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ROLL CALL

The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by President Aschkenasy.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Ms. Diane Christopher  Ms. Katie Van Patten
Mr. Tom Imeson          Mr. Jim Willis
Ms. Gail McAllister     Ms. Phyllis Wustenberg
Ms. Esther Puentes     Mr. John Wykoff

Dr. Herb Aschkenasy

Dr. Jim Whittaker was ill and unable to attend the meeting. Since his term has expired, Mr. Les Swanson has submitted his letter of resignation from the Board to Governor Kitzhaber.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the July 18, 1997 meeting. Ms. Christopher moved and Mr. Wykoff seconded approval of the minutes. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Puentes, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Dinner

President Aschkenasy remarked about the dinner for the Board held the previous evening in honor of Les Swanson who has served eight years on the Board. Virginia Thompson, who is retiring as Secretary of the Board, was also recognized. Dr. Aschkenasy again thanked Mr. Swanson for the many years of public service in various capacities in Oregon.

Executive Work Session

The Executive Committee met in a Work Session prior to the regular Board meeting. Dr. Aschkenasy reported that a draft working agenda for the Board had been discussed. Two items in particular received specific attention. One item has to do with System budgeting, broadly defined. "Periodically, the BAS Model has been both under attack and review. And there certainly are some things that are wrong with it. However, replacing it is no trivial matter, not only because of the political implications, but also because we need to replace it with something that everyone feels is better."
Continuing, Dr. Aschkenasy reminded the Board that Vice Chancellor Anslow is currently reviewing the model and a decision has been reached to form a Board Committee to assist in the review and to formulate some recommendations. The Committee will be composed of several Board members, and one or more non-Board members.

"The other subject discussed at some length is more philosophical in nature," President Aschkenasy reported. "We want to study the Board's activities, policies, and practices to determine how we might work in the future. We are facing changing circumstances and we need, in a sense, to respond to them in new ways.

"The other subject that came up had to do with the broad issue of technology and whether Oregon wants to be on the main road of the information highway or just a 'water stop.' Board members are not expert enough to deal with the subject, but we need to begin thinking about it and moving ahead."

Presidents
Gilbert and Wolf

Dr. Aschkenasy observed that during the four years he has been on the Board, there has been a 100 percent turnover of the System leadership — presidents and chancellor.

President Dave Gilbert had recently announced his intention of retiring at the end of the academic year. "Dave has been at EOU for a long time and he is going to be a hard act to follow."

President Larry Wolf has announced his plans to step down from his position as president and, after a sabbatical leave, to return to the teaching ranks.

CHAN-CELLOR'S REPORT
Addendum to President's Report

Chancellor Cox indicated that he wanted to add a postscript to the President Aschkenasy's announcements. "Both of these presidents will be incredibly difficult to replace. The challenge of finding these replacements is daunting. Dr. Thompson and I will be visiting the EOU campus in the next few weeks, meeting with the constituent groups. Dave is going to pursue the elusive trout in Lake Wallowa.

"As Dr. Aschkenasy indicated, President Wolf is returning to the faculty. He has an opportunity for a very interesting time with a major northwest industrial organization from which experience he will return to full time teaching for OIT in Portland. This is a change of venue for Larry — and back to his roots."
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BAS Model Review  

In further explaining Dr. Aschkenasy's remarks concerning the BAS Model review, Chancellor Cox indicated that he and the Vice Chancellors have begun a series of meetings with campus leadership groups regarding the BAS Model. "As we did with our budget and enrollment meetings, we will visit with the campus leadership on objectives and priorities by which we allocate tuition and state support resources. We look forward to very productive and potentially useful conversations around this topic."

Athletic Funding/Sports Action Lottery  

The first meeting of the Board's Committee on Athletic Funding and Sports Action Lottery was held on Thursday, September 18. Chancellor Cox indicated that the Committee had a good start. "Mr. Paul Bartlett of the Internal Audit Division has been released to assist the Committee in gathering information. We also have two consultants working with us: one is from Iowa and one from Arizona. Mr. Swanson's goal is to move to completion in late October or early November," the Chancellor concluded.

Recognitions  

Chancellor Cox acknowledged that Ms. Denise Yunker of OSSHE has recently been appointed to the Employee Benefits Board. This is a recognition of the talents and expertise Ms. Yunker has and is important for the System, as well.

President Youngblood has received the final report of the Northwest Association Accreditation review. "I asked Dr. Youngblood yesterday what she had done to produce such an absolutely uniformly complimentary report to which she replied that 'she had simply presented the truth.' I want to compliment the faculty and staff for an extraordinarily fine report," the Chancellor added.

Industry Engineering and Technology Council  

Chancellor Cox reminded the Board that $5 million of new investments were placed with the E-Board with the requirement that the Industry Engineering and Technology Council receive proposals as to how these resources should be invested. "The timing of the E-Board meetings is such that in conversations with the Committee Chair last week, it is clear that we will have difficulty finishing the work on the proposals in a timely way that works with our Board meetings. I just want to alert you to the possibility that Dean Dryden and I might have to bring recommendations to the Board via teleconference prior to the October meeting."

Personal Notes  

"Forty-nine other people who do what I do in this country have an organization called SHEEO (State Higher Education Executive
Officers organization).” Chancellor Cox commented. “Since I missed one meeting, I've been named to the executive committee and will be attending one or two meetings a year.

“Finally, I would like to extend my appreciation to the Board members and my colleagues, particularly Bill, Shirley, and Virginia, for their assistance over the past several weeks as I've attempted to deal with some difficult personal situations on the East coast.”

Two Meetings Finally, the Chancellor reported on two extraordinary meetings that occurred in the recent week. The first was a meeting on the Eastern Oregon University campus where, for the first time, all faculty at that four-year institution and the faculty of Blue Mountain and Treasure Valley Community Colleges met in a day-long session to plan how they could jointly better serve the region.

The other was a meeting of the Engineering Benchmarks Conference in Portland. "Clearly, there are some major developments that are only beginning to be understood by Oregonians. One of the most striking points about the data revealed was the growth in software outside the metro area. These are very good signs and make the case for investment in higher education as a way of building capacity and competitiveness in Oregon," the Chancellor concluded.

IFS REPORT Dr. Paul Simonds, president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) made the following report:

President Aschkenasy, Members of the Board, Chancellor Cox: There are six groups that interact to make the OSSHE a functional entity: 1) the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, 2) the Chancellor and staff of the Chancellor’s Office, 3) the institution presidents, 4) the faculty (officers of instruction and officers of administration), 5) the students, 6) the classified staff. At the August Board Renewal, the first three were discussed in detail and their roles sorted out. Because the main functions of the OSSHE are played out at the learning interface between the faculty and students, the senators of the IFS feel the members of the Board should have a statement from the faculty on the role of the faculty in the Oregon State System of Higher Education to match those on the Board itself, the Chancellor, and the presidents.
There is a tendency to look on the faculty as simply salaried employees of the System. We feel there are several reasons that view does not give the whole picture. First, the legislated charters include the faculty in the governance of the universities and OIT. Second, the Chancellor and presidents are also salaried employees and their administrative roles cover only a portion of the administration of the System. And, third, the faculty are strongly involved in developing programs and initiatives that come before the Board for approval and are the members of the System that take action to implement them after Board approval. Thus faculty make many of the administrative decisions at lower levels that both come before the Board or are implemented following already established policies.

The roles of the faculty are focused on the learning interface between students and faculty.

1. Provide the learning services for students
   • Develop, maintain and teach the courses in the curriculum.
   • Faculty develop their own courses, submit them for peer review at the department, college and institutional level before administrative review at the presidential or Board level.
   • With the continual flow of new research, faculty must incorporate new material in their courses on a regular basis.
   • Develop, maintain, and implement systems of student progress evaluation (grades and other forms of evaluation).
   • Advise students: review their progress toward the degree, inform them of their options to meet graduation requirements, and work with the student to maximize her or his learning experience.

2. Maintain and renew established programs
   • Maintain and update requirements for majors, minors and other programs.
   • Establish criteria and screen candidates for hiring new faculty within their disciplines.
   • Maintain academic standards by reviewing new programs, handling student appeals, reviewing faculty
performance, establishing standards for matriculation and graduation.

- Keep programs and the institution as a whole in conformity with standards of accrediting agencies.
- Keep the information in the system up-to-date by, for example, assisting the library in ordering monographs, serials and other materials.

3. Develop new programs as needed and submit them for Board approval
   - Faculty develop programs and courses, submit them for peer review within the institution before administrative review at the presidential and Board level.

4. Create new knowledge through research (with applications to teaching and the wider community).
   - The research function of faculty is more institutionalized in the research universities but it a vital role for all faculty. Research findings (ranging from reorganizing present knowledge in new configurations to funded research projects designed to expand the frontiers of human knowledge) are incorporated in courses as they are developed and taught.

5. Participate in institutional governance
   - Faculty serve on committees that, among other functions, establish academic policies, administer standards and requirements, and review proposed courses and programs.

We hope that this will fit in with the statements made about other elements in the System.

**UO MISSION STATEMENT**

The Board has general powers to assign missions and roles for the institutions under its jurisdiction. The Oregon Revised Statute states that:

...the State Board of Higher Education, for each institution, division and department under its control, shall: supervise the general course of instruction therein, and the research, extension, educational and other activities thereof. [ORS 351.070(2)(a)]
UO proposed the following mission statement:

The University of Oregon is a comprehensive research university that serves its students and the people of Oregon, the nation, and the world through the creation and transfer of knowledge in the liberal arts, the natural and social sciences, and the professions. It is the Association of American Universities flagship institution of the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

The University is a community of scholars dedicated to the highest standards of academic inquiry, learning, and service. Recognizing that knowledge is the fundamental wealth of civilization, the University strives to enrich the public that sustains it through:

— a commitment to undergraduate education, with a goal of helping the individual learn to question critically, think logically, communicate clearly, act creatively, and live ethically;

— a commitment to graduate education to develop creators and innovators who will generate new knowledge and shape experience for the benefit of humanity;

— a recognition that research, both basic and applied, is essential to the intellectual health of the University, as well as to the enrichment of the lives of Oregonians, by energizing the state’s economic, cultural, and political structure;

— the establishment of a framework for lifelong learning that leads to productive careers as well as the enduring joy of inquiry;

— the integration of teaching, research, and service as mutually enriching enterprises that together accomplish the University’s mission and support its spirit of community;
— the acceptance of the challenge of an evolving social, political, and technological environment by welcoming and guiding change rather than reacting to it;

— a dedication to the principles of equality of opportunity and freedom from unfair discrimination for all members of the University community and an acceptance of true diversity as an affirmation of individual identity within a welcoming community;

— a commitment to international awareness and understanding, and to the development of a faculty and student body that are capable of participating effectively in a global society;

— the conviction that freedom of thought and expression is the bedrock principle on which all University activity is based;

— the cultivation of an attitude toward citizenship that fosters a caring, supportive atmosphere on campus and the wise exercise of civic responsibilities and individual judgment throughout life; and,

— a continuing commitment to affordable public higher education.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board adopt the mission statement for the University of Oregon.

Board Discussion and Action

Chancellor Cox reminded the Board of its general powers to assign missions and roles to institutions. In the past several months the mission of SOU was discussed in some detail and a year ago, WOU had presented a revised statement.

Provost Moseley of the UO commented that the present mission statement was developed during the first year of President Frohnmayer’s tenure. "We fought the battle between a short mission statement and one that tried to cover all bases. Our compromise was
to have an opening paragraph that characterized the UO in a way that would be useful in a sound-bite environment. Then we felt that we really needed to describe our various commitments to undergraduate education, to graduate education, to research, to service, to diversity, and the other aspects in bullet points. We expect to use the mission statement both in its entirety as a description of how the UO views itself and would like to be viewed by the state and by the Board,” Dr. Moseley continued.

Ms. Wustenberg asked why, in the first paragraph, “the UO is called the Association of American Universities flagship institution of OSSHE. What does that mean?”

Provost Moseley indicated it was simply a statement of the fact that the UO is Oregon’s only AAU institution. Chancellor Cox added that as Oregon grown, an AAU institution, a land grant institution, an urban grant institution, a technical institute and three regional universities have evolved. “That is about as clean and distinct as one can make it. What really defines the differences are the mission assignments in specific categories,” the Chancellor indicated.

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

The 1997-1999 General Fund/Lottery appropriation of $596,218,488 has ended an era of disinvestment in Oregon higher education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-1999</td>
<td>$596.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1997</td>
<td>522.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1995</td>
<td>570.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1993</td>
<td>599.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base Budget**

The base budget funds 99.5 percent of the Governor’s approved current service level, including:

- $6.0 million for two percent per year inflationary adjustments for services and supplies, equipment, student wages, and graduate teaching assistant wages, and ten percent for library acquisitions;
• $13.1 million to fund the unclassified salary increases granted during last biennium; and,
• $3.0 million to fund operation and maintenance of new buildings coming on line during 1997-1999.

**Investment Budget**

The investment budget funds 77 percent of the Governor's approved investment budget proposal, including:
• $7.5 million for faculty recruitment and retention;
• $10.7 million (estimated) for unclassified salary increases;
• $2.7 million (estimated) for classified salary increases;
• $8.5 million to freeze instruction fees for resident undergraduates;
• $5.8 million for Regional Access to expand student access in eastern and southern Oregon;
• $5.0 million to enhance and expand engineering and computer science education;
• $100,000 for Oregon partnership in the Western Governor's University;
• $200,000 for Endophyte Toxicosis Research to the School of Veterinary Medicine, Oregon State University;
• $300,000 for Food Safety and Environmental Stewardship Research to the Agricultural Experiment Station, Oregon State University;
• $50,000 to the University of Oregon for the Pacific Program, and;
• $750,000 from Lottery Funds for Cereal Wheat Research to the Agricultural Experiment Station, Oregon State University.

The Governor's recommended budget for OSSHE included the following items not approved by the Legislature:
• $2.8 million for roll-forward costs of the classified salary settlement with the Oregon Public Employees Union (OPEU) and salary increases granted to the former management service classification of employees;
• $4.0 million of the proposed $9.0 million to enhance and expand engineering and computer science education;
• $2.9 million of the proposed $8.7 million for Regional Access; and
• $1.0 million for food processing industry.
The following table is a three-biennia comparison of OSSHE's Operating Budget resources, excluding Capital Construction funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund/Lottery</td>
<td>$570.2</td>
<td>$522.4</td>
<td>$596.2</td>
<td>$73.8</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>413.6</td>
<td>498.6</td>
<td>513.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Service Fees</td>
<td>249.4</td>
<td>249.7</td>
<td>289.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations &amp; Gifts</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>125.5</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>(29.1)</td>
<td>-23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>353.2</td>
<td>457.5</td>
<td>358.4</td>
<td>(99.1)</td>
<td>-21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed Direct St Loan*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>144.0</td>
<td>300.0</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>108.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>188.4</td>
<td>128.8</td>
<td>(59.6)</td>
<td>-31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,725.9</td>
<td>$2,186.1</td>
<td>$2,282.9</td>
<td>$96.8</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Federal Direct Student Loan was a new program in 1995-1997. Amount for 1997-1999 was not included in the Legislative Approved Non-Limited Budget estimate, but is included here for continuity.

