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ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 9:17 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
Ms. Katie Van Patten          Dr. Herb Aschkenasy

Mr. Tom Imeson was out of the country on business.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the May 16, 1997, regular meeting of the Board and the June 5, 1997, special meeting of the Board. Ms. Wustenberg moved and Mr. Swanson seconded the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

President Aschkenasy reported that UO President Frohnmayer’s daughter, Kirsten, died Thursday morning. He asked all present to observe 30 seconds of silence as an expression of deepest sympathy.

Welcome, D. Bernstine

Dr. Aschkenasy welcomed PSU President-elect Daniel Bernstine to his first Board meeting, noting that he would be attending the Board meeting and Renewal in July as well.

Thanks

President Aschkenasy thanked Board members for participating in the campus commencement ceremonies during the past month. He also thanked Mr. Kerans and his staff for their excellent work with the legislature. While they are still in session, discussing add-back issues, the higher education budget has been passed and signed by the Governor.
CHANCELLOR’S REPORT
Transitions

Chancellor Cox added his welcome to Mr. Bernstine. He also announced that Governor Kitzhaber and his wife are expecting a baby in November. Dr. Cox noted that he would be hosting a retirement celebration to recognize the many OSSHE employees who are concluding their service this year. In addition, he indicated that this was the last official meeting for Associate Board Secretary Vicki Shives, who will begin working for Vice Chancellor Clark in July. He announced that Ms. Lynda Rose, currently with the PASS Project, will be assuming that Board’s office role.

Kudos

Dr. Cox stated that 20 research universities recently gathered to form a new organization — the Pacific Rim Research Universities — and the University of Oregon was invited to join the group. “It bodes well for the kind of bridge building we’re trying to be engaged in across the rim.” Dr. Cox also applauded OIT for having just been included in the 100 “best buys” in America for 1997-98.

Employee Benefits

Chancellor Cox noted that his office is continuing to have discussions with employees regarding benefits packages being extended to cover domestic partners. He indicated that staff are watching how the court is handling the issue; he will keep the Board informed.

Board Renewal

Dr. Cox announced that Jim Lussier, CEO of the St. Charles Medical Center in Bend, is the Governor’s proposed replacement for Mr. Swanson. Mr. Lussier will be attending the Renewal Work Session. Mr. Swanson will also be there. Governor Kitzhaber has been asked to kick off the Renewal, describing his vision of the characteristics and attributes of the State System through the year 2003. “This will help us plan to build a jointly invested plan for the next three biennia that the executive branch supports.” Dr. Richard Jarvis, Chancellor of the University and Community College System in Nevada, will be facilitating the Board Renewal.

IFS Report

Dr. Simonds, president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS), reported on their June meeting. The main topic of discussion was faculty tenure review. The following points were raised:

- All OSSHE campuses have annual pre-tenure reviews, plus one or two major reviews before moving an assistant professor toward tenure.
- Most faculty hired at that level demonstrate strong promise, are highly trained, and highly recommended.
The pre-tenure period is a time of intense scrutiny of the faculty member's performance, including teaching, research, etc.

- Productivity in teaching and research is under close scrutiny.
- Even from this select population, those faculty who are promoted and tenured must meet high standards of performance. This carefully screened group of professors is then reviewed periodically after tenure is granted.
- Post-tenure reviews are conducted on all campuses at intervals of three to five years.

The IFS indicated that a review of the effectiveness of the various systems involved in promoting strong faculty careers is planned. Further information will be gathered before a detailed report (accompanied with recommendations) is presented to the Board. The IFS wants to include information about rewards for good performance and guidance for faculty career development, as well as sanctions for poor performance.

President Aschkenasy, referring to a previous staff presentation made to the Board regarding pre-tenure screening, stated that his sense was that the public is not concerned about pre-tenure, but rather with what happens after tenure is granted. Dr. Simonds responded that post-tenure issues are being examined as well.

Dr. Aschkenasy asked in what ways Vice Chancellor Clark and the Academic Affairs Council are involved. Dr. Clark responded that the Council has been discussing post-tenure review for some time — collecting national reports, collecting information on campus policies and practices — and is moving toward a more systematic review. “Within a short period of time, we could come to the Board to discuss what we believe the strengths and weaknesses are of our present post-tenure review policy and process, and make some recommendations for strengthening post-tenure review,” Dr. Clark added.

President Aschkenasy asked if the Board would receive separate reports from the two groups. Dr. Simonds responded yes, although recent conversation suggests some coordination between the IFS and the Academic Council. Dr. Clark noted that Dr. Simonds has agreed to provide her with an update of the IFS discussions. “We’re also going to have some campus representation, so we would be prepared in the fall to provide both faculty and administrative perspectives on
post-tenure review." Chancellor Cox added that the presidents are also discussing the subject. "We're going to do an internal, introspective look first, and then bring to the Board our own view about post-tenure review. So it will be a fairly well-discussed subject this fall."

Dr. Simonds indicated that the other major business of the June IFS meeting involved passage of the following resolution regarding benefits for domestic partners:

We, the senators of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate of the Oregon State System of Higher Education, hereby resolve that the Oregon State System of Higher Education seek to provide employment insurance benefits to the domestic partners and children of System employees in domestic partner relationships in the same fashion as is provided for married employees, and we respectfully request that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education and the Chancellor actively pursue and advocate for the timely extension of such employment insurance benefits with all public entities having jurisdiction in this matter, including, but not necessarily limited to, the State Employees Benefits Board (SEBB) and the Oregon Legislative Assembly.

Dr. Simonds pointed out that all faculty currently receive a lump dollar sum per month, which they then can allocate into the various categories of health insurance, life insurance, and related benefits. "The change in policy would simply allow employees to make choices that included domestic partners and would not increase the size of the fund available for allocation. This change in policy should not produce a change in the funding of employee benefits."

INTRODUCTION, BUILDING NAMING

In the 1989-90 period, when state funding began a downward trend, the State Board of Higher Education encouraged institutions to become more entrepreneurial and to increase fundraising efforts to accomplish needed academic, research, and student-life projects that previously would have been supported entirely by state tax funds. In 1996, the Board again emphasized a need for increased external funding when it endorsed a provision in the capital construction program priorities whereby institutions were to focus efforts to match planned bonded Education and General projects with gifts and revenue from non-state sources.
Each institution experiences different levels of giving, depending in part on its culture, the type of university, the length of time gift giving has been practiced, and the number of potential donors among the alumni and friends of the institution. A long-standing practice at private universities and colleges is to recognize donors in special ways, particularly by naming facilities and programs after the giver. The Board has an existing policy that anticipates that facilities would not be named after living donors except under special meritorious circumstances. In more recent times, as fundraising efforts have generated more significant contributions, institutions are bringing forward requests for exceptions to the existing Board policy; typically these are cases where individuals are providing outstanding service and/or significant donations. This month’s docket includes two such additional requests for this exception.

Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Anslow summarized the introduction to the two naming requests. President Aschkenasy suggested that the Board change its rules rather than continuing to request exceptions. Mr. Anslow responded that it (1) is common practice across the nation, and (2) puts the Board in the position of serving as a buffer against potential donor pressure. PSU President-elect Bernstine added that it’s a kind of recognition that donors appreciate as well.

Summary

The University of Oregon requests an exception to Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 580-050-0025 regarding the naming of buildings after a living person. The OAR provides that an exception may be made if “the donor contributes a substantial share of the cost of construction or if other unusually meritorious reasons exist.”

Staff Report to the Board

Officials at the University of Oregon have forwarded to the Office of Finance and Administration a request to name the new athletic Indoor Practice Facility the "Ed Moshofsky Sports Center" in honor of Ed Moshofsky. The Indoor Practice Facility is currently under construction and is expected to be completed in early 1998.

Mr. Moshofsky has long been associated with the University of Oregon, having graduated from the College of Business in 1943.
During his college days at the UO, he was an active student, lettering in varsity football and serving as a member of the Delta Epsilon fraternity and Friars Honorary. He has been inducted into the University’s Order of the Emerald.

Ed and Elaine Mosofsky are former co-owners of Mosofsky Enterprises, an umbrella corporation within the timber industry that was founded by the Mosofsky family. Mr. Mosofsky also served as chairman and CEO of Fort Hill Lumber Company as a partner of Whipple and Mosofsky Lumber Company.

The Mosofskys have committed $2 million for the construction of an indoor practice facility, approximately one-sixth of the total cost.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the new Indoor Practice Facility be named the Ed Mosofsky Sports Center in honor of Ed Mosofsky, a strong supporter of the University.

Board Discussion and Action

UO Provost Moseley reviewed the naming request. Ms. McAllister moved and Mr. Swanson seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

Summary

Portland State University requests an exception to Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 580-050-0025 regarding the naming of buildings after a living person. The OAR provides that an exception may be made if "the donor contributes a substantial share of the cost of construction or if other unusually meritorious reasons exist."

Staff Report to the Board

Officials at Portland State University have forwarded to the Office of Finance and Administration a request to name the existing Health and Physical Education (P.E.) building the "Peter W. Stott Center" in honor of Mr. Stott. The Health and P.E. building was constructed in
1965 and serves the University’s athletic department and student recreation and provides classroom and class laboratory space.

Mr. Stott, who attended Portland State University in the late 1960s, has been a major contributor to the PSU athletic program. Mr. Stott is the Chief Executive Officer of Crown Pacific, a publicly traded limited partnership in the forest products industry headquartered in Portland.

Mr. Stott has recently made a $1 million challenge grant to PSU and will serve as co-chair for the $3 million athletic capital and scholarship campaign for Portland State University athletics. The campaign donations will be split between athletic scholarships and capital improvements. The money contributed and raised through Mr. Stott's efforts will be used to refurbish and improve the Health and P.E. building, including upgrading the gymnasium, creating a Hall of Fame, improving locker rooms, as well as to develop an athletic practice field on the PSU campus and to improve Duniway Track, which is located near the PSU campus.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended that the Health and Physical Education building be renamed the Peter W. Stott Center in honor of Mr. Peter W. Stott, a strong supporter of the University.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Vice Chancellor Anslow reviewed the naming request. Ms. Puentes moved and Dr. Whittaker seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

**B.S. IN BIOCHEMISTRY, UO**

**Introduction**

The University of Oregon (UO) requests authorization to offer a new instructional program leading to the Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry. The Board reviewed a preliminary proposal for this program on February 16, 1996. This program will be offered through the Department of Chemistry in the College of Arts and Sciences. This proposed degree would rename the biochemistry track as it exists within the current chemistry degree program, and is consistent
with UO’s research university identity and mission. A biochemistry program currently exists at Oregon State University. The proposed program is within the capacity of the UO to offer as it is in response to the large proportion of chemistry students who currently pursue the biochemistry option. No new resources are needed to implement the program.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

The proposed program is consistent with UO’s mission statement, combines the UO emphases on research and undergraduate education, and would make “free-standing” the biochemistry option within the current chemistry major. The UO currently offers chemistry degrees through the Ph.D. level. This proposed program has been designed to prepare undergraduates for a research career in either an academic or industrial environment or a professional career, such as the medical profession.

2. Evidence of Need

The Chemistry Department regularly fields requests for the proposed program from current and potential students, and approximately one-half of the current chemistry majors choose the biochemistry track for their undergraduate degree. Further, having the biochemistry major specifically noted on their transcripts will assist students in seeking employment in such areas as Oregon’s growing biotechnology industry.

