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ROLL CALL
The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 10:50 a.m. by President Aschkenasy.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Ms. Diane Christopher        Dr. Jim Whittaker
Ms. Gail McAllister          Mr. Jim Willis
Ms. Esther Puentes           Ms. Phyllis Wustenberg
Mr. Les Swanson               Mr. John Wykoff
Dr. Herb Aschkenasy

Mr. Tom Imeson was absent due to illness.

MINUTES APPROVED
The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the December 20, 1996, meeting of the Board. Mr. Willis moved and Ms. McAllister seconded the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT
WOSC Visit
President Aschkenasy thanked WOSC President Youngblood and her staff for their warm hospitality and enthusiasm, and the presenters for the information about various programs at the institution.

Meeting with Governor
Dr. Aschkenasy reported on his recent meeting with Governor Kitzhaber. President Aschkenasy proposed three directions for the State System. The first would be to maintain the status quo, perhaps making incremental changes. The second option would be to revert to the public higher education structure in place before the legislature formed the Board, which would be with each institution under control of its own board rather than within the State System. The third option would be to focus each institution’s unique mission and direct resources accordingly. Dr. Aschkenasy indicated that Governor Kitzhaber supported the third approach. He concluded his remarks by stating, “No one’s against higher education. We don’t have enemies in the usual sense. We simply have people who have other concerns, other priorities. We need to learn how to work effectively in that kind of environment.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANCELLOR’S REPORT</th>
<th>January 17, 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resignation, J. Ramaley</td>
<td>Chancellor Cox announced that PSU President Ramaley had accepted an appointment as president of the University of Vermont, to begin after the June 1997 Commencement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Search, PSU</td>
<td>Dr. Cox provided the Board with a rough timeline of steps in the presidential search process. He indicated that he would be meeting with constituent groups at PSU soon to gather input about representation from the institution. Chancellor Cox stated that the goal would be for a new president to be name in summer 1997.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon College of Engineering and Computer Science</td>
<td>Chancellor Cox indicated that an important first step had occurred in the implementation of the Oregon College of Engineering and Computer Science. He and the Leadership Group have been meeting and the first order of business was to seek leadership for the Engineering and Technology Industry Council. Mr. Don VanLuvanee has agreed to accept that role. Mr. VanLuvanee, who chaired the Governor’s Task Force on Engineering Education, is president and CEO of ESI in Portland. Chancellor Cox and Mr. VanLuvanee will work together to make other appointments to the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL Center</td>
<td>The Chancellor noted that the CAPITAL Center planning policy group, consisting of the partners who jointly occupy the CAPITAL Center, have been meeting to help move toward the long-term collaborative educational partnership that is the vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement, L. Stevens</td>
<td>Dr. Cox announced a reorganization in the OSSHE Office of Corporate and Public Affairs, which has resulted in Ms. Lisa Stevens accepting responsibility as Director of Communication and Corporate Relations. “She will have responsibility for managing and coordinating the whole range of communication activities, both with the general public and the media, but most especially with the business communities and professional and business associations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSSHE Goals</td>
<td>Chancellor Cox reminded the Board that, at the last evening working session, they had directed him to begin working on goals and objectives for the State System. Dr. Cox indicated that he was presenting preliminary thinking in response to that directive, and requested further Board direction and input as he continued to refine the goals. (Following are his remarks as captured by the overheads he used during the Board presentation.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oregon’s Four Overarching Strategic Objectives and Accountability Indicators

**OSSHE Accountability Measures:** Identification of accountability measures in the Oregon State System of Higher Education is based on three assumptions:

- OSSHE will focus on those aspects of mission that are most important to the State Board of Higher Education and to Oregonians at this time.
- A limited number of accountability indicators will be used. This will simplify explanation and emphasize the importance of these indicators.

The goal is the preservation and reinforcement of standards of quality, both real and perceived, of each campus and the entire system.

**Expectation:** Each campus will forward to the Board its current mission statement for review, discussion, and ultimate approval. Within the context of the approve mission, each campus will propose by June 1997 a plan for accountability which focuses especially on its educational programs and which addresses the following four overarching objectives:

- enhancing existing quality,
- expanding access,
- maintaining reasonable cost-effectiveness, and
- ensuring employability.

**Quality.** Provide quality education to our students as measured by results on nationally normed examinations that assess general education and academic majors at each institution (in all fields in which national examinations are available). The objective is for each institution to place at least in the top half, and preferably in the top third, of comparable institutions within five years. The Chancellor’s Office will review — and the Board will approve — the specific examinations to be used at each institution.

There are other measurements of quality. This one assumes that the quality of the product, namely, students that do well in national exams, is a good indicator of the institution that produced them.

Indicators include:

- **Performance in general education:** This assessment helps measure value added in areas that are increasingly important in the complex career worlds faced by our graduates. For
example, if an institution finds that its students consistently score low on the problem-solving component of an examination, how does the institution plan to improve the situation?
- **Performance in academic majors:** Nationally normed instruments will be used in all academic areas in which they are available. In other areas, institutions should develop alternative measures. The Board's emphasis upon greater differentiation in institutional missions will require ongoing data collection for all programs in order to make the decisions necessary to build upon each institution's strengths.
- **Student satisfaction surveys:** High student satisfaction is an important component of quality. Do students find faculty accessible? Are needed courses available? Are students satisfied with the quality of instruction? Are they satisfied with support services such as academic and career advisement?

**Access.** Make available to all qualified applicants (i.e., people who meet the entrance requirements) an education at an OSSHE institution (or at a combination of community college and OSSHE institution) that is affordable, geographically accessible (off-campus education can be included where appropriate), and available at times compatible with the needs of nontraditional students.

This does not mean that every person will be accommodated regardless of cost; it does mean the great majority can and will be accommodated quite possibly more cost-effectively than by not accommodating them. When you have underutilized facilities, additional students are relatively inexpensive.

Indicators include:
- **Traditional students:** Percentage of qualified undergraduate applicants who are (a) accepted and (b) actually enroll by resident/nonresident status.
- **Nontraditional students:** Percentage of nontraditional students as well as the number and type of programs, locations, and modes of delivery to meet their needs.
- **Transfer students:** Percentage of graduates who transferred from a community college and student satisfaction concerning the ease of transfer.
- **Retention and graduation rates:** Comparability with peer institutions.
Cost. Reduce fully allocated cost (total undergraduate budget divided by total undergraduate FTE) by one percent per year until it is at the average of contiguous states, and keep it there. Further savings should be devoted to increasing faculty and/or staff salaries. Increases in unrestricted State subsidy should be used to reduce tuition further. (Decreases in State subsidy would necessitate tuition increases.)

The main reason for a public system is to provide an inexpensive, high-quality education. Tuition is too high and loans are too high. Tying the State subsidy to reducing or increasing tuition may help focus the discussion on what the subsidy is supposed to subsidize.

