988.
(facsimile)
Governor

(facsimile)
Secretary of State

(SEAL)

THIS BOND SHALL NOT BE VALID UNLESS
PROPERLY AUTHENTICATED BY THE OREGON STATE
TREASURY IN THE SPACE INDICATED BELOW.

DATED:

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHENTICATION
AND EXECUTION

This is one of the State of Oregon's
State Board of Higher Education General
Obligation Building Bonds, 1988 Series A,
issued pursuant to the Resolution described
herein.

OREGON STATE TREASURY

By
State Treasurer or Deputy

Note to Printer: The following language should be printed on
the reverse of the bond:

This bond is one of a series of $9,320,000 aggregate
principal amount of State Board of Higher Education General
Obligation Building Bonds, 1988 Series A, of the State, and is
issued in full and strict accordance and compliance with all of
the provisions of the Constitution and Statutes of the State of
Oregon.

The bonds maturing on or after May 1, 1998, are subject
to redemption prior to maturity at the option of the State in
whole on any date and in part on any interest payment date on or
after May 1, 1998, at a price of par plus accrued interest to the
date fixed for redemption.

The bonds are subject to extraordinary redemption at par
plus accrued interest on May 1, 1991, solely from, and to the
extent of, any proceeds of the bonds which remain unexpended on
that date.
Notice of any call or redemption, unless waived by the holders of the bonds, shall be mailed not less than thirty days and not more than sixty days prior to such call to the registered owners of the bonds, and otherwise given as required by law and the authorizing bond resolution (the "Resolution"); however, any failure to give notice shall not invalidate the redemption of the bonds. All bonds called for redemption shall cease to bear interest from the date designated in the notice.

Note to Printer: Insert if applicable:

The bonds maturing May 1, ________, shall be subject to mandatory redemption, by lot, at the principal amount thereof, without premium, plus accrued interest to the date fixed for redemption, in the amounts and on the dates set forth below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redemption Date (May 1)</th>
<th>Principal Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bonds optionally redeemed by the State may be credited against the mandatory redemption by lot as determined by the Registrar.

The bonds are issuable in the form of registered bonds without coupons in the denominations of $5,000 or any integral multiple thereof. Bonds may be exchanged for bonds of the same aggregate principal amount, but different authorized denominations.

Any transfer of this bond must be registered, as provided in the Resolution, upon the Bond Register kept for that purpose by the Registrar. The Registrar and the State Treasurer may treat the person in whose name this bond is registered as its absolute owner for all purposes, as provided in the Resolution.

The bondowner may exchange or transfer any bond only by surrendering it, together with a written instrument of exchange or transfer which is satisfactory to the Registrar or the State Treasurer and duly executed by the registered owner or his duly authorized attorney, at the principal corporate trust office of the Registrar or the office of the State Treasurer in the manner and subject to the conditions set forth in the Resolution.
ASSIGNMENT

FOR VALUE RECEIVED, the undersigned sells, assigns and transfers unto ____________________________.

Please insert social security or other identifying number of assignee
the within bond and does hereby irrevocably constitute and appoint ____________________________ as attorney to transfer this bond on the books kept for registration thereof with the full power of substitution in the premises.

Dated: ____________________________

_______________________________

NOTICE: The signature to this assignment must correspond with the name of the registered owner as it appears upon the face of the within bond in every particular, without alteration or enlargement or any change whatever.

Signature Guaranteed

(Bank, Trust Company or Brokerage Firm)

Authorized Officer

The following abbreviations, when used in the inscriptions on the face of the within bond, shall be construed as though they were written out in full according to applicable laws or regulations.

TEN COM -- tenants in common
TEN ENT -- as tenants by the entireties
JT TEN -- as joint tenants with right of survivorship
and not as tenants in common
OREGON CUSTODIANS use the following CUST UL OREG MIN
as custodian for (name of minor)
OR UNIF TRANS MIN ACT
under the Oregon Uniform Transfer to Minors Act

Additional abbreviations may also be used though not in the list above.
Section 8. Authentication, Registration and Transfer.

(a) No bond shall be entitled to any right or benefit under this resolution (the "Resolution") unless it shall have been authenticated by an authorized officer of the fiscal agency of the State of Oregon in the City and State of New York (the "Registrar") or the State Treasurer or Deputy. The Registrar or the State Treasurer or Deputy shall authenticate all bonds to be delivered at closing of this bond issue, and shall additionally authenticate all bonds properly surrendered for exchange or transfer pursuant to this Resolution. A successor Registrar may be appointed for the bonds by resolution of the State. The Registrar shall provide notice to bondowners of any change in the Registrar not later than the bond payment date following the change in Registrar.

(b) The ownership of all bonds shall be entered in the Bond Register maintained by the Registrar, and the State and the Registrar may treat the person listed as owner in the Bond Register as the owner of the bond for all purposes.

(c) The Registrar shall mail each interest payment on the interest payment date (or the next business day if the interest payment date is not a business day) to the name and address of the bondowner as they appear on the Bond Register as of the fifteenth day of the month preceding an interest payment date (the "Record Date"). If payment is so mailed, neither the State nor the Registrar shall have any further liability to any party for such payment.

(d) Bonds may be exchanged for an equal principal amount of bonds of the same maturity which are in different denominations, and bonds may be transferred to other owners if the bondowner submits the following to the Registrar or the State Treasurer:

(i) written instructions for exchange or transfer satisfactory to the Registrar or the State Treasurer, signed by the bondowner or his attorney in fact and guaranteed or witnessed in a manner satisfactory to the Registrar or the State Treasurer; and

(ii) the bonds to be exchanged or transferred.

(e) The Registrar or State Treasurer shall not be required to exchange or transfer any bonds submitted to it during any period beginning with a Record Date and ending on the next following payment date; however, such bonds shall be exchanged or transferred promptly following that payment date.

(f) The Registrar or State Treasurer shall note the date of authentication on each bond. The date of authentication shall
be the date on which the bondowner's name is listed on the bond register.