A career as a biochemist is listed as one of the current best options and fields for advancement as described in Field’s 100 Best Careers for the 21st Century (1996). Salary ranges are from $25,000 to $75,000 at the bachelor’s level in biochemistry. In addition to biotechnology areas, employment opportunities exist with and in pharmaceutical companies, clinical biochemistry, hospital laboratories, neuroscience research, genetic research studies, toxicology, forensic science and crime laboratories, agricultural chemicals, food sciences, feed manufacturers, consumer product manufacturers, and environmental protection fields.
3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

Because this proposed program is already being offered as the recognized "biochemistry track" of the current chemistry major, quality of the program is assured. The Chemistry Department has a research-active faculty and the department offers degrees through the Ph.D. level. The UO program is unique because of the Chemistry Department's relationship to the highly successful and interdepartmental Institute of Molecular Biology; students majoring in biochemistry have the opportunity to participate in research programs with faculty and staff of this highly respected organization. The current biochemistry program is certified by the American Chemical Society (ACS), which examines the curriculum, faculty, and other resources of the department. ACS certification of the proposed biochemistry major will be sought at the next five-year review in 1998 and, given the reputation and quality of the Chemistry Department and the UO's program in molecular biology, this proposed major should be easily certified.

The course of study for the major will consist of 156 credits of lower-division requirements in science and mathematics, 71-74 credits at the upper-division in science (chemistry, biochemistry, and biology), and three courses of advanced science electives.

The quality of the UO biochemistry program is also reflected in the success of its graduates. For example, in 1996, all nine of the chemistry/biochemistry students who applied to medical schools were accepted. (For 1997, the number is two out of three.) Medical schools to which graduates have gone include Oregon Health Sciences University, Northwestern University School of Medicine, Mayo Clinic School of Medicine, UCLA, Johns Hopkins University, and the University of Washington. Other biochemistry graduates have gone on to other graduate programs and directly into employment in industry.

4. **Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program**

**Faculty.** No new funds for faculty are required to implement this proposed program. Chemistry faculty are complemented by strong biochemically oriented faculty in the Biology and Physics
Departments. With the long-time existence of the biochemistry option within the chemistry major, the current course offerings in the Chemistry Department are entirely sufficient to support the proposed program.

**Library, Facilities, and Equipment.** Library resources at the UO are sufficient to support Ph.D. programs in chemistry/biochemistry and are, therefore, sufficient to support the demands of this proposed undergraduate major. Similarly, classroom space and laboratory facilities currently support the biochemistry track of the chemistry degree and are sufficient for the proposed major.

**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 the University of Oregon to establish a program leading to the B.S. in Biochemistry effective fall term 1997. A follow-up review of the program will be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs in the 2002-03 academic year.

**Board Discussion and Action**

UO Provost Moseley described the program, pointing out that knowledge does not “respect” the boundaries of disciplines. “For many years students have been taking courses that are the functional equivalent of a biochemistry degree,” explained Dr. Moseley, “but we did not have the authority to award them that degree.” This program would change that without adding new faculty or requiring additional resources.

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

The University of Oregon (UO) requests authorization to offer a new instructional program leading to the Bachelor of Science in Mathematics and Computer Science (Joint Major). The Board reviewed a preliminary proposal for this program on February 16, 1996. This program will be offered through the Departments of Mathematics and Computer and Information Science in the College of Arts and Sciences. The program is designed to develop team players in Oregon's information-based economic future and is most appropriate for students who would, at the present time, pursue a major in either computer science or mathematics. This proposed degree is a combination of two current degrees, both of which are consistent with UO's mission and the University's productivity plan. There are similar programs at Western Oregon University (recently approved by the Board at its April 18, 1997, meeting) and Southern Oregon University. The proposed program is within the capacity of the University to offer, is in response to growing needs in the high-tech sector of Oregon's economy, and provides a course of study that would enable graduates to directly enter industrial positions or pursue advanced programs of study in either discipline. No new resources are needed to implement the program.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

This proposed program combining existing majors is consistent with UO's mission by uniting its research and undergraduate education agendas. The UO currently offers degrees in both disciplines through the Ph.D. level. The proposed undergraduate degree program would (1) offer students substantial amounts of two complementary disciplines and combine them in a single degree program; (2) enable graduates of the program to proceed directly into appropriate industrial positions that require both computer science skills and mathematical problem-solving ability; and/or (3) prepare graduates to enter graduate study in either discipline (or in applied areas such as biological computational science).

The proposed program is also consistent with the University's 1994 academic productivity plan, which emphasizes the importance of offering realistic four-year degree programs.
Students who are likely to enroll in this proposed program are those currently interested in a major in mathematics, computer science, or a double major. This flexible degree program will emphasize basic principles in the two disciplines; will provide students with a well-rounded background in both areas; is at least as suitable and marketable than more specialized programs; and features a realistic expectation for completion in four years.

2. Evidence of Need

This program responds directly to identified market needs in the region as students will be well-prepared to enter Oregon’s expanding computer technologies industries. UO students have expressed considerable interest in pursuing a joint degree such as is proposed here, with as many as 10 to 20 percent of students now enrolled as mathematics or computer science majors as likely candidates. Ten to 20 graduates per year are anticipated.

Typically, students who major in mathematics or in math-computer science tend to be talented, hard-working students with highly developed analytical skills and, as a result, tend to be highly employable. This is especially true in today’s economy. National need for graduates of this program is indicated by the 1996-97 edition of the Occupational Outlook Handbook, which lists “computer scientists and systems analysts” to be the fastest-growing field (in terms of number of projected openings) during the years 1994 to 2005. Further, the Oregon Occupational Projections Handbook (for the years 1996 to 2005) indicates that employment in the categories of computer systems analysis, computer science, and computer science teachers will remain high in the state, with an accelerating ten-year job growth rate. Based on a projected growth rate of up to 8 percent, as many as 440 positions in the state’s software industry alone may be created annually. When the needs of other high-tech industries are considered, as well as the demand for high-tech employees in commercial businesses and government offices, as many as 800 to 1,200 positions in this field may be needed. In all OSSHE institutions last year, 167 students graduated with baccalaureates in computer science and 103 in mathematics. Given the projected trends in the industry, therefore, it is anticipated that the employment picture for UO’s mathematics and computer science degree holders will be excellent.
3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

The strength of the curriculum and the quality of the faculty all point to this proposed program as one of high quality.

**Curriculum.** The two disciplines that comprise this joint major are long-standing programs at UO, and the integrating theme of this degree will be mathematical and scientific rigor in the field of computer science. Much of present-day computer science evolved out of mathematics and these fields have always been connected. Faculty and student interests range along a continuum from pure mathematics to quite non-mathematical areas of computer science, with this joint major lying somewhere in the middle of that continuum. This proposed program consists of a coordinated blend of courses from the two fields.

Additionally, students in this program have the opportunity to participate in internships as part of their educational experience. A student intern receives credit or pay for work performed for an industry client under joint supervision of an industry mentor and a faculty member. Recent examples of local internship sites are Hyundai, Software Science, Dynamix, and Spectra Physics; summer internships have taken place at industries such as Intel, Tektronix, Sequent, Hewlett-Packard, and Silicon Graphics. Internships are generally seen as highly successful experiences for both the student and the industry client and often lead to permanent employment.

**Faculty.** The faculty of the Mathematics Department and the Computer and Information Science Department are nationally recognized experts in their respective fields. According to the classification system of mathematics departments by the American Mathematical Society, the UO department fits comfortably into "Group 1" (i.e., into the top tier of [the 40 best] math departments in the country). Faculty members have received a number of prestigious professional awards and fellowships and include two past presidents of the Mathematical Association of America.

The computer and information science faculty are similarly recognized. The department consists of an IEEE Fellow (the highest award conferred by the Institute of Electronic and Electrical Engineers); a recipient of the Fulkerson Prize in Discrete
Mathematics (from the Mathematical Programming Society and the American Mathematical Society); three award winners of the National Young Investigators Award/Career Award (from the National Science Foundation); and a recipient of the Faculty Award for Women (from the National Science Foundation). Department faculty have also been awarded a grant from the National Science Foundation in curriculum development in order to teach computer science in a holistic context, integrating cooperation and communication skills with scientific and technical education.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

**Faculty.** No new funds for faculty are required to implement this proposed program. The current course offerings in mathematics and computer science are entirely sufficient to support the proposed program.

**Library, Facilities, and Equipment.** Library resources at the UO are sufficient to support Ph.D. programs in each of the disciplinary areas and are therefore sufficient to support the demands of this proposed joint undergraduate major. Current computing facilities and equipment are sufficient to implement the program and include Macintosh laboratories administered by the computing center, the computer laboratory in the mathematics department, and the Unix workstation lab administered by the computer and information science department. Further, plans are underway to develop new undergraduate laboratories in cooperation with Intel and Microsoft.

**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 the University of Oregon to establish a program leading to the B.S. in Mathematics and Computer Science effective fall term 1997. A follow-up review of the program will be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs in the 2002-03 academic year.
Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Clark and UO Provost Moseley reviewed the docket item. Dr. Aschenasen asked if this program is expected to increase the number of people interested in the major. Dr. Moseley responded that they anticipate that it would draw more of the mathematics majors who are interested in computer science.

President Aschenasen inquired about the need for other OSSHE schools who currently offer computer science degrees to consider adding this program. Chancellor Cox responded that computer science grew out of the overlap between math and physics. That was the pattern at WOU and SOU. OSU's program grew out of engineering. Dr. Cox added that a recent article in The Chronicle of Higher Education noted the number of elite universities that are moving into distance education — institutions who had previously never considered distance education. "Boundaries will not mean much of anything. The customer is in charge. All of that has implications for us to be providing multiple offerings to students."

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

B.S. IN MANAGEMENT, OIT

Introduction

Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) requests authorization to offer the Bachelor of Science Degree in Management. OIT has a long history of offering management technology programs. An accounting emphasis dates back to the beginning of OIT in 1947, a marketing emphasis dates back to the late 1970s, and an entrepreneurship and small business management emphasis has been developing over the past several years. In 1994, OIT focused its B.S. in Industrial Management to comply with the Related Accreditation Council of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (RAC/ABET). This resulted in OIT's losing the flexibility to offer emphasis areas that were previously available. The proposed degree program would provide a home for those — and other — emphasis areas. This is essentially a splitting up of the existing Industrial Management degree, half of which becomes a newly titled Production and Operations Management Program accredited by RAC/ABET; the
proposed program in Management becomes the other half. The proposed program is fully in line with OIT's Strategic Plan for 1994-1999. All courses in the new core program are offered in the present Industrial Management core. The faculty needed to develop and deliver seven new or significantly revised courses are on staff and qualified for this set of responsibilities. No new resources are needed to implement the program.

**Staff Analysis**

1. **Relationship to Mission**

   The proposed program is directly related to OIT's mission, which includes providing degree programs in the applied technologies such as "business technologies." The mission of the Department of Management is to prepare leaders to manage organizations in the high technology environments of the 21st century. This program falls within this mission.

2. **Evidence of Need**

   The OIT program offered through the Department of Management within the School of Engineering and Industrial Technologies responds to regional needs. Klamath County employment is characterized by small businesses. There are expected to be increasing opportunities and demand for managers trained in small business management. Marketing, both at the level of the small business as well as industry and county levels, will become increasingly important. The emerging tourism industry will require skilled marketing specialists if it is to achieve its potential in southern Oregon. Klamath County's desire to increase production and marketing of processed agricultural products will also provide opportunities for managers knowledgeable in marketing.