Indicators include:

- **Instructional expenditures per FTE student**: Suggest an institution's level and direction of support for teaching and learning activities.
- **Instructional expenditures as a percentage of total institutional General Fund expenditures**: Suggest linkages with academic quality and institutional directions.
- **Academic support expenditures as a percentage of total institutional General Fund expenditures**: Suggest support of the infrastructure and services necessary for effective instruction and other academic activities. Examples include computing and libraries.
- **Tuition and fees per resident undergraduate student**: Focus upon the goal of moving to the midpoint of peer institutions.
- **Faculty and staff salaries**: Focus upon moving to a more competitive position relative to peer institutions.

**Employability**: Through timely counseling, high-quality instruction, and bridge building to potential employers (e.g., internships, co-op research projects, etc.) institutions will help graduates start careers. Success can be measured by placement rates and employer- and graduate-satisfaction surveys.

Employability is the principal objective of students entering our institutions. If we do a good job in selection of students admitted, counsel them on promising fields, give them a good education, develop a reputation with employers for high-quality graduates through achievement in national exams, internships, etc., then high placement rates should follow.
Indicators include:

- **Employer satisfaction**: Surveys of employers regarding their assessment of the career preparation of OSSHE graduates and the responsiveness of OSSHE in meeting needs of employers.

- **Post-graduation experience of OSSHE undergraduates**: Surveys of graduates within a specified timetable to determine job placement rates and if graduates are (a) employed, (b) employed in a field related to their academic work, (c) looking for employment, or (d) continuing their education.

- **Alumni satisfaction**: Surveys of alumni approximately five years after graduation regarding their assessment of the quality of their education and how well prepared they were for professional and personal challenges.

- **External service experience related to student's academic field**: Percentage of students who participate in internships, partnerships, volunteer experiences, community projects, and practica within existing curricula by program.

**Board Discussion**

Ms. Wustenberg asked which category would cover transferability. Chancellor Cox responded it was within “access.” He added that access applies to a number of scenarios, including students moving from a community college to an OSSHE institution, students moving between OSSHE institutions, and even some students moving from an OSSHE institution to a community college.

Ms. Christopher commented that the reports from the solution teams would probably help guide this thinking as well. Chancellor Cox agreed.

President Aschkenasy underlined the connection between internships and employability, and expressed his support of it.

**IFS Report**

Dr. Simonds, president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS), made the following report to the Board.

The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate will meet next on the 7th and 8th of February. There was no meeting this month. Since I reported last time, the letter to legislators from IFS, AOF, OFT, AAUP and APSOSC is edited and
being signed: It will be delivered to Salem next Tuesday. I will make a copy available to you.

I would like to make a comment on the Faculty Work report included in the agenda of this meeting. The report contains much useful information. It includes the point that ranked faculty on average taught 11.8 course credit hours per term in 1995-96. I would like to expand on that point. I will use my own teaching as an example to make the point but many other faculty have similar teaching experiences.

The course credit hours per term includes many different teaching environments. In my own case, I have had courses as large as 637 students yielding a very productive term for churning out student credit hours (1,911) for which students paid approximately $650,000 to $700,000 [$250,000 minimum if all were in state students, however a quick survey indicated approximately half were out of state] if you consider many were paying out of state tuition. Preparation time and instructional cost per student were relatively low in this case. Unless a course taught about 1970 at the University of Oregon's MacArthur Court enrolling around 2,000 students is included in the sample, this represents about the maximum size in the State System.

At the other extreme, I teach individual students in reading, research or other specialized one-on-one courses outside my regular scheduled courses. In these cases the cost per student is much higher. Such a course brings in between $400 and $1,600 in tuition but often takes as much faculty time for preparation and supervision as the previous example above.

There are many courses in between, ranging from around 20 to 100 students, involving varying degrees of faculty supervision and student participation. Graduate courses tend to the smaller end of the range and undergraduate courses average larger. The data given for course credit hours produced per faculty per term in the "Faculty Work" report therefore includes a wide range of different teaching settings. They also range in
productivity per faculty salary dollar from very high to quite low. On the other hand, productivity in terms of the quality of the learning experience is often the reverse with those classes with the lowest ratio of students to instructor often producing the greatest benefit for the student. Neither end of the range I have just described should be the total educational experience for a student in higher education. Handled correctly, both kinds of classes can contribute to a good education.

When you look at those bare figures, please think of them as representing this broad range of educational productivity.

AMENDMENT TO OAR
580-040-0035, SUMMER SESSION FEE BOOK

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 7, 1997. A report of that hearing will be presented at the Board meeting.

Summer Session Instruction Fees

The direct cost support policy for summer instruction, which began in 1982, is continued in the recommendation for 1997. This policy does not allow for any direct General Fund support of the summer session program, but rather requires its direct operating costs to be funded through summer session revenues. In addition, budget decisions of recent years have required summer session to support more and more of its indirect cost share as well. These decisions are reflected in the steady increases experienced in summer session rates.

Unlike the academic year fee structure with its credit-hour plateau, summer session instruction fees are assessed on a straight per-credit-hour basis regardless of the number of credit hours enrolled. There is no residency differential, but there is a graduate/undergraduate rate differential.

Undergraduate instruction fee increases have been recommended by five of the seven institutions, with only Oregon State University and Eastern Oregon State College maintaining current fee levels. Western Oregon State College instruction fees are proposed for an increase
of approximately 19 percent for undergraduates and 20 percent for graduates. WOSC has not increased its summer session instruction fees since 1993, choosing instead to rely on spending down some of its summer session cash reserves. Over the past five years, institutions have increased their instruction fee rates ranging from 14.4 percent to nearly 35 percent. With this increase, WOSC’s instruction fees will have increased by 26 percent since 1992.

Graduate instruction fee levels are increasing only at WOSC and SOSC.

Instruction fee rates recommended for 1997 compare with 1996 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hour</td>
<td>Each Add'l</td>
<td>First Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>97.50</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>100.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>101.50</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>101.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>119.50</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>121.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>99.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>96.00</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>93.50</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>93.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>146.50</td>
<td>116.00</td>
<td>146.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law</td>
<td>192.00</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>150.50</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>150.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>169.50</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>169.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>122.50</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>140.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>130.50</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>130.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OIT offers no graduate courses summer term

Resource Fees

Resource fees are mandatory enrollment fees assessed to students admitted to or generally understood to be enrolled in a school, college, department, or degree program. Resource fees may be assessed to certain classes of students, such as all freshmen,
seniors, or graduates, or to students admitted to or enrolled in a degree program, such as business, engineering, or law.

Residency status historically has not been assigned during summer session. However, as in the past three years, the University of Oregon will assess a resource fee of $25 per credit hour on all nonresidents. This requires a residency determination to be made for UO summer session students. UO has determined the associated administrative effort to be cost-effective. The UO Law School further assesses a general resource fee with a resident/nonresident differential.