(g) For purposes of this section, bonds shall be considered submitted to the Registrar on the date the Registrar or the State Treasurer actually receives the materials described in subsection (d) of this section.

(h) The State may alter these provisions regarding registration and transfer by mailing notification of the altered provisions to all bondowners. The altered provisions shall take effect on the date stated in the notice, which shall not be earlier than 45 days after notice is mailed.

Section 9. Maintenance of Tax-Exempt Status. The State covenants for the benefit of the owners of the bonds to comply with all provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the "Code") which are required for bond interest to be exempt from gross income for federal income taxation purposes (except for taxes on corporations), unless the State obtains an opinion of nationally recognized bond counsel that such compliance is not required in order for the interest paid on the bonds to be so excludable. The State makes the following specific covenants with respect to the Code:

(a) The State shall take no action or omit any action if it would cause the bonds to become "arbitrage bonds" under Section 148 of the Code, and shall pay to the United States all "rebates" on "gross proceeds" earnings which are required under Section 148 of the Code.

(b) The State shall operate the facilities financed with the bonds so that the bonds are not "private activity bonds" within the meaning of Section 141 of the Code.

(c) The State shall comply with all applicable reporting requirements.

(d) Covenants of the State in its tax certificate for the bonds shall be enforceable to the same extent as if contained herein.

Section 10. Sale of Bonds. The Executive Vice Chancellor, or his designee, shall cause to be published in the Daily Journal of Commerce, Portland, Oregon, and The Bond Buyer, New York, New York, notices of sale of the bonds in the form substantially as shown on Exhibit A attached hereto and by this reference incorporated herein, or summaries, as provided by law. The bonds shall be sold upon the terms provided in the attached Exhibit A, subject to such revisions as may be made by the Executive Vice Chancellor, or his designee, to enhance the marketability, sale or registration of the bonds. The bonds shall be sold on the
date and at the time and place stated in Exhibit A, unless the Executive Vice Chancellor, or his designee, establishes a different date, time, or place.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

Mr. Adams inquired whether there was any flexibility in the timing and advertising of bonds in order to take advantage of market conditions. Mr. Lemman replied that there is no flexibility once the bonds are announced. The timing is negotiated with the State Treasurer and other financial advisors. The sale could be cancelled and done at another time, but the sale could not be moved a day or two without starting over completely. The lead time for advertising is 30 days.

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

Board Discussion and Action

Miss Brooks presented the Committee report and recommendation.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and adopted the resolution on roll call vote. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Brooks, Chao, Hensley, Hermes, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: None. Director Dodson abstained due to a possible conflict of interest. Director Alltucker was absent from the meeting at this time.

Staff Report to the Committee

The rate of growth in cadet enrollment at the Oregon Police Academy on the Western Oregon State College campus has brought the Board on Police Standards and Training to require use of additional facilities at WOSC two years ahead of schedule.

To meet the revised projected need, Western Oregon State College has agreed to make space available in Maaske Hall in the summer of 1989, rather than 1991 as earlier planned. As a condition of occupancy, worked out in the original agreement which made permanent the Oregon Police Academy presence on the Western Oregon State College campus, the Board on Police Standards and Training would pay an additional accommodation fee of $556,000 to Western Oregon State College. The acceleration of the Maaske occupancy has resulted in a modification in the payment of the accommodation fee. Western Oregon State College has requested $120,000 be paid before June 30, 1989, and that the balance of $436,000 be paid at the rate of $109,000 per year for four years, beginning on or about July 1, 1991. The Board on Police Standards and Training has agreed to this modification, but requires an advance of funds to enable the payments to be made. The advances will be repaid from BPST revenues.
The staff proposes that funds be advanced from excess residence hall sinking funds to permit the payment to Western Oregon State College of the accommodation fee. The advance will be repaid by the Board on Police Standards and Training over a term not to exceed 15 years, with interest on the annual unpaid balance calculated at 9%.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

It was recommended that the Committee and the Board authorize the advance of $120,000 in June 1989 and $109,000 per year from excess residence hall sinking funds to assist the Board on Police Standards and Training in paying the required accommodation fee to Western Oregon State College. The advance will be repaid over a term not to exceed 15 years at an annual interest rate of 9% on the outstanding balance.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

The Committee discussed the term and interest rates for the advance. It was suggested the interest rate be tied to the prime, with the rate to be adjusted annually.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation, with the understanding that Mr. Lemman would determine prior to the Board meeting whether it would be possible to tie the interest rate to the prime rate.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Lemman presented the report and recommendation of the Committee. He indicated the Executive Director of the Board on Police Standards and Training had acceded to the proposal that the interest rate be the prime plus one-half percent, which is presently 9%.

The Board approved the Committee recommendation with the adjustment in the interest rate. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Brooks, Chao, Dodson, Hensley, Hermens, Richardson, and Schnitzer. Those voting no: None. Director Alltucker was absent from the meeting at this time.
SUMMARY OF FACILITIES DIVISION ACTIVITIES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

Staff Report to the Board

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

Contracts for Professional Services

Architecture & Allied Arts Addition & Alterations, UO

An Agreement was negotiated with L. R. Squier Associates, Inc., Lake Oswego, for geotechnical consulting services not to exceed $8,750. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Consulting Services, OHSU

An Agreement was negotiated with Lerch Bates & Associates, Inc., Lynnwood, Washington, for engineering services not to exceed $10,320. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Award of Construction Contracts

Dairy Barn Metal Roofing, OSU

On January 29, 1988, Parker Pole Buildings, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $31,820. Financing will be provided from funds available to the institution.

Dixon Recreation Center Weight Room Addition, OSU

On January 22, 1988, Terry Hackenbruck Construction was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $78,964. Financing will be provided from student funds.

Peavy Hall Room 254, Modifications, OSU

On February 15, 1988, Wayne Anderson Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $12,033. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Women’s Building Bio-Mechanics Lab, OSU

On February 15, 1988, Dale Ramsay Construction Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $79,465. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Hayward Field Improvements Phase II(b), UO

On February 8, 1988, John Hyland Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $432,638. Financing will be provided from XI-F(1) Bonds.