   An additional growing market is to serve the Klamath Tribes, where emphasis areas in accounting, marketing, and small business management are needed to facilitate several small businesses that have been started by members of the Klamath Tribes. As the Klamath Community College service district develops, an additional number of students are expected to move to Klamath Community College with an intention to participate in 2+2-type programs, requiring expanded demand for baccalaureate educational opportunities.
3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The program builds on a long tradition of OIT's offering Management Technology programs. The accounting emphasis dates back to the beginning of OIT in 1947. The marketing emphasis dates back to the late 1970s. The entrepreneurship and small business management emphasis has been developing over the past several years. With a focusing of the Industrial Management degree to comply with accreditation requirements in 1994, OIT lost flexibility to continue to offer these and other emphasis areas. The proposed program would enable OIT to split the existing Industrial Management degree so that half becomes a newly titled Production and Operations Management program accredited by RAC/ABET, and this becomes an additional program in the Department of Management, with emphases in accounting, marketing, and entrepreneurship and small business management.

The program is targeted for implementation in fall 1997. The majority of students in the program are expected to come from the local geographic area. This program provides opportunities for degree completion for people presently employed, as well as bringing groups into higher education not well represented at present, particularly those who will enter OIT via the Klamath Community College route.

All of the courses in the Management Technology core are present in the Industrial Management core program at OIT. In the three emphasis areas, OIT will offer a total of 27 courses; 20 have already been developed and delivered at OIT. Eleven faculty are available to participate in the program and qualified to develop and deliver the seven new or significantly revised courses.

The proposed program will be designed to bring students to a sophisticated level of competence in microcomputer applications. Application of technologies, especially in computer hardware and software, is a core competency in the course of instruction.

All students will complete senior projects. In each of the emphases, students will be required to work with an actual client in the business community to develop an original solution to a real-world problem. Each senior project requires a 200-hour commitment of time from the student, who must use tools and
techniques drawn from at least five disciplines within the curriculum. In addition to the senior projects, students have the opportunity to participate in co-op experiences and/or internships.

While the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) is the closest specialized accrediting body with standards relevant to this program, the regional universities' business programs are not presently accredited by ASBSP. OIT does not plan accreditation with ACBSP. A significant segment of the program that is already accredited by RAC/ABET will be maintained.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

All requisite resources to successfully offer this program are in place. Faculty currently involved in the Industrial Management program will be responsible for the proposed B.S. in Management. Library resources to support the proposed program are adequate. Facilities, equipment, and technology are adequately equipped to support the proposed program, which essentially is a spin-off from the existing Industrial Management program.

Program Review

The proposed program has been reviewed positively by appropriate institutional committees and the OSSHE Academic Council.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon Institute of Technology to establish a program leading to the Bachelor of Science in Management with emphases in Accounting, Marketing, and Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management, effective fall term 1997, with a follow-up review of the program to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs in the 2002-03 academic year.

Board Discussion and Action

OIT Provost Dow reviewed the program, noting that there has been considerable dialogue within the Klamath Basin community, including International Guard, Merle West Medical Center, Columbia Plywood, and Aqua Glass. She also indicated that OIT has a Small Business
Development Center that currently provides consulting. However, many of the people with whom they work would like actual coursework and degrees. In addition, there are many industry people with associate degrees who would like to complete baccalaureate degrees. Dr. Dow also stated that they are preparing to offer parts of this program in the evening, packaged as certificates for those people with degrees who would like a certificate in an emphasis area.

Ms. Wustenberg asked if the follow-up reviews are presented to the Board. Vice Chancellor Clark responded that they are, usually in July. "We have had a Board policy for perhaps six or seven years to do five-year follow-up reviews of programs. They are brief, descriptive reviews, but they are revealing."

Ms. McAllister asked if there is a mechanism for tracking programs that are dropped. Vice Chancellor Clark responded that her office does track programs that are dropped and provides that list to the Board periodically. "Sometimes you'll notice a statement in the program proposal that signals a phasing out of one program when the proposed program is installed. This is not true of all the programs, but some of them."

Ms. Christopher asked if all the programs brought before the Board for approval have gone through the preproposal process. Vice Chancellor Clark responded that while the majority do, this program was "fast tracked" so that OIT could respond to changing regional needs by making opportunities available more immediately. In addition, Dr. Cox pointed out that this program is an adaptation of an existing program rather than a new program. Ms. McAllister concurred that this fast tracking was important to address current needs. Ms. Christopher requested a list of when program preproposals have gone to the Board.

Ms. McAllister inquired about the basis for putting programs on the consent agenda. Dr. Thompson responded that the purpose of the consent agenda is to permit the public adequate time to respond to concerns about proposed programs. Dr. Clark added that all approved programs are automatically moved to the next month's consent agenda.
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Ms. Puentes moved and Ms. Christopher seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Ms. Christopher, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

B.S. IN HEALTH SCIENCES, OIT

Introduction

Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) requests authorization to offer the B.S. in Health Sciences. The Board reviewed a preproposa1 for this program at its February 16, 1996, meeting. This proposed health sciences program will (1) provide a basic science curriculum for students seeking entry-level positions in biomedical and biotechnology laboratories; (2) strengthen the quality of programs currently offered by OIT in the allied health sciences; (3) support the development of several related programs in the allied health sciences; and (4) provide a preparatory course of study for medical school and health-related professional and graduate programs. Although other OSSHE institutions offer programs generally described as "pre-medical," no other program fits the profile of this proposed program, which will prepare students for health-related careers through a unique sequence of courses, seminars, and a senior capstone experience. Current resources at OIT are sufficient to begin implementing this program.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

As the only public institute of technology in Oregon, OIT has historically been instrumental in providing degree programs in technical areas, including health technologies and nursing. In addition, OIT is recognized as a national leader in medical imaging technology and dental hygiene, has the only baccalaureate program in the nation in vascular imaging technology, and offers one of the few diagnostic sonography degrees in the country. In operating these programs, OIT manages a clinical externship program involving more than 65 hospitals and clinical sites in 19 states. The proposed health sciences degree program would extend OIT's mission to include preparation at the undergraduate level for entry into a number of other medical career paths.
2. Evidence of Need

The need for this proposed program is evident by identifying institutional needs as well as student opportunities. With the implementation of this proposed program, OIT seeks to broaden its upper division offerings in chemistry, microbiology, and anatomy and physiology, all of which are necessary to prepare students for health careers. OIT would, thus, have the ability to retain students who would otherwise be seeking to transfer to another institution to complete their preparation for post-baccalaureate health career programs. Additionally, OIT could retain other students who leave OIT's dental hygiene or medical imaging programs (and who may otherwise choose to leave campus programs) by offering them other health-related alternatives.

While the primary outcomes anticipated for graduates of the proposed health sciences program are entry into appropriate graduate and professional schools for health careers requiring advanced degrees, opportunities also exist for students who choose to seek employment at the B.S. degree level. For example, with the proliferation of biotechnology firms located in California and the Pacific Northwest, it is likely that opportunities in these companies would exist. According to industry representatives, the curriculum of the proposed program would provide suitable training for entry-level positions in their companies, and the training would be superior to that of most bachelor's degree graduates (biology or chemistry majors) competing for similar positions.

Further, data presented in the Occupational Outlook Handbook (1996/WWW version) suggest that individuals trained at the bachelor's degree level in this field are likely to find jobs as health technologists and technicians. One example of a position in this category is "medical record technician"; job prospects for individuals in this field should be very good, with employment demand growing much faster than average through the year 2005. This is due to the large rise in the number of medical tests, treatments, and procedures, and because medical records will be increasingly scrutinized by third-party payers, courts, and consumers.
3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The proposed program will be of high quality. All of the OIT faculty have experience teaching health science-related subjects, including anatomy and physiology, microbiology, biochemistry, laboratory technology, and immunology. Additional adjunct medical faculty are available from the Merle West Medical Center, several of whom currently teach for OIT. Thus, the high-quality programs offered by OIT in the allied health sciences will extend to this proposed program. Current OIT faculty are well regarded in their respective discipline. For example, the institution has a national reputation in areas related to medical imaging technology. Further, the placement rate for OIT graduates has typically been exceptional, with students highly trained in their technical area as well as in the verbal and written communication skills expected by employers.

Academic rigor is assured within the proposed curriculum. For example, the math and science prerequisites for the program meet or exceed the published entry requirements of allied health programs for entrance to medical and dental schools, and into related graduate programs. Students exiting the program will be qualified to enter health programs in a variety of disciplines and to apply for graduate and professional school programs. Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU) has been consulted in the process of developing the proposed program's curriculum.

OIT academic programs feature practica, projects, and other "hands-on" experiences to supplement the theoretical aspects of the discipline learned in the classroom — and this proposed program is no exception. Seminars will include interaction with practitioners from a variety of medical fields. All students enrolled in the proposed program will complete a capstone experience in their senior year; examples of possible senior projects include the following:

- Study of rural community health needs, working with the Area Health Education Center (AHEC) and OHSU.

- Study of nursing education in relation to nursing practice, working with the statewide nursing program.
• Comparison of several medical imaging modalities in the effective diagnosis and management of diseases.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

No new state resources are needed to offer the proposed program. Funding for the program will take place through a combination of internal reallocations and fundraising through external sources. Current OIT faculty and adjunct instructors are at a level sufficient to begin program implementation; no new faculty would be required for the first two years. In academic year 1999-2000 (the third year of implementation), two FTE faculty at the assistant professor level would be required additions to the program. One of these faculty members would teach courses related to public health and epidemiology; the other would teach in the areas of health psychology and growth and development. It is anticipated that these positions can be funded with internal reallocations made possible by faculty retirements as well as revenue generated from the first two years of the program's existence. External funding will be sought in support of this proposed and related programs in the Klamath Falls community.

With regard to reference sources, many of the basic materials are already available on campus. However, additional videotapes, CD-ROMs, books, and journals will be needed in public health and medical administration topics. Expenditures in the medical areas will be increased approximately ten percent above current levels; the acquisition of needed materials will be accomplished with an internal reallocation of funds. Additional equipment and supplies are needed for organic chemistry and the upper division course in microbiology. The funds for these materials will be also be provided for through an internal reallocation.

Program Review

The proposed program has been reviewed positively by all appropriate institutional committees and 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 Health Sciences effective fall term 1997, with a follow-up review of the
program to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs in the 2002-03 academic year.

**Board Discussion and Action (May 16, 1997)**

OIT Provost Dow reviewed the program proposal. Chancellor Cox emphasized that OIT is working to meet some regional needs, particularly for those 400 to 500 students who are not degree seeking or would have to leave because OIT’s offerings have not been comprehensive enough. This is not an alteration of OIT’s mission, but it is providing OIT with a little broader base. Dr. Dow added that it also enhances OIT’s existing programs in health technology and the collaborative nursing program.

