REGULAR MEETING OF THE
OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

January 19, 1996

ROLL CALL

MINUTES APPROVED

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT
   IFS Report
   President Emeritus for John V. Byrne

ACTION ITEM
   Linus Pauling Institute, OSU

REPORT ITEM
   Finance and Administration
      Independent Auditor's Report

ACTION ITEMS
   Finance and Administration
      Master Plan, PSU
   Revision to Campus Boundaries, WOSC
   Revision to Campus Boundaries, OIT
   Sale of President's Residence, WOSC

REPORT ITEM
   Finance and Administration
      Purchase of President's Residence, OIT
ACTION ITEMS

Finance and Administration
OAR 580-020-0100, OSSHE Human Resources System 18

Early Retirement Program 21

Policies Related to Reimbursement From Outside Sources & Travel Awards 23

Amendment to OAR 580-040-0035, Summer Session Fee Book 25

CONSENT ITEM

Appointment to Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee 32

COMMITTEES

Joint Boards Working Group 34

REPORT ITEMS

Academic Affairs
Report by Dr. Peter Ewell, Senior Associate, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) 35

Projects Funded through RFP for Academic Productivity & Educational Reform: Moving Toward the 2010 Vision 38

1995-96 Enrollment Report 44

ROUTINE ITEM

Finance and Administration
Summary of Facilities Contracting Activities 47

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS 48

ADJOURNMENT 49
ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 10:25 a.m. by President Les Swanson.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Dr. Herb Aschkenasy
Ms. Diane Christopher
Mr. Tom Imeson
Ms. Gail McAllister
Mr. Rob Miller
Mr. Mark Rhinard
Ms. April Waddy
Mr. Les Swanson

Mr. Willis arrived later in the meeting. Mr. Bailey was absent due to inclement weather; Ms. Puentes had a business conflict.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the November 17 and December 15, 1995, meetings of the Board. Ms. McAllister moved and Mr. Miller seconded the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, and Swanson. Those voting no: none. Directors Rhinard and Waddy were out of the room at the time the vote was taken. Mr. Willis was absent for this vote.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Swanson welcomed the Board to the first meeting of the new year and extended best wishes to all.

President Swanson expressed regrets that he was not able to attend the inaugural ceremonies for President Youngblood at Western Oregon State College. He and others were detained because of the bad weather. He congratulated Dr. Youngblood on officially becoming the president of Western.

Dr. Paul Risser was welcomed as the new president of Oregon State University. He was attending his first Board meeting in that capacity.

President Swanson congratulated the University of Oregon on its appearance in the Cotton Bowl. Although the final outcome was not
what had been hoped for, it was nevertheless a privilege for the University to represent Oregon in one of the Bowl games.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Cox added his welcome to President Paul Risser and introduced his wife, Les Risser, to the Board.

Vice Chancellor Shirley Clark was welcomed back to full-time status after a very difficult several months due to the illness and subsequent death of her husband, Dr. John Clark. "Dr. Clark has never been very far from work and we admire her courage and resiliency. It is great to have you 'all the way' back to work," the Chancellor added.

Chancellor Cox observed that exciting work is underway in the Task Forces. The dialogues, according to Dr. Cox, are provocative and challenging, and he expressed confidence in positive outcomes of the deliberations of the groups.

Over the past several weeks, Chancellor Cox reported that, by invitation, he had the opportunity to make several major presentations to the Board of Directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce at their annual retreat; the Board of the Oregon Associated Industries; and to the Board of the Oregon Business Council. "In all of those cases," the Chancellor said, "I am attempting to articulate the planning process in which we are engaged. The response has been overwhelmingly positive and encouraging, particularly because we are listening and responding creatively to the challenges rather than defensively.

"When I left the meeting of the Oregon Business Council, I came away with a new sense of urgency that the private sector in the state desperately needs our help, needs our collaboration. We must be open and listen, and we are in the process of doing that. I appreciate the fine work our presidents are doing also in this same endeavor."

A further development was noted in the continuing collaborative efforts between OSSHE and the community colleges. President Dave Gilbert and Eastern Oregon State College are engaged in conversations with Blue Mountain and Treasure Valley Community Colleges, exploring ways to more efficiently and effectively deliver services east of the mountains. "This fits perfectly with our overall strategy of collaboration and lines up with the imperative from the Governor to maximize our resources," Dr. Cox observed.
Chancellor Cox introduced Martha Sargent, new president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS). Ms. Sargent observed that Provost Reardon's presentation during the Portland State University visitation coincided with her comments. "My professional training is in accounting, but I enjoy studying organizational theory. Organizational theorists attempt to look at the environment of business, the product of the services they offer, their personnel, and classify them and talk about how they should best be managed.

"I looked up where colleges and universities fit and the category is called the 'professional bureaucracy,' which includes accounting and legal firms, places where the work must be done by a highly trained, highly skilled, highly educated, and highly independent workforce. Managing these kinds of businesses should be easy. However, it is much more difficult because the core is independent with their own work but they also seem to want to have a say in what happens to the organization as a whole. Many studies have shown that in a professional bureaucracy, to achieve the success that everyone wants, it takes a democratic process that involves that professional core, in our case, the faculty.

"Thank you for including us at the table during the Board work sessions. Thank you for putting us on the Task Forces. Thank you for assuming that is the right thing to do."

Chancellor Cox reported that officials at Oregon State University have recommended that the status of President Emeritus be conferred on Dr. John V. Byrne, effective January 1, 1996. "I heartily endorse this recommendation. There will be many other opportunities for the Board and all of us to celebrate the immense, marvelous, and never-ending contributions that John and Shirley Byrne have made and a career life at Oregon State that spans 30 years.

"John has been a professor of Oceanic and Atmospheric Sciences and, for the last 11 years, president of Oregon State University. These have been 11 difficult, challenging, and rewarding years. The tremendous admiration we have for John goes beyond description. At this time I simply want to note his tireless dedication to higher standards and absolute quest for excellence even in difficult times. His immense leadership capability has guided Oregon State University during good times and bad and assured its continued leadership
as an excellent and outstanding academic, research, and service institution. He has been a true asset for Oregon.

"I recommend the Board approve the designation of President Emeritus for Dr. John Byrne."

President Swanson moved and Ms. Christopher seconded a motion to designate Dr. John V. Byrne president emeritus of Oregon State University, effective January 1, 1996. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, and Swanson. Those voting no: none. Director Willis was absent for this vote.

Introduction

Oregon State University proposes to enter into an agreement with the Linus Pauling Institute of Science and Medicine (LPISM) now located in Palo Alto, California, to transfer the Institute to Oregon State University. Institutes and centers allow the University to focus the full skills and knowledge of its research faculty on needs to improve understanding, apply knowledge, and train future generations of scientists.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

Oregon State University's mission is to serve the people of Oregon, the nation, and the world through research, education, and service. As a Land, Sea, and Space Grant University, Oregon State University has a special responsibility for research and education.

The Linus Pauling Institute (LPI) would conduct research in areas of micronutrients, microconstituents, health, and disease, and apply the findings to health promotion and disease prevention. These areas of research are closely aligned with Oregon State University's mission.
2. **Evidence of Need**

Oregon State University is actively engaged in research in a variety of areas of interest to LPI. OSU offers a range of undergraduate and graduate programs in the sciences (e.g., chemistry, microbiology, physics) and health and food sciences (e.g., health and safety administration, environmental health management, public health, health care administration, pharmacy, community health, dietetics, food science). LPI would greatly strengthen Oregon State University's research programs.

3. **Quality of the Proposed Center**

LPISM was founded to carry out excellent research in health and disease. It has been a leader in the field. The future research of LPI in Oregon will be the study of the application of nutritional factors to health promotion and disease prevention.

Future programs in other fields (such as chemistry, molecular biology, physics, genetics, medicine, ethnics, and peace) may be undertaken when resources and circumstances permit. LPI will continue the commitment to health and scientific education, including dissemination of health information, implementation of outreach strategies, and convening of scientific conferences.

4. **Adequacy of Resources to Support the Center**

LPI will be established and operate under guidelines set by Oregon State University and as approved by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education. LPISM's assets will be transferred to the Oregon State University Foundation, and Oregon State University will use them to support an endowed Chair for the Scientific Director of LPI and to fulfill the purpose and mission of LPI. A Memorandum of Understanding will be entered into with LPISM.

Oregon State University will provide space and facilities for LPI and will bear the expense of renovation of laboratory and office space to be occupied by LPI. This is space that has
been vacated because of relocation of laboratories to new buildings.