Institute of Marine Biology (Interior Improvements), UO

On February 4, 1988, Upper Valley Builders, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $57,624. Financing will be provided by federal funds from NOAA.
On January 18, 1988, IVI Environmental Services, Inc., was awarded a contract for the Science Facilities Additions & Alterations (Science Library Asbestos Abatement) project in the amount of $53,253.12. Financing will be provided from federal funds.

On February 5, 1988, Michael J. Watt, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $42,139. Financing will be provided from state funds.

Acceptance of Projects

This project is complete and was accepted on January 14, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $608,149. Financing was provided from state funds paid by the Oregon Police Academy.

This project is complete and was accepted on December 31, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $405,962. Financing was provided from state funds (Capital Repair).

This project is complete and was accepted on January 22, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $19,767. Financing was provided from state funds.

The Electrical & Computer Engineering Building Related Alterations Project No. 2 (Handicapped Access to 5 Engineering Buildings) project is complete and was accepted on December 31, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $214,488.15. Financing was provided from State (Lottery) Funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on December 31, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $17,762. Financing was provided from student funds.

This project is complete and was accepted on February 19, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $138,508. Financing was provided from state funds (Capital Repair).

This project is complete and was accepted on February 17, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $76,194.90. Financing was provided from state funds (Capital Repair).

This project is complete and was accepted on January 21, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $88,524. Financing was provided from state funds available to the institution and reimbursement from Bonneville Power Administration.
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Campus Reroofing Phase III, UO

The Campus Reroofing Phase III (Clinical Services Building, Condon Hall, PLC and Villard Stage Loft) project is complete and was accepted on January 31, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $149,849. Financing was provided from state funds (Capital Repair).

Hamilton Hall Reroofing Project, UO

This project is complete and was accepted on January 30, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $351,805. Financing was provided from state funds (Capital Repair).

Baird Hall Room 18, Student Relocation (subset of OPC, ENT Remodel Project), OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on November 25, 1987. The estimated total project cost remains at $156,019. Financing was provided from funds available to the institution.

Residence Hall Reroofing, OHSU

This project is complete and was accepted on January 21, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $61,006.40. Financing was provided from state funds (Capital Repair).

Cramer Hall Third Floor Remodel, PSU

This project is complete and was accepted on January 6, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $76,890. Financing was provided from state funds.

Lincoln Hall Exterior—Painting, PSU

This project is complete and was accepted on January 31, 1988. The estimated total project cost remains at $25,734. Financing was provided from state funds (Capital Repair).

Board Discussion and Action

The Board accepted the report as presented.

Items from Board Members

Mr. Richardson reported that the Chancellor’s Search Committee had received and reviewed written proposals from five search firms since the last Board meeting. Two proposals were rejected because the firms were unwilling to tailor their services to the needs of the committee. Two other firms were rejected because they seemed to have little experience in higher education. The firm selected was the Presidential Search Consultation Services, the same firm that assisted the Board in the 1981-82 search for a Chancellor. Dr. Stanley Paulson, the individual who will handle the search for the committee, spent a very intensive two-day visit in Oregon talking with committee members, the Governor, legislators, Dr. Paul Bragdon, the Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and the search coordinator.

Mr. Richardson indicated the number of nominations had increased substantially, as of March 16, over the previous week.
Mr. Richardson then reported the Board/institutional relations committee had held its first meeting at Portland State University on March 10. It was basically an organizational meeting and was well attended. The committee members from Portland State were very appreciative of the fact that the Board was sensitive to and willing to devote time to improving relationships. There was a short discussion of possible issues the group might wish to address at subsequent meetings.

Mr. Dodson said the Presidential Search Committee for the Oregon Health Sciences University had presented two candidates to the Board for interview the previous day. Both were excellent candidates, but he indicated he did not have any further report on the negotiations.

Mr. Hermens said the Committee on Instruction had heard two additional reports. The first, on the minority tuition and fee awards, showed that 93% of the recipients were enrolled in winter quarter. He noted there had been Committee discussion with respect to the low grade point averages of students in this group at Portland State University and Eastern Oregon State College.

The second report concerned the faculty excellence awards. The Legislature cut the funding for this program so it will be necessary to defer any further awards until the present funds are released through the retirement or other departure of the present recipients. Mr. Hensley said the Committee would discuss this program further with respect to any needed modifications in the policy or legislative recommendations.

Mr. Richardson referred to the comment concerning the grades of minority students in the awards program at Portland State University and Eastern Oregon State College. He said he would like to hear what was being done to correct any problems at those two institutions.

Mr. Hensley explained that the Committee had asked those questions and added that there were substantial positive effects coming out of the program. Dr. Pierce said the number of applicants for the coming year had increased from 283 last year to about 450 for 1988-89. The pool has almost doubled and the grade point averages and the qualifications of the applicants are much higher this year. For that reason, the students accepted should be better prepared and able to carry a heavier load and achieve a better grade point average. It was also noted the retention rate has been very good.

Mr. Richardson said the minority awards program was a two-point effort. One is recruitment, and the other is retention. He said he wanted to make sure all of the institutions have programs in place that would ensure success in this area.
Mr. Adams said Board members had been mailed a summary of the recommendations of the Committee on the Location of the Chancellor's Office, together with the alternatives considered and the opinions and comments that the committee had collected during its study of this issue. The latter materials was intended for file purposes and for use in any future deliberations on this issue. He indicated the Committee had expressed the hope that the matter would not be raised in the near future. He then presented the following report and recommendation from the Committee and moved that the Board accept the report and approve the recommendations as presented.

**Discussion and Recommendation of the Committee**

President Petersen appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on the Location of the Chancellor's Office charged with the task of examining the question of the location of the Chancellor's Office. The members of the committee were: Mr. Robert W. Adams, Chairman; Mr. John Alltucker and Mrs. Arlene Schnitzer. Three meetings were held. The first was primarily an organizational meeting with some preliminary information and comment. Committee members agreed on the persons to be contacted for additional data. At the second meeting, reports were made of the information gathered from the various sources. At the final meeting, the Committee members reported on any final discussions or information they had obtained and expressed their opinions and concerns.