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

**Board Discussion and Action (June 20, 1997)**

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

**Introduction**

Oregon State University (OSU) requests authorization to offer the Ph.D. in Radiation Health Physics (also known as “radiation protection” or “health physics”). The Board reviewed a preproposal for this program at its May 17, 1996, meeting. This field of study focuses on the protection of humans and their environment from the harmful effects of radiation. Examples of areas in which health physicists are involved are: environmental monitoring; radiation and radioactive materials from nuclear facilities; radioactive material transportation; radiation detection instrumentation; emergency planning; risk assessment; and public information. The program will be administered by OSU's Department of Nuclear Engineering in the College of Engineering (which already administers the current B.S. and M.S. programs in radiation health physics). This proposed program is
wholly consistent with the land-grant mission of OSU and would be the only program of its kind in the Pacific Northwest. No new resources are needed to implement the program.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

The proposed program is directly related to OSU's land-grant mission and the institution's emphasis on providing high-quality programs in agricultural, science, and engineering fields. The field of health physics is interdisciplinary — spanning the areas of biology, chemistry, environmental sciences, physics, medicine, engineering, law, and sociology. The implementation of this Ph.D. degree program will improve the scope of OSU's educational offerings by building on the already strong and recognized bachelor's and master's radiation health physics degrees offered in the College of Engineering.

2. Evidence of Need

OSU's request for this program is based on capacity as well as need. With baccalaureate and master's programs of long standing, student interest in a Ph.D. program has been very strong and the core courses needed for this program are already being offered. During the past six years, there has been a steady expansion in student enrollment, research activities, and departmental faculty in the radiation health physics area. There are currently 25 students enrolled in the B.S. degree program and 12 in the M.S. program; seven of these M.S. students indicate that they are awaiting approval of the proposed Ph.D. program. Eventual enrollment in this program is anticipated to be five to ten students, with two to four graduating each year.

No Ph.D. programs in radiation health physics exist in Oregon or the Pacific Northwest. Only two of the 18 institutions granting Ph.D. degrees in this field are located west of the Mississippi River (the closest program is at Colorado State University). Regional need is high for individuals trained at the Ph.D. level given the major nuclear sites in the states of Washington, California, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, and Colorado. Many academic institutions (e.g., Colorado State University, Georgia State University, University of Washington, etc.), federal and state agencies (U.S.
Air Force, Army, Navy; U.S. Department of Energy, Oregon Department of Energy, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Aeronautical and Space Administration, etc.), as well as private sector employers (General Electric Co., Westinghouse Electric Corporation, Bechtel Hanford, Inc., etc.) now hire master’s-level graduates. There is a demand for more Ph.D.’s in this area. Many of these employers have expressed interest in potential OSU doctoral graduates in radiation health physics. Data taken from the Health Physics Society Newsletter from the period of February 1995 to February 1997 indicate 25 known openings (16 academic, 4 in government, 5 in industry). OSU would be at a geographic advantage in recruiting top students, linking with potential employers for the program’s graduates, and for involvement in research into environmental restoration, waste management, and health and safety issues.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

The proposed program builds on a 34-year history of the baccalaureate and master’s degree programs in radiation health physics at OSU and is a logical extension of the institution’s activities and aspirations in this field. The master’s degree was first approved by the Board in 1963 when the program was known as “radiation biology.” Undergraduate coursework in the field evolved in the 1980s in OSU’s Department of General Science and, in 1991, this activity was elevated to a full bachelor’s degree program — which by then was housed in the Department of Nuclear Engineering. In 1966, the general science Ph.D. program started offering an area of concentration in radiological biology (although this option was discontinued in 1983). With the exception of some 600-level course offerings, all courses for this program are already being offered. Several areas of concentration, currently offered for the master’s degree, will be immediately available for Ph.D. students. These concentration areas include nuclear medicine, emergency response planning, radiation shielding, radioactive material transport, radiation detection and instrumentation, as well as several others. The nine-member Oregon State University Department of Nuclear Engineering and Radiation Center Advisory Board (an external panel comprised of members from the public and private sectors) has recommended the addition of this Ph.D. program, deeming it “appropriate and necessary.”
Given the above considerations, the faculty of radiation health physics in OSU's Department of Nuclear Engineering is well-equipped to now offer this program. Research interests and activity in the department are at levels sufficient to support graduate student training for the Ph.D. The external review team (see below) indicated that "the present faculty of the nuclear engineering department is outstanding." Indeed, two of the faculty members in the department (Jack F. Higginbotham and Kathryn A. Higley) have received the coveted Elda E. Anderson Award from the national Health Physics Society. This award is for outstanding research and service to the profession and OSU is the only institution in the nation to have two award winners on its faculty.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

All requisite resources to successfully offer this program are now in place. The faculty currently involved in the B.S. and M.S. programs will be responsible for the proposed Ph.D. program. All core courses in the proposed curriculum (with the exception of the 600-level offerings) are currently being offered. OSU's Radiation Center, with its Triga reactor and supporting laboratories, is a facility fully and appropriately equipped to support a radiation health physics Ph.D. program. This proposed new program is an efficient utilization of existing resources; no new resources are needed to establish or maintain this program.

Program Review

The proposed program has been reviewed positively by all appropriate institutional committees, the Academic Council, and by an on-site external review team. The external review was conducted on February 21, 1997, by Wesley Bolch (University of Florida), Wayne Lei (Portland General Electric Company), and Nicholas Tsoulfanidis (University of Missouri - Rolla). The positive report produced from the review stated, in part, that: the proposed program "will strengthen the quality not only of the existing nuclear engineering and health physics program but will also have beneficial synergistic effects to other programs such as chemistry, biology, environmental engineering, and others"; "the present faculty...is active in research and...capable of generating more research support"; "the Radiation Center is an excellent facility...and the faculty have the expertise, ingenuity, and drive to utilize the laboratories in such a way that the benefit for
students is maximized; and that OSU "should be given the green light to start accepting doctoral candidates."

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon State University to establish a program leading to the Ph.D. in Radiation Health Physics effective fall term 1997, with a follow-up review of the program to be conducted by the State System Office of Academic Affairs in the 2002-03 academic year.

Board Discussion and Action (May 16, 1997)

OSU Provost Arnold reviewed the proposed program. Ms. McAllister moved and Mr. Imeson seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Swanson, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

Board Discussion and Action (June 20, 1997)

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

GRIEVANCE OF DR. ALAN REX MITCHELL, OSU

Executive Summary

The Board's administrative rule, OAR 580-021-0055, provides for the Board or its designee to review the president's decision in certain faculty grievances. Dr. Alan Mitchell is an assistant professor in the Department of Crop and Soil Science of the College of Agricultural Sciences at Oregon State University (OSU). He appeals President Risser's decision not to award him tenure and promote him to Associate Professor. Board President Aschkenasy appointed a subcommittee to review the matter in detail prior to Board action.

Staff Report to the Board

Dr. Mitchell is an assistant professor in the Department of Crop and Soil Science of the College of Agricultural Sciences at OSU. In December 1996, he filed a grievance alleging that the Crop Science Department and College of Agricultural Sciences failed to follow the
University promotion and tenure guidelines in five areas related to input from outside individuals, or "clients," and acceptance of "oral evaluations and undocumented input of an undisclosed source." The Faculty Grievance Committee conducted a hearing on the matter over the course of two days. The committee found there was insufficient evidence to support any of Dr. Mitchell's allegations. However, three of the five committee members believed that other unintentional shortcomings in the process supported extending the review process for an additional year. The other two members concluded that, because the promotion and tenure guidelines were followed, no remedy was appropriate. President Risser reviewed the matter and concluded that, although there were parts of the process that could be improved, there was no violation of the guidelines and no indication of unfairness. Therefore, he denied Dr. Mitchell's request for a re-evaluation of his application for promotion and tenure with stipulations suggested by Dr. Mitchell and extension of Dr. Mitchell's employment.

Dr. Mitchell sought Board review, asking the Board to implement the recommendation of the three committee members who supported an extension of Dr. Mitchell's employment. Dr. Mitchell made the following arguments in support of his appeal:

1. OSU violated fair procedure in allowing the Dean's decision to be based in part on "undisclosed personal observations."
2. "OSU violated fair procedure by not telling the external reviewers they should ignore all pre-OSU research."
3. "OSU violated fair procedure in not telling Dr. Mitchell that his pre-OSU research was irrelevant."
4. "OSU violated fair procedure by not reflecting Dr. Mitchell's annual reviews in the promotion and tenure process."
5. "OSU violated fair procedure in criticizing Dr. Mitchell for shortcomings in client relations when the promotion and tenure committee filed its negative recommendation without information from clients."
6. "OSU violated fair procedure by relying on information from clients when the clients were not provided any materials summarizing what the candidate had done."
7. "OSU violated fair procedure because 'the annual review, mentoring, and feedback mechanisms currently in place seem to have been flawed' for 'personnel at off-campus stations' (quoting the faculty grievance committee report)."
8. “President Risser rejected the recommendations of the faculty grievance committee without ever addressing the procedural flaws in the promotion and tenure process.”

The Board’s rule does not allow the Board to reverse a decision of a president unless:

(a) Procedural error was committed by the institution during the grievance procedure and the error resulted in prejudice to the grievant;
(b) The decision of the president is not supported by substantial evidence; or
(c) The decision is in conflict with applicable rules or law.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Because the Board was reviewing this grievance directly, staff had not prepared a recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Melinda Grier informed the Board that their procedures allow either for a full Board review of a grievance or for review by a Board designee. The President of the Board chose review by the Board, but because of the length of the materials, President Aschkenasy had decided to appoint the following subcommittee to review the materials in detail: Dr. Whittaker, chair; Mr. Willis; and Ms. McAllister.

Dr. Whittaker, on behalf of the subcommittee described Dr. Mitchell’s professional background and catalogued the process to date. Ms. Grier indicated that Dr. Mitchell had written a letter to the Board, “objecting to the characterization of his grievance as an appeal of the decision not to award him promotion and tenure.” Rather, Dr. Mitchell pointed out that the appeal states it is an “appeal of the decision of President Risser, which reversed the recommendation of the faculty grievance committee — that the procedures of the promotion and tenure committee were flawed....He [Dr. Mitchell] further states that the grievance never was, nor could be, about the promotion and tenure decision (the power for which lies with the University), but wants the Board to sustain the recommendation of the faculty grievance committee and uphold their remedy based on their finding of procedural shortcomings that prevented a fair hearing, and consisted of repeating the promotion and tenure process for Dr. Mitchell.” He would like the Board to focus on is whether there’s due
process at OSU in the grievance procedure.” Ms. Grier also indicated that Dr. Mitchell was present at the Board meeting. Finally, she reviewed the three bases upon which the Board could decide to reverse the president’s decision.

Mr. Swanson asked if the president of OSU had the authority to make a final decision, even if that was in conflict with the recommendation of the faculty grievance committee. Ms. Grier responded that the president did have that authority. “The requirement is that the president can find contrary to or consistent with the committee. If contrary, then the president is required to state the reasons. You have a copy of the letter in which President Risser stated his reasons. Dr. Risser did not disagree with the finding, but he did disagree with the recommendation.”

Dr. Whittaker stated that, after reviewing all the materials and consulting with Vice Chancellor Clark and Ms. Grier, the Board subcommittee made the following recommendation: “We recommend that President Risser’s decision be supported because we found no evidence to support reversal based on the three criteria allowed in the Board rule.”

Mr. Swanson requested that Dr. Mitchell be allowed to address the Board — not to get into a hearing, but as a culmination of the process. President Aschkenasy asked if any Board members objected. Hearing none, he invited Dr. Mitchell to address the Board.

Dr. Mitchell thanked Ms. Grier for reading the message he had sent. He added a couple of points that were not mentioned in the summary, such as that his supervisor at the research center wholly supported his promotion, as did the external reviewers outside the University. He also indicated his dismay that the process has taken such a long time to be resolved. He described his perspective about the awkward position the faculty grievance members are put in when they must choose whether to “rock the boat.” He expanded briefly about aspects of the process that seem problematic.