Oregon State University has agreed to assign a major gift development officer to raise funds to enhance LPI programs and facilities, and Oregon State University will extend its full range of development services to LPI. Initially, the fundraising priorities for LPI will be to house and equip the Institute and to enhance an endowed position for the LPI Scientific Director. A campaign will be initiated soon to raise funds for a permanent facility to house LPI. LPISM agrees to transfer its donor records to Oregon State University.

**Faculty.** Oregon State University will identify and hire a highly qualified world-class scientific director for LPI, who will have an academic appointment in an appropriate Oregon State University department.

LPI will be staffed at the discretion of the University. Scientists will be faculty and shall have academic appointments in Oregon State University departments.

**Library.** No additional library resources will be required.

**Facilities and Equipment.** Ownership of LPISM office and scientific equipment and supplies will be transferred to the Oregon State University Foundation with the condition that such material be used by Oregon State University for LPI. LPISM has agreed to provide Oregon State University an inventory of the equipment, office furniture, supplies, and other non-monetary assets. LPISM will cover the expense of relocation of any personnel and physical inventory to Oregon State University.

LPISM will transfer ownership and copyright of its books and archives. Any revenue from the sale or licensing of these materials will be restricted to use by LPI. In addition, LPISM grants and contracts will be transferred to Oregon State University as appropriate.

**Budget Impact.** No new funds are required to establish and operate LPI for the foreseeable future.
5. **Duplication.** No similar centers or institutes are operated in Oregon colleges or universities.

**Program Review**

Transfer of LPISM to Oregon State University was discussed by the OSSHE Academic Council at its meeting on January 18, 1996.

Oregon State University will create an external advisory committee for LPI. Members of the advisory committee will be appointed by the president upon recommendation of the dean of research. The committee will advise the dean and director on program directions, senior staffing, structure, and opportunities for LPI.

Oregon State University recognizes the importance of continuity of goals in the establishment and future direction of LPI at Oregon State University. Therefore, the initial committee shall include a member of the Pauling family. Furthermore, current LPISM trustees will be offered membership on the LPI External Advisory Committee.

In addition to the external advisory committee, Oregon State University will appoint an internal advisory committee, composed of Oregon State University faculty and administrators, to advise the dean and the director on program directions, senior staffing, structure, and opportunities for LPI.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended the Board authorize relocation of the Linus Pauling Institute to Oregon State University.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Vice Chancellor Clark reminded the Board that, at the November meeting, Chancellor Cox advised them of ongoing negotiations between the Linus Pauling Institute of Science and Medicine and Oregon State University. Those negotiations have largely been concluded, the essence of which is included in the staff report in the docket materials.

President Risser was asked to provide more background on the Institute. First he took the opportunity to thank Dr. Byrne for not only
being an excellent leader for Oregon State University during the past 11 years, but also for laying the groundwork for the type of institution he wanted to lead. In addition, he acknowledged the superb way Dr. Byrne had assisted in his beginning days. "I want to publicly thank him and Shirley for helping Les and me.

"Turning to the business at hand, the initiative of the Linus Pauling Institute for Science and Medicine was begun by Dr. Byrne, and his dedication and vision have brought us to today. We are proposing to move the Institute from Palo Alto, California, to Oregon State University. This is an institute that has conducted research on medicine, primarily vitamins and organic and inorganic materials and their effect on health and disease. The research has been noteworthy in many ways, and some has been controversial. Now it will become a part of the University. The opportunity we have here is to bring the best parts of the Institute to match the kinds of research that we are currently engaged in at Oregon State and the assets will move with this transfer. We have the obligation from the endowment to hire a first-class scientific director for the Institute. We will accept the donor list and the obligation to raise funds for the Institute.

"I think this is an opportunity for us to bring the best of this Institute to Oregon State and the state of Oregon will benefit from these resources."

Dr. Aschkenasy asked if the Institute would be self-supporting. President Risser indicated that it would be from public and private funds.

Ms. Christopher moved approval of the staff recommendation. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, and Swanson. Those voting no: none. Director Willis was absent for this vote.

The OSSHE financial statements for the fiscal year ending June 30,1995, have been audited by a private audit firm, Deloitte & Touche, LLP, Independent Public Accountants. The use of Deloitte & Touche was authorized and monitored by the State's Division of Audits. The auditors have concluded that the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of OSSHE, and they have issued an unqualified opinion. Copies of the financial statements have been previously mailed to Board members.
In addition, Deloitte & Touche will provide to Board members a management letter that includes comments and recommendations for improvement in internal controls. Responses to the internal control recommendations from OSSHE institutions and the Chancellor's Office are included in the management letter.

Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Ihrig introduced Mr. Tom Ihlan from Deloitte & Touche, the external auditors for OSSHE. He indicated that the Board had received copies of the full auditor's report for fiscal year 1994-95, as well as letters from the firm regarding the audit. The Executive Committee met prior to the Board meeting with the independent auditor and the state auditor without any staff from the Chancellor's Office except the Internal Auditor. This provided an opportunity to raise any concerns about the report.

Mr. Ihlan indicated that this is the second year of a contract with the Audit Division of the Secretary of State. He reported that his firm had received the full cooperation of the State System management and institutions. "We work with a lot of different people and I want to commend you on the very high-quality people at the colleges and universities, and the Chancellor's Office. They are very dedicated and hard working."

Mr. Ihlan indicated that the report was an unqualified opinion. "The only difference in the report from this year and last year is that there is a reference to the fact that OHSU had separate auditors and our opinion on the financial statement is dependent also on the report of the other auditors on Oregon Health Sciences University.

"The other two reports are required communications with the Board. One area deals with significant audit adjustments. There is a note that deals with the fact that the separate auditors and the financial statements for Oregon Health Sciences, when they prepared the financial statements for this year, did change some of their accounting policies from what the State System uses and this was to provide notice that the financial statements included in the report for Oregon Health Sciences University have been converted back to the accounting policies followed by the State System."
"We consider the internal control structure the State System uses in order to determine the audit procedures for the purposes of expressing an opinion on financial statements. Based upon that study of internal control, we noted no matters that we consider to be material weaknesses."

Mr. Miller asked for clarification regarding leasing equipment and bonding for equipment and the use of Certificates of Participation (COPs). Mr. Ihrig indicated that either method can be used and it is primarily a matter of obtaining the best price for the purchase.

In concluding the report of the independent auditors, Mr. Ihrig thanked Deloitte & Touche for the excellent report. In addition, he thanked Don Waggoner of the State Audit Division for making it possible for the State System to use an external auditor.

(No Board action required)

MASTER PLAN, PSU

The Board's Internal Management Directive (IMD) 7.100 requires each institution to prepare a long-range campus development plan to serve as a basis for making decisions about the facilities needed to support its instructional, research, and service programs. OAR 580-50-001(1) requires that the Board determine that any such plan complies with Statewide Planning Goals and is compatible with applicable local comprehensive plans. In addition, by practice, the Board of Higher Education approves new campus master plans at least once every ten years and updates at least once every five years. Portland State University's plan was reviewed in 1990.

In 1994, Portland State University and the City of Portland launched a unique planning effort that tied together the City's goals for the adjacent neighborhoods with the long-range plans of the University. The result is the University District, a 52-block area of downtown Portland including and surrounding Portland State University. Plans for each block of the area have been developed in concept, and public and private funding for the area's redevelopment in accordance with these plans is being sought and, in a few cases, already secured. Housing, retail, transportation, and education all figure prominently in these plans.
The University District, approved by the City Council in April 1995, has served as a catalyst for a variety of public and private development plans. Portland State University and the Portland Public Schools are currently moving toward agreement to construct an elementary school on campus as part of a planned student housing project. Redevelopment of a private parking lot with 220 units of non-University affordable housing is likely to get underway early in 1996. The transit mall will be extended onto the campus, already the biggest generator of transit ridership in the state; a street car linking Northwest 23rd and the River District through downtown to Portland State University is being designed and its alignment engineered with an ultimate extension to Oregon Health Sciences University as part of the design; and the north-south light rail is planning a station on the campus.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development expressed strong support for the University-City partnership embodied in the University District and has created a high-level task force to work with Portland State University and the City to help make the redevelopment of the campus and its environs a reality.