1997-98 Annual Allocation
The following are the issues and staff recommendations concerning the institution allocations for 1997-98.

The Allocation Process

The institutions generate and retain directly about 56 percent or $610 million of the $1 billion in annual revenues. Campus revenues include sponsored programs and sponsored gifts, grants, and contracts; designated operations including distance education, community workshops, and other self-sustaining public service and educational activities; and auxiliary activities (student housing, parking, food service, athletics, and incidental fee activities). The majority of tuition revenues and state tax dollars are pooled and then allocated to campuses and central services.
The Budget Allocation System (BAS) Model is the basis for determining most of the operating budget allocations to campuses. The BAS Model drives a proposed funding level for each institution based on academic program offerings, student enrollment mix by level, physical plant size and type, and student headcount, among other factors. In June 1996, after several months of discussion, the Presidents' Council reviewed and recommended an Annual Budget Allocation Plan for the 1997-1999 biennium that includes funding all resident undergraduate and all graduate students using the BAS Model, along with a nonresident incentive plan that has the UO retaining 90 percent of its nonresident undergraduate revenue. The remaining ten percent of UO's nonresident undergraduate tuition revenue is pooled and redistributed among the six other institutions.

The 1997-98 Annual Allocation Plan, in addition to the principles approved by the presidents, contains the following elements:

- $1.6 million of the available resource is proposed to provide funding stability for OIT, which otherwise would experience even deeper reductions in 1997-98 due to declining enrollment levels in the last few years;
- The $7.5 million biennial amount for faculty recruitment and retention is allocated to each institution using separately prepared guidelines;
- The Regional Access dollars, $2.9 annual ($5.8 biennial), are to be allocated as follows, for each year of the biennium
  - $1.2 million for EOU
  - $1.0 million for SOU
  - $700,000 for OIT;
- The $5.0 million (biennial) for engineering and computer science is not allocated in this budget recommendation. These funds will be allocated after review and recommendation to the Board of Higher Education by the Engineering and Technology Industry Council and the Chancellor and subsequent release of funds by the Emergency Board;
- The $100,000 (biennial) for the Western Governor's University is held in the Chancellor's Office pending a plan for its use;
- Achievable enrollment levels are budgeted for each institution as agreed to by the institution and the Chancellor's Office and as reported to the Board at the July 1997 meeting;
The Systemwide available resources (General Fund and instruction fees) are approximately one percent below the amount that would be necessary to fund the projected 1997-98 current service level prior to the application of the increases described above. The reason for the funding gap is twofold. First, the Legislature did not fund the requested roll-up costs for the classified salaries negotiated during the 1995-1997 biennium and recommended by the Governor. Second, the change in the mix of students resulting in fewer nonresident undergraduate students has created a gap in projected instruction fee revenue; and

- The Statewide Public Services at OSU (Agricultural Experiment Station, Extension Service, Forest Research Laboratory) receive line-item appropriations from the Legislature for their operations.

Education and General Services
Base Budget (Current Service Level)

The Base Budget for each institution has been adjusted to reflect a "current service level" prior to any adjustments for enrollment change. The 1997-98 "current service level" is defined as the 1996-97 allocation adjusted for inflation and the full cost of any programs phased in during 1996-97. The 1997-98 "current service level" components are as follows:

- Two percent inflation adjustment for services and supplies, equipment, student wages, graduate assistant salaries, and ten percent for library acquisitions;
- New building operation and maintenance costs for any new buildings approved by the 1995 Legislature, or prior Legislatures, that are coming on line during 1997-1999;
- Roll-forward costs for unclassified salary increases granted during 1995-1997; and

The Legislative General Fund appropriation provides the General Fund portion necessary to finance all of the current service level adjustments except for the roll-forward costs of the 1995-1997 classified salary increases.
The current service levels for the regional universities and OIT have been adjusted by $90,000 each to assist in financing the incremental operating costs of the conversion to a new Human Resources Information System. The current service level of the Chancellor’s Office, after being reduced by one percent to reflect the same reduction in current service level funding in a manner similar to campuses, has also been adjusted upward by $256,000 to reflect implementation of personnel and labor relations responsibilities as outlined in Senate Bill 271. Furthermore, another $300,000 is being targeted to the Chancellor’s Office to reflect cost increases associated with operating the FIS and HRIS “Fifth Site” for the regional universities and OIT.

The Governor’s Recommended Budget left the current service level unfunded by $220,183 ($440,366 biennial) when funds for the Veterinary School and the Joint Graduate School of Engineering were shifted from the Lottery to the General Fund; in the process, the level of previous Lottery funding was not fully restored.

**Enrollment**

The Chancellor’s staff met with institution presidents and their staffs to determine the enrollment level that would be budgeted in 1997-98. Several campuses are targeted for significant changes in midpoint three-term FTE enrollment for 1997-98 compared to those set for the 1995-1997 period. The UO (resident/graduate), PSU, SOU, and WOU are targeted to increase; EOU remains at about the same level; and UO (nonresident), OIT, and OSU are targeted to decline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1997-98 Budget Midpoint FTE</th>
<th>Original 1996-97 Budget FTE</th>
<th>Number Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOU</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>(352)</td>
<td>-17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,702</td>
<td>(702)</td>
<td>-5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>9,872</td>
<td>8,815</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOU</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>3,729</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO-Res/Gr</td>
<td>10,949</td>
<td>10,528</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of the significant shift in enrollment among the institutions, the 1997-98 allocations include a BAS adjustment that modifies the current services level (base budget) so that enrollment by discipline and level of instruction is funded on a comparable basis at each institution. At the UO, the current service level budget for enrollment is impacted in two ways. First, the budget is increased because resident undergraduate and all graduate enrollment is projected to be up in 1997-98. Second, planned 1997-98 nonresident undergraduate enrollment is below the planned level for 1996-97; thus the UO will realize less nonresident income than was included in the current service level budget for 1996-97.

The reduction in enrollment at OIT implies a budget cut of 17 percent, or over $3.3 million. Chancellor’s Office staff concluded that a budget reduction of this magnitude, taken in a single year, might seriously disrupt this institution’s effort to expand and reorganize academic program offerings in order to attract the 1,708 FTE students planned for 1997-98, and perhaps prevent OIT from being able to return to prior enrollment levels. OIT is an important element in the higher education delivery system in Oregon and provides student access to programs that are valuable to Oregon’s economy; therefore, $1.6 million of “special funding” is recommended to be allocated so that OIT has an opportunity to recover from this recent shortfall in enrollment.

Special Allocations

- Regional Access: EOU, SOU, and OIT have each entered into an agreement with community colleges to expand access for students in the region. The Legislature provided $5.8 million (biennial) to OSSHE to expand access in these three regions. The recommended 1997-98 allocations contain the following special allocations for regional access:
>$1.2 million (annual) for EOU
>$1.0 million (annual) for SOU
>$700,000 (annual) for OIT

These amounts will be allocated upon submission and review of a plan for each area.

- Engineering and Computer Science: The Legislature provided $5.0 million (biennial) to expand and enhance engineering and computer education in OSSHE. These funds have not been allocated as a part of this allocation plan but will be allocated following review and recommendation by the Engineering and Technology Industry Council to the Board of Higher Education. OSSHE must prepare a plan and a request to the Emergency Board for release of these funds. The plan is being developed through the Engineering Leadership Group. The Chancellor will bring the proposals to the Engineering and Technology Industry Advisory Council and the Board before submitting the request to the Emergency Board this fall.

- Western Governor's University: The Legislature provided $100,000 (biennial) for support of the Western Governor's University. These funds have been allocated to the Chancellor's Office. The assumption is that these funds will be used to pay Oregon's dues to the Western Governor's University.

- Faculty Recruitment and Retention: The Legislature provided $7.5 million (biennial) for faculty recruitment and retention. In providing these funds, the Ways and Means Committee included the following Budget Note: "The Department of Higher Education, in preparing its budget presentation to the 1999 Session of the Legislative Assembly, shall include in its current service level projection, the amount that reflects the ongoing costs (including roll-ups) of the $7.5 million academic salary supplement for recruitment and retention, calculated as if a one percent general salary increase was awarded on July 1, 1997 and a one percent general academic salary increase was awarded on July 1, 1998."

In light of this Budget Note, the 1997-98 allocation to the institutions is $2.6 million dollars, or one percent of each institution's unclassified salary base, minus the former management service dollars that are now included as part of the unclassified salary base. However, the plans for the use of
these funds cannot be a general salary increase of one percent. The institutions are being requested to submit plans for the use of these funds according to separately prepared guidelines.

- Unclassified Salary Adjustments: The state General Funds appropriated to OSSHE for salary adjustments for unclassified employees total $10.7 million for 1997-1999. The Department of Administrative Services will present the general pay adjustment plan to the Emergency Board at its January 1998 meeting. OSSHE’s funding for unclassified and classified staff pay adjustments will be included in that action. The DAS has indicated to the Chancellor that $13.4 million of the total $62.5 million statewide package has been earmarked for OSSHE general pay adjustments.

- Classified Salary Adjustments: The state General Funds appropriated to OSSHE for salary adjustments to classified employees total $2.7 million for 1997-1999.

Budget recommendations and allocations for 1997-98 are summarized on Tables 1 and 2, following.
### Table 1: Summary Comparison of 1996-97 Budget to 1997-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1996-97</th>
<th>1997-98</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon University</td>
<td>13,909,989</td>
<td>14,531,695</td>
<td>621,706</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>18,491,635</td>
<td>17,819,328</td>
<td>(672,307)</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>140,778,314</td>
<td>138,824,965</td>
<td>(953,349)</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>78,907,968</td>
<td>90,475,835</td>
<td>11,567,867</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>26,126,287</td>
<td>27,743,557</td>
<td>1,617,260</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>141,604,470</td>
<td>149,149,684</td>
<td>7,545,214</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>23,568,943</td>
<td>25,178,154</td>
<td>1,609,211</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Institutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>443,387,616</strong></td>
<td><strong>464,723,218</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,335,602</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCATE</td>
<td>2,486,996</td>
<td>2,547,494</td>
<td>60,498</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Office Operations</td>
<td>12,407,938</td>
<td>12,698,540</td>
<td>280,602</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Expense</td>
<td>4,603,435</td>
<td>4,815,382</td>
<td>211,947</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts To Be Allocated-Pending Plan</td>
<td>3,509,009</td>
<td>13,966,045*</td>
<td>10,457,036</td>
<td>298.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undistributed Limitation</td>
<td>26,118,625</td>
<td>26,470,045</td>
<td>353,420</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Education &amp; General</strong></td>
<td><strong>492,511,619</strong></td>
<td><strong>525,210,724</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,699,105</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>24,974,540</td>
<td>27,030,452</td>
<td>2,055,912</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Service</td>
<td>23,731,560</td>
<td>25,016,944</td>
<td>1,285,384</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Research Laboratory</td>
<td>5,798,045</td>
<td>5,901,587</td>
<td>103,542</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Statewide Public Svcs</strong></td>
<td><strong>54,504,245</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,948,983</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,444,738</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure Limitation</strong></td>
<td><strong>547,015,864</strong></td>
<td><strong>583,159,707</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,143,843</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Limited Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>1996-97</th>
<th>1997-98</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Support Activities</td>
<td>171,742,940</td>
<td>177,850,000</td>
<td>6,107,060</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>238,688,750</td>
<td>241,270,000</td>
<td>2,583,250</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Action Activity</td>
<td>3,264,000</td>
<td>3,280,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonbudgeted</th>
<th>1996-97</th>
<th>1997-98</th>
<th>Dollar Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Aid/Loans</td>
<td>54,755,357</td>
<td>55,450,000</td>
<td>694,643</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Debt Svc</td>
<td>8,145,002</td>
<td>8,466,303</td>
<td>321,301</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Fund Debt Svc</td>
<td>27,452,088</td>
<td>28,392,745</td>
<td>940,657</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Debt Service</strong></td>
<td>35,597,090</td>
<td>36,859,048</td>
<td>1,261,958</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Non-Limited Operations  | 504,046,137  | 514,709,048  | 10,662,911    | 2.1%     |

| Total Operating Budget 1997-98 | 1,051,062,001 | 1,097,868,755 | 46,806,754    | 4.5%     |

---

* Amounts To Be Allocated
  - Pending Plan
    - Regional Access - EOU: 1,200,000
    - Regional Access - SOU: 1,000,000
    - Regional Access - OIT: 700,000
    - Engineering Education: 2,500,000
    - Joint Business: 889,737
    - Joint Engineering: 889,737
    - Endowment Match
      - (Prior Year Balances): 579,064
    - Faculty Diversity: 500,000
    - Faculty Recruitment & Retention: 2,348,033
    - Unclassified Pay Adjustment: 2,570,672
    - Classified Pay Adjustment: 788,802