“I really hadn’t planned on addressing the Board in the event that they would rule against me,” said Dr. Mitchell, “because I didn’t think that anything I said would influence you because I’ve been painted into a box as a disgruntled OSU employee. Nothing could be further from the truth. I’ve very much enjoyed my time at OSU and the work I was able to do and, again, it comes back to the procedure.”
President Aschkenasy thanked Dr. Mitchell for his comments, and he also thanked Dr. Whittaker and members of the subcommittee for their careful and thoughtful review and recommendation.

Mr. Swanson indicated that he had reviewed the materials and understood where the process could be improved in terms of "incidental steps along the way." However, he did not find any place in the record that would support that there was denial of some material phase of the process as this appeal progressed. "In other words, Dr. Mitchell was given every opportunity to be heard and to be reviewed. And these are difficult issues and I appreciate his position in coming before a board in the very last step of the process....I can only conclude that there's been a lot of process here. However, there has not been fundamental violation of the procedures along the way."

Mr. Swanson indicated that the Board subcommittee had given him more confidence in making a decision as a Board member. He expressed his appreciation to Dr. Mitchell for having addressed the Board, but stated that the Board can't make hiring and firing decisions, and that he supported the recommendation of the subcommittee.

Ms. Wustenberg asked if the issue was whether the president of OSU did the correct thing. Ms. Grier responded that the Board is really working to determine that there was substantial evidence to support the president's decision that the promotion and tenure procedures that were followed in Dr. Mitchell's review did not violate OSU's procedures.

Ms. Wustenberg stated that it's unfortunate that perceived inequities in the procedures could detract from the basic question of whether someone should be promoted and tenured. "Maybe the procedure could be cleaned up a little or made more straightforward. If it is straightforward, then why was there any misunderstanding?" Ms. Grier responded that the issue is indeed promotion and tenure, but that Dr. Mitchell's grievance was that the procedure was not fair and that he was disadvantaged by that.

Ms. Christopher asked if OSU's promotion and tenure guidelines had been reviewed recently. "Midpoint, did the rules change? If the guidelines changed, did they [faculty seeking promotion and tenure] then have new standards to meet? Or maybe they were broadened; maybe it was better." OSU Provost Arnold responded that there has been major revision in the last three years in OSU's promotion and
tenure guidelines. Two significant parts were related to evaluation of scholarship: the basic performance of assigned responsibility and demonstration of scholarship. Now the position description for that faculty role was to be included in the dossier that is considered when the promotion and tenure decisions are made. Formerly, it was optional. Currently, upon hiring, a position description is developed, to be annually reviewed and updated, and all versions are then included in the dossier. Consequently, evaluations of performance of responsibilities and scholarship are made in relation to the expectations of the position. The net effect works to the benefit of the faculty member, especially those who have assignments that may be somewhat distinctive or unique.

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

ACCELERATED BACCA-
LAUREATE DEGREE PLANNING, SOU

Overview

There are a number of models for accelerating progress toward the baccalaureate degree in place nationwide. Southern Oregon University (SOU) has been exploring such models over the last several years and is implementing an innovative, experimental accelerated program beginning fall 1997. The program is designed for highly motivated, goal-oriented students to accelerate progress toward a baccalaureate degree by assessing proficiencies and reducing the number of required general education credits, resulting in a minimum of 135 and maximum of 150 credit hours. (The requirement for four-year students is 180 credits in the quarter system.) This would mean a reduction of 9 to 24 credits from general education, and in all cases 21 reduced elective credits. Students would complete a traditional college major of 39 to 54 credit hours and a range of 30 to 60 remaining elective credits toward the completion of the baccalaureate degree. Specific credits reduced will be identified by the student's advisor and the Accelerated Baccalaureate Committee. Credits can be reduced in the major and in general education courses using a variety of proficiency measures. Seven departments are participating at the current time. SOU expects to admit an 11-student cohort for 1997-98.
A more complete description of the SOU accelerated baccalaureate program model is provided in the supplementary section of the Board’s docket.

**Background: National and State Issues**

**The Issue.** Increasingly, policymakers, legislators, and others are looking at the cost of educating students as the public’s investment in students, from early childhood through baccalaureate programs. The aim is for students to achieve a specified level of educational attainment with the greatest cost efficiency to the state, regardless of the time it takes to meet this standard, i.e., 16 or fewer years.

**Time to Degree.** National data indicate that about one-third of U.S. baccalaureate recipients graduate within four years (36.1 percent), about one-third (31.1 percent) between four to five years, and about one-third (32.8 percent) between five and seven years (NCES, 1993). OSSHE’s time to graduation is similar to national rates. While these statistics are linked to factors such as the role of academic preparation on college retention rates, demographic variables (gender, race/ethnic group, residency), reasons for students selecting the institution, and transfer status (Astin, 1993; Porter, 1989), there is widespread consensus that institutions must work hard to reduce attrition and time to degree.

**K-12 School Reform.** Many states are engaged in K-12 school reform aimed at enabling students to reach higher standards of achievement. The goal is to reduce student attrition and increase readiness for entry into the workforce and postsecondary programs. With expectations of higher standards in high schools, there is growing pressure to increase the use of acceleration mechanisms and determine "college readiness" through proficiency-based assessments for college admissions. States such as Oregon, Wisconsin, Florida, Georgia, and Colorado are leaders in such K-12 reforms.

Oregon is the leading state addressing the development and implementation of proficiency-based college admissions. OSSHE’s Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS) aligns with the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century (adopted by the 1991 Oregon Legislature) to reform K-12 to move toward world-class standards. The Act calls for implementation of new Certificates of Initial Mastery (CIM) for students at about grade 10 and Certificates of Advanced Mastery (CAM) for students at about grade 12, and calls
for a new "seamlessness" between high school and college. Implicit in the Act is a move toward proficiency-based demonstrations of learning and away from grade- and course-based college admissions. These changes are expected to be important components of time-shortened baccalaureate degrees as more high school students move out of "lockstep" to begin college programs as they are ready.

**Acceleration Strategies.** Multiple strategies have been proposed for shortening time to baccalaureate degrees. Blanco for SHEEO (1994) compiled the following list of 17:

- Control/reduce number of credits required for the degree
- Increase use of acceleration mechanisms (Advanced Placement, dual enrollment, etc.)
- Maximize summer school
- Foster use of technology and distance learning
- Compress semesters/terms
- Offer financial awards to institutions
- Return fiscal savings to institutions to support these types of efforts
- Limit state-subsidized education
- Reward faculty directly
- Reward degrees for competency attainment
- Establish graduation award for student (financial)
- Limit course credits to define adequate progress toward a degree
- Implement an excessive credit surcharge
- Increase full-time credit loads and consider block tuition
- Improve academic advising
- Provide tuition rebates for using selected technologies or course time periods
- Allow elective credit for service learning

Early college admissions programs have long been an acceleration mechanism. The Advanced Placement (AP) and College Level Examination (CLEP) programs were established by the College Board in the 1950s. AP allowed students to take college-level foundation courses while still in high school; they received advanced standing once they matriculated to a postsecondary institution. CLEP examinations enabled students to test out of beginning-level courses at postsecondary institutions (Robertson-Smith, 1990).
There has long been wide acknowledgment of the benefits of providing high school seniors with early college-level opportunities (NASSP, 1982). During the past 20 years, many states have implemented "early college" programs, typically through AP, "college-high," international baccalaureate (IB), etc. States such as Colorado, Minnesota, and Washington have pursued postsecondary options programs for large numbers of students to attend college while still in high school, or move fully into college when ready. A significant barrier to expansion of these programs is financial. Do the dollars available to educate a 12th grader who takes college-level work flow to the college or stay with the high school? Also, many hold the perception that the instructional/social setting of secondary schools is more conducive to the teaching-learning process for adolescents than the college setting (NASSP, 1982).

Most "college-high" programs are emphasizing college-level curriculum that is available on-site in the high school. Students are typically required to pass tests at the end of courses, for which a fee is charged, and once students move into college, they may not necessarily receive credits for this work. In some cases, the number of credits required for college graduation is not reduced by students entering with AP credits. In addition, there are many questions about whether the college-level courses offered in high school are, in fact, college level. The national pass rates for students taking CLEP, AP, and IB programs suggest that many students are not yet doing college-level work. The fault may not lie with the students. Courses to develop students' knowledge and skills may be inadequately taught and/or students may not be adequately advised about preparation for these tests or what constitutes college-level work.

Many colleges provide courses directly to high schools with the rationale that this provides greater assurance of college-level instruction (and credit) than would be provided in AP courses (Smith, 1979). The literature depicts numerous liabilities when courses are provided at high school sites: difficulty maintaining a suitably serious academic atmosphere in a high school environment, excessive workload for the high school teacher selected to teach the university-level course, teacher-dominated class discussions, and territorial jealousy displayed by high school teachers of "regular" classes. The use of college courses at high schools is also more expensive than using AP courses (Smith 1979).
Concurrent enrollment options are prevalent in colleges. A representative sample of American higher education institutions in 1982 found that 87 percent of institutions were admitting at least a small number of qualified high school students prior to high school graduation (Fluit and Strickland, 1982). The benefits of concurrent enrollment programs include: acceleration of progress for students, reduced tuition costs, reassurance for parents concerning their children's ability to handle college-level academic responsibilities, relief of high school senior ennui, productive interaction between high schools and colleges, improved high school faculty status, enhanced high school standing, facilitated student recruitment, grant opportunities, school-college faculty interaction, enhanced college-community relations, and social equity (Greenberg, 1989). Concurrent enrollment programs have been generally more successful (i.e., more students participating) when the student tuition costs are covered (Wilbur, 1982). For example, Florida's Postsecondary Education Planning Commission reports that enrollments in AP courses increased dramatically after its funding incentive program was implemented (Blanco, 1995).

OSSHE has a number of acceleration mechanisms in place to assist high school students in moving through their college programs more expeditiously. Key mechanisms have included use of AP courses and tests offered by the College Board to determine the awarding of credit to students entering OSSHE institutions, College-High (negotiated college-level courses taught in high schools by approved high school teachers), IB, and concurrent enrollment programs.

OSSHE has been tracking student participation in AP for a number of years. Data indicate that while Oregon high school seniors taking AP exams make up only about 6 percent of the year's graduating class, they do make up 17 percent of those enrolling in a four-year college the fall following graduation. In 1994, 4,605 AP exams were taken by 3,481 students. It is important to note that only about two-thirds (68 percent) achieved a score high enough to earn college credit, and students taking the exams represent only two-thirds or less of all students taking AP exams.

Despite a substantial number of AP, college-high, and IB courses taken in Oregon schools, there are many problems associated with any future reliance on the use of these options. With the introduction of K-12 school reforms, many high schools have had to reallocate resources away from their most talented high school students to more
broad-scale reforms. Higher education has been notified that some high schools are reducing their AP and college-high course offerings, and many high schools that continue to offer them are experiencing large enrollment courses (35+), which may seriously compromise the expectations that these are, in fact, college-level classes. Increasingly, there is a call for students who are ready for college-level work to move into college, and not tie up high school resources for this purpose.

All OSSHE institutions have some provision for concurrent enrollment for high school students. These are not particularly visible, nor for various reasons, have institutions actively recruited college-ready high school students.