The University District defines Portland State University's long-range campus development plan. Such plans, by their nature, will continue to evolve as new opportunities arise. Any future adjustments will be brought to the Board for approval.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board find that the University District plan, prepared and presented by Portland State University, complies with Statewide Planning Goals and is compatible with the land use plans of the jurisdictions in which the campus is located. Staff recommended further that the Board accept and approve the University District plan.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Ihrig reminded the Board that the Internal Management Directives require institutions to have Board approval for changes in their master plan. The campus master plans set up the overall boundaries of the institution and the University District Plan for Portland State University is significant within the metropolitan area.
Dr. Ramaley, president of Portland State University, indicated that the institution is a vital part of a new development called "Central City 2000," which calls for a revitalization of downtown Portland. "With the Board's concurrence," President Ramaley explained, "we are creating the University District -- an urban neighborhood -- which was approved in the City plan in April of 1995. We will be stimulating local business, contributing to light rail, and changing the patterns of public movement within the central city and surrounding counties. I believe what you will watch happening in Portland is the emergence of a new form of relationship between public universities and their communities reflecting new funding strategies, new development strategies in capacity building, and new ways of thinking about what excellence means."

President Ramaley explained that what the Board would be seeing would be a map of opportunity that would develop over the years shown now as a conceptual design, knowing that the individual components will change.

Vice President George Pemsteiner pointed out for the Board the kind of planning that has been occurring with the City of Portland. "We have an agreement, in concept, with the superintendent of schools, as we build student housing on the upper floors, we will build and lease back to the schools space for an elementary school. This is expected to open fall term of 1998. Our overall framework is to talk about the University as a community -- housing, retail, university and public schools, and a cultural core of Portland, linked," Mr. Pernsteiner emphasized.

Dr. Aschkenasy asked what assumptions Portland State University was using regarding the size of the student population. Mr. Pernsteiner responded that the plan can and would continue regardless of whether the additional numbers are realized. "If they do come to the University, we would be able to provide the academic space to serve those students." To Ms. Christopher's questions regarding the period of time for completion, Mr. Pernsteiner remarked that most of the development would take place over the next seven to ten years. Another important feature of the project is the proposal to locate Waseda University within the University District.
Mr. Swanson observed that this plan is a very exciting development for Portland State University and indicates a great deal of hard work over the years.

Ms. McAllister moved and Ms. Christopher seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, and Swanson. Those voting no: none. Director Willis was absent for this vote.

Summary

During the past year, Western Oregon State College reviewed and updated the "Campus Development Plan for Western Oregon State College, July 1987." As a result of this review, an "Interim Update, Western Oregon State College Campus Master Plan, June 1995" (Update Plan) has been prepared. The Update Plan revealed a pressing need for more classroom space in the core of the campus. In order to meet this need, it will be necessary to expand the campus boundaries.

Staff Report to the Board

The Update Plan identified a clear and pressing need for more classroom space within the core of the campus. The campus core is defined as within a five-minute walking distance to the library. In order to provide more options for building sites within the campus core, the College has attempted to have Monmouth Avenue, which runs through the center of campus, closed to vehicle traffic; however, pressure from surrounding neighbors prevented the closure. The alternative is to relocate nonclassroom programs currently within the core to the perimeter of campus. The land on all sides of the campus, except that on the west side of the playing fields located in the northwest portion of campus, are developed and unavailable for campus expansion. However, the owner of the undeveloped parcel to the west of the playing fields has decided to sell the property and has offered the College the first opportunity to purchase the property. The parcel consists of approximately 34 acres, 18 of which the College is interested in acquiring. A portion of the 18-acre parcel is within the City of Monmouth boundaries, and the remainder is within the urban growth boundary of the City. All of the area is zoned low-density residential. Western Oregon State College officials have indicated
that they should be able to have the zoning changed to Public Service-College. Any acquisition of the property would be dependent upon first obtaining a zoning change.

The College is requesting that the 18-acre parcel be incorporated and made a part of the campus. In addition, the College is requesting authority to begin negotiations with the owner to acquire the parcel. The owner has offered it to the College for $360,000. The College is in the process of having an appraisal made of the parcel. If the College is not able to acquire this land, it is felt that it will be purchased by others and developed, thus making any future acquisition prohibitively expensive. Funding for the purchase will come from funds available to the Board and institution.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the campus boundaries of Western Oregon State College be expanded to include the 18-acre parcel of land currently owned by Mrs. Margaret L. Schultz and that College officials be authorized to begin negotiations with the owner for the purchase at a price not to exceed $360,000.

Board Discussion and Action

Since there is a great deal of residential building occurring around Western Oregon State College, Vice Chancellor Ihrig underscored the importance of purchasing the adjacent land to enable future campus expansion. Ms. McAllister asked how the land would be paid for and Mr. Ihrig indicated it would come from funds generated over time by the institution.

Ms. Christopher moved and Ms. McAllister seconded the staff recommendation. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, and Swanson. Those voting no: none. Director Willis was absent for this vote.

Summary

The Oregon Institute of Technology campus is experiencing ever-increasing pressure on its boundaries, as adjacent properties are being developed for commercial and residential uses. In order to preserve
sufficient land to allow for future campus expansion and to have the ability to control access and use of existing institutional property, Oregon Institute of Technology officials are requesting that the campus boundaries be expanded by approximately 73 acres.

Staff Report to the Board

In past years, the Oregon Institute of Technology campus was relatively isolated and did not have to deal with the current urbanization of the neighborhood. Recently the industrial park to the west of campus, and the hospital and related amenities to the south and west, have expanded. Additionally, there are plans to build retirement or other housing to the east of campus. The college has two major concerns: increased traffic on college-owned streets and the potential for a loss or lessening of the geothermal water available to the college for heating of all college facilities if the immediately adjacent land is developed, thus encircling or abutting many of the Oregon Institute of Technology wells.

The campus was originally designed to have perimeter automobile access, with parking and pedestrian ways each offset to create a quiet, safe, and uncluttered campus core. To preserve this design, it will be necessary to acquire the adjacent undeveloped parcels. The parcels that are being requested to be included within the campus boundaries are those whose topography have the most potential for development by the college or other owner. A Master Plan update process is currently underway, which will recommend a revision of the campus boundaries.

All of the parcels have recently been placed on the market, and building/development activity in the area is running very high. Campus officials do not expect the undeveloped parcels to remain vacant land very long. It would be the intent of college officials to acquire the additional parcels as funds become available, either through state appropriation, from gifts and grants, or any other source available to the college.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the campus boundaries of Oregon Institute of Technology be expanded to include the 73 acres of land to the north and east of campus.
Meeting #649

January 19, 1996

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Ihrig indicated that Oregon Institute of Technology is observing development that is occurring around the campus. The proposal before the Board is to allow expansion of the current campus boundaries to include 73 acres. This will enable the campus to expand in the future when land goes on the market.

Ms. Christopher moved and Ms. Waddy seconded the staff recommendation. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, and Swanson. Those voting no: none. Director Willis was absent for this vote.

Summary

At the September 15, 1995, meeting, the Board approved taking action for the sale of the old president's residence at Western Oregon State College. At that time the Office of Finance and Administration agreed to return to the Board for approval to sell the residence. WOSC officials now report that they have a buyer for the residence at 395 S. College Street.

Staff Report to the Board

College officials at Western Oregon State College report that after the September meeting appropriate steps were taken regarding the sale of state property, including offering the property to other state and local agencies. The property was appraised by a real estate appraiser and valued at $147,500, after which the residence was advertised for sale. College officials now have a willing buyer, who has signed an earnest money agreement and paid a $1,000 deposit to purchase the residence for $149,500. This is above the estimate that College officials had expected to receive for the residence and is equal to the price paid for the new president's residence. As reported at the October meeting, the proceeds from this sale will be used to fund the purchase of the new president's residence.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Office of Finance and Administration be authorized to proceed with the sale of the property at 395 S. College Street to Mr. & Mrs. John R. Bowman.
Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Imeson moved and Ms. Christopher seconded the staff recommendation. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, and Swanson. Those voting no: none. Director Willis was absent for this vote.

Summary

Officials at Oregon Institute of Technology have been reviewing several properties in Klamath Falls as a replacement for the president's residence necessitated by having to vacate the current president's residence. A residence at 909 Lorna Linda has been located, and an option for $240,000 has been signed.

Staff Report to the Board

At the Board's December 15, 1995, meeting, staff reported that the owner of the residence being leased for the Oregon Institute of Technology president wished to occupy the house and was ending the lease. College officials have since contacted several local realtors for help in locating a suitable residence for the president. As a result, a residence at 909 Loma Linda has been offered to the state for $240,000. The residence is owned by Peggie P. Eccles and is located on the side of a hill with other executive-type homes about 1.5 miles from campus. The house is approximately 37 years old and has 3,800 square feet of living space situated on two lots. An appraisal was made on the home, and it has been valued at $240,000.