The Committee then considered all of the information gathered during the three-month study and prepared a recommendation.

The Committee recommended:

1. That the Chancellor's Office remain on the University of Oregon campus;

2. That the Chancellor's Salem Office be retained; and

3. That consideration should be given to a more visible presence in Portland.

**Board Discussion and Action**

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

Mr. Alltucker said the Board had approved the establishment of a hundred privately-funded scholarships for students who did not make the cut in the presidential scholarships but who had demonstrated substantial leadership qualities. These scholarships
were established in recognition of the fact that one of the unique functions of higher education was to help prepare future leaders.

Mr. Alltucker indicated he had just spent the last hour with a group which he believed was going to accept the responsibility for raising the money for these scholarships. The group also would be interested in being involved in the selection process and this is likely to encourage the members to follow the careers of these potential future leaders from all parts of Oregon. He said he hoped this program would be in place this fall.

Mr. Hensley and the Chancellor thanked Mr. Alltucker for his efforts in this regard.

Mr. Chao commented briefly on the spring schedule for CCATE and asked that material describing the activities be distributed.

**COMMUNICATIONS**
The Secretary distributed student survey information from the Associated Students of Portland State University. The findings will be reported to the Board in May. She also distributed copies of three communications addressed to the Board from the following individuals: Coleen M. Grant, Les Ruark, and Thomas Youngblood.

**Bond Sale**
Mr. Lemman announced that a meeting of the Board by conference telephone connection would be scheduled for April 19, 1988, at 11:00 a.m., for the purpose of considering the bids and authorizing the sale of bonds if the bids are satisfactory.

The Board meeting was recessed until 3:00 p.m. at which time it was reconvened as a Board workshop on governance.

**Workshop on Governance**
Mr. Hensley stated the Board workshop on governance was designed to provide background and information in preparation for the Board/Legislative Forum on Governance to be held later in the day. He requested the Chancellor to comment on governance and some of the issues which it would be helpful to explore in the later session with legislators. The Chancellor had distributed previously a document entitled, "Governance and Coordination of Public Education in the Fifty States."

The Chancellor reviewed the history of the State System and its prevailing policy over more than 50 years. He summarized the data presented in the report with respect to governance in the other states. He indicated there seemed to be no coordination between the type of governance and the prestige or quality of the institutions. Faculty compensation and expenditure per student show the highest correlation with excellence.

The question which the Board must address at this particular time relates to the expectations as to the role of the Board and its governance authority in its relationship to the institutions on one side and the legislature and citizens of Oregon on the other.
He characterized the State System as a central authority with decentralized management, and he cited examples. He noted the Board’s reliance on the presidents of the institutions to communicate policies and decisions between the Board and the people at the institutions.

Board members serve as representatives of the state as a whole and are expected to be advocates for higher education. They are responsible for holding the institutions accountable for quality, and access, and for fulfilling their assigned missions. The Board must be responsive to legislative interest, concern, and opinion. The Legislature sets broad policy and has great power because it controls the appropriations. In the past, the Legislature has been content to delegate to the Board responsibility for making policies and providing the leadership and governance of higher education directly, without interfering with Board decisions.

The relationship with the Governor must be examined. Although a Governor has great power, governors have delegated these powers and responsibilities in the past to the governing board for the specific planning and implementation.

With respect to the role of the Chancellor, the job is political in its interaction with the Governor and the Legislature and as an advocate for higher education and the representative of the institutions in the political arena. The Chancellor also is expected to be educator and an administrator of a very comprehensive fiscal operation. He said it was his opinion that, for maximum effectiveness, it was tremendously important the Governor, the Legislature, the Board, the Chancellor, and the presidents of the institutions work in close cooperation and harmony in a common cause. The common cause is to provide the maximum educational opportunities in terms of access, quality, academic, and research programs in order to provide maximum service to the state and to support its economic development.

Dr. Pierce said the issue presently is whether Oregon is going to change its governance of education. He then described the current organizational structure as set forth in, "The Governance of Higher Education." The statutes are clear in establishing this governance model. He said the Board must recognize its responsibilities as set forth in the statutes and hold to those duties with the Legislature, the Governor, and others.

Mr. Hensley then asked the presidents to comment on whether the present structure needed to be broadened or modified.

President Olum said he believed the structure was exactly right. He also mentioned that attention must be paid to respecting the great traditions that have been built up in educational institutions and the State System over a long period of time. These traditions are never written down but develop from mutual respect and because they work well.
President Cox said as a new member to the State System he considered the structure an ideal blend of autonomy and distinctiveness. Each institution has a unique personality. This is a tribute to the Board’s understanding of its role in making policy and delegating its implementation to the presidents.

President Byrne said the problem is not with the State System but is a problem of a shift in the balance of power. A shift in the balance of power always results in concerns which may be based as much on perception as reality.

President Sicuro stated there was real concern nationally among those in higher education with respect to the Governor’s taking a role in leading higher education. He applauded the Governor’s visionary statements and programs, not only for higher education, but in other areas as well. He concurred there was no need to change the governance structure.

Mr. Hensley referred to concerns expressed by some legislators about the speed with which the Governor was moving in actions concerning higher education. Mrs. Schnitzer asked what prompted the comments other than the resignation of the Chancellor.

Mr. Hensley said he believed the statements resulted from the departure of the Chancellor in the manner in which it happened and was publicized. He said he believed there was a fear of how much power the Governor was going to exert in the area of budgeting and possibly encroaching upon some of the powers which were the exclusive prerogative of the Legislature.

President Byrne said perhaps a greater concern was whether the Legislature will play a larger role than normal in budgetary matters. He said the concerns should be focused on political intrusion from any source in decisions that should be made only by the Board of Higher Education.

The Chancellor commented that President Olum had made an excellent point about tradition and respecting tradition by exercising self-restraint. A governor’s powers are awesome, and it is only by restraint of judgment and tradition that the governor does not do certain things. Likewise, the Legislature’s power is awesome, and the restraint is that which it exercises.