In 1993, OSSHE representatives participated in a small national meeting with institutions interested in accelerated baccalaureate programs (e.g., Stanford University, SUNY, Oberlin). Subsequently, SOU participated with Black Hills State College and the University of Wisconsin System Office in a session on "Accelerated Degrees" at the January 1995 Association of American Colleges and Universities meeting. At this meeting, SOU learned of tentative interest in many states. There were widespread concerns, however, about the wisdom of accelerating programs. Issues raised at the meeting included: watering down the college curriculum, the value of a three-year degree, the reality of compressing courses, the level of student maturity, the ability of traditional students to cope with the pressure of an accelerated degree, the adequacy of high school preparation necessary for students entering the university to tackle a three-year degree, whether students need to progress through the institution at the same rate, what is the heart of a college major, can teaching/learning occur in different time frames, and can outcomes-based education and assessment really change time to degree (Hopkins-Powell, 1995).

This debate has an historical base. While four-year baccalaureate programs have been the norm in the United States, there are many exceptions as well. Hopkins-Powell reports that four-year degrees were under attack in the early 1900s. In 1906, as many as 36 percent of the class at Harvard completed in three years. At Johns Hopkins, the collegiate program was three years (motivated students could complete in two). At Columbia and many other prominent American universities, there was the professional option plan that allowed students, after two years, to enter a professional school. The
University of Chicago used the model that several schools currently use — a four-quarter plan that allows students to progress more quickly.

In 1971, the Carnegie Commission reported the "length of time spent on the way to the B.A. can be reduced by one-fourth without sacrificing educational quality." This recommendation was based on the perceived redundancy of the high school/college freshman year. The report prompted a reexamination of three-year degrees. Subsequently, SUNY, Goucher, and Northwestern developed three-year options (Hopkins-Powell, 1995). Still the popularity of the four-year degree has persisted.

An area of keen interest is compressed baccalaureate majors, although the institutions adopting these options tend to be private institutions (e.g., Oberlin, Stanford, Middlebury, Brigham Young) that attract students who come to college with a significant amount of college credit (e.g., AP) and/or those that develop special articulated programs with particular "feeder" high schools.

However, public institutions have few examples. One comes from the University of South Florida's St. Petersburg campus, working in collaboration with Pinellas County Schools and St. Petersburg Junior College. The "Fast Track B.A." offers the opportunity to obtain the bachelor's degree within three years after high school graduation. Students in the program must be enrolled in concurrent enrollment programs such as AP or dual credit, receive special counseling in high school to ensure that course choices provide appropriate options upon entering college, and select model programs from 19 different majors (e.g., literature, geography, history, psychology, business, education, special education) designed to present a preferred sequence of courses. The State of Florida has agreed to pay fees (two semesters of college work free of costs) in support of providing a challenge for motivated high school students (Three-Year Baccalaureate in Pinellas County, 1994).

Black Hills State University (BHSU) is also offering an Accelerated Degree Program in four degrees: elementary education, English, business administration, and psychology. It stresses early college admissions (CLEP, high school programs), reduced number of credits for a degree, compressed semesters (13 weeks rather than 15 to 16), moving to a tri-session structure, distance learning, and use of summer school. BHSU notes that "at this point in time, the impact on
the quality or success of existing strategies for accelerated degree programs is unknown. Few states or institutions have evaluated the effectiveness of this alternative" (Usera, 1995).

Strategies by Board of Higher Education and OSSHE Institutions

All OSSHE institutions have been involved in discussions for several years about accelerated baccalaureate programs as part of the System's mandate in the early 1990s that campuses develop productivity plans, including consideration of options for time-shortened degrees. All campuses have some activities underway toward this goal; however, no campus has a significant number of approaches that have been tested and proven to significantly move students through their programs more expeditiously.

The issue of accelerated baccalaureate degrees was raised during the 1997 Legislative session, with testimony provided by Associated Oregon Industries (AOI) regarding the need for accelerated approaches. Under proposed amendments to Senate Bill 919, expected to be passed by the legislature: "The State Board of Higher Education shall: (3) Continue experimentation with and implementa-
tion of various accelerated baccalaureate degree models at state institutions of higher education in applicable programs. The models may include but need not be limited to early entry and postsecondary options and models that are jointly developed with the State Board of Education."

SOU's Background for Developing the Proposed Program

SOU's Early College Entry program, in place for a number of years, provides students a mix of college courses taken at SOU while students simultaneously take courses at the high school. A problem with this model is that students can take a variety of courses which may not result in time-shortened degrees.

In 1991, SOU decided to explore the development of an accelerated baccalaureate option. The initiative was geared to the expectations of a changed secondary school environment as K-12 prepared to put in place the provisions of the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. SOU saw this as a unique opportunity to calibrate entrance standards with the newly defined exit standards of Oregon public high schools in such a manner as to identify students whose intellectual background and motivation would prepare them for additional
performance-based learning through a compressed baccalaureate program.

In 1993, SOU was the recipient of an OSSHE Academic Productivity and Educational Reform grant ($35,000) entitled *Refocusing Undergraduate Education (Accelerated Baccalaureate Program)*. The project enabled SOU to continue development of an accelerated baccalaureate program by achieving a calibration among the standards for the CAM, admission to an OSSHE institution, and the performance indicators of SOU's undergraduate core curriculum. SOU worked on an accelerated baccalaureate program with the following features: a restructured general education, minor, and major subject requirements; and student mastery model of assessment. SOU consulted with Portland State University on general education curriculum development efforts. SOU also consulted with Eastern Oregon University, whose experience with prior learning assessment would be useful in evaluating student applicants for an accelerated college program.

In 1994, SOU with OSSHE submitted a federal grant proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) to serve as a campus demonstration site of key components in accelerated baccalaureate programs for replicability in Oregon public institutions. In 1995, SOU received the three-year ($186,670) FIPSE grant to develop an accelerated degree program that will allow students to complete requirements in less than the usual four years.

The SOU plan at this time represents a credit-reduction system for students in an experimental accelerated baccalaureate program.

**Review Processes for Present Proposal**

The SOU Accelerated Baccalaureate degree has wide support across the campus, including the President, Provost, Curriculum Committee, Core Education (General Education) Committee, Faculty Senate, and a wide ranging group of individual faculty and administrators.

The program was reviewed in May 1997 by the OSSHE Academic Council, which raised the following issues and concerns:
- Will it be necessary to match up faculty from the various disciplines across the System to develop proficiencies for graduation if/as other campuses move into acceleration approaches?

- An outcomes-based (proficiency attainment) assessment is emphasized in the proposed admission process but then, as students proceed through the major, they enroll in courses without additional outcomes assessments.

- There may be issues for graduate school acceptance and performance eventually. While graduate deans have been consulted and graduate schools generally do have experience evaluating undergraduates who have had nontraditional baccalaureate experiences, it may be disadvantageous for students to be moved ahead more quickly in terms of their skill attainment compared to the four-year students. Only follow-up evaluation studies of student admission to graduate school and their performance in graduate school will illuminate this set of concerns.

- A similar issue was raised regarding industry's needs. AOI supports more students coming through higher education more quickly; however, employers also express concerns about writing, communication skills, critical thinking, etc. Would the three-year program have a leveling effect on those students participating, having them graduate with about the same skills as everyone else? Would this make them less competitive with their peers (when they were among the highest ability group students prior to college)?

- Should there be a specific commitment to terminate this effort if it seems unsuccessful, or to expand it if successful? What is the ultimate capacity for such a program?

- Other models are in place in OSSHE. Do other models have more promise than this one? For example, PSU is working with area high schools to offer its general education program courses that would enable successful students to enter the University with some required work completed.

In light of these concerns, but in recognition of the need for an OSSHE campus to experiment significantly with acceleration
approaches, the Council favored continued implementation of the experimental program at SOU. Continuation should include development of a systematic evaluation plan so that the program could be discontinued within a three- to five-year period if findings suggest that students in the experimental program are not meeting the expected outcomes of a baccalaureate program. Data should be collected on the ability of students interested in pursuing graduate and professional school options to do so successfully. Also the evaluation should take into consideration the ongoing reviews conducted by Northwest Regional Accreditation Association.

Board Action

No Board action is required for implementation of the SOU experimental program using existing majors. Staff recommends that SOU should be encouraged by the Board to continue implementation of this experimental model, and to design and implement a concomitant evaluation component to include issues raised by the OSSHE Academic Council, and components included in reviews by the Northwest Regional Accrediting Association. SOU should keep the OSSHE Academic Council informed about implementation of the experimental program and program outcomes. Staff should return to the Board on a periodic basis for status reports on the SOU model.

Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Clark described the broad parameters of the experimental accelerated baccalaureate program that SOU is implementing in the fall of 1997 with a cohort of 11 students. It is a program that is designed for highly motivated, goal-oriented students. President Reno added that this program provides a unique opportunity to calibrate entrance standards with exit standards. He added that this endeavor provides an unprecedented opportunity for SOU to reach "across the back fence to K-12" and to work with them as they define their exit standards and SOU's entrance standards.

SOU Provost Hopkins-Powell added that the number of credits required to complete a course of studies is being reduced from 180 hours to 135-150 hours. "This proposal balances and protects the students as we go forward and assures that the major is completed in its entirety. No new course work will be required, but it will take additional coordination and advising," she continued.
Ms. Wustenberg asked what majors would be included in the program. To date, the following are included: sociology, foreign language, economics, communication, psychology, mathematics, and business. Provost Hopkins-Powell explained that participating departments must make a commitment to offer courses in the same sequence each year to assure that students can complete the requirements.

Mr. Swanson asked how this “accelerated program” differed from a student taking 45 credits per year and graduating with 135 credits. He indicted that he “always thought a three-year degree was an accelerated program where a student would be taking exams and showing proficiencies so that they were excused from credits, perhaps writing a major paper and getting an additional number of credits.” Provost Hopkins-Powell indicated that was “an early expectation of the program and something we still hope to be able to do. We are essentially looking at the proficiencies being assessed from high school or any previous work for entrance. Looking at accelerating a program by doing that within the college as well is a harder issue and one that still must be dealt with.”

Chancellor Cox underscored the absolute importance of tying the accelerated program with Oregon’s K-12 reform plan. “If students are not able to achieve a high level at the time of exit from high school, they will not be admitted to the program,” he continued. Dr. Cox asked if the calendar year of quarters was an issue. The provost responded that SOU is a proponent of the semester system and that it would give the institution more flexibility.

Mr. Willis asked about the connection with the community colleges and how a student might be able to transfer in their second year. Dr. Hopkins-Powell indicated that SOU has had conversations with Rogue Community College and has also been studying models around the country that are working well. It is an important part of all of the articulation planning that is occurring Systemwide, she indicated.

President Reno observed that one of the benefits of the planning around this program was that it was bringing faculties of SOU and Rogue Community College together, in many cases, for the first time. “Departments are meeting and discussing possibilities and finding new ways to provide a closer fit,” he added.
Ms. Puentes asked what had been done to assess mastery or proficiency of students. Provost Hopkins-Powell indicated that SOU had taken bits and pieces of some of the existing PASS proficiencies. "The faculty has probably spent more time on this question than anything else. It is not an exact science," she added. "Faculty have worked intensively with the students who have applied this year and I think they feel comfortable with how they have assessed the proficiencies." Continuing, Ms. Puentes inquired how SOU would assess how well students in the accelerated program had done compared to those in a regular four-year program. Provost Hopkins-Powell responded that all students do a capstone project, a kind of senior project, and a comparative study of the two different modes of degree completion could be assessed.