A professional home inspection has been completed, and the inspector gave the house an excellent rating, scoring 9 on a scale of 10. The inspection did indicate some minor conditions that would need attention, including installing ground fault interrupters (not required when the house was constructed) and repairing the air conditioning system. The home is heated by a geothermal well that is shared with two neighbors. The house has brick siding, the roof was replaced about two years ago, and the plumbing was recently checked and all toilet fixtures modernized. The house has formal living and dining rooms, family room, four bedrooms, hobby room, playroom, four bathrooms, a laundry room, and a six-car, heated garage. The house is very attractive from the street and is disabled accessible. A deck along the west side of the house overlooks...
Klamath Falls. The house has many storage closets, a gas fireplace, and a small, very well landscaped yard with underground sprinklers. The layout of the house will serve the president very well when entertaining.

The house will need some carpeting, painting, wallpapering, and a smoke detector system, as well as repairs to the air conditioning system.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Board

1995 Oregon Laws, Chapter 612, (SB 271) requires the Oregon State System of Higher Education, in accordance with rules adopted by the State Board of Higher Education, to implement a personnel system for classified and management service employees separate from the system administered by the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) under ORS Chapter 240. The proposed rule delegates authority to the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, or designee, and the institutions to develop, implement, and maintain a personnel system, including a job evaluation and compensation plan for its employees. OSSHE institutions are currently operating under DAS personnel rules and policies for classified and management service employees.

Senate Bill 271 provides the opportunity to create a new personnel system that is less costly, more efficient, and more responsive to the needs of higher education employees and managers. The role of the Chancellor’s Office will be to provide leadership, consultation to the institutions, and policy development and coordination across the System. The institutions will assume responsibility for decision-making wherever possible and for the ongoing operation of the new personnel system. To this end, nine task force groups have been appointed with institutional leadership and participation: Employee Relations, Labor Relations, Recruitment and Selection, Position Management, Records, Job Evaluation and Compensation, Benefits, Training, and Human Resource Information Systems. Watson Wyatt Worldwide, a national consulting firm, has been retained to assist with the transition and to bring best practices and new thinking to the process. The Chancellor’s Office Human Resources Division is providing coordination and leadership for the project.
Some positive changes have already occurred, and others will be accomplished over the next several months. On November 1, OSSHE stopped transmitting duplicate personnel data to DAS. Also in November, a simplified, more efficient process for position changes was implemented. Collective bargaining directly between OSSHE and the Oregon Public Employees Union (OPEU) has begun on a positive note. On February 1, the institutions are prepared to assume responsibility for all recruitment and selection of classified and management service employees. From February until July, the task force groups will be working on employee relations policies and processes for unrepresented employees, and a new compensation and job evaluation system will be evaluated. An evaluation of group insurance plans will begin in July.

The Chancellor’s Office Human Resources Division and the campus human resources offices concurrently are working on developing written internal management directives, policies, and procedures to implement the new system. Some internal management directives and policies will apply to all seven institutions, while others will be campus specific. Significant accomplishments with the new personnel system will be reported to the Board as they occur.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following Oregon Administrative Rule:

**Human Resources System**

580-020-0100  (1) The Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, or designee, shall develop, implement, and maintain a human resources system to include:

(a) A job evaluation system for positions within the State System of Higher Education;

(b) A plan for compensating employees consistent with the job evaluation system; and

(c) Policies for employees not covered by collective bargaining agreements relating to leave, lay-offs, terminations, grievances, and other terms of employment.

(2) Each institution is responsible for evaluating jobs and allocating them according to the job evaluation system and assuring
that employee compensation is in accordance with the compensation plan.

(3) The Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, or designee, shall engage in collective bargaining with any certified or recognized exclusive employee representative.

(4) Each institution shall develop, implement, and maintain recruitment and selection methods designed to achieve a qualified and diverse workforce.

(5) Until the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, or designee, and the institutions implement internal management directives or policies for job evaluation, compensation, recruitment, terms of employment and position management, the rules and procedures established by the Department of Administrative Services, under ORS Chapter 240 as they existed on the effective date of 1995 Oregon Laws, Chapter 612, (July 1, 1995) shall apply to the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Board Discussion and Action

As part of the implementation of SB 271, the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act, OSSHE staff have moved on the design of a personnel system for classified and management service employees. Vice Chancellor Ihrig highlighted the important aspects of the revised Oregon Administrative Rule. "We have ten task force groups working on various areas such as recruitment, selection, administrative appointments, labor relations, information system, management, and training. The role of the Chancellor's Office is to coordinate these efforts. The bottom line, of course, is to operate our personnel systems more effectively and efficiently. We will come back to you to let you how we are operating the system and how well it is going. These rules are the operating policies that give us the authority to proceed. We will continue to use the Department of Administrative Services rules as they existed last July 1995, until we come up with our own policies.

"I need to make two corrections to what appeared in the docket material," Mr. Ihrig continued. "Paragraph (1) should read, 'The Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration or designee, shall develop, implement, and maintain a human resources system for nonacademic employees to include:'"
"Finally, the number of the rule is incorrect in the docket." Vice Chancellor Ihrig said that staff would correct it before filing.

Mr. Rhinard asked what the timeframe was for bringing the general directives to the Board. Mr. Ihrig indicated that it would be over time and would probably take the rest of the academic year. Following up, Mr. Rhinard asked if the general directives were to allow the campuses to create their own personnel procedures. Mr. Ihrig responded that there will be a Systemwide job evaluation system and compensation plan. Decision making within that will be done at the campus and departmental levels on the campuses, assuring that decisions are made closer to the users.

Ms. Christopher asked how collective bargaining with Oregon Public Employees Union would be handled. In response, Mr. Ihrig indicated that the Board would receive more information during the Executive Session scheduled for noon. The State System will be the negotiation team for collective bargaining and those agreements would be reported to the Board. Joe Sicotte, Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, has been designated as the System negotiator.

Ms. Christopher moved approval of the staff recommendation with the changes noted above and Mr. Miller seconded the motion. On roll call the following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, Willis, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.

Staff Report to the Board

As the State System continues to accommodate the ongoing reductions in state support, it is important that the campuses have the maximum possible flexibility to adjust staffing as necessary. Such flexibility is a key factor in achieving productivity, as well as diversity, goals throughout the System.

Staffing flexibility is best achieved when there exist positive incentives, such as early retirement options for eligible faculty and staff. The Chancellor’s Office has been working with the campuses to develop appropriate early retirement options for the current biennium.

An early retirement incentive plan being developed would be made available to all eligible unrepresented employees, and the plan could
be offered through collective bargaining to the represented employees. Participants would have to be retirement-eligible by June 30, 1997, and they would have to agree to resign by that date. The plan would be offered at institutional discretion. The incentive would be one-half annual salary and the subsidy of health insurance premiums for seven years.

In addition, a phased retirement plan being developed would be made available to all eligible unrepresented employees and could be offered through collective bargaining to represented employees. Participants would have to be retirement-eligible and agree to leave by December 31, 1998. The incentive would be one-fourth annual salary and seven years of subsidy of health insurance premium. However, the participants would have to agree to accept half-time employment or reassignment by June 30, 1997, and then to resign not later than December 31, 1998.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration be authorized to implement an early retirement/phased retirement incentive plan for OSSHE employees to accomplish the necessary savings for the 1997-1999 biennium.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Vice Chancellor Ihrig indicated that the State System must continue to provide institutions with the maximum possible flexibility to adjust staffing. Therefore, authority was requested to provide two early retirement incentive programs: one direct retirement and the other a phased retirement plan. It is estimated that approximately 2,000 individuals would be eligible throughout OSSHE, probably the largest in a number of years.

Ms. Christopher moved and Ms. Waddy seconded the staff recommendation. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, Willis, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.
The Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act, 1995 Oregon Laws, Chapter 621, authorized the Board to establish its own travel policy. Previously, the Board adopted policies regarding travel awards and reimbursement from outside sources. ORS 351.067 requires the Board to approve receipt of funds or other compensation from outside sources. However, prior to the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act, other statutes or policies prevented OSSHE from adopting the most efficient policies. Staff proposes the following policies that will enable travel to be handled in the most cost-effective way.

Reimbursement from Outside Sources

At its April 1990 meeting, the Board authorized employees to accept reimbursement for travel expenses associated with their participation on advisory bodies and public commissions and in professional organizations related to their work. Not only is faculty members' travel paid from nonstate funds, this type of travel provides an opportunity for faculty members to perform service to a wider community, consistent with institutional missions. Because the Board's authority for compensation prior to the Higher Education Efficiency Act was limited to academic employees, the original policy applied only to academic employees. Staff recommends the Board expand its policy to all OSSHE employees.