**Total Amounts to be Allocated**: 13,966,045
Table 2: Summary Comparison of Changes from 1996-97 Budget to 1997-98 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>96-97 Base Enroll &amp; PERS Reqmt</th>
<th>Inflation/ Assmt</th>
<th>New Building O&amp;M</th>
<th>Cl/MgtSvc Pay Adj Not Funded</th>
<th>Funding For Enroll Changes</th>
<th>Institution Income Adjustment</th>
<th>Other Budgeted Adjust</th>
<th>Total Changes 96-97/97-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon University</td>
<td>112,180</td>
<td>365,786</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(46,274)</td>
<td>37,001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163,013</td>
<td>621,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>191,617</td>
<td>744,276</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(51,847)</td>
<td>(1,623,661)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67,306</td>
<td>(672,307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>558,988</td>
<td>3,109,624</td>
<td>1,058,545</td>
<td>(326,262)</td>
<td>(5,933,812)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>579,568</td>
<td>(953,349)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>1,059,764</td>
<td>2,060,421</td>
<td>1,223,382</td>
<td>(161,511)</td>
<td>5,754,557</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>131,254</td>
<td>11,567,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>329,918</td>
<td>796,901</td>
<td>17,081</td>
<td>(76,759)</td>
<td>(352,887)</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>528,006</td>
<td>1,617,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1,615,957</td>
<td>3,553,779</td>
<td>124,427</td>
<td>(375,475)</td>
<td>(1,014,891)</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>941,417</td>
<td>7,545,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>317,565</td>
<td>587,961</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>(71,817)</td>
<td>554,196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216,265</td>
<td>1,809,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Institutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,185,989</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,208,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,428,276</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,109,745)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(2,579,497)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,575,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,628,829</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,335,802</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCATE</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>56,394</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2,261)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor's Office Operations</td>
<td>54,486</td>
<td>202,662</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(64,189)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(350,530)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>562,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts To Be Allocated-Pending Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60,180</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,396,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undistributed Limitation</td>
<td>(3,250,000)</td>
<td>467,332</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,579,497</td>
<td>(4,575,000)</td>
<td>5,131,591</td>
<td>353,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Education &amp; General</strong></td>
<td><strong>994,265</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,644,788</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,428,276</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,176,195)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,807,771</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,698,905</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Station</td>
<td>741,260</td>
<td>514,965</td>
<td>145,778</td>
<td>(103,326)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>757,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Service</td>
<td>692,955</td>
<td>530,323</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(72,580)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Research Laboratory</td>
<td>61,820</td>
<td>89,783</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(9,973)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(38,088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Statewide Public Svcs</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,496,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,135,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>145,778</strong></td>
<td><strong>(185,859)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>853,713</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,444,738</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure Limitation</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,490,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,779,859</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,574,054</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,362,054)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,661,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,143,643</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions**

96-97 Base: Permanent adjustments made after the 1996-97 budget. Includes enrollment contingency and restores PERS underfunding.
Inflation/Assmt: Adds inflation adjustment of approximately 2% and resets the allocation for state and OSSHE assessments.
New Building O&M: Provides funding for operation and maintenance costs of new buildings coming on line in 1997-98.
Cl/MgtSvc Pay Adj Not Funded: Reflects removal of General Fund support for the January 1997 pay adjustment for classified and management service.
Funding for Enroll Changes: Adjustments for changes in enrollment and other allocation model rediistributions.
Institution Income Adjustment: Distribution of limitation for institutions generating more income that earlier predicted.
Other Budgeted Adjust: Sum of all other adjustments including technical adjustments and special allocations for specific institutions.
Travel Reimbursements

With the passage of SB 271, the Board of Higher Education approves the travel reimbursement rates for employees, as well as nonemployees, of OSSHE. The following travel reimbursement rates are recommended for 1997-98 and are effective the first day of the month following Board approval.

In-State:

Meals and Incidental Expenses and Lodging:

*Standard:* Per diem using OSSHE High-Low classification. Ashland, Bend, Portland Metropolitan area, and Oregon coastal communities are classified as "high." All other Oregon cities are classified as "low." For "low" cities, the per diem for meals and incidental expenses is $28, and lodging (including tax) is $60. For "high" cities, the per diem for meals and incidental expenses is $28, and lodging (including tax) is $77. No receipts required for lodging, meals, and incidental expenses.

*Exception (e.g., conferences):* Per diem for meals and incidental expenses of $28 and lodging at actual and reasonable cost. Lodging receipts required. Deductions required for meals provided. Institutional policy applies regarding pre-approvals.

Institutional policy applies regarding exceptions for reimbursement of lodging at actual and reasonable cost for the Portland Metropolitan area, lodging receipts required.

Out-of-State (Continental U.S.):

Meals and Incidental Expenses and Lodging:

*Standard:* Per diem using federal High-Low Schedule. Cities are classified as either "low," with meals and incidental expenses of $32 and lodging (including tax) of $77; or classified as "high," with meals and incidental expenses of $40 and lodging (including tax) of $126. No receipts required for lodging, meals, and incidental expenses.
Exception (e.g., conferences): Per diem for meals and incidental expenses of $40 and lodging at actual and reasonable cost. Lodging receipts required. Deductions required for meals provided. Institutional policy applies regarding pre-approvals.

Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, U.S. Possessions, and International: Meals and Incidental Expenses and Lodging:
Standard: Per diem for meals and incidental expenses as well as lodging using Federal Specific Locality Table. No receipts required for lodging, meals, and incidental expenses.

Exception: (e.g., conferences): Per diem for meals and incidental expenses using Federal Specific Locality Table and lodging at actual and reasonable cost. Lodging receipts required. Deductions required for meals provided. Institutional policy applies regarding pre-approvals.

Private Vehicle Mileage: Reimburse at $.28 per mile.

Vehicle Rentals: Receipts are required for vehicle rentals.

Noncommercial Lodging: When using noncommercial facilities, the per diem for lodging is $17.

Staff Recommendations to the Board

The staff recommended that (1) the Board of Higher Education approve the budget recommendations and allocations for 1997-98 as discussed above and as summarized on Tables 1 and 2 and that (2) the Board approve the 1997-98 travel reimbursement rates shown above.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Anslow pointed out that, in many ways, the budget in front of the Board for consideration was built on the planning of Education Unbounded, the work of the Board last year in preparing the budget request that went into the Governor’s budget recommendation, and that the Legislature finally approved as OSSHE’s budget. “I should further point out that much of the work done in terms of allocations was considered again about 12 months ago. Now we are at the point of implementation,” Mr. Anslow continued.
“Two important considerations should be noted in our presentation today. The first is that the general fund, that is the tax funds of the state, when combined with lottery resources, are up considerably from the previous year and that is a turnaround in terms of what has happened to OSSHE’s budgets in the last seven or eight years or so. I think that is very good news.

“The second piece of information I bring to you,” Vice Chancellor Anslow continued, “is that unlike previous allocation methodologies that were presented to you, this is a one-year allocation versus a biennial allocation budget. Our rationale for that is that, as President Aschkenasy reported, we are looking at the allocation structure and we will see whether or not in the second year of this biennium, you should consider changes to the existing structure.”

Vice Chancellor Anslow pointed out to the Board that within the budget, as recommended by the Legislature and provided by the approved budget, is $8.5 million of tax funds that allow the Board to freeze tuition both for the current year and the year after this. “That is an exception. I think since 1989, tuition has risen dramatically. At least the instructional fee component is held constant across the time period. When this is combined with some of the actions at the federal level in terms of scholarships and tax credits for going to school, I think students are provided an opportunity to take advantage of public higher education this year and into the future,” Mr. Anslow observed.

Mr. Anslow highlighted several other points. “Much of the money that moves around, in addition to inflationary costs and new buildings, is driven by enrollment changes. One of the most significant occurs at OIT. In the judgment of staff, OIT could not absorb the full reduction of the BAS allocation at this time. The Board has approved a number of new programs for OIT in an effort to improve enrollment choices and access at OIT. On special allocations for regional access ($1.2 million for EOU, $1 million for SOU, and $700,000 for OIT) the moneys will be made available when the institutions have submitted plans for how it is to be used.”

Vice Chancellor Anslow reviewed a supplemental document on salary increases:
Salary Bases July 1, 1997 E & G w/SWPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classified Salary Base</th>
<th>$61.8 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Salary Base (Instruction &amp; Research Faculty Base $133.4 million)</td>
<td>$242.9 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Board of Higher Education anticipates that these funds will be allocated to classified and unclassified employees who have performed satisfactorily and/or who have earned additional merit increases. Further, the Board anticipates that campuses will limit the allocation to a 6.11 percent roll-up. Most campus administrators prefer the salary plans presented below.

**Unclassified Employee Compensation Plan**

Two separate legislative allocations were appropriated for salary increases: approximately $10.7 million for satisfactory performance and merit salary increases, and $7.5 million for faculty recruitment and retention (“faculty fighting” fund).

**Satisfactory Performance/Merit Salary Increases**

Approximately $10.7 million is to be allocated for satisfactory performance and merit salary increases (including increases for targeted purposes). This equates to two percent of the salary pool for unclassified employees in January of each of the two years of the biennium. In order to fully utilize these salary dollars, it is suggested that the roll-up costs equate to 6.11 percent. These salary increases would apply to all unclassified employees (i.e., faculty, administrators, and former management service). All campuses and the Chancellor's Office would receive incremental allocations based on the unclassified employee salary pool budgeted as of July 1, 1997. Those campuses with faculty unions will be subject to collective bargaining statutes. Each campus would be required to prepare plans to show how the incremental salary increase funds are to be applied. Plans will be forwarded to the Chancellor for review and approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 1998</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1999</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Recruitment and Retention Fund
The legislature provided $7.5 million to attract and retain quality faculty. While there may be instances where campuses seek to retain certain key academic administrators and professional staff, the legislative response to our proposal was to direct $7.5 million to faculty. Given the legislative intent, it is recommended that these incremental funds be targeted to full time instructional and research faculty.

Distribution Guidelines
Roll-up of the total dollars is limited to $7.5 million for this biennium, per the legislative budget vote.

Campuses have discretion in allocating portions for recruitment and retention, but allocations are expected in each.

Those campuses with faculty unions will be subject to collective bargaining statutes.

Each campus' compensation plan will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor prior to the expenditure of funds.

Each campus will be required to report actual distribution to show how the incremental salary increase funds were applied. Reports will be due in February and June of 1999.

Allocation
A one percent increase would be assigned to all full time instructional and research faculty salaries as of July 1997 and as estimated for July 1998. This would account for approximately $4.2 million (including OPE costs). The remainder of the funds would be distributed at the conclusion of specific study and analysis, currently underway. The study and analysis phase will be completed over the next two months, and presidents will again participate in developing the recommended allocations. The analysis will include: discussions about peer campuses; percentage distribution of faculty by rank; and discipline and market differences.

Comprehensive Salary Study
It is further recommended that a comprehensive salary study be continued by the Chancellor's Office with campus representatives, to develop strategies and desired outcomes in the next five months.
These results would provide a framework for the development of compensation plans for the next two or three biennia in an effort to recruit and retain talented faculty in the academic market and to expand access and availability of quality academic programs sought by students.

Several Board members asked for clarification of employee categories such as management service and non-teaching faculty and which of the groups are covered by collective bargaining.

Vice Chancellor Anslow pointed out that the recommendation before the Board is to target faculty in teaching and research. "That makes a difference in terms of the pools of money that go to campuses and how those pools will be used. Our sense is that campuses would have discretion in allocating portions of the funds for both recruitment purposes and for retention, targeting the money for the best faculty and making sure that they are not being hired away by some other opportunity that comes along. Each campus will be asked to develop a compensation plan that is approved by the Chancellor. They would be expected, then, to follow the specific allocation plan. The Chancellor's Office has been engaged in a study of peer salary data to assist in planning. We want to try to understand distributions by disciplines and market, but that study is not completed at this time."

President Aschkenasy remarked that capital expenditures are not included in the present budget, but maintenance of facilities is. "We agree to build a building and this commits us to the hereafter to keep that building up. How do we control the building of buildings and the fluctuations of FTE?"

Mr. Anslow responded that when a decision is made to build a building it is a 30-70 year commitment, at the least. "On the other hand, programmatic decisions are made for a five-ten year time period and then enrollment fluctuates on a year-to-year basis, and our budgets on an essentially one- or two-year basis. I believe we must begin to build a formula that doesn't just pay because the building is there, but rather incents the campus to put productive programs inside those buildings so that either students are being served, research is being conducted, and/or the facility is kept empty. Boards have had to look at issues of tearing down a building when it is no longer useful and the cost of putting them back into shape is too expensive to do given a different enrollment configuration on that campus."
Chancellor Cox indicated that the discussion of capital construction and maintenance were not inconsequential and that at some time, the Board would have to face making a recommendation for changes.

Mr. Imeson asked where the resources would come from for the $1.6 million special funding for OIT. Mr. Anslow indicated that the dollar amount was determined by what it would take to bring the enrollment figures up. The resources come from every part of the System — a portion from a very thin fund balance and a portion from what campuses would otherwise receive because their enrollments have gone up.

Chancellor Cox indicated, for the record, that this was a one-time cushioning to allow for adjustments that must be made and for the new programmatic activities to be implemented.

Vice Chancellor Clark indicated that it appeared that the response to the three new programs was very encouraging, with about 150 students having expressed interest.

Mr. Anslow pointed out that there was an additional item, required since the passage of SB 271, which relates to travel reimbursement rates for the 1997 year.

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

Executive Summary
Portland State University requested that the School of Government be renamed the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government. Board policy requires Board approval for renaming schools.

Staff Report to the Board
The School of Government was created on January 1, 1997, to bring together the University’s academic programs dealing directly with the study of government. The School offers undergraduate programs in political science and administration of justice as well as master’s and Ph.D. programs in administration of justice, political science, public administration, and public policy. The fall 1996 enrollment was 6,231
student credit hours; the 1996-1997 average adjusted student FTE was 441.34. Within the three divisions of the School, there are 26 full-time faculty members, 28 adjunct faculty, and 4 emeriti faculty.

Mark O. Hatfield has spent his entire professional life in education and government. He currently serves as Distinguished Professor of Government in the School. Throughout his lengthy career in government, Senator Hatfield has distinguished himself as a principled individual with the level of integrity and courage that is unsurpassed in our political leaders. While the naming of the School is intended to honor him, it is also intended to utilize his career in state and national government as an example for future generations of students who will go through this School. Finally, naming the School after Senator Hatfield is intended to recognize his lifelong commitment to higher education and the strong support he has given to urban universities, the University District of Portland, and Portland State University. His insight, support, and encouragement have been invaluable. This request has the support of Dean Nohad Toulan, as well as the faculty and executive committee of the School. It was positively reviewed by the OSSHE Academic Council at the July 1997 meeting.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that Portland State University's School of Government be renamed the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government in honor of Senator Hatfield's distinguished professional career in education and government.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Clark summarized the recommendation to rename the School of Government at PSU to the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government. She reminded the Board that at the January 1997 meeting, the Board received a report and recommendations concerning a reorganization of the School of Urban and Public Affairs.

President Bernstine indicated that the new school would include the divisions of Administration of Justice, Political Science, and Public Administration, all of which touch on the nature and function of government. "Therefore," President Bernstine concluded, "it is very consistent that this School bears the Senator's name since he has served in all levels of state government as well as decades in the U.S. Senate."
Mr. Imeson moved and Ms. Puentes seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Puentes, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

Introduction

Portland State University requested authorization to offer a Ph.D. in Mathematics Education effective fall term 1997. The Board positively reviewed a preproposal for this program at its April 18, 1997, meeting. Although OSU currently offers a Ph.D. option in Mathematics Education, the proposed program would be different in emphasis. The OSU program has a greater emphasis on knowledge of pure mathematics for students in each of its doctoral options, while the PSU program combines the knowledge of mathematics with the knowledge of research about teaching and learning mathematics.