Mr. Swanson offered some final comments. "One of the things the Board has been concerned about is the cost efficiency of programs and the employability of graduates. The cost of a higher education continues to go up so there is considerable pressure to do our business less expensively, in shorter periods of time, and more efficiently. At the same time, our society is becoming more complex. Diversity continues to increase and that will require more understanding, more attention to interests that are outside our own narrow interests, and expanding them by reading more, having more exposure to a vast array of scientific information that has ethical ramifications. In some ways, we ought to be expanding the number of courses and opportunities for students before they get a degree. So there is a push here and a pull there to do things differently. I think it is very important that we look at high school students being able to take exams to get credit, for students to come in and sit down with someone and design a program they can complete in three years by doing four years worth of credits through extra work. It is extremely important that there be some real experimentation with various ways within our System. I would encourage you to keep working on acceleration as you go ahead with this program because the acceleration aspect is the most exciting."

Dr. Whittaker concluded the discussion by adding, "This is truly nontraditional. I am pretty conservative, but I find it exciting and I think it offers a lot of opportunities. I would encourage SOU to report back to the Board on a regular basis and discuss how the assessment is
going, the successes that you see, and the fine tuning that is needed. Keep us informed on how it is going

(No Board action required)

Overview

In most categories, the Oregon State System of Higher Education's enrollment distribution, by racial/ethnic group, is comparable to the distribution among public high school graduates and in the Oregon population overall (Table 1). The exceptions are Asian American students who are over-represented in OSSHE compared to high school graduates and the Oregon population as a whole, and Hispanic/Latino students who are underrepresented. However, the proportion of resident Hispanic/Latino first-time freshmen in fall 1996 is higher than the proportion of Hispanic/Latino undergraduates overall, and more closely matches the distribution of Hispanic/Latino high school graduates and the Oregon population.

Approximately 75 percent of the OSSHE students who entered as freshmen in fall 1995 were still enrolled in OSSHE in fall 1996 (including students transferring to another OSSHE institution after initial enrollment in OSSHE). The retention rate for minority group students overall is comparable to the rate for other groups, although the rate varies among the individual racial/ethnic groups. The retention rate is higher for Asian Americans (80 percent) and for nonresident aliens (79 percent), and lower for Native American students (63 percent).

Long-term retention and graduation rates show a similar pattern. There are higher six-year graduation rates for Asian American students (55 percent for the State System) and lower rates for Native American students (31 percent).

OSSHE Enrollment

Between fall 1981 and fall 1996, the number of minority group students in OSSHE increased by 57.7 percent, while the total number of OSSHE students decreased by 6.5 percent (Table 2). The most dramatic increase is among Hispanic/Latino students, whose number nearly tripled — from 655 to 1,851 over the 15-year period.
The number of students in the "unknown/decline to respond" category increased by nearly 30 percent between fall 1981 and fall 1996. One likely reason may be the difficulty for students of multiple racial or ethnic origins to choose a single identifying category. The recent addition of a larger array of choices on the forms used to collect racial/ethnic data should reduce the number of "unknowns" in future reports.

In fall 1996, students of color constituted 12.6 percent of OSSHE students, ranging from 8.2 percent at Southern Oregon University to 15.7 percent at Portland State University (Table 3). Asian American students make up the largest proportion of minority group students at Portland State University (8.5 percent of the total enrollment), Oregon State University (7.1 percent), the University of Oregon (6.8 percent), and Oregon Institute of Technology (4.5 percent). Hispanic/Latino students comprise the largest proportion of minority group students at Eastern Oregon University (3.6 percent of the total enrollment), Southern Oregon University (3.2 percent), and Western Oregon University (3.2 percent).

First-Time Freshmen

The enrollment of minority group first-time freshmen has grown dramatically since 1981, especially among Oregon residents (Table 4). Minority resident first-time freshmen doubled between fall 1981 and fall 1996, from 383 to 788. In contrast, the number of European American resident first-time freshmen declined 15 percent, from 5,770 in fall 1981 to 4,887 in fall 1996.

First-year retention rates for first-time freshmen vary across institutions and minority groups (Table 5). The highest first-year retention rates are at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University (79 percent overall at each institution), with lower rates at institutions with larger nontraditional student populations (Portland State University with 65.4 percent and Southern Oregon University with 65.7 percent).

First-year retention rates for Asian American freshmen are above the institution averages except at Eastern Oregon University and Southern Oregon University. Rates for African American and Hispanic/Latino freshmen are at or above institution averages in nearly all cases. Rates for Native American freshmen are below institution averages except at Oregon Institute of Technology.
The six-year graduation rates for full-time first-time freshmen entering OSSHE in fall 1989 also vary across institutions and minority groups (Table 6). Again, the highest rates are at University of Oregon (63.7 percent) and Oregon State University (61.9 percent). Among minority groups, Asian American students show the highest graduation rates at Oregon State University and University of Oregon. African American students have the highest minority group rates at Portland State University, and Hispanic/Latino students have the highest rates at Eastern Oregon University, Oregon Institute of Technology, Southern Oregon University, and Western Oregon University. Native American students have the lowest graduation rates among minority groups at nearly all OSSHE institutions.

Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Clark pointed out to the Board that two reports were being presented on diversity. The first report describes the racial and ethnic make-up of OSSHE students and compares previous enrollment data with current information. Dr. Clark also reminded Board members that she is currently conducting a search for a replacement for Dr. Thom Coley who left in January to take a position in Cleveland, Ohio. “After Dr. Coley’s departure, we gave consideration to what the System needs in the broad area of diversity at the level of the Chancellor’s Office. As a result, we have done some position restructuring. We now have a search underway for a diversity position. The incumbent will work jointly with me in Academic Affairs and with Melinda Grier in legal services on a range of responsibilities, including affirmative action and working on behalf of students with disabilities. So it will be a position with a broadened perspective, and we hope to have a person by late summer or early fall. We will also plan to report to you in early fall on the faculty diversity initiative.”

Dr. Clark highlighted four points from the report. First, System enrollment overall by race/ethnicity is very similar in proportions to both Oregon’s high school graduates (from which OSSHE draws resident student enrollment) and also to the Oregon population in general. Secondly, the retention rate of students of color, if we look at students who stayed as sophomores from their freshman year, overall, is comparable to the rates for other groups — European Americans and nonresident aliens. There is, however, great variation among the minority groups, with the highest retention rate among Asian American students (at about 80 percent) and the lowest for
Native Americans (63 percent). This is eventually reflected, as well, in graduation rates at the sixth year as would logically be expected.

The third point was that over the past 15 years, the proportion of minority-group students has increased very substantially at 58 percent. There is a particularly high growth in the proportion of Hispanic Latino students whose numbers tripled over that same period. The last point Dr. Clark made was that there is considerable institutional variation in proportions of minority students overall that is related to the location of the institution as well as the mission and the combination of programs that are available.

(No Board action required)

(Note: Tables referenced in this report are included in the supplementary materials and are on file in the Board’s office.)

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a campus climate survey conducted by the Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE). Although this study explored many dimensions of campus climate, it was primarily undertaken to gauge student perceptions of issues related to race and ethnicity on OSSHE campuses as well as to guide future policy deliberations. A similar survey was conducted by OSSHE in 1994, but the continuing interest in these issues by the Board, and an upsurge of campus activism nationally, led to a decision to assess the climates of public campuses in Oregon once again.

Initially, a literature search was conducted to discover what scholars of higher education were reporting on this topic. The literature suggested that:

- Students’ attitudes about racial diversity vary from group to group, and even on apparently calm campuses, there is usually considerable social distance and alienation from campus life perceived by minority students on predominantly white campuses (Hurtado, 1992).

- The degree of cohesiveness among racial/ethnic groups is enhanced when there are relatively small numbers of minority students on predominantly white campuses. Small groups tend
to form subcultures, which create a sense of "we are different" for their members and, as the members interact and bond, they tend to move toward an "us versus them" isolation from the majority group. As a result, a tranquil and diverse student body will not happen by simply putting groups of differing heritage together. There must be a mechanism to encourage positive social interaction among the members of the various groups (Kuh, 1990, 1991).

The survey was conducted during fall term 1996. A draft version of a questionnaire was produced and reviewed by student focus groups on four OSSHE campuses before the survey form was finalized. Questionnaires were then mailed to 5,989 randomly selected students on all seven OSSHE campuses, of which 2,296 were returned in useable form for a response rate of 39.8 percent. The sample was weighted to ensure a meaningful minority-student response. Of the respondents, 57.0 percent were female and 42.4 percent were male. Single students made up 75 percent of the population and 70.2 percent were undergraduates. The distribution of racial/ethnic groups was: Native Americans (3.8 percent), Asian Americans (13.7 percent), African Americans (3.2 percent), Hispanic/Latinos (8.1 percent), and European Americans (68.3 percent). A substantial proportion of respondents (43.3 percent) said they had taken diversity-related courses and 32.4 percent indicated they had participated in diversity-oriented activities.

Among the most important of the study's findings were the following:

- Financial aid was a concern for all students. Native American respondents worked the most hours per week (mean=18.3 hours per week) and received the highest percentage of public and state scholarships (44.8 percent). Asian Americans received the highest percentage of work study aid (22.6 percent) and also parental financial support (40.8 percent), but they and European Americans received the lowest percentage of state aid (16.2 percent and 16.3 percent respectively). African American students relied heavily on loans (57.5 percent) and received the lowest percentage of parental support (13.7 percent), but they also received the second highest rate of work study (19.2 percent). Hispanic/Latino students relied the heaviest on loans (58.9 percent) and also were the highest percentage group to work off campus (48.1 percent). European Americans relied heavily on loans (52.5
percent), had a better level of parental financial support (34.7 percent), but were second highest in working off campus (46.5 percent).

- Students report generally low levels of participation in many activities outside of class, whether those activities were general extracurricular (81.3 percent reported never or occasionally participated) or in ethnic/cultural events (89.7 percent reported never or occasionally). Additionally, most said that they would feel welcome at such events (73.1 percent said welcome at general events; 58.8 percent said welcome at cultural/ethnic events). However, in a series of statements designed to explore how hospitable their campuses felt, 2.7 percent overall said that they felt rejected.

- Enrollment in diversity-related courses was widespread among all groups (43.3 percent). African American students were the most likely to have enrolled in such courses (46.6 percent) and also were most likely to have participated in diversity-related activities out of class (60.3 percent). Women were more likely than men to have enrolled in a diversity-related class (47.2 percent for women and 38.0 percent for men).

- Racial/ethnic diversity on campus was generally viewed as a positive value and experience by students of all groups. The specifics of satisfaction and dissatisfaction varied by group:

  - African Americans were consistently the most supportive of both diversity and affirmative action.
  - Native American and Hispanic/Latino students were about equally supportive of diversity, but less supportive of affirmative action.
  - Asian Americans were very supportive of diversity (the highest overall) but were the least supportive of affirmative action, along with the European American students.
  - The European Americans were generally positive about diversity, but overall were the least supportive of affirmative action, both with regard to hiring practices and admission standards.
Student satisfaction varied according to the topic. Students were generally pleased with their treatment in classes (92.6 percent), although minority students complained about a lack of faculty role models (e.g., African Americans, 54.8 percent; Asian Americans, 33.8 percent; Native Americans, 31.0 percent were dissatisfied in this regard). For those students expressing an opinion, observations regarding other aspects of campus climate included:

- Students had some reservations that “experiences with different ethnic groups had a major impact on their intellectual development” (45.4 percent agree, 42.5 percent disagree).