Travel Awards

In October 1990, the Board adopted a policy that travel awards, including frequent flyer miles, were compensation and could be used by employees as they chose. The policy was based on a review that indicated that the administrative cost of collecting and tracking miles far exceeded the benefit to OSSHE. OSSHE also surveyed other entities and found that many large businesses had developed similar policies. However, the 1993 legislature enacted legislation requiring employees to use travel awards earned when traveling on state business for future state business. As a result, at its September 1993 meeting, the Board amended its policy to be consistent with state law.

Believing that the Board's original policy is the most cost-efficient, staff recommends that the Board once again authorize employees to use travel awards as they choose unless the terms of a grant or contract require otherwise. At the time that the Board adopted its
original policy, it had authority only to apply it to academic employees. As a result of the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act, the Board may extend its policy to cover all OSSHE employees. Staff recommends that it do so.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following policies related to travel by all OSSHE employees:

Travel Paid by Outside Source

Outside entities may reimburse the campus, pay a service provider directly, or reimburse an employee for travel expenses related to OSSHE business. If the service provider is paid directly, or if reimbursement is made to an employee, documentation should be maintained in the campus travel records. Documentation should include the traveler's name, identity of the outside source, travel destination, travel dates, and OSSHE business purpose. If reimbursement is made to the campus, it should be accounted for as a reduction of expense. When a travel reimbursement payment is made by the foundation, it must be reported by the foundation to the president annually as required by OAR 580-46-035(6)(d).

Travel Awards and Frequent Flyer Mileage

All employees are required to travel using routes, schedules and airlines that provide the lowest rates and most efficient travel. Because the cost of record-keeping outweighs any monetary benefit, OSSHE will not recapture airline bonuses awarded employees for frequent flyer miles. Frequent flyer bonuses may be used by employees as they choose unless the terms of a grant or contract require otherwise.

Board Discussion and Action

Two modifications to policies related to reimbursement for travel were presented for action. Faculty have had permission to accept travel and conference reimbursement when they were invited to participate in a conference. The proposed policies were requested to expand the authority to include staff as well as faculty. Secondly, staff recommended a change in travel awards, including frequent flyer miles,
which would reinstate a decision the Board made in 1990 that was later reversed by legislation.

Under the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act, the State System has the authority to develop its own travel policies to assure the greatest range of flexibility to realize efficiencies. Mr. Imeson agreed with what Vice Chancellor Ihrig proposed, but asked about the political implications of reversing a legislative rule compared to the value. Mr. Ihrig responded that it was a judgment call, but that the former policy was not efficient for either OSSHE or its employees.

Mr. Imeson continued, "It is not a glamorous thing to travel; it is a pain. It seems to me that the policy recognizes this. Beyond that, it is a further pain if you want to try to take advantage of the miles and recoup for the state or whoever paid for the ticket. But it seems that you have to come down pretty strongly on one side or the other. This policy recognizes both that it is a form of compensation if people have to be gone a lot and it would be extremely difficult to track in any meaningful way. Even though it may incur some reaction, I believe it is the right thing to do."

Mr. Willis added that the important thing would be to be prepared for reactions from the legislature.

Mr. Willis moved and Mr. Miller seconded approval of the staff recommendation. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, Willis, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.

**Staff Report to the Board**

Fee rates and policies are set forth in the preliminary Summer Session Fee Book. Rates are recommended for Board approval as submitted by the institutions. A public hearing was conducted January 4, 1996.
Summer Session Instruction Fees

The direct cost support policy for summer instruction, which began in 1982, is continued in the recommendation for 1996. However, the impact of Measure 5 on the institutions has also created the need for a greater contribution from the summer session toward the indirect costs associated with these programs. The direct cost support feature has resulted in institutional fee recommendations that reflect the differences in programs as well as the differences in approaches to balancing program costs with resources. Similarities of the institutional fee structures include incremental charges for each additional credit hour and undergraduate/graduate rate differentials.

Residency status is not normally assigned during summer session and is not applicable to summer fee determination. However, the University of Oregon, following a two-year experiment in assessing a resident/nonresident instruction fee differential, is assessing a nonresident surcharge of an additional $25 per credit hour. This will require a residency determination to be made for University of Oregon summer session students.

Additional resource fees include technology fees at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University. Oregon State University's technology fee is new for summer session 1996, having been first assessed in the 1995-96 academic year. The University of Oregon Law School further assesses a general resource fee with a resident/nonresident differential.

Instruction fee increases have been recommended by five of the seven institutions. Instruction fee rates recommended for 1996 compare with 1995 as follows:
### Instruction Fees - Summer Session 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>1996 First</th>
<th>Each Add' l Hour</th>
<th>1995 First</th>
<th>Each Add' l Hour</th>
<th>Percent Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$97.50</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$95.50</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>101.50</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>101.50</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>119.50</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>115.50</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSC</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>93.50</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>85.50</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996 First</th>
<th>Each Add' l Hour</th>
<th>1995 First</th>
<th>Each Add' l Hour</th>
<th>Percent Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$146.50</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$143.50</td>
<td>$113.00</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law</td>
<td>192.00</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>187.00</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>150.50</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>169.50</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>164.50</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>122.50</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>122.50</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>137.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>130.50</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>122.50</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* OIT offers no graduate courses summer term.

### Resource Fees

The University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University are recommending technology fees for summer session. The University of Oregon is assessing a nonresident surcharge. The University of Oregon Law School assesses an additional resource fee.
Resource Fees - Summer Session 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Each Add'l</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Fee - All</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresid</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresid - Law</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsrce Resid-Law</td>
<td>68.50</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>66.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsrce Nonr-Law</td>
<td>72.50</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>66.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Fee - All</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Fee - All</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Fee

The building fee is maintained at $14.50 per student. This is consistent with the fee levels authorized by the 1995 Legislature and assessed in the 1995-96 academic year.

Incidental Fee

Incidental fee recommendations reflect the various activity and service levels proposed by the institutions. The incidental fees are based on recommendations proposed by student Incidental Fee Committees at each institution. Charges compare for 1995 and 1996 as follows:
### Incidental Fees - Summer Session 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC (6 hrs. or more)</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC (8 hrs. or more)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health Service Fee

Health service fees, like the building fee, are assessed at a single sum per student, based upon the service level available at each institution. The University of Oregon and Western Oregon State College are proposing increases in this rate. These increases are necessary to maintain the level of health services available. The increases were reviewed with the respective campus Student Health Advisory Committee. For institutions providing summer health service, rates compare as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$46.00</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC (6 hrs. or more)</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC (8 hrs. or more)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fees Compared to Preceding Academic Year

Rate structures for summer session have developed as institutions adapted to direct cost support following the 1982 elimination of General Fund support. The effect of direct cost support on fees and assessments can be measured to some extent by comparison with
academic year charges. The summer session rates proposed for 1996 and the 1995-96 academic year resident rates, except for the University of Oregon as noted, are compared on the following schedule:

### Academic Year Term to Summer Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Tuition</th>
<th>12 Credit Hours - Undergraduate</th>
<th>9 Credit Hours Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Acad.Term Percent</td>
<td>Summer Acad.Term Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Res.</td>
<td>$1,009 $1,127 89.5%</td>
<td>$1,194 $1,792 66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Nonres.</td>
<td>1,309 3,731 35.1%</td>
<td>1,419 2,959 48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>1,066 1,104 96.6%</td>
<td>1,294 1,769 73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>967 1,061 91.1%</td>
<td>1,207 1,729 69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>803 995 80.7%</td>
<td>935 1,543 60.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOS</td>
<td>789 983 80.3%</td>
<td>1,071 1,537 69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>891 966 92.2%</td>
<td>1,017 1,543 65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>825 1,010 81.7%</td>
<td>-- -- --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Tuition rates are not fully comparable. The academic year rates apply to a range of credit hours designated for full-time students classified as residents (12-18 credit hours for undergraduates and 9-16 credit hours for graduates). Summer session rates displayed are for 12 credits undergraduate and 9 credits graduate. Additional summer credit hours require incremental charges. Also, incidental and health service levels differ from academic year to summer.*

* The percent difference column represents the percentage that summer term tuition is compared to the academic year term tuition.