The Chancellor cited issues in which restraint should be used and decisions left to the Board. The process of setting priorities for programs goes through extensive review and budget analysis at the institutions. Then it is reviewed by the Chancellor’s Office and approved by the Board and is ultimately submitted as a recommendation to the Governor and in his recommendation to the Legislature. Once the priorities reach the Legislature, requests are
considered by a subcommittee of six people in the Ways and Means Committee to determine budget. They get into non-budget issues as a result of lobbying efforts by individual faculty members who have contacted legislators as private citizens in an attempt to overturn through the legislative process decisions made by the department, the college, the institution, the central office, and the Board.

There was a brief discussion of opportunities for conferring with legislators. President Sicuro proposed having each president submit and explain the institution's budget to the Ways and Means Committee with Board members, Chancellor, and staff present.

Mr. Hensley said it had been his personal observation that one of the strengths of the State System had been the united front it had been able to present to the Legislature through the Chancellor. There is also a concern the rest of the state runs a great risk in the development of the five-county area around Portland because the population shift and the political power developing within this region can outvote the rest of the state. Thus, the institutions outside the Portland area would tend to suffer.

President Olum said although there were disadvantages to the University of Oregon in being part of a State System, there is also an advantage in preventing the internecine warfare which occurs when every institution seeks its own individual budget.

The Chancellor said institutional budgets are never presented to the legislature individually. The Legislature receives a set of decision packages, but the internal budgets are not presented directly.

President Sicuro said his intent in making the suggestion had been to respond to criticisms from legislators that they never saw the institutional budgets. The individual presentations would be an expansion of the budget request from the central office.

Dr. Bill Cowart, Provost at Western Oregon State College, said he supported the comments of the presidents. He mentioned he had testified directly to the Texas legislature and defended his institution's budget in his previous position. However, Texas had a formula funding process that established all the criteria, and institutions were not negotiating basic operating budgets. It would be a very dangerous process to go into individual institutional budgets without some explicit agreed-upon statewide funding criteria. He expressed concern with legislative identification of specific items of interest with an ultimate deterioration of institutional authority.
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Mr. Alltucker reviewed the history leading to the establishment of the State System and the rivalries which prompted the legislation. He described charts illustrating the statutory relationships among the Governor, the Legislature, Board of Higher Education, and taxpayers of Oregon. He also showed the funding process, indicating that the Legislature allocates a certain amount of money to the Board which has the sole statutory responsibility for distributing funds to the institutions.

Mr. Alltucker then emphasized the need for clear lines of communication with legislators and the public. It is particularly essential for the Board to communicate with the Governor and legislators because the Board is totally ineffective without their support and the necessary resources.

The Chancellor described procedures which had been used in the past to communicate with legislators and taxpayers.

In response to a question about the primary purpose of the subsequent meeting with legislators, Mr. Hensley said there was a great deal of uncertainty about the emerging roles of the Governor, the Legislature, and the Board. Earlier discussions in Corvallis had a common theme that a strong Board was necessary and one that would be a good communicator with the Legislature and have its respect.

Mr. Adams referred to Mr. Alltucker’s description of the relationships among the various groups and suggested they might be divided into sets of relationships with a list of possible items within the purview of each.

Mr. Richardson stated the real purpose of the meeting was to discuss the governance of the State System of Higher Education. He said the key entities all had the same goal of improving higher education, but there was a question of process. Governance includes both decision-making authority and accountability. He indicated he would prefer to talk about governance and who was going to be responsible.

Mr. Dodson said in his view presidents of the institutions were most familiar with their missions and were the best persons to describe the institutions to the Governor, even though this might not fit the established governance structure.

Mr. Hensley said it was his impression the Governor viewed his meetings with presidents as an opportunity to educate himself about the institutions in order to defend the budget he will be presenting. In conversations with the Governor, his attitude has been that once agreement is reached on the budget, the Governor and the Board will be united in defending it. The Governor has also stated he fully supported a strong Board of Higher Education and that the Board was the proper group for transmitting information.
Mr. Alltucker indicated that, as long as there was a systemwide plan which everyone in the State System understood and accepted, he would have no objections to the presidents talking directly to the Governor. He would oppose any effort to seek a larger share for any institution than had been approved in the systemwide plan.

President Byrne said the citizens of Oregon were well served by the State System of Higher Education. The problem is that the Board must stand up for its responsibilities. A series of events over the past six months has created a credibility problem for the Board and it must exercise its responsibility and authority. Every institution, faculty member, and student probably will support the Board in that position.

Mrs. Schnitzer agreed that the Board had not backed its own decisions strongly and positively enough.

Mr. Adams commented that this is an age of appeals where almost every decision is appealed. The Board has made decisions, some of which have been difficult ones. He said he viewed that as a sign of strength, particularly if the decisions were considered carefully. He said he did not view this as a sign of weakness but as a sign of people not necessarily agreeing with the Board's decisions.

Mr. Hensley said it had been valuable for the Board to hear the opinions of the leaders of its institutions. Board members have a great deal of respect for their opinions and performance.

In summarizing the meeting, governance was identified as a primary concern. It was also noted that, even though the Board acts within its statutory authority in reaching difficult decisions, the Legislature may not perceive the Board as being responsive to faculty and student concerns when those groups communicate opposition directly to legislators. Adequate consultation and consensus taking is an important element in achieving support for Board decisions. Faculty and students understand the Board makes the decision, but they want a chance to be heard.

The meeting was recessed at 5:15 p.m. to reconvene at 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Hensley welcomed the legislators who were participating in the Board/Legislative Forum on Governance. He indicated the Board had met during the afternoon with the presidents of the institutions to consider some of the issues which might be discussed during the forum. He said the purpose of the Forum was to explore with legislators their feelings about the Board and its role in the governance of higher education and how the Board and the Legislature should work together during the next legislative period. He then requested Mr. Alltucker to open the discussion.
Mr. Alltucker said he had accepted an appointment to the Board with the idea of helping to effect constructive changes in the way higher education was governed and funded. After talking to Governor Atiyeh and the new Chancellor, he said he was convinced there was an opportunity to effect change and he had not been disappointed. Mr. Alltucker said there had been difficulties from time to time but it is now clear that higher education has the attention of the general public, the Legislature, and the present governor's office, all of whom are very much interested in doing something better than has been done in the past.