The technology fee is a resource fee assessed to all students to supplement instructional technology support and services. All institutions except Oregon Institute of Technology are proposing technology fees. Three institutions — WOSC, SOSC, and EOSC — are assessing technology fees for the first time during summer session 1997, which are comparable to the fees they each assess during the regular academic year.

Most of the resource fees are assessed with a per-credit-hour increment with no upper limit. Three institutions, however, have a cap on the maximum amount they will assess for this fee. The OSU technology fee is $15 for up to four credit hours, after which it is a flat amount of $30, regardless of the credit hours enrolled. SOSC's technology fee increases at $2 per credit hour up to a maximum of $24. EOSC increases its technology fee at $4 per credit hour up to a maximum of $50.

### Resource Fees - Summer Session 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hour Each Add'l</td>
<td>First Hour Each Add'l</td>
<td>First Hour Each Add'l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Fee All</td>
<td>30.00 0.00</td>
<td>30.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresid</td>
<td>25.00 25.00</td>
<td>25.00 25.00</td>
<td>0.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresid - Law</td>
<td>26.00 26.00</td>
<td>26.00 26.00</td>
<td>0.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsnc Res - Law</td>
<td>68.50 68.00</td>
<td>68.50 68.00</td>
<td>0.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rsnc Non-Law</td>
<td>72.50 72.00</td>
<td>72.50 72.00</td>
<td>0.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Fee - All *</td>
<td>15.00 0.00</td>
<td>15.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Fee - All</td>
<td>3.00 3.00</td>
<td>3.00 3.00</td>
<td>0.00% 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOSC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Resource Fees - Summer Session 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996</th>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hour</td>
<td>Each Add'l</td>
<td>First Hour</td>
<td>Each Add'l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Fee - All</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOSC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Fee - All **</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EOSC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Fee - All **</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* OSU: 1-4 Credit Hours = $15; 5+ Credit Hours = $30.
** SOSC: $24 Max.; EOSC: $50 Max.

### 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 1996-97 academic year.

Any adjustment to the building fee authorized by the 1997 Legislature will be first reflected in the 1997-98 Academic Year Fee Book.

### 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. Portland State University's incidental fee is increasing by 35 percent, due to recommendations from its student incidental fee committee to have summer session students pay their pro rata share of incidental fee-supported activities. Similarly, EOSC is proposing a 25% increase in its incidental fee following a decision by its student incidental fee committee. The EOSC incidental fee had not been adjusted since 1993 when it had been decreased from $30.50 to the current $24.

OSU assesses its incidental fee on an incremental basis starting at $41, with an increase of $5 for each additional credit hour up to a maximum of $76. All other institutions assess a flat amount regardless of the number of credit hours enrolled.

Charges compare for 1996 and 1997 as follows:
## Incidental Fees - Summer Session 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Hour</td>
<td>Each Add'l</td>
<td>First Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30.50</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 provided at each institution. UO, OSU, and SOSC are proposing increases in this rate. These increases are necessary to maintain the level of health services available. The increases were reviewed with campus student health advisory committees. The OSU rate is increasing by 28 percent due primarily to increasing services available during summer session up to levels comparable to that of the academic year. SOSC makes health services available on a student-option basis for students enrolled for less than nine credit hours. EOSC and OIT do not provide health services during summer session. For institutions providing summer health service, rates compare as follows:

## Health Service Fees - Summer Session 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>28.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC (5 hrs or more)</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC (9 hrs or more)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</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 1997 and the 1996-97 academic year resident rates, except for UO as noted, are compared on the following schedule:

### Academic Year Term to Summer Session

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Tuition</th>
<th>Summer 1997</th>
<th>Acad. Term 1996-97</th>
<th>Percent Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO Res.</td>
<td>1,052.00</td>
<td>1,180.00</td>
<td>89.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Nonr.</td>
<td>1,352.00</td>
<td>3,888.00</td>
<td>34.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>1,062.00</td>
<td>1,149.00</td>
<td>92.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>1,004.00</td>
<td>1,114.00</td>
<td>90.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>961.00</td>
<td>1,033.00</td>
<td>93.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>856.00</td>
<td>1,049.00</td>
<td>81.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>947.00</td>
<td>1,054.00</td>
<td>89.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>838.00</td>
<td>1,048.00</td>
<td>79.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law Res*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law NR*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 Credit Hours - Graduate</th>
<th>Summer 1997</th>
<th>Acad. Term 1996-97</th>
<th>Percent Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,201.00</td>
<td>1,963.00</td>
<td>61.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,426.00</td>
<td>3,354.00</td>
<td>42.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,290.00</td>
<td>1,932.00</td>
<td>66.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,220.00</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
<td>64.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,117.00</td>
<td>1,603.00</td>
<td>69.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
<td>1,625.00</td>
<td>70.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,059.00</td>
<td>1,654.00</td>
<td>64.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1,599.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,451.00</td>
<td>3,030.00</td>
<td>80.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,705.00</td>
<td>4,524.00</td>
<td>59.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Law School amounts are stated in per-term rates, although the academic year is on the semester basis.

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.

### Fees Compared to Summer Session 1996

The following schedule demonstrates the rates of increase from summer session 1996 to summer session 1997. In spite of some significant increases in selected components of the summer session tuition, generally the overall increases are well within expected rates of increase. The noted exception is WOSC, where the first increase
in its instruction fee since 1993 and the addition of the technology resource fee have a significant impact on the overall rate of increase. The addition of the technology resource fee also caused the increase in SOSC’s and EOSC’s rates over those of 1996.

### Summer Session 1996 to Summer Session 1997

<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 1996</td>
<td>Summer 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Res.</td>
<td>1,009.00</td>
<td>1,052.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Nonres.</td>
<td>1,309.00</td>
<td>1,352.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>1,046.00</td>
<td>1,062.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>967.00</td>
<td>1,004.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC</td>
<td>803.00</td>
<td>961.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSC</td>
<td>789.00</td>
<td>856.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOSC</td>
<td>891.00</td>
<td>947.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>838.00</td>
<td>838.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law Res</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO Law NR</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 academic year.

The rates shown in the tables in the fee book are for all campuses except PSU, 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 PSU officials before becoming effective.

Proposed rate increases from summer session of 1996 to 1997 generally vary from no increase to a 10.6 percent increase for a basic housing package. UO and OIT have the highest increases, at 10.1 and 10.6 percent respectively. These and the other institutions’ rate increases are consistent with increases for the preceding academic year. They are based on anticipated cost increases for labor, utilities, services, food, and debt service pool, as well as some facilities improvement and expansion of services available to residents.
Public Hearing

A hearing concerning the 1997 Summer Session Fee Book was conducted on January 7, 1997, at 10 a.m. in Room 121 of Susan Campbell Hall on the University of Oregon campus. A report on that hearing will be presented at the Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

After consideration of any comments or testimony received at the public hearing, it was recommended that 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 [January 19, 1996] January 17, 1997, 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 1997 summer session were adopted.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Anslow reviewed the docket item. Ms. Wustenberg indicated that the comparison of academic year term to summer session was not adequately reflected in percentage terms. Mr. Anslow agreed that it reflects the relationship costs in summer versus what it would cost in a regular academic term.