The proposed program is closely aligned with key elements of PSU’s mission, addressing the specific needs of Oregon’s urban communities and working on a nationwide urban agenda as well. The program will likely enroll 6 to 8 students in each of the first few years; program capacity would be 12 to 15 at any one time.

Career prospects are optimistic for students in this program. Graduates will be prepared for employment as postsecondary mathematics education faculty, district curriculum specialists in mathematics, middle or secondary school mathematics supervisors, or mathematics specialists in state or local departments of education or in the private sector.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

The mission of PSU, approved by the Board in 1991, states that PSU is to “enhance the intellectual, social, cultural and economic qualities of urban life by providing access . . . to a quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to the metropolitan area. The University will promote actively the development of a network of educational institutions that will serve the community and will conduct research and community service to support a high-quality educational
environment..." The proposed program satisfies the goals of the mission by: (1) promoting K-16 educational reform in mathematics education; (2) contributing to quality undergraduate education, a central feature of which is quantitative reasoning and competence in mathematics; and (3) working closely with public schools and community colleges to design a continuum of education opportunities in mathematics.

2. Evidence of Need

School Reform. According to the external review team, "[t]he strongest case for introduction of a new graduate degree program in mathematics education is the continuing need for high-level leadership and professional expertise as the state of Oregon and the nation work on fundamental reform of school mathematics curricula and teaching." This applies not only to K-12, but to college-level teaching as well.

Graduates from the proposed PSU program will be highly qualified to respond to this state and national agenda because of the strength of both the mathematics background and the mathematics education background. Various areas of concentration within the proposed program are supported by current faculty expertise. Faculty research areas include:

- The impact of technology on the teaching and learning of secondary and postsecondary precalculus and calculus;
- school change, particularly on the effect of mathematics support in school;
- student mathematical conceptual development (grades 5-10), and;
- mathematics curriculum development.

PSU’s geographic location in the state, coupled with existing partnerships with area schools and demonstrated faculty expertise in the field of mathematics education, make this the ideal location for the proposed program.

Students. Increasingly, students (including classroom teachers who are placebound) have inquired about the possibility of pursuing a Ph.D. in mathematics education at PSU. Many of the graduate students in PSU’s Department of Mathematical Sciences have expressed the desire to pursue their education
beyond the master’s level. Some hope to teach in K-12 or postsecondary institutions; others wish to assume positions of leadership in teaching and curriculum development. For those students who choose the Ed.D. through Curriculum and Instruction, the proposed program would provide opportunities to obtain a major concentration in mathematics education through co-listed seminar courses.

Employment Opportunities. According to the online version of the 1996-97 Occupational Outlook Handbook, occupations for (1) college and university faculty and (2) those holding a doctorate in mathematics and all other mathematical scientists are among the fastest growing and will have the largest numerical increase in employment through the year 2005. In each of the past five years, there have been more new positions than qualified applicants in mathematics education at colleges and universities. While the total number of applicants has been many, a great number of those have been trained only in pure mathematics and have little or no experience in research, curriculum development, or teacher training in mathematics education. During the 1996-97 academic year alone, more than 60 positions for a Ph.D. in Mathematics Education with a master's in Mathematics have been advertised by U.S. colleges and universities. However, the expected number of 1997 U.S. graduates with these qualifications is 16. And, in addition to academic job opportunities, private sector companies are looking for qualified people to direct their inservice mathematics training.

Research and Curriculum in the State and Nation. PSU has established master’s programs in the department and has conducted cutting-edge research and curriculum development. The metro area schools will continue to benefit from PSU’s growing expertise in mathematics education while providing natural settings for continued research on the teaching and learning of mathematics.

The Curriculum Development Laboratory (CDL) and The Math Learning Center (MLC) at Portland State University have, as their primary mission, the development of mathematics curricula that enhances the power and use of visual thinking in school mathematics and the provision of ongoing support, teacher enhancement, and leadership development programs.
for teachers who are implementing the curricula. Their work extends beyond the Portland region; programs developed by the CDL and MLC are currently being taught in over 40 states and in other countries as well. The MLC middle school mathematics materials are being used in a national study, with Portsmouth Middle School in Portland serving as one of six test sites across the nation chosen by the Ford Foundation-funded QUASAR project for model middle school mathematics curricula.

The partnerships and programs already in place will provide a natural laboratory for doctoral students in this program. In addition to their involvement in school reform, programs for students in math and science such as those conducted through OMSI, MESA,* and Northwest EQUALS,** may provide other vehicles for candidates to become involved in community outreach.

* The MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement) program offers hands-on after school, weekend, and summer activities to middle and high school students.
** The purpose of Northwest EQUALS is to increase student participation in math, science, and technology studies, with a focus on historically underrepresented female, ethnic, and racial minority students.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

A number of features combine synergistically to make this a high-quality doctoral program. The balance of mathematics and mathematics education opens up more employment options than does either area alone. Mathematics courses are currently in place, and mathematics education courses are already being developed. The research practicum prior to the dissertation provides the types of experience and exposure that enrich student work and future employment prospects. Review of the faculty members collective record of research, publication, and professional outreach to mathematics educators suggests they demonstrate the requisite qualifications to offer a doctoral program. In addition, the faculty have been involved in over $4 million of grant activity over the past ten years. According to the external review, "[t]heir potential for continuing the development of this program and obtaining outside funding is very good."
Ongoing program quality will be assured through both an internal and an external review process.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. The faculty involved in the proposed program have diverse and complementary experience and expertise (e.g., technology in teaching calculus and precalculus, mathematics curriculum development, teacher professional development). Recent faculty appointments have added strength to the mathematics education specialization. No new faculty will need to be hired.

Library, Facilities, and Equipment. Current library holdings, facilities, and equipment are adequate for the start-up of this program. Additional library materials will be acquired using the Department of Mathematical Sciences' existing allocations and augmented by a modest commitment from the director of the library. As the program develops, a classroom equipped with special video and videotaping capabilities and with access to computer networking will be needed. Funding is expected to come from existing allocations for computer equipment and from future research grants and contracts.

Graduate Student Support. Support for six to eight graduate students in the program is included in the proposal. Such support would probably be in the form of teaching assistantships and compensation would be at a level comparable to other schools. As the program develops, student support will also come from research grants and contracts.

Program Review

The proposed program has been reviewed positively by all appropriate institutional committees, the Academic Council, and by an external review team. The team, with mathematics faculty representatives from Washington State University, the University of Maryland, and San Diego State University, visited PSU on June 18-19, 1997. They reported that, "[s]uch a program is rare . . . . Students finishing this program will have all the areas of expertise one would hope for in a mathematics educator — theory, research, and practice." They also support PSU being well-positioned to offer such a program, stating that the "urban setting will naturally provide rich opportunities for
research and development activities not only with local relevance, but also with regional and national implications. The mathematics education communities at different levels — research, school practice, evaluation, and policy studies — will be enriched by this program and its human and intellectual products."

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to establish a program leading to the Ph.D. in Mathematics Education 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. The proposal will be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the October Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Clark briefly reviewed the proposal and underscored that there is a national effort to improve a students' performance, specifically in the areas of mathematics and reading. Higher education is conducting research about mathematics teaching and learning. "I want to mention, and President Bernstine will elaborate further, that we are announcing the receipt of a large new competitive grant awarded to PSU that will support new ways of teaching mathematics and sciences. It is complimentary of the quality of the faculty that PSU has assembled."

President Bernstine added that educators hope to improve mathematics and science skills of all students and to increase the number of minorities and women who are teaching these subjects. "It is my pleasure to announce and I hope you will join me in congratulating those faculty who received a $5 million National Science Foundation grant to support this project. Although the project is based at PSU, it is a collaborative program involving co-directors from a number of institutions throughout the state, including faculty members from EOU, WOU, OSU, and the UO."

Dr. Aschkenasy asked if there were other mathematics doctoral programs and why those graduates couldn't be provided education courses to prepare them for teaching. President Bernstine indicated
that PSU did not have control over those programs and they were interested in fulfilling a perceived need. Further, he indicated the other institutions with those programs were supporting this new PSU program as well.

Ms. Puentes asked if there would be research and curriculum development associated with the program, to which President Bernstine indicated that there would be. Ms. McAllister raised a question about the requirement for students to have a foreign language and whether computer programming would be considered as fulfilling that requirement. Dr. Clark indicated that this issue had been raised with PSU and there was an understanding that this must be worked out. "In this case, transforming a foreign language requirement to something more relevant is at least as appropriate as maintaining some specific languages."

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

Executive Summary

The Board's Administrative Rule, OAR 580-021-0055, provides for the Board or its designee to review a president's decision in certain faculty grievances. Dr. Michael Hollister is a professor in the English Department at Portland State University (PSU). He appeals former President Judith Ramaley's decision not to award him merit compensation in addition to that which he received in January 1997.

Staff Report to the Board

Dr. Hollister is a professor in the English Department at PSU. In December 1996, Dr. Hollister filed a grievance alleging that he did not receive a fair merit salary increase. He cited four bases for his allegation: 1) the English Department Promotion, Tenure and Salary Increase Committee (PT&SIC) "failed to read accurately or completely" the material he submitted for their consideration; 2) the PT&SIC incorrectly evaluated his performance; 3) the PT&SIC recommended a salary increase lower than for others of "comparable or lesser achievements;" and 4) the PT&SIC refused to grant him a hearing to ask questions regarding merit, although other faculty members were given such an opportunity.
The Peer Hearing Committee conducted a hearing on the matter and reviewed the materials submitted by Professor Hollister. It found no evidence that the PT&SIC was unfair in its review of Professor Hollister's materials, but acknowledged that one member of the committee did not participate because she is a named defendant in a lawsuit filed by Professor Hollister. The Peer Hearing Committee found that because the distinguishing factor between those who received outstanding merit and those who received high merit, including Dr. Hollister, was published books, the PT&SIC did not make specific references to articles and other publications where Professor Hollister had been more active. The Peer Hearing Committee suggested the PT&SIC develop a written statement that more accurately reflected Professor Hollister's accomplishments. Finally, the Peer Hearing Committee did not believe that the salary increase awarded Dr. Hollister was unfair. However, "in the spirit of fostering healing in the English Department," the committee recommended increasing his merit award.

The provost reviewed the material from the Peer Hearing Committee. He concurred with the findings but concluded that since there was no evidence that the original merit award was unfair, Dr. Hollister's award would not be increased. Professor Hollister appealed to President Ramaley who reviewed Professor Hollister's materials and the hearing material. She concurred with the provost's decision.

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.

In his appeal to the Board, Professor Hollister cites a number of facts to support his grievance related to the three bases upon which the Board can reverse the decision of a president. As to procedural error, Professor Hollister lists instances of procedural error that he believes provide a basis for the Board to reverse the president's decision. In summary, two relate to failure to publicize faculty salary decisions and figures. One relates to membership of a Department Executive Committee member on the PT&SIC, one relates to the evaluation of teaching by the PT&SIC, four relate to the unwillingness of three
individuals to participate because they were named defendants in a lawsuit filed by Professor Hollister, two relate to a number of events before or during the hearing by the Peer Hearing Committee, two relate to the finding and recommendation of the Peer Hearing Committee, four relate to the timeliness or substance of the provost’s and president’s response, and one describes events alleging bias by the PT&SIC chair.

Professor Hollister alleges that the decision is not supported by substantial evidence because no one has attempted to refute the evidence he presented and there was no investigation of his grievance.

Professor Hollister alleges the following rules or law were violated: the Open Records Law; *Departmental Procedures and Practices, Guidelines for Promotion* (1988); *Tenure and Salary Increase in the English Department* (1991); *PSU Policies and Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty for Tenure, Promotion, and Merit Increase* (1996); the collective bargaining agreement between PSU and AAUP (1995-1997); and the PSU Faculty Grievance and Complaint Procedure.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Board President Aschkenasy designated Vice Chancellor Shirley Clark to review the matter and report to the Board. Vice Chancellor Clark presented the results of her review and recommended that the Board not reverse the decision made by PSU.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Vice Chancellor Clark reviewed the situation regarding Dr. Michael Hollister, a PSU professor. She indicated that this grievance comes before the Board after consideration by a faculty grievance committee (the Peer Hearing committee), Provost Michael Reardon, and former President Judith Ramaley. None of these concluded that the salary awarded Professor Hollister was unfair.

Continuing, Dr. Clark indicated that Professor Hollister alleged many violations of procedure, some of which relate to procedures followed in developing the salary recommendation. “I did not find evidence of
such procedural errors. Secondly, I find substantial evidence to support former President Ramaley's conclusion that the award to Professor Hollister was not unfair."

Furthermore, Vice Chancellor Clark indicated that it was evident that Professor Hollister sincerely believed that his performance deserved an award of Outstanding Merit; those who evaluated him did not agree. "My review does not suggest that the decisions violate public records law. Therefore," Dr. Clark indicated, "I find no basis on which the Board can reverse the president's decision.

"While I find no basis upon which the Board should reverse the president's decision, and no evidence that the salary decision was unfair, it is apparent from my review of the record that there is a long history of acrimony between Professor Hollister and some members of the English Department. PSU should take special care to ensure that future consideration of salary increases for Professor Hollister be carried out in a way that is designed to provide a neutral evaluation of his performance," Vice Chancellor Clark concluded.

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

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

Dr. George W. Brown, director of the Forest Research Laboratory, with the concurrence of President Paul Risser, have made the following recommendation:
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- Appointment of Mr. David L. Bowden to a three-year term as an industry representative to replace Stuart J. (John) Shelk, Jr. who has completed seven years of service on the Committee. Mr. Bowden is Senior Vice President-Timber for Longview Fibre Company, with 41 years of experience in the forest products industry, 38 of those with Longview Fibre. He is past president of the Oregon Logging Conference, Pacific Logging Congress, and the Oregon Forest Industries Council. In addition, he serves as Director of Keep Oregon Green and Western Forestry Foundation.