Mr. Alltucker said the Board has a long-range plan in place now and it becomes the responsibility of the Board to make sure that the necessary resources, both human and financial, are in place. In order to assure that financial resources will be available from the Legislature, it is essential for the Board to have the understanding, respect, and support of the Legislature. Meetings such as the present one with legislators should be a regular part of the legislative process because when almost a third of the state's budget goes into the educational process, it is important for the Board to have the confidence of the Legislature.

Mr. Hosticka commented he would have liked to have the Governor or Mr. Bragdon present at the meeting. Because of the situation surrounding the departure of the current Chancellor, applicants for the position will undoubtedly have a lot of questions about the situation they would be facing. Presumably, applicants will be asking various people about that, and it would be desirable to have them get the same signals from the Board, the Governor, and the administrators of the institutions.

Mr. Hosticka said there has been a certain amount of strain between the Board and the Legislature. It has been occasioned by a series of decisions, each one of which is probably justifiable and could be said to be the prerogative of the Board. However, the cumulative impact has been the strained relationship. He said he was concerned also with the degree to which the System of Higher Education was integrated with the general culture of Oregon. To many people outside of Eugene and Corvallis, it is viewed as almost an alien body, with the institutions looking to other national and international institutions of higher education as their peer and reference groups rather than to Oregon and its citizens. He said he was increasingly interested in trying to develop a process by which the culture and value fit gets better between the State System and the general community in Oregon. The Board and the Legislature could both play an effective role in this communication process.

Mr. Mason stated the relationship between higher education and the Legislature had tended to be hostile due to lack of communication and myth. There are three myths that run through every Legislative Session: (1) Higher education has more money than it
knows what to do with, (2) the Board is not responsive to what the Legislature wants, and (3) there is immense duplication. Each session follows the same pattern of negotiation between the Chancellor and the Ways and Means Committee. The present meeting is very encouraging and extremely significant because the lack of relationship between the Legislature and the Board has been very detrimental. The average legislator has not felt a real closeness to the State System or any real desire to help it. There should be more such meetings. Most of the myths, and perhaps similar ones with respect to legislators, would prove to be misunderstandings.

Mr. Trow said the present search for a new Chancellor would be different from the one six years ago. The current change, due to the way it occurred, has drawn a great deal of publicity, not only in Oregon, but nationally among education groups. There will be doubts in the minds of good people who otherwise might be interested in applying. This may lessen the Board's ability to attract the very best people.

Mr. Trow indicated he had considered things which could happen to improve the situation with the Legislature and suggested the following points:

1. Resolve internal issues concerning higher education groups internally so that they do not reach the Legislature. He cited faculty and student problems. By resolving problems internally, the staff would reduce the things the staff had to do and give them more time to be more effective.

2. Incorporate faculty representatives into the Board's official activities as non-voting participants to provide the Board with more perspective about the operation of the State System and resolve issues without reaching the Legislature.

3. Establish Board committees on faculty relations and student relations to meet periodically with faculty and students or hold hearings on the various campuses to explore problems. This might alleviate the perception the Board does not communicate sufficiently with its constituencies.

4. Include legislative liaison through use of a skilled and highly-regarded lobbyist and by having the staff organized and ready to trouble-shoot for issues concerning individual legislators. The Board should also have staff ready to utilize local institutional personnel to explain pertinent issues.

5. Have staff contact individual legislators often.

6. Make sure the staff shows concern and respect for individual legislators and the legislative process. This is virtually always done, but in a few instances there may have been a perception this was not the case.
7. Speak with a unified voice to legislators, particularly with respect to issues between the institutions.

8. Get the Governor in favor of legislation before it is enacted.

9. Be concerned about decisions when they have intersegmental effects, or other wider effects, such as the semester conversion, new programs, entrance requirements, lower-division distribution requirements, etc.

There was a brief discussion of the need to communicate with legislators which did not have a college or university within their community.

Mr. Thorne said the Board was very sensitive to the governance issue but he viewed this as a non-issue. The real emphasis has been on the issue of funding basic education. As a member of the Legislature, Mr. Thorne said he was seeking direction and leadership from the Board. The real challenge for the Board is to decide what it wants the State System to be. He then referred to the very real economic issues in many parts of the state and its impact on the budgetary decisions the Legislature must make. The greatest service the Board can offer to the Legislature is to offer a choice of priorities so it can make decisions based upon what Board members, as good advisors, tell the Legislature the consequences will be.

Mr. Hensley indicated three presidents of State System institutions had met with the Governor and had an opportunity to visit with him about their institutions, budgets, and priorities. He has indicated he is holding meetings to educate himself in order to understand higher education’s budget better. The Board believes the Governor is very supportive of higher education and places it in a high priority in his administration. However, the presidents have some concern this might not be the case with the Legislature. The Legislature may have other agenda items, one of which might be governance. In addition, Mr. Hensley said he had been assured by Mr. Bragdon that his new position was primarily to assist the Governor in making decisions related to all education and to keep the Governor informed. He asked the legislators to comment on this concern about the role the Legislature might play in the governance of higher education.

There were brief comments with respect to the anticipated roles of various elements in the governance process and some of the factors which have caused concern.

Mr. Hosticka said the issue that would drive the budget process in the next session is the state expenditure limitation. That is essentially a political matter the Legislature must resolve, but
it will drive the budget-making process and will impact what the Legislature does relative to higher education. Prior to the next session, it would be beneficial to determine what the roles of the Governor, the Board, the new Chancellor, and Mr. Bragdon will be in those discussions. He said he viewed the state's expenditure limitation as one of the major controversies that would permeate the next session of the Legislature.