President Aschkenasy pointed out that the Board was really being asked two questions, the obvious one being to approve the fees. But the larger implicit question was whether to change the nature of summer session charges, which are self-supporting. He asked, "Is there anyone on the Board who wants to revisit that subject that we authorized in 1982, that this be a self-supporting activity?" Ms. Christopher asked if that was a topic being discussed by any of the solution teams. Chancellor Cox indicated that it was. Dr. Aschkenasy
stated that, unless someone on the Board wants to propose changing it, he would "take it to mean that we're approving continuation of that policy, as well as voting on the recommended increases."

Ms. Christopher moved and Mr. Willis seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. On roll call, the following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

B.S. IN ULTRASOUND WITH OPTIONS IN VASCULAR TECHNOLOGY & DIAGNOSTIC MEDICAL SONOGRAPHY, OIT

Introduction

Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) requests authorization to offer a new instructional program leading to the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in Ultrasound. The Board reviewed a preliminary proposal for this program on February 16, 1996. The proposed degree will be offered through the Department of Medical Imaging Technology in the School of Health and the Arts and Sciences, and be comprised of two options, Diagnostic Medical Sonography (DMS) and Vascular Technology (VT). Medical sonographers direct an ultrasound beam through the body in order to provide images of the abdomen, pelvis, reproductive systems, and associated pathologies. This practice is also used to furnish images and conduct tests of the fetus in utero. Vascular technologists direct an ultrasound beam through the body in order to provide images of veins, arteries, and associated pathological conditions.

This proposed program will (1) prepare graduates for immediate employment as vascular technologists or diagnostic sonographers, (2) prepare graduates to sit for the national certification examination in these fields, (3) promote lifelong learning as these professions mandate continuing education to maintain certification, and (4) develop ethical awareness and critical thinking skills in the program's graduates. The DMS option will seek accreditation from the accrediting body, the Joint Review Committee for Diagnostic Medical Sonography (JRCDMS), after the proposed program has been implemented. The VT option will seek accreditation when the JRCDMS begins accrediting such programs. There are no other programs of this type in the state of Oregon.
Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

The proposed degree program is directly related to OIT's mission — as the State System's only institute of technology — to provide degree programs in the applied technologies, including health technologies. This degree is also consistent with the OIT mission and strategic plan because it provides a program that enables graduates to seek immediate employment in their field of study and by creating partnerships between OIT and industry. This link between OIT and industry is reflected in a core element of the proposed degree program, the clinical externship — a 12-month, 40-hour-per-week practical field experience spent at one of many OIT-approved clinical affiliates located throughout the United States. Students in these settings will perform procedures under the supervision of qualified personnel and be monitored by both on-site clinical personnel as well as OIT faculty.

2. Evidence of Need

As health care systems in the United States continue to expand and diversify, the U. S. Department of Labor projects an increase in all health technology jobs by the year 2000. The specific need for medical sonographers and vascular technologists has been documented through various surveys. All former officers and board members of the Oregon Society of Radiologic Technologists (OSRT) who were contacted expressed a perceived need for more sonographers, and half indicated a current need in their own departments. In response to a survey of Oregon hospitals, 47 percent indicated a current need for at least one full-time sonographer. Two professional publications in the field, RT Image and Advance, typically average 20 to 25 job listings, respectively, per week for sonographers.

Interest in this proposed degree program is high among students as well. In a 1993 survey of OIT students enrolled in the Medical Imaging Technology program, 35 percent of respondents expressed an interest in the proposed DMS option. An enrollment limitation of 20 students per year in the DMS option and 40 students per year in the VT option is
proposed. Based on current enrollment data, the majority of the students are projected to be from Oregon, with significant numbers from Northern California and Washington as well. The new DMS option is expected to attract significant numbers of additional students to OIT every year.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The proposed degree program builds on a rich history of medical imaging at OIT, dating back to 1952 and the establishment of the first college-based radiologic technology program in the United States. The vascular technology program, at the present time an option of the Medical Imaging Technology bachelor’s degree, is the only one of its kind in the country and its curriculum has been in place since its approval in 1992. The student completion rate for the VT option has been about 80 percent since it began, and the pass rate on the certification examination is 100 percent.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. No new funds are sought to implement this proposed new program. Four of the necessary five faculty positions are in place, three long-time OIT professors and one recently hired instructor. One additional faculty member is yet to be hired into a position already approved for the Medical Imaging Department — made available by the retirement of a current faculty member in 1997. This additional full-time faculty member will come with five years’ experience, certification in the fields of medical sonography and vascular technology, and assist in the refinement of courses and establishment of externship sites.

Library, Facilities, and Equipment. The current VT program has two modern ultrasound units with dual VT and DMS capabilities; OIT is in the process of purchasing three more state-of-the-art units at the present time. Existing laboratory space is adequate and the enrollment limitations will prevent the overload of non-departmental courses. The Learning Resource Center has an excellent selection of sonography and vascular books and periodicals. Some additional reference sources may be necessary and will be purchased through current levels of funding through the Books and Bindings budget. Students
have access to the library at the Merle West Medical Center as well.

Program Review

The proposed program has been reviewed positively by all appropriate institutional committees as well as the Academic Council.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon Institute of Technology to establish a program leading to the B.S. in Ultrasound with Options in Vascular Technology and Diagnostic Medical Sonography effective fall term 1997. A follow-up review of the program will be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs in the 2002-2003 academic year.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Clark and OIT Provost Dow reviewed the program. Chancellor Cox asked if this replaced the program in medical imaging. Dr. Dow replied no; medical imaging has a radiologic emphasis, whereas this degree has an ultrasound emphasis.

Dr. Aschkenasy asked if OHSU has a similar program. Provost Dow responded that, at the baccalaureate level, they do not.

Mr. Swanson moved and Mr. Whittaker seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

AUTHORIZATION TO AWARD AN HONORARY DOCTORATE, OIT

Staff Report to the Board

The Board of Higher Education permits institutions, with the concurrence of their faculty, to award honorary degrees. Each institution wishing to award honorary degrees must adopt criteria and procedures for selection that will assure that the award honors distinguished achievement and outstanding contributions to the institution, state, or society. Criteria and procedures for selection must be forwarded to the Chancellor for approval and, when approved, filed with the Secretary of the Board. Institutions are required to forward
their recommendations for honorary degrees for the Board's approval 90 days before the date for awarding the degrees.

Oregon Institute of Technology requests authorization to award an Honorary Doctorate of Technology to Senator Mark O. Hatfield at an academic convocation on April 24, 1997, that will be part of OIT's 50th Anniversary Symposium, April 23-26, 1997.