- Appointment of Dr. Deborah M. Brosnan, President and Founder of the Sustainable Ecosystems Institute in Portland to replace Nancy N. Russell who has completed seven years of service as a public representative. Dr. Brosnan serves on the advisory boards of: CTO, Caribbean Action for Sustainable Tourism; World Congress on Coastal and Marine Tourism; and the Marine Reserve, St. Barthelemy. She is a scientific advisor for Washington State Parks and Recreational Marine Parks and for the development and monitoring of artificially created and wheelchair accessible tide pools in Newport, Oregon. She is a member of the Society for Conservation Biology; International Society for Coral Reef Studies; Ecological Society of America; American Association for the Advancement of Science; and Association for Women in Science.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

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

Board Discussion and Action

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

B.S. IN
APPLIED
PSYCHOLOGY,
OIT

Introduction

Oregon Institute of Technology (OIT) requested authorization to offer the B.S. in Applied Psychology. This proposed program will (1) produce graduates with the necessary levels of social and communi-
cation skills required by a variety of social service agencies, (2) provide educational opportunities for placebound students wanting to pursue an applied social science curriculum related to current employment opportunities or in preparation for graduate programs in the field, (3) provide bachelor's-level training for working in social service settings with mandated clients such as criminal substance abusers, and (4) serve as a minor field of study in health psychology for students training for health-related occupations. All other OSSHE institutions offer programs in psychology; the proposed program differs, however, in its applied emphasis, course structure, and nature of practicum experiences available. Current resources at OIT are sufficient to begin implementing this program in the first year. In succeeding years, additional resources will be required. Due to the immediacy of student enrollment needs, expressed student interest in the availability of a major in this field, and regional need, no preproposal was presented to the Board.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

The historical mission of OIT has been to prepare individuals in applied technology fields. While the term “technology” is most commonly used in the context of the physical/biological sciences and engineering, it may also refer to practical applications in other fields, such as health care and psychology. This proposed program will focus on applications of psychological research and the social sciences for improving health, understanding human relations in the business world, and addressing substance abuse and other social problems.

OIT's mission (approved in February 1992) further states that one objective is “to develop ... the ethical and cultural awareness required to meet the changing needs of individuals and societies.” OIT has developed clearly defined outcomes in line with these objectives. Specifically, students in this proposed program will develop the:

- ability to listen effectively to clients or other respondents;
- ability to effectively interview clients or other respondents;
• ability to understand thinking patterns underlying maladaptive behaviors and promote positive changes;
• ability to conduct field research to document treatments or program outcomes; and,
• ability to understand and navigate the complex networks involved in the delivery of social and health care services.

Finally, while this program does expand OIT’s mission in a modest way, it is justified both in terms of its importance in serving the needs of the community and state, and in its capacity to strengthen existing health sciences programs offered by the institution.

2. Evidence of Need

The need for this proposed program is evident by identifying community and institutional needs as well as employment opportunities for graduates.

Community & Institutional Needs

Access. Placebound students in the Klamath Basin have very limited curricular choices for programs at the baccalaureate-degree level. Psychology, nationwide, is the second largest major by student enrollment. This program would expand the academic options for local students.

OIT seeks to accommodate a diverse population of students in this program, hence evening courses will be an important feature. In addition, a newly established advisory center will provide services to part-time students, evening students, and others who require special scheduling and course-delivery options.

Retention. A poll of current students suggests that current general studies students would be retained through the bachelor’s degree level were this proposed program to be implemented. It is estimated that perhaps as many as 50 or 60 students would remain at OIT rather than transferring to another college or leaving higher education altogether.
Strengthening existing programs. This proposed program would provide a minor and additional elective courses for students in management and in the allied health programs.

Employment Opportunities

This proposed program will provide training relevant to current employment opportunities, both in the Klamath Basin and across the state. According to the on-line version of the 1996-97 Occupational Outlook Handbook, "A bachelor's degree in psychology qualifies a person to assist psychologists and other professionals in community mental health centers, vocational rehabilitation offices, and correctional programs." Bureau of Labor statistics (1996) indicate that three career fields suitable for applied psychology graduates rank within the top 20 fastest-growing occupations: residential counselors (9th), human service workers (10th), and correctional officers (18th). Nationally, the need for correctional officers is expected to increase much faster than average, a trend that is particularly relevant for Oregon due to Measure 11. The state is expecting its prison population to more than double by the year 2006, with corresponding prison staff growth. Graduates of OIT's applied psychology program will be trained to work with both treatment providers and the criminal justice system. Starting salaries for these positions typically range from $24,000 to $30,000.

OIT has received widespread external encouragement to develop this proposed program, particularly for the plans to train individuals to work with court-mandated clients. Both the director of the Oregon Department of Corrections and the department head of Klamath and Lake Community Corrections indicate that this program would help meet future personnel needs.

The National Association of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Counselors also supports the program, stating that there is an "urgent need" for such graduates. The Klamath branch of Services to Children and Families indicates positive employment opportunities as well, adding that they would be interested in participating as an externship site.
Students in the health psychology emphasis area will be prepared for careers in clinical support services and health-related counseling. The courses in this emphasis area support the allied health curriculum or may serve as a minor. The director of the Center for Medical Research, Merle West Medical Center, supports this proposed program.

The solid theoretical foundation, coupled with the field-based practica and externships, will equip program graduates with the skills necessary to find employment in an array of social service areas.

3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

The proposed program will be of high quality, as evidenced by the quality of the curriculum and faculty.

**Curriculum.** The program permits students to select one of three emphasis areas for more in-depth study: human services, health psychology, or organizational development. While all will share a common core of classes (e.g., Community Psychology, Psychological Research Methods, Human Growth and Development), the specific emphasis areas will allow students to focus their learning. Students with a human services emphasis, for example, will take classes such as Psychology of Addiction, Behavior Modification, Criminology, and Therapeutic Communities. The health psychology curriculum will include such courses as Social Psychology of Health Care, while organizational development students will study Industrial Psychology, Organizational Behavior, and Statistical Methods.

Planning discussions are underway with both SOU and WOU for delivery of selected courses, thereby utilizing strengths of other OSSHE institutions. Potential courses include Group Counseling, Interviewing and Appraisal, Human Services, and Principles and Methods of Psychological Assessment.

OIT’s program in applied psychology will use both practica and externships for experiential learning. (OIT defines practica as courses taught during the junior year in which students work with an agency as part of the course with a duration of two days to two months. Students in externships work off campus
with a duration of two weeks to one year. In externships, the host organization supervises and financially supports the student’s work at the organization.) Sites are currently being developed for these experiences.

The proposed curriculum is strong enough to support student movement either into employment directly after graduation or into a related field of graduate study, such as counseling, social work, or psychology.

Faculty. Within the existing department, faculty members have sufficient expertise and appropriate credentials to begin implementation of the program in fall 1997. One professor has been involved in approximately $4 million worth of field research dealing with social problems and has worked closely with social service and criminal justice system agencies. Another faculty member is chair of the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences and has a great deal of relevant teaching and professional experience. OIT also has a cadre of qualified adjunct faculty prepared to teach in the proposed program.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

While some new resources will be needed to support this program, internal reallocation, the potential for federal grant monies, and funding generated through anticipated increased enrollment will, in part, address the program resource issues.

Faculty. Two FTE faculty would be anticipated for the upper division courses. No new faculty would be required for the first two years of the program. There are many qualified adjunct faculty available locally; $5,000 would be needed for adjunct salaries, to be covered by existing funds administered by the provost.

The extent to which courses are delivered from other OSSHE campuses will have a direct impact on the use of adjunct professors and on hiring the anticipated one or two additional full-time faculty members. Since there is currently a student waiting list for this program, enrollments may be large enough to support the additional faculty needed.
Library, Facilities, and Equipment. The OIT Library currently subscribes to a number of psychology review journals that are adequate for lower division courses in psychology. More specialized material is required for upper division courses. Immediate upgrade costs for texts, monographs, and new journal subscriptions are estimated at less than $2,000 for 1998-99. New videotapes, films, and other support materials are estimated at approximately $3,000 for 1998-99 and about $750 per year thereafter. Additional consideration will be given to increasing access to reference sources via on-line computer facilities, especially Internet sources. New reference materials for this program will also be a priority for the library academic program budget.

No additional facilities are needed to implement the program. The availability of a dedicated PicTel/Socrates classroom for videotelephone conferencing and course delivery, in addition to an ED-NET satellite transmission and receiving studio, permits distance delivery of courses. As distance learning modes become more prevalent, additional equipment support for videotelephone capacity and Internet systems may be needed.

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 Applied Psychology 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 (July 18, 1997)

Vice Chancellor Clark and Provost Dow reviewed the proposed program and the fact that the addition of this major would result in a modest extension of the mission of OIT. Dr. Clark indicated that the
program was well developed and had a high likelihood of meeting the academic needs of students staying in the Klamath Falls area who do not have the opportunity of a bachelor's level program.

In response to Dr. Aschkenasy's question of how many more students this might add to OIT, Provost Dow indicated that there is a list of 30 students who are interested in the major. When asked about the cost of adding the program, Dr. Dow indicated that in the first two years there would be no new faculty or staff. However, when enrollment grows, they will use one faculty position that had been held. In addition, they are engaged in discussions with SOU and WOU with regard to sharing courses.

Several Board members asked questions related to the "fast track" used for this program. In response to Mr. Imeson's question regarding how long it took to develop the program, Dr. Dow indicated it had been six weeks since OIT received directions to proceed. The program resulted from a request from the community and will increase OIT's flexibility to recruit and retain students.

Ms. Puentes moved and Mr. Imeson seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation and place the program on the September consent agenda. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Puentes, Swanson, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

**Board Discussion and Action (September 19, 1997)**

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

In an increasingly competitive educational arena whose traditional geographic and pedagogical parameters are rendered almost meaningless by technology, and the entry into the marketplace of nimble service providers who focus on instruction and ignore the other two of higher education's traditional roles (viz., research and service), there is a premium placed on flexibility. As in business, and more lately in health care, the race, the profits, and ultimately survival, are to the swift. Entrepreneurial faculty will do well in this changing world. Institutions that facilitate and orchestrate the quasi-independent activities of these faculty will likely steal a march on those who
continue in a more traditional fashion. This is the context in which the Oregon State System of Higher Education (OSSHE) operates. The challenge for the Chancellor's Office is to provide the maximum autonomy and flexibility to its institutions while maintaining its commitment to the public purposes for which it was founded. The state government advocacy role, especially where it deals with general fund support, is properly a System responsibility. It is clear, too, that the Board should address such issues as campus mission differentiation, geographic access, admission standards for state residents, the allocation of state General Fund appropriations, the establishment of broad accounting principles, and the facilitation of expensive programs which state policy demands but which cannot be offered profitably.

But in the judgment of most of the solution team, institutional autonomy should prevail in almost every other aspect of the enterprise. The Board should provide policy direction and demand accountability. However, control by the Chancellor's Office, either by direct service provision or by regulatory activity, should be minimized. Each campus, too, should be free to offer programs that are consistent with its mission and with specific Board policies. And each campus should be able to enter into cooperative arrangements with any entity, within or outside OSSHE, to provide educational services consistent with its mission so long as those activities do not compromise the overall needs of the System or infringe on the activities of another institution.

The centralized services currently offered by the Chancellor's Office should be reviewed in light of individual campus needs and the System as a whole. Each campus should be free to choose for itself which support services it wishes from the Chancellor's Office and should pay only for those services.

The System should be coordinated by the Chancellor working closely with the Presidents as the management team of the State System. As a group, they should recommend policy to the Board and be responsible for interpreting and carrying out the policy decisions of the Board. They would and should be guided by the needs of the state as articulated by the Board and as translated by the Chancellor. And their efforts must be carried out in the very real world of the emerging competitive educational marketplace.
Part I: The Work of the Solution Team

At its June 1996 meeting, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education established a Solution Team and gave it the following charge:

Focus the Chancellor's Office on policy, criteria setting, System strategy, and necessary central services, ensuring the institutions have appropriate support, flexibility, and incentives to achieve strategic objectives.

The Solution Team, at its first meeting, reviewed the Board’s charge and proposed the following modifications:

Focus the Chancellor's Office on policy, criteria setting, advocacy, System strategy, and necessary central services, ensuring the institutions have appropriate support, flexibility, and incentives to achieve their strategic objectives, and those of OSSHE as a whole.

The membership of the Solution Team was finalized in September 1996 and over the next two months, work began, in the form of fact-finding, as President Stephen Reno (Southern Oregon University) and Provost John Moseley (University of Oregon) conducted interviews with the presidents, provosts, chief administrative officers, and chief student affairs officers of all seven campuses. In addition, they interviewed members of the public and senior staff in the Chancellor's Office.

These interviews provided an initial set of information for the full solution team to review at its first meeting, which took place on November 7. The team directed Reno and Moseley to conduct further interviews. In all, the solution team met a total of four times (November 7, 1996, January 15, 1997, February 19, 1997, and May 22, 1997). Part One of this report begins with a summary of the interviews that were conducted. The interviews and the early discussions of the solution team yielded (1) a set of assumptions that guided subsequent discussions, and (2) findings regarding the operations of the Chancellor's Office.

Part Two of this report articulates a vision for the Chancellor's Office and suggests a set of principles by which it would operate, satisfying first the statutory responsibilities of the Board, while preserving distinctive prerogative for the Chancellor's Office and the OSSHE.
campuses. The Solution Team members believe that the goal of having the seven campuses truly function as a system can be realized by the Chancellor's Office operating in a more decentralized manner. This judgment is forwarded now to the Board and the Chancellor for review and discussion. The principles outlined in Part Two are intended to help Board members understand the implications of a more decentralized operation.

Assumptions Derived from Interviews:

1. We assume that Oregon needs and benefits from coordination of its efforts in public higher education. Thus, it is assumed that the Chancellor's Office will continue to exist, although its role needs to be better defined and more sharply focused.

2. We assume that the final fiduciary and coordinating authority for the Oregon State System of Higher Education rests with the State Board of Higher Education.

3. We assume that many, if not all, of the responsibilities of the Chancellor's Office that are specifically defined in the Oregon Revised Statutes will continue for the foreseeable future.

4. We assume that, while the Chancellor's Office has statutory responsibility for a particular function, this does not preclude part of that function being delegated to individual System campuses, with the Chancellor's Office maintaining general oversight.

5. We assume that a primary responsibility of the Chancellor's Office is to make it possible for the individual campuses to accomplish their missions, and to add value to the campuses.

6. We assume that the seven OSSHE institutions wish to work together in such a way as to be truly responsive to the needs of their multiple customers, and to provide the best education possible, within available resources.

Findings Derived from Interviews:

1. There is general agreement that Oregon is better served by a system rather than by seven institutions acting independently. The benefits of a system include: economies of scale, reducing the chances of inter-institutional conflicts, encouraging cooperative
efforts, relating to state government, compelling collective action when it is necessary to do so, assuring the public that its needs are being addressed, protecting activities that are in the general interest of the state that might be overlooked by individual campuses, and serving as a clearinghouse for information.

2. There is general consensus that the Chancellor's Office should: coordinate the collective efforts of the seven campuses to be responsive to public needs, facilitate cooperation among the institutions, take the lead in the relationship of the campuses to state government, be an advocate for the campuses, and provide fiscal oversight.

3. There is agreement that the Chancellor's Office can be most effective when it relies on a team management approach, heavily involving campus leadership in decision making, and there is acknowledgment that it has been moving in this direction.