### Fees Compared to Summer Session 1995

The following schedule demonstrates the rates of increase from summer session 1995 to summer session 1996.
Summer Session 1996 to Summer Session 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Tuition</th>
<th>12 Credit Hours - Undergraduate</th>
<th>9 Credit Hours - Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO Res.</td>
<td>$1,009</td>
<td>$981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Nonres.</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>1,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>1,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law Res.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law Nonres.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Room and Board Rates

Summer session room and board accommodations on each campus vary according to the need and demand. They may include rates by day, week, multi-week, or term. A combined room and board rate is usually offered, as well as rates for room only, board only, and conference activities. Rates are generally comparable to those for individual terms of the academic year.

The rates shown in the tables in the fee book are for all campuses except Portland State University, where College Housing Northwest, Inc., operates the residence halls and establishes the rates as specified in a service contract. The rates require preliminary review and approval by Portland State University officials before becoming effective.

Proposed rate increases from summer session of 1995 to 1996 generally vary from one percent to six percent for a basic housing package. Oregon State University has the highest increase at 15.8 percent, due to expanding the number of meals offered during summer, as well as moving to bring summer rates in line with comparable academic year rates. Other institutions' rate increases are consistent with increases for the preceding academic year. They are based on anticipated cost increases for utilities, services, food, and debt service pool, as well as some facilities improvement and expansion of services available to residents.
Public Hearing

A hearing was conducted on January 4 at 10:00 a.m. in Room 121 of Susan Campbell Hall on the University of Oregon campus concerning the 1996 Summer Session Fee Book. No one appeared at the hearing, nor were any written comments submitted.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board amend OAR 580-040-0035 as follows:

(NOTE: Underline denotes addition; brackets denote deletion.)

Summer Session Fee Book

580-040-0035 The document entitled "Summer Session Fee Book" dated [February 17, 1995] January 19, 1996, is hereby amended by reference as a permanent rule. All prior adoptions of summer session fee documents are hereby repealed, except as to rights and obligations previously acquired or incurred thereunder.

Through the amendment, the residence hall and food service charges and the tuition and fee rates and policies applicable during the 1996 summer session will be adopted.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Christopher moved and Ms. Waddy seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. On roll call, the following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, Willis, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.

APPOINTMENT TO FOREST RESEARCH LABORATORY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Staff Report to the Board

ORS 526.225 specifies that the Board of Higher Education shall appoint a Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee composed of 15 members, 9 of whom are to be individuals who are engaged, actively and principally, in timber management of forest lands, harvesting, or processing of forest products; 3 individuals who are the
heads of state and federal public forestry agencies; and 3 individuals from the public-at-large. Although the statute does not prescribe the terms of the Committee members, the practice has been to make appointments for a period of three years. Traditionally, those who are performing actively and effectively have been recommended for reappointment to a second three-year term, with all members replaced at the conclusion of a second term.

Dr. George W. Brown, director of the Forest Research Laboratory, with the concurrence of President Paul Risser, recommends the following appointments for a three-year term:

Appointment of Robert F. Turner, Senior Vice President for Jeld Wen. Mr. Turner has had 25 years of experience in the forest products industry and provides leadership to a firm that is at the forefront of Oregon's secondary manufacturing industry. Mr. Turner replaces Thomas C. MacDonald who has completed his three-year term of service.

Appointment of Steven R. Rogel, President and CEO for Willamette Industries. Mr. Rogel, who has worked as a forest products industry executive for 25 years, and now leads one of Oregon's most important forest products firms that operates 92 manufacturing facilities in 21 states, replaces Mr. Donald F. Smith, who has completed his second three-year term of service.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended the Board approve the above appointments to the Forest Research Laboratory Advisory Committee.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Mr. Willis moved and Ms. Christopher seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. Those voting in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, Willis, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.
President Swanson reported that the Joint Boards Working Group had met on January 10, 1996, in Portland. He indicated that it was a very productive meeting.

One outcome of the meeting was development of a Resolution to Require Continuing Professional Development for Educators. The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (TSPC) is proposing continuing professional development for educators throughout their careers. There has been some opposition to this proposal and the Joint Boards Working Group wanted to go on record supporting TSPC in adopting policies and rules that require this professional development for all educators.

RESOLUTION TO REQUIRE CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATORS

WHEREAS, Oregon's Educational Act for the 21st Century requires new curriculum and methods of instruction; and

WHEREAS, the successful implementation of the new educational act will depend, in large measure, on professional educators currently in the system as well as those who will be entering the system in the years to come; and

WHEREAS, continuing education during professional life is a responsibility of all professional people including educators; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon State System of Higher Education is a major provider of educators for Oregon's public schools; and

WHEREAS, the Oregon State Board of Education and the local boards of education are the primary employers of the professional educators produced by the State System of Higher Education; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Joint Boards of Education strongly recommends that the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission adopt policies and administrative rules and
propose new statutes that will require continuing professional development for teachers and administrators as a condition for renewal of an Oregon license.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Ms. McAllister moved the Board approve the proposed resolution. Those voting in favor of the motion: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Rhinard, Waddy, Willis, and Swanson. Those opposed: none.

To help address increasingly constrained fiscal and operating conditions, OSSHE launched a number of academic productivity planning and implementation efforts beginning in 1993. A key initiative was a series of pilot demonstration projects solicited from OSSHE campuses through two rounds of a Request for Proposal (Academic Productivity and Educational Reform), the first issued October 1993, and the second, February 1994. Funds available totaled $500,000. The completed 22 projects involved a wide range of disciplines, all OSSHE institutions, and innovative approaches to instructional delivery.

In 1995, OSSHE received a grant from the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), funded by the federal Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE), to evaluate lessons learned in the course of the productivity projects. Dr. Peter Ewell, Senior Associate at NCHEMS, was selected as the outside evaluator for the OSSHE project because of his national expertise in assessment/outcomes in a broad range of higher education areas. Dr. Ewell will present his final evaluation findings to the OSSHE Statewide Forum on Productivity and Educational Reform held on January 17, 1996. The forum was broadcast to seven OSSHE institution's ED-NET sites and attended by over 100 campus administrators, faculty project participants, and others associated with technology-based innovations at OSSHE campuses.

Dr. Ewell will be in attendance to share highlights from his evaluation findings with the Board.
Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Clark recalled for the Board that there has been a focus in the past several years on academic productivity and educational reform. A competitive incentive fund had been established at the System level for projects that would be proposed by faculty members. The projects most currently funded have focused heavily on the integration of technology into instruction, the development of new educational tools, and interinstitutional cooperative projects.

As a result of these activities, the System was eligible to apply for a competitive grant to evaluate what has been learned from these productivity efforts. "We have been extremely fortunate," Dr. Clark added, "to secure the services of Dr. Peter Ewell, Senior Associate at NCHEMS. He is a well-known expert and consultant on assessment and evaluation. He has reviewed all System projects, made site visits, and just recently participated in an ED-NET telecommunicated forum attended by participants at seven sites."

Dr. Ewell commended the Board for the actions it has taken to implement the academic productivity projects. "I have worked with a lot of projects and as I have traveled from state-to-state, the reactions of people have been, 'You mean these people aren't just talking about this -- they are actually doing something.'"

Dr. Ewell reminded the Board that the purpose of the productivity projects was to increase productivity or demonstrate the potential of productivity. "The initial focus of the evaluation is to discover if that potential is still viable. The good news is that the efficiency side of it is very much still on the table. These projects do demonstrate the potential for gaining efficiency in terms of undergraduate instruction, particularly. Hard numbers are not available, but it appears the gains are in the neighborhood of about 50 percent in terms of instructional cost and the numbers of students served. Productivity has to assume that when efficiency is realized, learning remains the same. A number of the projects did look at this dimension and preliminary results show that there was learning at least equivalent to traditional modes of delivery in the classroom. This is an area that needs further investigation."
"One of the most striking things on the outcomes side that we found across the board was student interest in learning in these alternative manners -- active learning, self-paced learning -- and a lot of the efficiency gains that were noted were really gains because students stayed to the end. Retention rates were up, students were more in control, felt more self-confident, and therefore did not drop out."

Dr. Ewell pointed out that implementation of these projects took more time than anyone anticipated since some of them required entire re-engineering of courses. The positive side of this is that once these changes are made, the application of those kinds of techniques and alternatives can be adapted more quickly to another class. The initial costs are high in an endeavor of this kind.

Dr. Ewell presented recommendations that resulted from his evaluation of the Productivity Projects. He recommended that future instructional innovations of this kind should:

- Proceed from educational "first principles"
- Be embedded in a wider vision of institutional change
- Place special emphasis on faculty development and the definition/support of new instructional roles
- Involve multiple technologies that are carefully linked together to capitalize on what each does best
- Not look for productivity gains in the short run
- Be carefully assessed and monitored, especially with regard to long-term student outcomes

Dr. Clark thanked Dr. Ewell for his work in evaluating the projects and pointed out that, at this time, additional funding is not available for other projects. However, efforts continue to further expand the number and scope of the initiatives as funds permit.