Mark O. Hatfield

Senator Mark O. Hatfield's retirement from the United States Senate after five terms ends a remarkable career spanning more than four decades in public office on behalf of Oregon. The career contributions of Mark Hatfield are so widely known among Oregonians, as well as others in the nation, that only selected highlights will be presented here.

Mark Hatfield has established the most enduring political career in Oregon history: 46 years in office, 11 campaigns, and no losses. He was elected to the Oregon House in 1950 after teaching political science at Willamette University, moved to the Oregon Senate in 1954, then became Secretary of State in 1956, and finally Governor in 1958. Eight years later, Mark Hatfield was elected to the United States Senate, where he has remained for 30 years.

Indisputably, Senator Hatfield is held in high esteem, whether for his courageous independence on issues such as U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War, or his civility with those with whom he disagreed, or for his practice of seeking bipartisan solutions to complex national problems, including natural resource issues. At a dinner honoring Senator Hatfield last summer, President Clinton said, "He has lived his convictions as well as anyone I have ever known in public life."

In 1973, Senator Hatfield was appointed to the Appropriations Committee, becoming its chair first in 1981 and serving twice in this powerful role. Access to federal money for Oregon was a by-product of his leadership, thus ensuring funds for significant investment in the state's infrastructure, economic development, and the higher education system, both public and private.

Oregon Institute of Technology wishes to acknowledge those aspects of Senator Hatfield's career that, within the broader context, relate specially to this institution. Senator Hatfield has always supported
applied education and education for the development of the workforce. In 1959, he signed the bill that provided funds to build the new OIT campus and the bill transferring OIT to the Board of Higher Education. As Governor, Mark Hatfield supported funding for the construction of the campus, which has come to represent exemplary technology education. Oregon Institute of Technology was included in the Governor's recommendation to the legislature. Senator Hatfield spoke at the dedication of the campus in 1964.

As Senator, Mark Hatfield created the legislation that led to the establishment and support of the Geo-Heat Center, which has developed an international reputation and is now celebrating its 20th anniversary. That Center has been one of the keys to the economic development of Klamath Falls. Finally, Senator Hatfield has been a commencement speaker at Oregon Institute of Technology.

For all of these reasons, the students, faculty, and staff at Oregon Institute of Technology count Senator Hatfield among their closest friends and strongest supporters. His is a stellar example of a career dedicated to public service and is a model for students everywhere.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended Board approval of Oregon Institute of Technology's request to award an Honorary Doctorate of Technology to Mark O. Hatfield at the 50th Anniversary Symposium on April 24, 1997.

Board Discussion and Action

After Vice Chancellor Clark and OIT President Wolf summarized the request, Chancellor Cox indicated to the Board the intention of the OSSHE institutions to each recognize Senator Hatfield by awarding him with honorary doctorates, and the Board will receive UO's proposal in February.

Ms. Wustenberg moved and Ms. Puentes seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.
RESOLUTION REGARDING NAME CHANGE FOR COLLEGES

From time to time, OSSHE institutions and their constituents have indicated interest in changing the name of the institution. In 1983, the Board approved an Internal Management Directive 1.031 that states:

Any change in the name of an institution proposed by an institution shall be submitted to the Board for approval. If approved, the Board will submit the request to the Legislative Assembly.

Considerable interest has been demonstrated by constituents of Eastern Oregon State College, Southern Oregon State College, and Western Oregon State College to change the name of these institutions from college to university. Draft legislation to accomplish this has been prepared for introduction to the 1997 Legislative Assembly.

OSSHE institutions may be described according to the Carnegie Classifications. Within these classifications, EOSC, SOSC, and WOSC meet the criteria for being either a university or college. The majority of the comparable institutions in the country use the "comprehensive university" designation.

In September 1996, WOSC President Youngblood discussed this topic in response to a presentation by Representative John Schoon and a subsequent question from President Aschkenasy. At that time, President Youngblood stated:

The real issue goes back to the distinction between a doctoral-granting campus as the university, and a comprehensive institution, which offers an array of baccalaureate programs and education offerings through the master's degree. Whenever the name WOSC is changed, for example, based on that name change, you will not find us returning to ask the Board to alter the mission of the institution. That is absolutely unnecessary because the name change would simply recognize us for what we are today.

The Council of Presidents is in agreement with the classification change. In addition, the presidents of the three affected institutions have discussed the implications of the name change and agree to the following:

1. The name change is to reflect where our institutions are now — not what they propose to become in the future.
The missions of the institutions will remain essentially the same.

2. The institutions will not begin to plan for or request development of doctoral programs. Development of additional master's programs will be done in accordance with Board policies.

3. The name change does not imply the need for any additional resources for any programmatic developments.

The draft legislation proposes that the institutions be renamed the University of Eastern Oregon, the University of Southern Oregon, and the University of Western Oregon. To provide continuity of names, staff recommend that "university" follow the institution designation: Eastern Oregon University, Southern Oregon University, and Western Oregon University.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board approve the introduction of legislation into the 1997 Legislature to change the name of EOSC, SOSC, and WOSC to Eastern Oregon University, Southern Oregon University, and Western Oregon University.

Board Discussion and Action

President Aschkenasy indicated that, when this issue first arose, he had concerns about the fiscal implications of changing the names of colleges to universities. As a result of communication with President Youngblood, his concerns have been allayed, and he has shared Dr. Youngblood's responses with the Board members.

Mr. Swanson asked in which Carnegie categories the colleges are presently categorized. Chancellor Cox responded that WOSC and SOSC are in the category of Master's Comprehensive University/College I, and EOSC is category II. Mr. Swanson continued that, along the lines of Dr. Aschkenasy earlier concerns, he wanted the record to be clear: "What we are approving is a name change with regard to the types of programs now being taught at these colleges. If one of those now-comprehensive universities wants to initiate a Ph.D. program, for example, it would require the same major
categorical change and decision making by the Board that it would if their name was 'college' rather than 'university.'" Chancellor Cox indicated that, in the statute as it's currently drafted (LC 1150), section 3 states: "Western Oregon University, Southern Oregon University and Eastern Oregon University are established as comprehensive universities that offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and graduate programs through the master's degree."

Dr. Aschkenasy indicated that State Representative Lane Shetterly asked if the Board was willing to be listed as a co-sponsor of the bill, and asked if any Board members objected to that. (There were no objections.)

Ms. Christopher moved and Ms. Puentes seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

**Staff Report to the Board**

Portland State University (PSU) has proposed a reorganization and renaming of the School of Urban and Public Affairs to increase its academic visibility and efficiency and to reduce its administrative infrastructure. The change does not include new degree programs. Rather it would draw three major units, to be renamed schools, into the new framework. These units are: the School of Government, the School of Urban Studies and Planning, and the School of Community Health. Each one has several divisions.

The only additions to the renamed College of Urban and Public Affairs would be the Department of Political Science, to be moved from the College of Arts and Sciences, and the transfer of the Lewis & Clark Public Administration Program faculty to PSU. It is anticipated that cost savings will accrue to the University through reductions in the number of department chairs and in the overall size of the college administration.