4. As the role of the State of Oregon has diminished substantially in the funding of higher education, and those costs fall increasingly on student tuition and other private sources of funds, the role of the Chancellor's Office should be re-examined, and the institutions must be given more flexibility, and more responsibility, for the management of their resources.

Part II: A Vision for the OSSHE Chancellor's Office

The Chancellor's Office should provide maximum autonomy and flexibility to its constituent institutions while maintaining its commitment to the public purposes for which it was founded. The Oregon State Board of Higher Education should establish policy for the System in order to meet the needs of the state and approve the mission for each institution in the System. In doing so, the Board should make clear its expectations for each institution consistent with its mission, and hold campus presidents responsible for meeting them. The focus of accountability will be on educational results.

The State System shall be managed and coordinated by the Chancellor, working together with the institution Presidents. They will recommend policies to the Board and will share responsibility for interpreting and carrying out the policies of the Board and the legal mandates established by the State of Oregon.
The Chancellor will provide staff support to the Board. It will be the role of the Chancellor's Office to implement the policies of the Board and to facilitate the efforts of the campuses.

All seven OSSHE campuses will perform instructional, research, and public service activities either directly or in partnership with other entities.

**Realizing the Vision: The Context, the Challenges, the Principles**

Whether the body responsible for a public higher education system is governing or coordinating in nature, the System itself generally exists to serve the following principal purposes:

1. "Systems may help meet the need for stability, continuity, and long-term perspective in an increasingly turbulent political environment."

2. Systems may provide the means to respond to the increasing demands of the clientele for statewide consistency in quality and accessibility of higher education services and in credit transfer.

3. In a more market-oriented environment, intense pressures for cost containment and technological advances are likely to lead to the same kinds of mergers and consolidations now under way in health care."

Even the most casual observer of the Systemwide OSSHE Strategic Planning Initiative, begun in December 1995, would notice that each of these three concerns has been expressed during that effort.

**The Context: Stability and Long-Term Perspective**

The passage of Ballot Measure 5 in 1990 was an important event in the recent history of OSSHE in two senses. First, it marked the beginning of a seven-year period of decreasing state investment in the public higher education system. Second, it set higher education in direct competition with other state-funded agencies and programs and, moreover, created an artificial distinction between K-12 education and community college (which the Measure required to maintain current funding levels using state General Funds) and higher education (with requirement for funding stability). In the ensuing years, higher education has been required both to seek alignment
with the other educational sectors (including community colleges) as part of a "continuum of education" and to "make its own case" based upon its unique contribution to society and to the economy. Also within this same period, the public and the legislature have expressed increasing concern regarding the responsiveness, cost effectiveness, quality, and availability of higher education. Both within and outside the educational community, there is recognition that it is necessary not only to establish in the mind of the public and its representatives the value of higher education, but also to document its effects in clearly measurable ways.

As the experience of the last seven years demonstrates, these messages are best conveyed on behalf of higher education and to the many "publics" it serves by a single coordinating Board and CEO. In addition to legislators, other governmental agencies, business, industry, and the professions, the other "publics" with shareholder interests in higher education want to deal with one, rather than many, spokespersons, and with one, rather than multiple, plans.

The Challenges: Demands for Quality and Accessibility

The report, *Gaining the Competitive Advantage*, (issued by the Associated Oregon Industries, Oregon Business Council, et al.) was a blunt challenge to Oregon public higher education to be more "customer oriented," more concerned with quality, accessibility, achieving better geographic distribution of programs, and being a partner with business and industry, especially in providing (1) an excellent core undergraduate education, (2) current technology education, and (3) timely and "on-time" continuing professional education.

The report illustrates a public perception that higher education has been slow to respond to the needs of the business and professional community; that its own values, traditions, structure, and operating procedures make flexibility difficult; and that it is resistant to continuous outcome assessment. The particular issue of high technology education in the Portland metropolitan area is but an example of these concerns. In formulating its recommendations, the AOI/OBC report assumed that OSSHE's response would be a coordinated one, one that is greater than could be achieved by a single institution. At the same time, those who have followed higher education closely over the past seven years would note many positive responses to the issues outlined above.
All OSSHE institutions have managed the reduction in state General Funds in responsible and innovative ways, with quality and access remaining paramount values. All campuses have made major commitments to the improvement of undergraduate education, reduced administrative costs (some through the Board's Administrative Review Committee, [BARC] process), taken advantage of the flexibility afforded them by SB 271 (the Higher Education Administrative Efficiency Act), and made significant progress in computer networking and instructional technology.

The Challenges: Pressures for Cost Containment & Technological Advances

The OSSHE planning document Education Unbounded (the product of the Board's 2010 Advisory Panel) recognized that, notwithstanding decreasing state funding, the System would need to invest in both instructional and administrative technology to provide access to its programs using distance-learning formats. While the total intellectual wealth of the System could not, and should not, be replicated on each of the seven campuses, much could be shared through technology. At the same time, through mediated instruction, professors and students could use their time differently, more effectively. Thus cost containment and technology advancement were linked, at least conceptually.

With these more recent developments shaping the current discussion, it is useful to recall some historic facts about the Oregon State Board for Higher Education. It was created by the Legislature in 1929. In 1931, the Board adopted a resolution that included a plan for central administration. In March 1932, a Board committee presented a report that included a recommendation to hire a chancellor. Access to programs, the distribution of programs across the campuses, and accountability were key concerns of the Board at that time. The Board and the Chancellor's Office were designed to manage the total resources of the System, to represent its interests to its various constituencies (including the Legislature), and to be accountable to the public through the Legislature.

In the more than 60 years since its establishment, the Board, OSSHE, a Chancellor, and the central office staff have remained faithful to the legislative mandate, providing general oversight and direction, mediating the missions of individual campuses, integrating institutional with collective goals, providing advocacy and accountability, and
relieving campuses, where possible, of functions and costs by consolidating them within the Chancellor's Office.

The Principles

MacTaggart's study of system governance sets out 12 principles, or so-called "best practice," developed after a thorough review of public higher education governing or coordinating bodies nationally. The OSSHE Chancellor's Office is currently operating in the spirit of many of these principles, including, for example, its key role in legislative and gubernatorial relations. In what follows, we cite several of the other principles and relate each to issues or interests that would illustrate a more decentralized style of operation for the Chancellor's Office.

1) "The System should have explicit objectives that relate to both external state and societal priorities and internal system priorities."

It is recognized that OSSHE has a vision, goals, and objectives that are complementary to, but different from, the missions of the individual campuses. These are framed most recently in the document Education Unbounded. While a given campus might see its work in terms of a regional service area or, alternatively, of providing the program or service within the System, the Board and the Chancellor's Office should focus on statewide needs, be responsive to changing conditions, and orchestrate the distinctive missions of the seven campuses. The Chancellor's Office should develop statewide master planning in consultation with the campuses and with the approval of the State Board. The vision articulated in Education Unbounded did not lead to significant change for at least three reasons. (1) Campuses were more occupied in dealing with budget reductions resulting from the implementation of Measure 5 than they were with their role within system-wide planning; (2) neither the Board nor the Chancellor's Office specifically used Education Unbounded as a charter for system-wide planning; and (3) the Oregon business community (through such organizations as the Associated Oregon Industries and the Oregon Business Council) opened a conversation with OSSHE regarding performance and expectation that led, in part, to a new strategic planning initiative (begun in 1995) as well as a joint strategy for the 1997 Legislative Session.
As part of the strategic planning initiative, the Board and Chancellor's Office is currently reviewing the mission statements of the seven campuses. The goal is to achieve differentiation and complementarity. Ideally, a mission statement should be specific enough to shape individual campus planning and decision making. The challenge will be for the Board and the Chancellor's Office to help the campuses frame such specific mission statements while ensuring that the collective effect of them all serves the public interest. But once its mission statement has been approved, an individual campus should be granted latitude to operate within that framework and held accountable in terms of it.

2) "The presumption should always be in favor of decentralization to the individual campuses or units."

It is accepted business practice today that quality and efficiency are best served when the provision of a service or the management of a function is carried out as close as is practical to where the service is utilized or the function operates. For OSSHE, centralization of some services and functions is established in statute, but this should not prevent our seeking changes in these statutes, as we did with SB 271, if we believe that decentralization would better serve the mission of higher education. MacTaggart suggests that the question of centralization should be reviewed in the light of the following considerations:

a. Is this a function that cannot be undertaken more effectively and efficiently by the individual campuses?
b. Is this a function that addresses System and public interest questions that individual campuses cannot address?
c. Does this function add value to the sum of the contribution of the individual campuses?
d. In the case of services, is this a service that campuses could purchase from another source other than the System at a lower cost and at the same or higher quality?
e. Does the provision of a service by the Chancellor's Office contribute directly to each campus fulfilling its mission most effectively?

MacTaggart also advises, "Before adding a system-level operational or service function, systems should explore all other opportunities." This advice is consistent with Recommendation 4 of the BARC review of the Chancellor's Office. "Eliminate services which are not highly valued by institutional customers of the Chancellors Office."
BARC review estimated that $4.1 million could be saved in the Chancellor's Office annually through the elimination of service identified in that report, but did not address the issue of the costs to the campuses of providing those services that were necessary to the campuses. Information from the Reno/Moseley interviews provides a more recent update on provision of services, from a campus perspective.

*There is agreement that the following central services should be provided by the Chancellor's Office:*

a. Liaison among campuses, and between the Board and the campuses  
b. Administrative support for the Board  
c. Legal services, at least for the smaller campuses  
d. Coordination of campus presidential searches, and the evaluation of presidents, with adequate participation by the affected campus  
e. Audit functions: financial, compliance, and performance (focused on educational outcomes)  
f. Provide system payroll, although "contracting out" and delegation to the larger campuses should be permitted.

*There is agreement that the campuses should play a significantly larger role than they do at present in organizing and providing the following services:*

a. Human resources/personnel operations, particularly with HRIS  
b. Facilitation of OSSHE collaboration with K-12 and community colleges  
c. Resident student recruitment  
d. Affirmative action and diversity programs  
e. Collective bargaining, particularly with faculty unions  
f. Joint academic programs  
g. Capital construction planning, budgeting, and implementation  
h. Accounting  
i. Corporate relations  
j. Developing and implementing new programs to respond to market needs (without prior approval).
There is agreement that there are some services that can best be done by the individual campuses, with only a small coordinating role played by the Chancellor's Office:

a. Instructional technology/distance learning
b. Electronic library systems
c. International education
d. Federal governmental relations

If properly implemented, the increasing decentralization of services described above should both improve the quality of those services, and decrease their overall cost to the system. However, some additional funding will be needed by the campuses to cover their costs in provision of some of these services.

3. "The System should seek to break bureaucratic links between and among campuses and academic units with significantly different missions."

There seems to be great potential for dissonance between Systemwide policies and certain non-uniform arrangements across the campuses. Collective bargaining is an illustrative case. Of the seven OSSHE campuses, three have faculty collective bargaining units, while all OSSHE classified personnel are represented by a Systemwide OPEU/OSSHE. In the former instance, for example, there have been occasions when OSSHE allocates faculty salary increases solely on the basis of retention or performance, while an individual campus administration is challenged to negotiate salary increases with a faculty collective bargaining unit that is insistent upon raising the base salary level of all its membership. While the campus administration might be empathetic with the local union concerns, it is, nonetheless, compelled to "fall in rank" with the other OSSHE campuses. This creates tensions among OSSHE campuses overall and especially among those with collective bargaining.

However, a current example of success in this area is the design of the Master's in Software Engineering degree. Each campus involved in the design of this program has its own campus-based process for the development and approval of graduate programs, and for the admission and monitoring of graduate students. Furthermore, each department has differing expertise in software engineering. All of these barriers were overcome through the motivation of the departments to put together a program that would be attractive to industry
and to their students. This is a perfect case study where the "System" provided only the incentive—the promise to seek state funding for the program if it were properly designed. The individual departments worked together in good will to design an excellent program, and to overcome the differing campus processes.

Efforts must be made to ensure that opportunities to improve campus programs, operations, and facilities are not stymied by rigid policies and practices imposed at the System level. This is especially true where a campus initiative would have little or no adverse effect on other campuses. Further, the flexibility for campuses to offer programs in a competitive marketplace is essential for their success. Systemwide rules that inhibit program offerings as to type, location, mode of delivery, financing, cooperative arrangement with other campuses or non-System entities, timing, or content tend to stifle campus initiative and hamper the ability of campuses to thrive and to provide services to Oregonians.

4. "The System should provide for new or pilot demonstration sites to be established within the system that are separate, and preferably isolated from, other units so as to increase the chances for innovation and improvement."

Off-campus centers such as the Central Oregon University Center (COUC) and the Capital Center provide OSSHE with opportunities to experiment with new models of educational delivery to meet the higher-education needs of under-served areas. In the current biennium, plans are underway to expand the COUC to "Phase II," and to initiate a South Coast University Center. It is anticipated that these centers will operate in such a way as to broker the services of a number of institutions, both public and private, to the community being served. Such pilot or demonstration sites afford OSSHE greater flexibility to serve industry and business more extensively and effectively, to broaden access to undergraduate and graduate degree programs, to provide further education, professional development, and "just-in-time" educational offerings, and to share more effectively the intellectual wealth of the System.

5. "The System should use financing policy to influence, through incentives and other means, the willingness of institutions to respond to major public priorities and to undertake their own internal renewal and restructuring."
This principle, perhaps more than any of the others, illustrates clearly one consequence of a more decentralized style of operation within the Chancellor's Office.

Current financing policy, as exemplified by the BAS Model, was designed in a time when the state general fund provided a major portion of the instructional funds available to the campuses, and when the need for flexibility in curriculum and delivery systems was low. Today, the state provides less than half of the instructional funds, and the need for flexibility in today's higher education marketplace is critical. Thus the need for a major change in financing policy is evident.

For example, the "enrollment corridor" aspect of the current financing system works directly counter to the public priorities of access and of maximizing income. With the current System, a campus is guaranteed a certain level of funding, derived from the state General Fund and the pooled system tuition income, so long as its enrollment falls within a specified corridor. If the campus feels confident that its enrollment will fall within this corridor, it has no incentive to recruit, or to otherwise provide access, to additional students. In fact, the campus will maximize the funds it has available per student by limiting its enrollment to near the bottom of its corridor. This reduces income to the System, which must maintain an "enrollment reserve" against this possibility.