(No Board action required)
Background

Academic productivity and educational reform plans have been underway at all State System campuses for some time. Such efforts came at the direction of the Chancellor who included their development in the September 1993 workplan for the Board of Higher Education. Campus plans were reviewed by the Chancellor's Office in spring 1994 and linked to the 1995-1997 biennial budget.

State System institutions have been actively engaged in five categories of activities (faculty, students, curriculum, service delivery, and fees) that will serve to significantly redesign the way that they function and that have demonstrable academic productivity dimensions. These efforts will increase the numbers of students served in quality instructional programs within existing resource constraints, assist more students to be successful while pursuing their educational goals, and enable students to complete degrees more swiftly.

The Chancellor's Office previously reported to the Board on the completion of the process for the Request for Proposals (RFP) for Academic Productivity and Educational Reform (two rounds). A new Request for Proposal for Academic Productivity and Educational Reform: Moving Toward the 2010 Vision was issued on August 7, 1995, to continue the Board's commitment to campus innovation in this area. The purpose of the RFP was "to undertake projects with potential for implementation and impact that go beyond a single institution to enable OSSHE institutions to increase their academic productivity and enhance teaching and learning quality through the use of developing technologies." Proposals were sought in two priority areas:

- collaborative course, degree, and/or curricula projects, with distance education dimensions, and
- new learning modes to enhance access and the changing roles of faculty and students.

Fifteen proposals were submitted by campuses by the deadline date of November 14, 1995. Budget requests totaled $1,004,617 -- the RFP budget amount was $500,000. After a review of the proposals by the Chancellor's Office, ten projects were selected for funding;
$338,901 has been allocated to date, with one project's budget under negotiation. The Academic Council will be reviewing the funded projects and advising the Office of Academic Affairs about high priority uses of any uncommitted funds over the next few months. This will allow time for the Board's Strategic Planning Task Forces to consider access issues, and the new Interinstitutional Educational Technology Council (an advisory body to the OSSHE Academic Council) to identify other high-priority areas.

Funded proposals meet the following specifications:

- There is long-term interest in the project direction by campus leadership and the testing out of ideas that show high potential for implementation within ongoing campus resources.

- There is strong potential for interinstitutional uses and impact beyond a single institution.

- There is the potential to improve educational quality without adding to the cost of education programs in the long term.

- The primary focus is on undergraduate education and especially key curricular areas that affect a significant number of students at the institution or within the State System.

- An evaluation component will assess results including cost implications, particularly to facilitate portability to other institutions.

The funded projects are diverse in discipline areas and approaches. For example, there are student self-paced, mastery-learning projects; projects that will develop cutting-edge, interactive course materials for publication on the World Wide Web; projects that will deliver college-level courses to high school seniors in order to assist them in accelerating their progress toward a college degree; and projects that stress interinstitutional cooperation and collaboration in program/course delivery.
Ten Projects Funded to Date

Oregon Health Sciences University (with Southern Oregon State College, Oregon Institute of Technology, Eastern Oregon State College), "Increasing Learning Productivity with Self-Paced Multimedia Coursework," $35,000. This project supports the conversion of a required, traditionally delivered entry-level nursing course (in health assessment skills) into a multimedia, hypertext-based learning package for undergraduate nursing students. This module will be developed so that students can progress through the content in a self-paced, individualized manner. Faculty from all four of the School of Nursing campuses will take part in identifying essential course content and desirable learning outcomes. The final product has the potential to achieve desired student outcomes while reducing the need for faculty travel to a wide range of geographical locations.

Portland State University (with Portland and Beaverton Public Schools), "Joint Ventures in K-16 Reform: Portland State University and Metropolitan Area High Schools Collaborate for Improved Student Opportunity and Faculty Development," $38,809. This project is a collaboration among Portland State University, Portland's Grant High School, and Beaverton's Westview High School. Mixed high school-university faculty teams, with the assistance of peer mentors, will teach Senior Inquiry, a version of PSU's new University Studies Freshman Inquiry course. University Studies courses are designed with low student-to-faculty ratios, involve faculty from diverse disciplines, stress critical thinking and effective communication, expose students to a variety of perspectives, and include the exploration of ethical and social responsibility issues. The Senior Inquiry program will assist high school seniors in building self-confidence and help them prepare for postsecondary education. Senior Inquiry will be open to all interested seniors at the two high schools, will meet institutional requirements of the high schools while maintaining the academic rigor of the University course of study, and allow students to complete 15 college credit hours (thereby giving them a head start on their college careers).

Southern Oregon State College, "New Directions in Teaching and Assessing Writing and Thinking," $28,500. This project will assist
in the development of writing tutorials and address the supplemental instruction needs for an estimated 30 percent of entering students who will need assistance in the writing and thinking skills portion of the College’s new Core Colloquium (a sequence of courses integrating writing, oral communication, critical thinking, academic advising, and “college success” elements). The tutorials to be developed will be mastery-based, with students exiting at the time they have satisfied specific outcome measures. This project will result in improved student learning and better academic progress; provide for the design and proficiency standards and assessment instruments; support the training of tutorial instructors; and allow for the development and piloting of a mastery-based supplemental writing/thinking course. There are plans to share outcomes of this effort with other OSSHE institutions, specifically Portland State University that is developing a research protocol for course evaluation; SOSC will be sharing its new knowledge of outcome measures and assessments.

**University of Oregon, “Historical and Cultural Atlas for the Internet,” $25,000.** This project will support the development of a series of digitized “maps” that will be published on the Internet. These maps will utilize sophisticated geographical information and multimedia graphics tools in their production and have applicability in fields such as history, literature, languages, and political science. The maps will include physical data as well as cultural, demographic, historical, and other information. The goal will be to produce images that are not traditional static representations, but images that will move and emphasize change and the historical process. Since these materials will be published on the World Wide Web, OSSHE faculty and students will have immediate access to these reference materials.

**University of Oregon, “GET READY: Basics of Information Technology for Incoming Students,” $23,092.** This project is designed to provide data about the best way(s) to deliver training about the World Wide Web and other information technologies to incoming students. As more and more faculty members are using emerging technologies in their courses, many have expressed the desire for a standardized training program of basic computer and Internet skills for all students. Often, class time—which should be focused on course content—is instead devoted to helping students
understand the technologies involved. Several ways of delivering the requisite knowledge (lectures, video, Web-based lessons) to large groups of students will be designed and tested in the course of this project to be led by the University Library. During fall 1996, data will be gathered about the most cost-effective approach to provide training, in anticipation of launching a fully developed program for all students by fall 1997.

Oregon State University (with OSSHE campuses), "Use of CD-ROM, Multimedia, and Internet Technology to Provide Participatory Educational Experiences in Economics 202: Principles of Macroeconomics," $40,000. This project will involve faculty at all OSSHE campuses who teach economics. A collaborative team of OSSHE faculty from economics will develop, implement, and evaluate two instructional modules based on CD-ROM, Multimedia, and Internet technology as an alternative instructional format for Economics 202: Principles of Macroeconomics. Each module will be the equivalent of four to six hours of traditional instruction and include student progress checks, homework, and self- and proctored-examinations. This is a pilot effort that is an important first step in working toward major instructional innovations and increased faculty productivity in undergraduate economics instruction. In the 1990-1995 period, these courses annually served approximately 8,000 students at OSSHE institutions. The information available in these modules will be available to geographically dispersed, home-bound, and lifelong learners anywhere, anytime. Delivery of this course in this manner should significantly reduce the FTE and per-student cost of instruction.

University of Oregon (with Southern Oregon State College), "Improved Student Learning Through Networked Interactive Experiments," $45,000. This project is designed to impact the traditional lecture-based science curriculum (in physics at the University of Oregon and chemistry at Southern Oregon State College) with the development of a series of computer-based interactive experiments. New technology in the form of the JAVA programming language (an extension of the World Wide Web document structure) will allow the construction of conceptually and physically correct interactive experiments to be designed and delivered over the Internet. This will address a critical need to engage large numbers of introductory science students in an experimentation
mode not available with traditional laboratories and current resources. The large size of introductory science classes precludes active experimentation, with students currently exposed to traditional classroom lectures interspersed with only a few demonstrations. This new technology has the potential to reach large numbers of students with truly interactive material, thus providing greater engagement with the subject matter and substantive learning enhancements.