The proposed reorganization was favorably reviewed by the OSSHE Academic Council in November. An abbreviated version of the reorganization proposal presented by PSU follows.
SCHOOL OF URBAN AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
A Proposed Reorganization

The School of Urban and Public Affairs' planned reorganization is intended to enhance academic visibility and efficiency and reduce the administrative infrastructure. There are two phases to this reorganization. The first, and the one that requires University Senate input, deals with the instructional units. A second phase will address the configuration of the five research units that currently function as separate administrative entities and report directly to the Dean. This phase will be addressed during the 1997-98 academic year, and it is not expected to produce changes that require external approval.

The central theme of the proposed reorganization is summarized as follows:

1. Move the Department of Political Science from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences to the School of Urban and Public Affairs effective January 1, 1997.


2. Establish within the new college a School of Government combining the three departments of Administration of Justice, Political Science, and Public Administration. The School will also administer the Ph.D. program in Public Administration and Policy. The School will be administered by a director who will be selected using the procedures currently applied to the selection of department chair, will function at the level of department chairs, and will report to the Dean.

3. Rename the Departments of Urban Studies and Planning and Public Health Education to School of Urban Studies and Planning and School of Community Health, respectively.

Existing Structure and Organization
The School of Urban and Public Affairs houses four instructional departments and five research centers and institutes. In addition, the establishment of a Criminal Justice Research Institute is currently under consideration at the urging of State agencies that deal with corrections and crime prevention. Of the nine existing units, only the Center for Public Health Studies is relatively inactive and as such
does not have a director and does not receive permanent funding. Of the four departments, Urban Studies and Planning is the largest with 22 faculty members, followed by Public Health Education (10 faculty members), Public Administration (7 faculty members), and Administration of Justice (6 faculty members). In terms of enrollment, Public Health Education is the largest, followed by Urban Studies and Planning, Administration of Justice, and Public Administration. The School also administers three Ph.D. programs, two of which (Urban Studies and Regional Science) are housed in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning. The third program (Public Administration and Policy) is interdepartmentally administered by a faculty group drawn from all four departments. In addition, the School administers the Physical Education Activity Program as a service to the University.

The proposed new organization will also incorporate the Department of Political Science that is currently in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (nine faculty members) and the Public Administration Program of Lewis and Clark College (six faculty members). Including these two units, the reorganization will have to be viewed as impacting six existing departments with a total of 60 faculty members. It follows, therefore, that under the existing structure, the School has 13 administrators including the Dean.

Rationale for Proposed Changes

The School of Urban and Public Affairs at Portland State University is the only one of its kind in the Pacific Northwest and remains one of the few in the U.S. offering a comprehensive set of academic and research programs devoted to public affairs. The School's contribution to the mission of PSU and to the educational needs of the community, state, and nation has been considerable. It is equally productive in research and public service. Moreover, the success of the School's graduates is another major contributor to the local, national, and international reputation of PSU. On the local scene, most governmental agencies that hire planners, public administrators, and criminal justice officers have graduates of these programs in positions of responsibility. The School's graduates also can be found in most of the major institutions providing health care within the region. The same situation exists in several foreign countries, particularly in the Middle East, West Africa, and Southeast Asia. Some graduates are cabinet ministers, deans, and department heads. Nationally, Ph.D. graduates of UPA can be found on the faculties of more than 40 major universities.
Since past accomplishments are not a guarantee of future success unless there is a willingness and capability to meet changing societal needs, the School also needs to develop new identities that will thrust it more visibly on the national and international scenes. There are limits to advancement with the current fragmented structure and academic emphasis. It is appropriate for the School to develop a new mission and organization to meet the challenge of the 21st century.

**Proposed Structure and Organization**

The newly reconfigured School will be renamed the College of Urban and Public Affairs with three instructional units instead of the six that currently exist. While these units will function administratively at the department level, it is proposed that they be named schools for national recognition and to acknowledge the consolidation of several existing departments. Each of the three schools will be headed by a director selected by utilizing procedures currently used in the selection of department chairs. Under this reorganization, the three schools will be of comparable size, at least in the long run. This is because of the growth potential associated with public and community health. The largest of the three will be the School of Government with 27 members followed by the School of Urban Studies and Planning (22 faculty members) and the School of Community Health (10 faculty members).

The new School of Government will combine the Department of Administration of Justice, the Department of Political Science, the PSU Department of Public Administration, and faculty in the Lewis & Clark Public Administration Program. It will also include the Ph.D. program in Public Administration and Policy.

The proposed reorganization will address a current weakness in the School where two departments are heavily graduate oriented and two are heavily undergraduate oriented. The three new schools will all have sizable undergraduate offerings, will all have academic and professional master's degree programs, and anticipate having Ph.D. programs when a proposal for a Ph.D. program in Community Health is developed in the future.

In the first phase of the reorganization, the four active research units will report directly to the Dean. The Center for Public Health Studies will be attached to the School of Community Health and, if a new Center for Criminal Justice Research is approved, it will be attached
to the School of Government. The exact configuration of the four freestanding research centers will be determined at a later date after the proposed model has been implemented. As a result, the proposed reorganization will immediately reduce the number of administrators to ten. This represents a 50 percent reduction in the number of department chairs and a 25 percent reduction in the overall size of the School administration. Should the research centers shift to the Schools with a change in status, the number of administrators could be reduced to no more than six. Other savings at this point are limited to one vacant position in public administration that will be eliminated as part of the Lewis & Clark program faculty joining the University.

**Academic Degree Programs**

It is proposed that, in the future, the new college will offer through its three schools, one certificate program, four undergraduate minors, four undergraduate majors, nine master's degree programs, and three Ph.D. programs. These will be distributed as follows:

**School of Government**

1. B.A. and B.S. in Administration of Justice  
2. B.A. and B.S. in Political Science  
3. Minor in Political Science  
4. M.S. in Administration of Justice  
5. M.A. and M.S. in Political Science  
6. M.A.T. and M.S.T.  
7. Master of Public Administration (MPA)  
8. MPA/Health Administration  
9. Master of Public Health (MPH) Jointly with Community Health, OHSU, and OSU  
10. Ph.D. in Public Administration and Policy

**School of Urban Studies and Planning**

1. Minor in Urban Studies  
2. B.A. and B.S. in Community Development  
3. Graduate Certificate in Gerontology  
4. Master of Urban Studies (MUS)  
5. Master of Urban and Regional Planning (MURP)  
6. Ph.D. in Urban Studies  
7. Ph.D. in Urban Studies/Regional Science
School of Community Health

1. Minor in Health Education
2. Minor in Athletic Training
3. B.A. and B.S. in Health Education
4. M.A. and M.S. in Health Education

Academic Autonomy

The new organization is designed to enhance administrative efficiency and provide greater opportunities for faculty who share common interests to interact, cooperate, and support each other. It is not intended to diminish the curricular autonomy of the existing degree programs. As a result, faculty within each School are expected to divide into different groupings or divisions each corresponding to the particular disciplines involved. Each division will have full autonomy on matters related to curriculum development, monitoring, and assessment. Each will also be responsible for advising its students. Matters of promotion and tenure will be defined by the faculties of the Schools during the first year of the reorganization. Budgets, scheduling, and other administrative tasks, however, will be done at the School level. The proposed divisions are as follows:

School of Government

1. Division of Administration of Justice
2. Division of Political Science
3. Division of Public Administration

School of Urban Studies and Planning

1. Division of Urban Studies
2. Division of Urban and Regional Planning

School of Community Health

1. Division of Health Education
2. Division of Community Health (to be established when resources become available)

None of these divisions is intended to function as a separate department. In the case of Public Administration and Urban and Regional Planning, however, autonomy is required to meet accreditation requirements of the two programs. The model used by urban
planning within the existing Department of Urban Studies and Planning is the guide for the establishment of the new divisions.