The "corridor" introduces a number of inequities into financing policy, which inevitably effect how the individual campuses tune their enrollment activities. The campus that finds itself near the top of its corridor is teaching a substantial number of its students without any additional funding, and its "over-realized" tuition is going to subsidize the campuses who are below the midpoint of their corridor. While this should result in an upward movement of the corridor, and funding, in the next biennium, the up to two year lag time is a strong disincentive to increasing enrollment and thereby maximizing revenue and access unless a campus is confident that it can "break out" of the top of the corridor. It also represents an effective "tax" on the students on the campus with the enrollment near the top of its corridor. Furthermore, the width of the corridors represent very substantially different
fractions of the total enrollments of the institutions, providing differing relative subsidies, and hence incentives, for some institutions to remain near the bottom of their corridors. An institution near the bottom of its corridor receives full funding, but, at least technically, if it falls just one student below the corridor, it will lose substantial funding.

On the other hand, a state system, according to MacTaggart, "should retain sufficient authority to use financing policy and other tools to curb unnecessary program duplication, counter 'mission creep,' and resolve inevitable disputes among regions and interest groups." One way to balance these needs would be to have each campus retain all tuition and other funds collected directly by the campus, and to have the System allocate those funds appropriated by the state. This could be initially established in a "budget neutral" way, and over time the state funds used to provide incentives for the campuses to address public priorities, account for differing funding needs based on national benchmarks, and reward campuses for creatively addressing state needs.

Under such a system, campuses would have the incentive of the additional tuition to recruit additional students, and since fixed costs are presumably covered in the "base budget," these tuition funds will, in almost all cases, more than cover the direct instructional costs of the additional students. Overall income to the system would be increased. No distinction would be needed between tuition, fees, or income from continuing education or summer session. Campuses would have an appropriate incentive to quickly initiate new programs where there was a demonstrated need, to provide more distance education, and to serve more students, and the incentive to "manipulate" enrollment estimates would be minimized.

While it is true that such a tuition policy might lead to pressure for higher tuition for very expensive programs, especially those whose direct instructional costs exceed tuition, such pressure would be openly expressed, and could be considered on its merits.

Whatever tuition policy is finally adopted, the process leading to it, as well as its regular monitoring, should be collaborative and open, and Systemwide financial data readily available to all the campuses.
Concluding Remarks

As will be noted, the Solution Team makes no specific recommendations with respect to budget and staffing of the Chancellor's Office. Instead, it places its emphasis on those changes that would, in the language of the Board's charge, "focus the Chancellor's Office on policy, criteria setting, (advocacy), System strategy, and necessary central services..." The Solution Team wishes to underscore the importance of a truly consultative relationship among the seven OSSHE presidents and between them and the Chancellor and his staff. The President's Council should be used as the primary advisory group to the Chancellor to recommend, and, where appropriate, to determine policy. Moreover, the Academic and Administrative Councils should be used for policy discussion, determination, and recommendation. Neither of these recommendations abridges the statutory responsibilities of the State Board or the Chancellor, but rather should contribute to a greater sense of being part of a system that is committed to serving Oregon and Oregonians more effectively. Such a structure will truly ensure that the seven campuses "...have appropriate support, flexibility, and incentives to achieve (their) strategic objectives, (and those of OSSHE as a whole)." Finally, the role of the Chancellor's Office should be to focus on policy, advocacy, strategy, incentives, and accountability for educational outcomes and leave the universities free to mount programs and offer services in any way so long as they are consistent with their Board-approved missions and will serve the state's educational goals.

Addendum

After this report had been prepared in final draft, Governor John Kitzhaber addressed the Oregon State Board of Higher Education at its July 18th, 1997 meeting. On that occasion the Governor shared with the Board and the System leadership his thoughts on future directions of higher education in the state. It is worthy of note that there are many points of coincidence between the Governor's vision and the general recommendations of this report. Specifically, the Governor expressed the judgment that OSSHE needs a "change in focus" in three areas: (1) the agenda of the Board, (2) its budget, and (3) the management of the System. As is noted in this report, the Governor believes that the new focus in all of these areas should be conditioned by the needs of the economic and educational marketplace, the students and the citizens of Oregon, rather than by the needs of individual institutions or of the System itself. As does this
report, the Governor called for "institutional flexibility," for budget allocations that are student-driven rather than institutionally driven, and characterized the proper role of the Chancellor as an "opportunity broker rather than a paper checker." Governor Kitzhaber also called for more partnerships with other educational organizations and communities. The members of the solution team believe that the considerations and recommendations set forth in this report will serve these purposes.

Board Discussion

Chancellor Cox reminded the Board that during the work of the strategic planning effort, one of the questions put forward for further study dealt with what kind of system of higher education we were and what kind did we want/need to be and defining the appropriate relationship among the Board, the Chancellor, and the institutions. A Solution Team was created that Dr. Reno and Dr. Moseley agreed to chair.

President Reno called the Board’s attention to the report of the Solution Team included in the docket materials. He thanked the other members of the Team:

Herb Aschkenasy, President  
Oregon State Board of Higher Education  
Owner, Oregon Freeze Dry

Joan Austin, Sr. Vice President  
Owner, A-dec

Bob Bailey, Former OSSHE Board Member  
Owner, Orchard View Farms

Carolyn Chambers, Owner  
Chambers Communications  
Chambers Construction  
Hinman Vineyard

John Eskildsen, CEO & Chairman  
US Bank Oregon
Dr. John Moseley, Vice President
Academic Affairs & Provost
University of Oregon

George Pernsteiner, Vice Provost
Resource Management
University of Oregon

Dr. Stephen Reno, President
Southern Oregon University

Bruce Shepard, Provost
Eastern Oregon University

Virginia L. Thompson, Secretary of the Board
OSSHE

Bill Thorndike, Jr., President
Medford Fabrication

Duncan Wyse, President
Oregon Business Council

Dr. Reno pointed out that the Solution Team changed slightly the charge given to them by the Chancellor and included advocacy as part of the functions of the Chancellor's Office and made a distinction between strategic objectives of the campuses and of the System as a whole and the need for the Chancellor's Office to mediate them.

The Board's attention was called to a statement that read, "the challenge for the Chancellor's Office is to provide the maximum autonomy and flexibility to its institutions, while maintaining its commitment to the public purposes for which it was founded." That, indicated Dr. Reno, "was the balancing act that we have attempted to think through in the course of this report." He then proceeded to walk the Board members through the major portions of the document.

Dr. Aschkenasy observed that it seemed to him "that the idea of paying a chancellor for services needs some refinement. Two things we need to know: 1) can the institutions, and I mean all of them, provide the services for themselves at either no higher cost or less cost than we save in the Chancellor's Office? There has to be a cost benefit at some level and a permanent one; 2) Along the lines of what
the Governor said, how does any of this help us become more of a System? In some ways, you could argue that it makes us less of a System."

Dr. Reno responded that on the question of services, the Solution Team recognized that if you look at those currently provided by the Chancellor’s Office and the majority of those interviewed on the campuses feel that was a service they could provide more cost effectively, we merely reported it. We did not do an analysis that you rightly point out needs to be done. On the second point, simply by putting these ideas down in print provides something for us to react to. We don’t have the final answers, but feel these are things the Board should look at."

Dr. Moseley added that there are several places where the report points out that there are mixed reactions. “I’m not sure what the term ‘be more of a System’ means. I believe that the consensus was that it was important for higher education in Oregon to move toward a different way of operating. The market requires that if we are going to succeed we need to become more entrepreneurial, more flexible, and that we need to operate differently.”

Ms. Christopher asked what things, specifically, would be less expensive for the campuses to do and remove them from the System. Dr. Reno replied that he was reluctant to identify specific things. “We did not, for example, go into HRIS and do a repeat analysis of it. We reported it and indicated it should be looked at. It may be that no changes should be made. We didn’t get into that level of detail.”

Continuing, Ms. Christopher expressed that “the report felt ‘vague.’ There are still things that the smaller institutions want to have provided. It just isn’t very clear to me how you would start undoing systems that are in place.”

Dr. Moseley observed that “many items on the list in the report have been moving in a decentralized fashion. FIS is a specific example, whereby having the system in place, the campuses are much better able to manage their fiscal affairs. The big gain from FIS is not so much from the dollar cost of managing our financial affairs, but in being able to better manage our financial affairs.”
Ms. Christopher continued the line of inquiry by indicating that she was "trying to come to grips with what the report was suggesting be taken away from the Chancellor's Office and given to the institutions in the spirit of decentralizing." Dr. Reno cited the example of the recent increased effort on the part of the System to manage enrollment. That's absolutely consistent with the recommendations of the Solution Team."

Ms. McAllister thanked the Solution Team for a thoughtful document and indicated that the direct references to "Board responsibility. As you heard earlier, the Board will have a Committee that will be looking at Board governance and this Report will be helpful."

Continuing, Ms. McAllister asked about a statement that the "focus of the Board on accountability would be on education results. I was wondering, did fiscal oversight come into the discussion?"

Dr. Moseley responded that "the Solution Team understands that the Board has the responsibility for fiscal oversight for the campuses. I think the intention of that statement was written to say that the missions of institutions are educational and we were talking about that kind of accountability. We were trying to express the thought that the Board and Chancellor's Office should not be trying to micro-manage the institutions on how they should deliver their educational programs, they should hold them responsible for the results of those programs."

Mr. Imeson agreed that the report put a lot of good issues on the table that ought to get serious consideration. "One area I wonder about," he continued, "is whether there are some functions of the Chancellor's Office in the area of research and measurement? It seems to me that we all as a System need more information on what happens to people who attend our institutions, what worked and what didn't work. Doing that on a Systemwide basis is really an important thing to do, building that research capability at each institution is probably pretty duplicative. Did I miss this?"

Dr. Reno assured Mr. Imeson that he didn't miss it in the report. "It belongs there and serves the purpose of the System and the Board setting overall policy and holding not only the individual campuses accountable, but itself as well."
Ms. Christopher questioned concluding remarks that related to universities having freedom to mount programs and offer services in any way in which they choose. "Is that saying that there should be no Board approval for programs," she asked.

Dr. Reno indicated that the Board would still exercise approval rights, but that it would be on a fast track. Mr. Imeson said that related to an earlier discussion about increased accountability on campuses. "If your budgets are used more on your success in attracting students," he indicated, "and less on buildings and programs, campuses ought to be both more independent when it comes to developing programs, but more accountable when they don't work."

Continuing the discussion, Ms. Christopher indicated she would need more explanation of how it would work if the Board didn't have responsibility for approving programs, given that the Board makes financial decisions. Ms. Wustenberg asked how much time it takes at the Board level for program approval. "Are we taking as much time as the campus?" she asked.

Dr. Moseley responded that "when I talk about the Board, I'm talking about the whole process, meaning preproposal to Academic Council, preproposal to the Board. Some proposals, like with OIT, have been put on a fast track. But the standard procedure is much longer, typically it has taken a year. And that is on top of the process on the campus which also typically takes a year. We need to push on both ends of the process so the timeline is more typical for some of the OIT programs this year."

Ms. Van Patten asked what percentage of proposals initiated on campuses make it to the Board. Provost Moseley said that there is a strong filtering mechanism that occurs on the campuses to ensure that they pass smoothly through the process.

Mr. Willis added, "We talk about streamlining down to one year for product development. What are the private institutions doing? How quickly are they able to start a new program? Can you compete with them? I think that is what we ought to be looking at. We need to be real focused on the market."

Ms. Puentes asked for further clarification of the campus responsibility regarding collective bargaining and how that fits into recommendations of the report. President Reno indicated it was a very difficult
issue. "It's the Board's responsibility to interpret legislative intent, especially for faculty salary increases. When only three of seven campuses have collective bargaining (for faculty) it sometimes puts campus leadership in a difficult position, trying to be a System player, while working in the culture of the individual campus. Merit increase is a case in point. While we at SOU recognize the authority of the Board to set merit as a factor, how that gets defined and implemented on campus is an example of the tension that can exist between System policy and individual collective bargaining."

President Aschkenasy, in closing the discussion, indicated that there were a number of questions that seem to require next steps. Chancellor Cox reflected back to the Executive Committee work session and the interest on the part of Board members on focusing on governance and Board relations with campuses. He suggested that would be the ideal venue to have some further discussions.

In closing, Dr. Reno thanked all of the members of the Solution Team for the effort in bringing forth the report.

(No Board action required)

REPORT OF GRIEVANCES FILED UNDER OAR 580-021-0050

The Board's grievance procedure for unclassified employees with faculty rank, Oregon Administrative Rule 580-021-0050, requires each institution to report annually the number, basis, and outcome of all formal grievances filed under the institutional procedures adopted pursuant to the rule. In addition to the grievances reported here, other grievances were filed under procedures contained in collective bargaining contracts. The institutions reported as follows for the 1996-97 academic year.

EOU One grievance was filed.

A fixed-term adjunct faculty member alleged she had improperly been denied consideration for tenure and did not receive proper consideration when she applied for tenure-track openings. She had previously been given notice that her fixed-term appointment would not be renewed. The faculty member appealed the dean's decision that her grievance regarding tenure was untimely and that the procedure was not intended for grievances related to hiring. The faculty committee heard the grievance related to timeliness, after which
they found that the grievance on tenure was not timely. However, they recommended that the grievance go forward to provide an opportunity for consideration of the faculty member's concerns. President Gilbert adopted the committee's recommendation regarding timeliness but concluded untimely grievances should not proceed.

OIT

Two grievances were filed.

A professional employee alleged the nonrenewal of his fixed-term appointment was due to national origin discrimination. The Faculty Grievance Committee did not find evidence to support the grievance and recommended that it be denied. President Wolf upheld the committee's recommendation.

A faculty member alleged that he was wronged when the faculty Promotion Advisory Committee did not recommend him for promotion. The Faculty Grievance Committee did not find evidence to support his grievance and recommended that it be denied. President Wolf upheld the committee's recommendation.

OSU

Five grievances were filed.

Two faculty members filed grievances related to the nonrenewal of fixed-term appointments. The Faculty Grievance Committee rejected the grievances because they did not allege a violation of a "right" as required by the Board for grievances related to nonrenewal. President Risser concurred with the committee's recommendation.

A faculty member alleged that the nonrenewal of a fixed-term appointment was retaliation for other activities. The faculty member chose to appeal the unit head's denial of the grievance directly to President Risser, who found no evidence of retaliation and denied the grievance.

A faculty member alleged her supervisor retaliated against her in completing a response to a workers'
compensation claim. While President Risser concluded that no retaliation had occurred, the university submitted a revised claim form to resolve the matter.

A faculty member filed a grievance regarding the denial of promotion and tenure, alleging that the promotion and tenure guidelines were not followed. The Faculty Grievance Committee rejected the faculty member's allegations, but three committee members recommended granting the grievance on other grounds. Two recommended the grievance be denied. President Risser denied the grievance. The faculty member appealed to the Board, which considered the grievance at the June meeting.