Mr. Mason commented that real excellence is going to cost money and it will be essential to discuss resources at some point.

Once the Board has established priorities in terms of its long-range planning, it should provide leadership in maintaining those priorities. Both legislators and Board members agreed it was important to resist efforts to introduce elements which were not consistent with carefully determined long-range planning.

Mr. Hensley commented that the Board was exploring options with its presidents for alternatives in the event revenues remain the same. The Board feels it has an obligation to provide quality, and the Governor has addressed that in his conversations.

Mr. Chao said the state cannot afford incredible amounts of funding for higher education and choices were necessary. The Board has tried to place the emphasis where it believed funds were most important. He indicated he had been disappointed during the last session that faculty salary money had been spread rather than focused so that there could be real excellence.

Mr. Thorne asked how the appropriate faculty salary level had been determined and what it would take to get to that level. In discussing faculty salaries, Mr. Chao said the Board had asked the presidents to identify how they were going to be better. If that means raising salaries in departments that are excellent, then this should be done and the money found somewhere else in the institution. Mr. Alltucker described more fully the Board's discussions which led to placing faculty salaries as a first priority as a means of getting the greatest value for the educational dollar. Mr. Thorne emphasized that legislators wanted to know where the Board thought the State System should go on salaries and other issues and also how those conclusions were made.

Mr. Adams added that pouring large amounts into salaries did not necessarily improve a program or staff. The Board would like to be in a position to retain good people who are continually getting offers from other locations and to employ good people who are in higher-paid positions elsewhere. It is also important to have funds for maintenance and repair.

Mr. Hermens and Miss Brooks referred to earlier comments with respect to student opinion. They cited examples in which the Board was responsive to student comment.
Those in attendance agreed that similar meetings would be advantageous, probably on a quarterly basis, and with specific topics for discussion. Legislators were invited to make suggestions for future meetings or propose topics for inclusion on subsequent meeting agendas.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

James C. Petersen, President

Wilma L. Foster, Secretary
SUPPLEMENT A

Admission Requirements for 1989-90
OREGON STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION
ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS EFFECTIVE 1989–90

(As approved and subsequently modified as authorized by Board action.)

OREGON RESIDENT STUDENTS

To be admitted to freshman standing\(^1\), students need to fulfill each of the
requirements (or alternatives) as specified in 1 through 4 below:

1. **High School Graduation.** Public high school graduates must have been
graduated from a standard or accredited high school. Private high
school graduates must have been graduated from an accredited high
school.

   Nongraduates to be admitted must have (1) a minimum score of 40 on each
of the five subtests of the Test of General Educational Development
(GED) and (2) an average score for the five tests of 58 (UO, OSU,
SOSC), 55 (WOSC), 51 (EDSC), 46 (PSU), 45 (OIT).

   Graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools must have (1) a
minimum score of 970 SAT or 22 ACT (UO, OSU) or 890 SAT or 20 ACT (PSU,
EDSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) and (2) an average 410 or above (1230 total) on
three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and
a third of the student’s choice); or meet the summer qualifying
alternative (4b).

2. **Admission Tests.** Must submit scores of the Scholastic Aptitude Test
(SAT) or American College Test (ACT). Except as alternatives to the
GPA and as noted below, scores are not used for admission decisions,
but are used for guidance and placement purposes.

   a. To enroll at UO and OSU, students must score a minimum of 30 on
the Test of Standard Written English (a part of the SAT) or 12 on
the English portion of the ACT.

   b. To enroll at SOSC, students must score a minimum of 30 TSWE or 15
ACT-English or take Writing 40 at an extra fee.

3. **Subject Requirement.** Must satisfactorily complete fourteen units (one
year equal to one unit) of college preparatory work in the following
subject areas:

   a. **English (4 units).** Shall include the study of the English
language, literature, speaking and listening, and writing, with
emphasis on and frequent practice in writing expository prose
during all four years.

\(^1\) Students with any college credit note Nonresident Transfer Student
requirement.
b. **Mathematics (3 units).** Shall include first year algebra and two additional years of college preparatory mathematics such as geometry (deductive or descriptive) advanced topics in algebra, trigonometry, analytical geometry, finite mathematics, advanced applications, calculus, probability and statistics, or courses that integrate topics from two or more of these areas. (One unit is highly recommended in the senior year. Algebra and geometry taken prior to the ninth grade will be accepted.)

c. **Science (2 units).** Shall include a year each in two fields of college preparatory science such as biology, chemistry, physics, or earth and physical science, one recommended as a laboratory science.

d. **Social Studies (3 units).** Shall include one year of U.S. history, one year of global studies (world history, geography, etc.), and one year of a social studies elective (government strongly recommended).

e. **Other College Preparatory (2 units).** May be foreign language (highly recommended), computer science, fine and performing arts, or other college preparatory electives including advanced-level vocational-technical courses. (Units need not be in same subject.)

**Alternatives to the Subject Requirements.** (Any one of the following.)

a. Score an average of 410 or above (1230 total) on three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and a third of the student’s choice).

b. Take make-up course work (high school or college-level) for specific subject requirements missed in high school and achieve a passing grade. (One three hour college-level, term course is equal to one unit of high school work.)

c. Earn a minimum of 2.00 GPA in 12 hours of (OSU, UO) or 9 hours (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of prescribed summer session college-level work at the respective campus for UO, OSU, and PSU, or at any accredited college for EOSC, OIT, SOSC, and WOSC.

4. **Grade Point Average Requirement.** To be admitted, students must have a grade point average in all graded subjects taken towards graduation in four years of high school of 3.00 (UO), 2.75 (OSU), 2.50 (PSU, SOSC, WOSC), 2.50 (EOSC, except 2.00 for students from Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Union, Wallowa, Wheeler, and noncommunity college portions of Baker and Malheur counties), and 2.25 (OIT).
Alternatives to the GPA Requirement. (Either of the following.)

a. SAT or ACT scores and high school grades to predict a 2.00 college GPA (UO, OSU); 890 SAT or 20 ACT (PSU, OIT); 890 SAT or 20 ACT or 2.00 predicted college GPA (EOSC, SOSC, WOSC).

b. Earn a minimum of 2.00 GPA in 12 hours (OSU) or 9 hours (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of prescribed summer session college-level work at the respective campus for OSU, and PSU, or at any accredited college for EOSC, OIT, SOSC, and WOSC.