Western Oregon State College and Oregon Institute of Technology, "Partnership to Enhance Technology-Based Cooperative Learning Education," $28,500. This project extends the work accomplished at Western Oregon State College under two previous OSSHE academic productivity and educational reform grants. In an innovative approach toward entry-level mathematics and biology, Western's instructional delivery system has demonstrated significant student learning gains, a dramatically increased completion rate, and decreased instructional costs. In partnership, OIT and Western plan to repeat the successful efforts in entry-level mathematics (developed to address a general education math requirement at Western) to additional entry-level mathematics courses (at OIT) that are prerequisites for other math and computer science courses. Increasing student success in such courses has the potential to significantly increase the number of students able to succeed in technical degree programs at OIT. This project will demonstrate the portability of Western's approach to other OSSHE campuses.

Oregon State University (with District 4J, Linn-Benton Community College), "InterQuest Suite: Seamless Uses of Internet Technology in Education," $75,000. The project extends work underway at Oregon State University under a previous academic productivity and educational reform grant, which produced an innovative World Wide Web course entitled "InterQuest: Introducing Philosophy." This course has been successfully delivered over the Web since fall 1994 and, during spring 1995, it was a collaborative effort between OSU and PSU. This phase of the project broadens the focus to another academic discipline and increases the number of educational sectors involved. A course similar in delivery style to the philosophy course will be developed in calculus. Both courses will be offered for college credit to students already enrolled in other institutions. The philosophy course will be available to high
school students enrolled in the new 4J Cyberschool program in Eugene, and the calculus course will be offered for credit at Linn-Benton Community College. This project enhances intersector cooperation, addresses course-content overlap, and expands the amount of material available to OSSHE students with state-of-the-art technology.

Southern Oregon State College (with Oregon Institute of Technology, Central Oregon University Center, Rogue Community College, Southwestern Oregon Community College, Umpqua Community College), "A Regional Approach in Environmental Studies," (funding level yet to be determined). This project addresses the coordination of course delivery among Southern Oregon State College and the many other institutions in the southern region of the state that provide courses and/or programs in the increasingly popular environmental sciences area. Each institution is currently developing new courses in Environmental Studies and/or applied environmental sciences. The participating institutions wish to offer collaborative courses in this field. This project will facilitate coordination of their efforts with the goals of: improving the compatibility of course offerings; increasing access to higher education services regardless of geographic location; evaluating new technologies for cost-effective course delivery; and implementing a strategy for team-teaching a course among diverse cooperating institutions.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Board

For the first time in three years, actual headcount enrollment at OSSHE institutions increased, with fall 1995 reaching 58,365, a gain of 345 students from the previous fall. Targeted headcount enrollment for each year of the 1995-1997 biennium is 60,912 (47,322 three-term FTE). The University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Western Oregon State College exceeded their 1994-95 headcount enrollments while Portland State University, Southern Oregon State College, Eastern Oregon State College, and Oregon Institute of Technology fell only slightly below the previous year’s figures. Tables A and B provide the 1995-96 enrollment statistics. Please note that, pursuant to the passage of Senate Bill 2 during the 1995 Legislative
session, enrollment figures for the Oregon Health Sciences University are not included in any of the data shown.

Table A. HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT
1995-96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1994-95 Fall</th>
<th>1995-96 Planned</th>
<th>1995-96 Fall</th>
<th>Dif Fall 95 vs Plan</th>
<th>Dif Fall 95 vs Fall 94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Resident</td>
<td>37,993</td>
<td>40,552</td>
<td>38,136</td>
<td>(2,416)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Nonres</td>
<td>8,868</td>
<td>9,145</td>
<td>9,311</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Resident</td>
<td>9,073</td>
<td>9,403</td>
<td>8,701</td>
<td>(702)</td>
<td>(372)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Nonresident</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Resident</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Nonresident</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Medicine</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,912</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,365</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2,547)</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B. SUMMARY OF ENROLLMENT CHANGES
1995-96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>18,013</td>
<td>17,139</td>
<td>16,680</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>14,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>14,756</td>
<td>14,161</td>
<td>14,131</td>
<td>12,702</td>
<td>11,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>15,045</td>
<td>14,348</td>
<td>14,428</td>
<td>8,815</td>
<td>8,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>3,861</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>3,284</td>
<td>3,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>4,535</td>
<td>3,729*</td>
<td>3,566*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>1,847</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>1,622*</td>
<td>1,504*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>2,444</td>
<td>2,070*</td>
<td>1,770*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,912</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,365</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,020</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,322</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,577</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The increase in total headcount enrollment comes despite continued increases in tuition and reflects that Oregonians are seeing the value of public higher education in Oregon. Resident undergraduate enrollment for fall 1995 has increased for the first time since 1990. This increase can be attributable, at least in part, to the beginning of a long-term trend of growing numbers of high school graduates in Oregon. The OSSHE institutions continue to accommodate all qualified Oregonians wishing to enroll in the State System. Savings realized due to the 1995 passage of the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act and improved learning productivity allow OSSHE to accommodate increases in student enrollment.

Nonresident undergraduate enrollment continues to increase, with a five percent gain in 1995 over 1994. The growth comes despite tuition increases (nonresident undergraduates pay the full cost of their education). The UO, OSU, PSU, WOSC, and SOSC, in particular, have seen growth in their numbers of nonresident undergraduates with increases of 4 percent, 5 percent, 19 percent, 11 percent, and 11 percent, respectively, over fall 1994.

Graduate enrollment continued its decline in 1995, dropping 2.8 percent from fall 1994. Graduate resident enrollment dropped nearly 4.1 percent, while the number of graduate nonresidents increased 4.6 percent. Law school enrollment increased over 13 percent in 1995, with the increase a result of greater nonresident enrollment.

While fall term enrollment is the State System's benchmark, during the past academic year OSSHE actually served around 200,000 students. The academic year unduplicated headcount number from summer 1994 through spring 1995 was 98,096 for all students enrolled in credit courses, either in regular campus courses or through self-supported courses. Additionally, OSSHE served an estimated 100,000 students in noncredit courses. Noncredit courses include noncredit offerings aimed at upgrading skills and maintaining licensure; programs aimed at youths and seniors; professional development activities; and community education and personal development courses.
Summer 1995 enrollment figures are shown in Table C. They reflect a 2.1 percent decrease from Summer 1994.

### Table C. SUMMER 1995 HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Total 1995</th>
<th>Total 1994</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>4,613</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>6,818</td>
<td>6,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>4,245</td>
<td>4,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>6,151</td>
<td>8,874</td>
<td>15,025</td>
<td>15,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>1,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>2,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16,807</td>
<td>14,641</td>
<td>31,448</td>
<td>32,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(No Board action required)

**SUMMARY OF FACILITIES CONTRACTING ACTIVITIES**

A summary of facilities contracting activities within the Office of Finance and Administration is presented below:

**Award of Construction Contracts**

**HMSC Visitor and Ship Support Services Project, OSU**

On December 18, 1995, Dale Ramsay Construction Company, was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $5,420,463. Financing will be provided from federal funds.

**Laboratory Theater Project, OSU**

On December 14, 1995, Woodburn Construction, Co., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $506,000. Financing will be provided from gift funds.

**Printing Services Remodel Project, UO**

On November 1, 1995, 2G Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $151,297. Financing will be provided from state funds.
Servery Improvements at Carson & Hamilton Halls Project. UO
On November 1, 1995, Emerald Valley Construction, was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $178,373. Financing will be provided from housing department maintenance reserve funds.

University Inn Dishwashing Equipment Upgrade Project. UO
On November 1, 1995, Morris P. Kielty General Contractor, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $53,280. Financing will be provided from housing department maintenance reserve funds.

Acceptance of Projects

Primary Standby Feeder Phase I. UO
This project is complete and was accepted on December 14, 1995. The final direct construction costs were $98,690. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

Property Administration Building Project. OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on December 15, 1995. The final direct construction costs were $500,487. Financing was provided from year end fund balances.

Langton Hall ADA Upgrade Project. OSU
This project is complete and was accepted on December 15, 1995. The final direct construction costs were $82,726. Financing was provided from capital repair funds.

(No Board action required)

Ms. Waddy thanked the Board members for their expressions of support since the birth of her son, Isaiah.
Meeting #649

ADJOURNMENT  The meeting of the Board adjourned at 12:15 p.m. to an executive session.

Virginia L. Thompson
Secretary of the Board

Les Swanson, Jr.
President of the Board