**Proposed Implementation Schedule**

1. September 1, 1996: Combine PSU and Lewis & Clark Public Administration Programs into one department.

2. October 1, 1996: Appoint a faculty task force to develop bylaws for the newly configured School of Government and to define relations and commitments toward International Studies and the ties between the PAP Ph.D. Program and the School of Urban Studies and Planning that currently provide a major share of the support for the Program.

3. January 1, 1997: Start the new organization but keep the departments of Administration of Justice, Political Science, and Public Administration with their current administrative structure for a one-year transitional period.

4. April 1997: Select the first director for the School of Government.

5. July 1, 1997: Combine the budgets of the consolidated departments without impacting the existing administrative support, given the fact that the three units remain in different locations.

6. January 1, 1999: Complete the merger as the College of Urban and Public Affairs moves into its new home.

**The Process**

The idea of this reorganization was first discussed in 1989. It resulted from the University's interest in creating a named school of government along the lines of the Kennedy School at Harvard, the LBJ School at Texas, and the Humphrey Institute at Minnesota. While the idea remained alive for seven years, circumstances were not yet ripe for the change. From the beginning, faculty have been involved. A faculty committee reviewed the proposed organization in 1990 and recommended its implementation. In January 1996, a task force chaired by Dr. Elizabeth Kutza reviewed the proposal and recommended going ahead with it. The task force included the chairs of all
departments (including Political Science), a faculty member from each of the five departments, and an associate dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Halfway through the process, the Department of Political Science voted to join the new School of Government. All impacted departments have had the opportunity to discuss this proposal with the Dean. At the same time, negotiations began between PSU and Lewis & Clark College for a merger of the Public Administration faculties. The urgency reflected in the above schedule is caused by planning needs related to physical space requirements.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Willis asked if there were focused goals defined as this reorganization was being developed. Mr. Perneister responded that this move is directly in keeping the Board-approved mission statement for PSU, which includes a focus on public administration and urban affairs as a key part of the urban mission.

President Aschenasny requested that staff be more specific and more direct when presenting items to the Board. For example, rather than state that “it is anticipated that cost savings will accrue through reduction,” indicate to the Board how much, in dollars, and then explain what will be done with the money.

(No Board action required)

**Presentation to the Board**

Gary Petersen, Multiple Engineering Cooperative Program (MECOP) coordinator; Larry Martin, Oremet Titanium; and Fred Vetter, vice president of engineering, Oregon Freeze Dry, presented an overview of the MECOP program to the Board. Launched in 1978, key ingredients to MECOP’s success are (1) financial support by the external customer; (2) program coordination by the education unit (i.e., OSU College of Engineering); and (3) acceptance of only screened students. Benefits of the program include:

- Direct curricular input
- Links with industry (e.g., extension of campus-based labs, guest lectures)
- Reduced costs of recruitment by industry
- Greater employment opportunities resulting from the internships
• Strengthened faculty network with private sector engineers
• Assists in financial support of students

The solution team proposed to use the MECOP as a model for Multiple Education Cooperative Programs (MECOP) throughout the state. The mission would be to “Develop a system of outcome-based education cooperative programs through Oregon’s System of Higher Education which is of the highest quality and meets the needs of private enterprise in the Pacific Northwest.” Private enterprise would include manufacturing, retail, transportation, health care, agriculture, school boards, and media/communications. The structure of the Program would use MECOP as a model. Consequently, the Program would work within the following framework:

**Education Unit**
- Related discipline sets will be identified and localized at the appropriate education unit.
- Each education unit will coordinate their specific discipline set(s).
- Each MECOP program will have a coordinator
  - paid by the external customer
  - functional reporting to external customer for MECOP activity
  - remain an employee of the education unit
- Each MECOP program will be given administrative and physical support by the education unit.
- The MECOP coordinator’s direct supervisor will play an active role, presenting the education unit at all MECOP events.

**External Customer**
- Set the strategic direction of the MECOP program.
- Fund 100 percent of the MECOP coordinator’s salary and benefits.
- Select and place the students.
- Provide quality internship sites.
- Provide trained mentors.
- Provide active senior management support.
- Maintain an organization hierarchy of at least chair, vice chair, and treasurer.
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- Abdicate some individual freedom for the program selected
- no "say" in placement site
- accountable to high academic and professional standards

Implementation strategies and timetables were also presented.

Board Discussion

Dr. Aschkenasy indicated that, as a company that has participated in MECOP for many years, he perceived the students to be very high quality. He commended OSU for incubating this program.

(No Board action required)

(TECHNOLOGY SOLUTION TEAM)

(Note: The following excerpt is the conclusion section from the full solution team report, which is available from the Board’s office.)

Technology encompasses many fields and relates to many professions. Technicians and technologists are themselves professionals in that those who will be most effective in these endeavors will have invested in a progression of specialized education and experiences involving a broad range of skills and general and scientific education. Recent developments in computers, instruments, and telecommunications have made the participation of technological personnel ubiquitous in virtually all professions and almost every business and industry, whether goods producing or service based. In fact, the distinction between manufacturing and service has become old-fashioned since, in an age of intense global competition, manufacturing is merely the service of making things for people. Responsiveness is the key, and technicians and technologists have proven their value in making the delivery systems more human and effective.

The education of technological personnel requires all sectors of education, public and private, K through 12, community colleges, and graduate and undergraduate higher education. More than ever, the business and industrial corporations who may have been more or less passive receivers and users of the personnel produced by the educational systems, must be active partners in the process. They see this as enlightened self-interest and are anxious to play an evermore visible and meaningful role.
Oregon is rich in institutions which have, in the past, stepped up to the plate and batted effectively as educators of technological personnel. But, in an era of a changing support base for education, these schools have been overtaken by an order of magnitude increase in demand, qualitatively as well as quantitatively. The users of technological education have become dramatically more varied in their educational backgrounds, family structures, and financial circumstances. Furthermore, the students clearly see themselves as customers and demand a responsive and flexible delivery system offering them great mobility as their interest and circumstances change throughout their lives. A fragmented approach to meeting the need for technological personnel as well as for preparing more Oregonians for fuller participation in the rewards of the new economy is becoming less and less viable.