OREGON TRANSFER STUDENTS

1. To be admitted as a transfer student, resident applicants must have a minimum GPA of 2.00 in 30 credit hours (UO, OSU, PSU) or 24 credit hours (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of acceptable college work.

2. Students who have accumulated 12 or more credit hours of collegiate work, but fewer than 30 (UO, OSU, PSU) or 24 (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) must meet the freshman admission requirements above and have a 2.00 GPA average in all college work attempted.

FIVE PERCENT SPECIAL ADMISSION

1. Institutions are authorized to admit a quota of freshmen totaling no more than five percent of the institution's first-time freshmen class for the previous academic year as exceptions to the stated admission requirements. To qualify for five percent special admission, applicants are considered on a case-by-case basis.

NONRESIDENT STUDENTS

To be admitted to freshman standing\(^2\), nonresident students need to fulfill each of the requirements (or alternatives) as specified in 1 through 4 below:

1. High School Graduation. Public high school graduates must have been graduated from a standard or accredited high school. Private high school graduates must have been graduated from an accredited high school.

   Nongraduates to be admitted must have (1) a minimum score of 40 on each of the five subtests of the Test of General Educational Development (GED) and (2) an average score for the five tests of 58 (UO, OSU, SOSC), 55 (WOSC), 51 (EOSC), 46 (PSU), 45 (OIT).

   Graduates of nonstandard or unaccredited high schools must have (1) a minimum score of 970 SAT or 22 ACT (UO, OSU) or 890 SAT or 20 ACT (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) and (2) an average of 410 or above (1230 total) on three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and a third of the student’s choice); or meet the prescribed summer session admission alternative.

\(^2\) Students with any college credit note Nonresident Transfer Student requirement.
2. **Admission Tests.** Must submit scores of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or American College Test (ACT). Except as alternatives to the GPA and as noted below, scores are not used for admission decisions, but are used for guidance and placement purposes.

   a. To enroll at UO and OSU, students must score a minimum of 30 on the SAT-Test of Standard Written English or 12 on the ACT-English subtest.

   b. To enroll at SOSC, students must score a minimum of 30 TSNE or 15 ACT-English or take Writing 40 at an extra fee.

3. **Subject Requirement.** Must satisfactorily complete fourteen units (one year equal to one unit) of college preparatory work in the following subject areas:

   a. **English (4 units).** Shall include the study of the English language, literature, speaking and listening, and writing, with emphasis on and frequent practice in writing expository prose during all four years.

   b. **Mathematics (3 units).** Shall include first year algebra and two additional years of college preparatory mathematics such as geometry (deductive or descriptive) advanced topics in algebra, trigonometry, analytical geometry, finite mathematics, advanced applications, calculus, probability and statistics, or courses that integrate topics from two or more of these areas. One unit is highly recommended in the senior year. (Algebra and geometry taken prior to the ninth grade will be accepted.)

   c. **Science (2 units).** Shall include a year each in two fields of college preparatory science such as biology, chemistry, physics, or earth and physical science; one recommended as a laboratory science.

   d. **Social Studies (3 units).** Shall include one year of U.S. history, one year of global studies (world history, geography, etc.), and one year of a social studies elective (government strongly recommended).

   e. **Other College Preparatory (2 units).** May be foreign language (highly recommended), computer science, fine and performing arts, or other college preparatory electives including advanced-level vocational-technical courses. (Units need not be in same subject.)

**Alternatives to the Subject Requirements.** (Any of the following.)

   a. Score an average of 410 or above (1230 total) on three College Board Achievement Tests (English, Math Level I or II, and a third of the student's choice).
b. Take make-up course work (high school or college-level) for specific subject requirements missed in high school and achieve a passing grade. (One three hour college-level, term course is equal to one unit of high school work.)

c. Earn a minimum of 2.00 GPA in 12 hours (OSU) or 9 hours (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of prescribed summer session college-level work at the respective campus for OSU, and PSU, or at any accredited college for EOSC, OIT, SOSC, and WOSC.

4. Grade Point Average Requirement. To be admitted, nonresident students must have a grade point average in all graded subjects taken towards graduation in four years of high school of 3.00 (UO), 2.75 (OSU), 2.50 (PSU, EOSC, SOSC, WOSC), and 2.25 (OIT).

Alternatives to the GPA Requirement. (Either of the following.)

a. UO, OSU, PSU: SAT (or ACT) scores and high school grades to predict a 2.00 college GPA;

   EOSC, SOSC, WOSC: 890 SAT (or 20 ACT) score or SAT (or ACT) scores and high school grades to predict 2.00 college GPA;

   OIT: have a minimum score of 890 SAT (or 20 ACT).

b. Earn a minimum of 2.00 in 12 hours (OSU, UO) or 9 hours (PSU, EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of prescribed summer session college-level work at the respective campus for UO, OSU, and PSU, or at any accredited college for EOSC, OIT, SOSC, and WOSC.

NONRESIDENT TRANSFER STUDENTS

1. Nonresident applicants must have a minimum GPA of 2.25 in 30 hours (UO, OSU, PSU) or 2.00 in 24 hours (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) of acceptable college work.

2. Nonresident students who have accumulated 12 or more hours of collegiate work, but fewer than 30 (UO, OSU, PSU) or 24 (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) must meet the freshman admission requirements above and have a minimum GPA of 2.25 (UO, OSU, PSU) or 2.00 (EOSC, OIT, SOSC, WOSC) in all college work attempted.

FIVE PERCENT SPECIAL ADMISSION

1. Institutions are authorized to admit a quota of freshmen totaling no more than five percent of the institution’s first-time freshman class for the previous academic year as exceptions to the stated admission requirements. To qualify for five percent special admission, applicants are considered on a case-by-case basis.