- More often than not, students agreed with the statement that they were “more likely to participate in a cultural event or activity” (47.7 percent agree, 37.2 percent disagree).

- Students generally indicated they “share values similar to my faculty instructors” (56.1 percent agree, 26.9 percent disagree), and that “faculty are interested in my academic development” (69.5 percent agree, 25.5 percent disagree).

- A significant proportion of students agreed with the statement “I am satisfied with the time I invest in preparing for classes” (67.1 percent agree, 30.8 percent disagree).

Incidents of discrimination were reported by all racial/ethnic groups on all campuses:

- African American students appeared to experience more discrimination than other groups, reporting the highest percentage at 75 percent (9 of 12) of the categories explored. The percentage of reports exceeded 19 percent in seven categories of discrimination: (1) by student’s race (54.8 percent); (2) by other students (41.1 percent); (3) by gender (23.2 percent); (4) by age (20.5 percent); (5) by administrators (20.5 percent); (6) by choosing not to participate in an African American group event (19.2 percent); and (7) by faculty (19.2 percent).

- Native Americans indicated they experienced discrimination from students (20.6 percent), due to their heritage (24.9 percent), gender (21.8), age (18.4 percent), and religion (9.2 percent).
- For Asian Americans, the common types of discrimination reported were from other students (21.1 percent) and due to their heritage (24.9 percent). Discrimination by gender (13.4 percent) and by faculty (13.1 percent) was also reported.

- Hispanic/Latino students reported less overall discrimination, but still significant for them was harassment by other students (15.7 percent), due to their racial heritage (16.2 percent), by gender (15.2 percent), and by faculty (10.8 percent).

- European American students reported the lowest overall rates of discrimination, but still reported negative experiences related to gender (14.0 percent), age (10.1 percent), and from faculty (9.3 percent).

The results of this study suggest the following implications for policymakers in Oregon:

- Campus diversity policies should be deliberately planned and thoughtfully implemented in Oregon’s public higher education institutions.

- Oregon’s higher education policymakers and administrators need to stay informed and current with the changing perspectives of individual racial/ethnic groups.

- Campus administrators should find ways to keep informed of discriminatory incidents, practices, and attitudes at their institutions, and must be able to take appropriate and timely action to address such behavior.

- Students of all racial/ethnic backgrounds need positive and productive models of racial/ethnic diversity. All students have a right to an environment in which they feel safe and affirmed, and in which diversity becomes an enriching element of their educational experience.

- Finally, this study suggests that minority group students are only partially satisfied with diversity-oriented programs on their campuses. What appears to be more important than programming is access to higher education, especially with regard to financial resources to finish their education and feeling welcome and safe on campus. These universal
concerns of college students today are particularly intense among students of color.

Board Discussion

In introducing the study, Vice Chancellor Clark acknowledged the assistance of UO doctoral student David Waggoner who, with Dr. Jim Arnold, had major responsibility for doing much of the basic analysis and drafting of the report. She then introduced Dr. Jim Arnold who presented the highlights of the study. His remarks were presented in the five major categories of the study: defining campus climate and how it can be measured; how the data were collected; who the respondents were; what the respondents said; and what the responses meant. (The complete study is on file in the Board’s office.)

Dr. Arnold indicated that the good news is that there are generally high levels of satisfaction in these areas: academic development; faculty interest in students’ academic development; the time invested in preparation for classes; the presence of role models among faculty; the number of people on campus with whom the students could identify; and shared values with instructors. However, deeper examination of the data indicate that there are some aspects of campus climate that are not quite as encouraging. For example, approximately 24 percent, overall, of the students disagreed with the statement that there were appropriate role models for them. Upon deeper analysis, African American students disagreed about the statement regarding role models about 55 percent of the time; Asian Americans 34 percent, Native Americans 31 percent, and Hispanic Latino about 29 percent of the time. Similar disparities held throughout the entire study.

In concluding the overview, Dr. Arnold said, “it is not too much of a stretch to conclude that there is room for improvement in the campus climate, in particular for students of color. It is wise to stay informed.” The study suggests that campus diversity policies should be deliberately planned and thoughtfully implemented in OSSHE institutions; campus administrators should find ways to keep informed of discriminatory incidents, practices, and attitudes; and students of all racial/ethnic backgrounds need positive and productive role models of racial/ethnic diversity.

Mr. Willis asked whether there was a relationship between those students who left before degree completion and those who stayed
until completing a degree. Dr. Arnold responded that there is a significant correlation in this regard. There has been broad research on student retention as related to academic and social integration. The research deals explicitly with student experiences such as opportunities to make friends on campus. If students don't make friends and feel integrated, they leave. Pursuing the issue a little more, Mr. Willis asked if there were data available on how many racial/ethnic diverse students were graduating by institution, by program. Dr. Clark indicated that the answers would be reflected in the graduation rate data which are, in general, looking better.

Dr. Clark reminded the Board that the real point of the survey was to gather information on how students were experiencing the climate at the institutions. However, survey questions also explored aspects of how students were financing their education and revealed some interesting information regarding the amount of time many minority students invest in work and finding creative ways to finance their education.

The report has been shared with academic and student affairs offices as well as campus coordinators of UMASP. The expectation is that there will be focused discussions on what the data mean and what concrete steps should be undertaken. In particular, the African American students express discomfort on some of the campuses and that must be explored in much greater depth. "I think these data are very important for campus planning and also important information for any external experts we may have come in to advise us," Dr. Clark added.

Ms. Puentes observed that the survey provided good information in the area of discrimination directed from or focused on other students. However, she said that she did feel that it does not give enough insight as to how the students were discriminated against or provide enough detail to focus actions to remedy it. Dr. Clark indicated that planning of that kind should be developed by faculty and administrators on the campuses. "The survey provides very gross indicators that something is wrong, but we don't know exactly what without sitting down with students and asking them what has happened to them. We have to know more than we do from this kind of survey."

Continuing, Ms. Puentes indicated that the African American results are quite different from other ethnic groups and wondered whether
there is a correlation between how they are doing academically. Again, Dr. Clark indicated that the survey did not provide data to interpret this question and agreed with Ms. Puentes that is extremely important to hear from students in order to build sufficient consensus to address these issues.

Mr. Swanson made two recommendations. The first is “in line with other issues in which we have particular interest and in which we want to see progress. We ought to think very seriously about being willing to pay for improvement and to offer campuses the opportunity to come forward with a plan for improving a situation that might require additional resources up to a certain level and then have the State System be willing to run a program with very definite objectives. Secondly, we ought to have some model plan or plans. There are campuses around the country that have had more success than others in dealing with these issues and we should learn from them.”

Ms. McAllister said that the report reminded her of the SMILE program at OSU and she asked whether there are plans to track the retention rate of participating students. Dr. Clark indicated that OSU is tracking the number who enter college from that program. Additionally, the MESA program has been successful with students of color.

(No Board action required)

**Staff Report to the Board**

The Board will hear a presentation and update on the Riverfront Research Park, a public/private project of the University of Oregon. The project briefly described below is more fully presented in the supplemental material, which is on file in the Board’s office. At the July meeting, the Board will be requested to review and approve a long-term ground lease and property subdivision to allow for the development of a 47,000-square-foot multi-tenant building and the construction of a public street.

The Riverfront Research Park project is a cooperative effort of the University of Oregon, the City of Eugene/Urban Renewal Agency (URA), and private developers to build a university-related research park adjacent to the University campus on the south bank of the Willamette River. The project provides a master-planned setting where knowledge-based businesses and organizations can develop
collaborative association with the research capabilities of the University. The Research Park is expected to help diversify the region's economy and provide quality employment opportunities. It is being developed in phases over an approximate 20-year period as there is market demand.

The Research Park is governed by an intergovernmental agreement among the University, the City/Urban Renewal Agency, and the State Board of Higher Education and is overseen by the Riverfront Research Park Commission. The land, owned by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education on behalf of the University, is leased in parcels on a long-term basis (up to 98 years) to developers who then own the buildings they construct on the land. At the end of the lease, ownership of the buildings reverts to the State Board of Higher Education.

The University serves as the focus for technology transfer and provides access to its faculty, equipment, and facilities, in addition to managing the ongoing project. The Urban Renewal Agency is providing public infrastructure, financed primarily with tax increment revenues from the Riverfront district. Private developers are responsible for the acquisition of financing, construction, ownership, and management of the Research Park's buildings, parking, utilities, landscaping, amenities, and maintenance.

The Research Park was in the planning and pre-development stages in 1985-1990. Construction of the first-phase infrastructure occurred in 1990-91, and the first building was constructed in 1992-93: The second building, known as the Riverfront Innovation Center, opened in 1994. The second-phase infrastructure, including a railroad underpass and the extension of Riverfront Parkway, was completed in 1996. The third building and the extension of Millrace Drive will be constructed in 1997.

The Research Park houses an impressive array of high-technology tenants including Dynamix Incorporated, System Technology Development Corporation, the Computational Intelligence Research Laboratory, the New Media Center, the Software Engineering Research Center, Electrical Geodesics Incorporated, and Marker Gene Technologies. Percon Incorporated, a company that researches, designs, manufactures, and markets bar-code-based data collection and software management products will be the anchor tenant of the third building scheduled for completion during 1997.
Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Anslow introduced Diane Wiley, manager of the Riverfront Research Park. She indicated that for quite a while, universities have created high tech parks close to campus. The reason for the presentation at this meeting was that, at the July meeting, the Board will be asked to approve a proposed long-term (98 years) ground lease at the Park for additional activity and approve a subdivision that will create the lots and designate the right-of-way to the Park. The presentation at this meeting is intended to provide the Board with sufficient information to enable it to make an informed decision at the July meeting.

Mr. Swanson indicated how very important this project is for the UO. When he lived and practiced as an attorney in Eugene, he served as city attorney. "I am aware of the hard work that went on in the 1970s and '80s on this project. It provides a good example of private citizens, business and industry, and the university working together. It is a great example of how all the sectors of society can come together in a cooperative venture."

(No Board action required)

CORPORATE & PUBLIC AFFAIRS Legislative Update

Chancellor Cox provided the Board with a brief update on legislative matters and indicated that the General Fund base budget for higher education had passed both houses and been signed by the Governor. "Everyone is clear in Salem on what our add-back issues are," the Chancellor continued. "They are faculty salaries, the engineering program, access, and technology. I cannot predict what the outcomes of these requests might be, but chances are it will all work out next week."

COMMITTEE REPORTS Nominating Committee

Mr. Swanson reported that the Nominating Committee, consisting of Ms. McAllister, Mr. Willis, and himself, had met on May 16, 1997. They submitted the following nominations for the 1997-98 year: Dr. Aschkenasy, president; Mr. Imeson, vice president; and Executive Committee members in addition to the president and vice president, Ms. Christopher, Ms. McAllister, and Ms. Wustenberg.
Mr. Swanson moved and Mr. Willis seconded the motion to approve the slate of officers. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, McAllister, Swanson, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none. (Ms. Puentes was not in the room at the time the vote was taken.)

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Several Board members mentioned the commencements that they had attended during the early weeks of June and commended the presidents on the impressive ceremonies.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Virginia L. Thompson
Secretary of the Board

Herbert Aschkenasy
President of the Board