The key to all the solutions, which have emerged herein, is the bridging among educational institutions, educational sectors, the professions, and employers. Yet, at the same time, higher education has been warned that only by decentralization to the most local level and by adopting the point of view of the many customers can it marshal the responsiveness necessary to make a difference.

Board Discussion

President Wolf presented highlights of the full report to the Board. There were no Board member questions.

(No Board action required)

Executive Summary

Knowledge is our business.

The business of higher education is knowledge. Faculty work on three interrelated activities about knowledge: teaching, research, and service. Faculty effort committed to these activities varies by field of study and campus mission.
Experienced faculty are the most important asset in OSSHE's portfolio.

The majority of OSSHE students are taught by regular, full-time faculty. Of the 2,957 instructional faculty, 80 percent are full-time and 20 percent are part-time.

- Ranked instructional faculty teach three-fourths of the class sections.
- Adjunct faculty and administrators teach about one-fifth of the classes.
- Graduate assistants teach six percent of the classes.
- Two-thirds of the faculty are full or associate professors and 68 percent are tenured.

Teaching is the major focus of faculty.

In an average 50-hour-plus work week, OSSHE faculty spend the largest portion of their time involved in teaching activities. Other time is spent in research and service activities.

OSSHE faculty are productive.

The faculty produced 2.3 million student credit hours in 1995-96, including extended studies and summer session.

On average, the ranked faculty who taught in 1995-96 produced 11.8 course credit hours per term.
Trends in productivity improvements have continued. In 1993 compared to 1991, total student credit hour production per faculty increased 5.5 percent. In 1995 compared to 1993, a 3 percent increase was realized.

OSSHE Faculty Productivity Improvements, 1995 Compared to 1993

Newer approaches.

A number of OSSHE initiatives address faculty productivity and effectiveness, including the establishment of an incentive fund to sponsor demonstration projects. More than 30 campus projects have been supported, primarily in the areas of greater technology use in instruction and reforming the undergraduate curricula, to better integrate courses "thematically." Most projects involve collaboration of two or more campuses, and represent cross-disciplinary approaches at the campuses.

Demands for continuing education are increasing as employers attempt to remain competitive in rapidly changing work environments. Short courses, degree programs, and "just-in-time" training are delivered directly to employer sites or employee homes.
Research adds value to the enterprise.

Total expenditures from gifts, grants, and contracts have grown steadily over the past ten years.

Sponsored research expenditures (from gifts, grants, and contracts) in the past fiscal year (1994-95) totaled $185 million.

Average revenue per full-time faculty member from federal grants and contracts (1994-95) were $70,812.

Three out of four dollars for scientific and research equipment at OSSHE institutions comes from federal sources.

Public service addresses pressing needs.

Public service activities enable faculty and staff the opportunity to use their knowledge in real-life settings for Oregon's citizens, businesses, local governments, and students of the State System. The benefits to Oregonians touch all areas of life: family, health, business, financial, educational, and recreational. Research at OSSHE's universities proves its worth, in part, by service to Oregon, the nation, and the world.
- Hundreds of highly specialized services are offered by laboratories and clinics associated with the professional schools within the State System (e.g., Early Intervention Services, Institute of Aging, Regional Resource Center for the Deaf and Hearing Impaired).

- Many of OSSHE's public services are provided through statewide and regional initiatives (e.g., Extension Service, Small Business Institutes, Center for Population Research and Census).

- Other community services are provided through a wide variety of public attractions such as museums, galleries, library collections, lectures, performances, observatories, athletic facilities and events, and conferences.

In addition, individual faculty (or teams of faculty and advanced students) are energetically engaged in addressing the pressing issues of our times. Faculty service relates directly to the intellectual work of the professor. These services are carried out through consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, and program evaluation.

**Board Discussion**

Vice Chancellor Clark indicated that this faculty work report is a revision of the document prepared for the last legislative session. Tables and figures have been updated and fresh examples provided. Dr. Clark reported that frequently questions relate to class size. "The preponderant number of our classes are 30 students or fewer, and most undergraduate students have a mix of small classes with an occasionally larger class. But we have relatively few truly larger classes in our System. In fact, this was enough of a concern with respect to productivity in recent years that we decided we ought to take seriously the need to be able to offer larger classes, and that was one of the considerations in building the state-of-the-art Harrison Hall on the PSU campus."

Vice Chancellor Clark also noted that faculty are very productive in attracting sponsored research dollars, as well as innovative teaching and class formats as demonstrated through the System productivity grant programs. Dr. Clark indicated that some of that work has served as seed projects, leveraging funds from other areas such as federal and foundation sources.
Ms. Wustenberg inquired in which category student advising was addressed. Vice Chancellor Clark responded it was part of instructional activity. "It doesn't generate credit hours," Dr. Clark explained, "but there's much of instruction that does not generate credit hours." There is a whole range of faculty activity that is very legitimately part of the instructional process, not all of which is tied to credit hours.

(No Board action required)

COMMITTEES

Investment Committee

Mr. Swanson reported that the Investment Committee met on December 5, 1996, with R.V. Kuhns representatives. After Committee discussion, it was agreed that OSSHE would recommend to the Oregon Investment Council (OIC) that R.V. Kuhns perform a full asset allocation study and compile a list of fund managers for OSSHE's pooled endowment funds.

President Aschkenasy appointed Ms. Wustenberg to serve on the Investment Committee.

CORPORATE & PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. Kerans directed Board attention to the new Legislative Notebook, and thanked Dr. Nancy Goldschmidt and all those who assisted her in this effort. Mr. Andy Clark reminded Board members to return the survey he distributed in December so that the Government Relations staff can assess which legislative contacts can be made and by whom.

Mr. Kerans indicated that the basic strategy with the session is a future-focused budget. While there will be some communication with newer legislators about higher education's history (e.g., post-Measure 5 environment, SB 271), the focus will be to look ahead to the strategic planning and initiatives identified by the Board in the budget and which have survived in the Governor's budget.

Mr. Kerans also announced that the successful, weekly legislative newsletter would be published again this session.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Wykoff commented that he enjoyed his first official meeting.

Ms. Puentes and Ms. McAllister thanked President Youngblood for the excellent visit, and commended her and her staff for the informative presentations. Dr. Aschkenasy echoed their sentiments, stating that WOSC is strengthening what they're already very good at.
Ms. Wustenberg thanked Presidents Frohnmaryer, Ramaley, and Risser, and Board President Aschkenasy, for representing the State System in such a positive manner on the recent Oregon Public Broadcasting program “Seven Days.”

ADJOURNMENT The Board meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Virginia L. Thompson
Secretary of the Board

Herbert Aschkenasy
President of the Board