PSU

Two grievances were filed.

A professional employee alleged she was wronged in the nonrenewal of her fixed-term contract because she had not received adequate evaluation and because of union activities. The matter was resolved prior to a faculty hearing.

A faculty member alleged unfair treatment in the award of a merit salary increase. The Faculty Grievance Committee did not find evidence to support his allegations and recommended the grievance be denied. Former President Ramaley adopted the recommendation. The faculty member has appealed to the Board, which will consider the matter at the September meeting.

SOU

No grievances were filed.

UO

Three grievances were filed; two carried over from the previous year.

A faculty member alleged unfair treatment in the denial of promotion and indefinite tenure. The Promotion-Tenure-Retention Appeal Committee recommended the provost's decision be upheld. President Frohnmayer agreed.
Two grievances, pending at the last report, in which faculty members alleged wrongs related to "other conditions of employment," were resolved after hearings before the Faculty Grievance Appeal Committee.

Two faculty members allege they were wronged in connection with compensation. A hearing is upcoming in one; the initial response is being prepared for the second.

WOU No grievances were filed.

(No Board action required)

WOMEN'S STUDIES

Women's studies as a legitimate academic field emerged in the late '60s and early '70s, which is not surprising given the social and political context. This was a period when people previously silent found voice to question the dominant culture (e.g., the civil rights movement). Considered by some to be the educational extension of the women's liberation movement, women's studies was built on the premise that "knowledge based on exclusionary practices is inevitably partial and inadequate (¶ 1)."

Early in the development of the field, women's studies focused on the re-examination of scholarly work across the disciplines, identifying omissions related to women — women's perspectives, contributions, and representation. In a 1981 report, Gerda Lerner, Robinson Edwards Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and then-president of the Organization of American Historians, characterized the challenges of re-examining scholarship relative to the field of history in this way:

Women's experience encompasses all that is human; we share—and always have shared — the world equally with men. Equally in the sense that half, at least, of all the world's experience has been ours, half of the world's work and much of its product. . . . But history is not the record of all past events; rather it is the record of past events as interpreted by succeeding generations of historians. (p. 39)²
"Women's history..." Lerner concluded, "is an effort to counteract the androcentric bias in the recording and interpretation of the past." (p. 41)

While this effort to integrate women's experience and perspectives into the knowledge of the disciplines continues, as the field has matured, women's studies scholarship has increasingly focused attention on gender as a social construction and a central dimension of human experience. Feminist scholarship may be broadly defined as the search for new knowledge through the lens of gender. As described by the report, Liberal Learning and the Women's Studies Major, "[t]he subject matter of Women's Studies is all of women's experience as it has been constructed and described for women in a gendered world. . . . Women's Studies is also an approach, a critical framework through which to view all knowledge." (p. 8) Women's studies includes the study of the economic status of women and the effect of institutional structures and policies on women's class position. Courses on the status of women in the labor force, the feminization of poverty, and issues related to women's health have been particularly useful to students gaining employment in the social services, policy development, and health care. Feminist scholarship and gender analysis have had a great impact on traditional disciplines and continue to provide methods and perspectives for scholars in a wide range of fields.

Having its roots in the turbulent '60s has not been without impact on the discipline of women's studies, even as it extends into the '90s. The political origins can color discussions. Other challenges stem from the interdisciplinary nature of women's studies. In 1995, Dana Scully of the Virginia Commonwealth University conducted a study of all U.S. women's studies programs. Her results, based on responses from 276 programs (45 percent) demonstrate that women's studies, like other interdisciplinary programs, are treated differently than programs organized within regular departments.

Yet despite these and other obstacles, Scully learned that "new programs and departments continue to be established, providing evidence of the health of the field. . . ." and that "the majority of programs and departments have existed for over a decade, revealing the stability of the field." (p. 126) In addition, interdisciplinary programs such as women's studies allow for a rich cross-fertilization of scholarship that has influenced all areas of the humanities and social sciences.
Scully's findings about the stability of the field align with our own research. The following table illustrates the status of women's studies programs in other western public universities.
# Women's Studies Programs in Selected Western Public Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, minor, certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>University of Arizona, Tucson</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, minor, master's</td>
<td>master's is either academic or applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Cal State Univ., Fullerton</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>minor; major being developed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Cal State Univ., San Marcos</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, minor, liberal studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>special field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, minor, master's</td>
<td>courses offered since '70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, master's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of CA, Berkeley</td>
<td>'76</td>
<td>major, minor, graduate emphasis</td>
<td>became a department in '91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of CA, Davis</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, minor</td>
<td>graduate emphasis in Feminist Theory &amp; Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of CA, Irvine</td>
<td>'75</td>
<td>major, minor</td>
<td>graduate emphasis in Feminist Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of CA, Los Angeles</td>
<td>'75</td>
<td>major, minor</td>
<td>graduate program to begin within two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of CA, Riverside</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of CA, San Diego</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of CA, Santa Barbara</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, minor, doctoral emphasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of CA, Santa Cruz</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, doctoral concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>University of Southern CA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>major, minor, graduate certificate</td>
<td>entitled Study of Women &amp; Men in Society (Gender Studies Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>University of Idaho, Moscow</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Central Washington University</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Eastern Washington University</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>'70</td>
<td>major, minor, graduate certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>undergraduate major concentration, minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institution Web pages (July/August 1997)
In addition to the longevity of the discipline, there is consistency in the objectives of the programs across the country. The programs we reviewed for this paper consider women's studies to be a liberal arts degree and, consequently, have the same objectives as other liberal arts programs. In addition, women's studies programs typically include in their goal statements that they are preparing students to do such things as:

- think, write, and speak critically about the role of gender in culture and society;
- evaluate, from a feminist perspective, knowledge gained through the traditional academic disciplines; and
- learn about the achievements of women (crossing ethnic and geographic boundaries).

How well does such an education serve its graduates? In a random sample of 162 U.S. women's studies programs with Web sites, we found that many programs include information on the outcomes of their graduates. Most of the institutions have general, concise information, such as the following excerpt from the University of California, Santa Cruz Web page:

Women's studies prepares undergraduates for a variety of careers. The B.A. degree in women's studies, for example, provides excellent grounding for undergraduates with career aspirations in law, health, public administration, and social services. Students wishing to pursue doctoral work will also find that interdisciplinary training in women's studies equips them with theoretical and methodological strengths in most disciplines and applied research fields. Increasingly, specialists in women's studies are being used as consultants in industry, higher education, insurance companies, and personnel firms. State and federal government agencies employ people who have special training in understanding gender relations. And, educational institutions need specialists to develop and administer women's studies programs, women's centers, and other institutional structures designed specifically to study and assist women.

Some universities provide more detailed information about their women's studies graduates. The University of Massachusetts at
Amherst states that more than 400 majors and minors have graduated since 1974, and their Web page specifically lists the jobs held by their alumni (Attachment A). Mankato State University, Minnesota, which first offered women's studies courses in 1970, reports that their graduates are currently working in such fields as human service programs, journalism, business, and college administration. The University of Connecticut, Storrs, actually lists the names of their graduates beneath specific professions such as attorneys, social service providers, writers, medical personnel, and teachers.

A final example of employment outcomes is from Arizona State University. In 1995 they conducted a survey of activities of their women's studies graduates and found them working in a broad array of fields, such as:

- political and judicial research,
- hospital staff nursing,
- sexual abuse therapy,
- job developer/trainer for Arizona Women's Education and Employment,
- high school teaching,
- community college teaching,
- graduate school (law, justice, psychology, social work, sociology, public administration), and
- staff of such groups as Arizona Women's Town Hall; ASU Commission on the Status of Women.

Finally, beyond the institution-by-institution information are the results of a national survey conducted by Luebke and Reilly to answer the question: "What can someone do with a major in women's studies?"

Based on responses from a sample of 89 women's studies graduates, ages 21-73, they, too, found that graduates were working in a wide variety of fields, including communications, medicine, retail, public relations, social and human services, education, law, and the arts. There seems to be "skepticism about the vocational value of any liberal arts degree," assert the authors, and one of their respondents defends her choice of degree programs in this way:

I explain that "what I do with a women's studies degree" is the same as I'd do with a degree in psychology or sociology or
anything — go out and try to find a job that will be satisfying for me economically and politically. (p. 19)²

It appears graduates of women's studies programs are doing just that.

Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Clark indicated that her staff had produced two brief reports on women's studies and ethnic studies programs around the country. The purpose of these studies was to be responsive to a number of Board questions and concerns raised several months ago in the context of presenting preproposals for Women's Studies programs at PSU and the UO, and also an Ethnic Studies major at the UO. "It is our intent to bring you proposals for programs for Women's Studies programs at PSU and the UO in October. I would invite your review of these reports and, in particular, to the tables in each report. These place the idea of programs coming forward within the context of peer groups of other institutions that have similar programs.

(No Board action required)

¹ Women's studies at the University of Michigan: A twenty year perspective. Available: http://www.umich.edu/womenstd/20persp.htm [1997, July 7].


³ Ibid.


⁹ Why Major in Women's Studies? Available:
Meeting #666


10 What can I do with a major in Women’s Studies? Available:

Teachers College Press.

12 Ibid.
Attachment A
Excerpt from the UMass List of Outcomes for Women's Studies Alums

Business
Founder/Director of an executive search firm
Manager/Instructor, Valley Women's Martial Arts
Co-Manager of a bookstore
International banking consultant
Commercial property management
Resolution Trust Corporation, Kansas City, MO
National Sales and Marketing Manager, The Larkin Group
Vice President, Market Street Research, Inc.

Health
Doctor
Women's Occupational Health Coordinator, Department of Public Health, Boston
Supervisor of Nursing
Manager, International Family Health, London
Doula (childbirth labor assistant) and post-partum family care
Executive Director, International Family Health

Law
Attorney with the U.S. Department of Transportation
Founding lawyer of law partnership
Practicing attorney, Law clerk to a federal magistrate judge in U.S. District Court
Lawyers Alliance for New York, Development Department
Legal assistant, Environmental Committee, NY State Assembly

Research
Co-creator and director of Mentors in Violence Prevention Project (at Northeastern University's Center for the Study of Sport in Society)
Researcher, Institute for the Study of Smoking Behavior and Policy (Harvard)

Counseling/Human Services
Director, First Call for Help
Residential Director, Shelton's, Inc. (agency serving disabled people)
Coordinator, State Rental Assistance Program
Program Coordinator, Community United Against Violence
Health Care Coordinator for a human service agency
Investigator of Care and Protection cases (child abuse) for district court
Employee Assistance counselor
Counselor of pregnant and parenting teens
Psychotherapist, private practice
Clinical therapist
ETHNIC STUDIES

Ethnic studies as an academic field has grown and stabilized in U.S. colleges and universities over the last couple of decades. In the early '90s, there were more than 800 programs or departments of ethnic studies in this country; approximately 600 of those could be categorized as ethnic specific (e.g., Chicano/a Studies, African American Studies).¹

What is ethnic studies? According to Dr. Evelyn Hu-DeHart of the University of Colorado, Boulder, ethnic studies is "more than just a grab bag of unrelated applications of separate discipline-based methodologies. Ethnic studies scholarship focuses on the central roles that race and ethnicity play in the construction of American history, culture, and society."² It differs from area studies (e.g., African studies, Asian studies, Latin American studies) in that the focus of area studies programs is external to the U.S., whereas ethnic studies programs focus on U.S. minorities. Dr. Hu-DeHart describes this in more detail.

Groups of color have a shared history of having been viewed as distinct from the European immigrants and their descendants. They are the "unmeltable ethnics," or ethnics without options regarding whether to invoke their ethnicity. . . . Most ethnic studies scholars today adopt a relational and comparative approach, looking at questions of power through the prisms of race, class, and gender. . . . Ethnic studies seeks to recover and reconstruct the histories of those Americans whom history has neglected; to identify and credit their contributions to the making of U.S. society and culture; to chronicle protest and resistance; and to establish alternative values and visions, institutions, and cultures. Ethnic studies scholarship has become a new discipline in and of itself. It is continuously defining and clarifying its own unique methodology and epistemology.³

It would be easy to assume that ethnic studies programs developed in the U.S. simply as a response to the civil unrest of the '60s and early '70s. However, other national events contributed as well. The American cultural climate shifted. At the beginning of the 20th century, the national identity was one of commonality, with differences
de-emphasized or suppressed. . . . The second half of the twentieth century would see a remarkable shift in this relatively uniform sense of the American experience. Beginning in the 1950s and culminating in the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, African Americans, one of the more culturally distinct and socially excluded groups of people in the country, participated in a concentrated period of urban discontent and insurrection. . . . By the latter part of the century, impelled also by unexpectedly high rates of Asian and Latino immigration and the rapid expansion of a global economy and international mobility, cultural, racial, and ethnic differences had acquired a more positive currency in the United States.  

The economy also affected higher education by broadening student populations in terms of both composition and sheer numbers. Before World War II, the economy was largely labor intensive and, consequently, only a small proportion of Americans sought higher education — primarily white males from higher socioeconomic levels. After the war, a more global marketplace resulted in more careers requiring formal education. As a result, higher education began to serve as a gatekeeper to employment opportunities.

In addition, "hundreds of thousands of military personnel, out of the service and provided with government assistance, enrolled in the nation's colleges and universities."6 People enrolled in college who, before then, had little knowledge of, or access to, formal higher education. In the U.S., total enrollment in higher education nearly tripled from 2.5 million in 1948-1949 to over 7.6 million in 1968-1969.  

The whole environment in this country was ripe for the emergence of ethnic studies programs. "Because higher education is inextricably linked to the larger society which surrounds and permeates it, colleges and universities mirror the issues and concerns that are part of daily living. . . . In many respects, the pursuit of educational change inside institutions does not and cannot proceed without attention to the controversies and conflicts which characterize what is going on outside."7
In the 1970s and 1980s, ethnic studies explored interdisciplinary approaches to scholarship. As the field has matured, it has drawn from many disciplines to explore and clarify the experiences of U.S. minority populations.  

Ethnic studies continues to thrive as a legitimate academic area. “Increasingly, ethnic materials are moving outside of the separate ethnic studies units and into established and required courses.” The following table illustrates the prevalence and variety of ethnic studies programs in the western United States.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Maj</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Certificate / Concentration / Option</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARIZONA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASU</td>
<td>Chicano/a Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• program estab. '97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• African American &amp; Asian American programs under development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona Univ.</td>
<td>Native American Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Arizona</td>
<td>Mexican American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State, Chico</td>
<td>Multicultural &amp; Gender Studies++</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++related degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State, Fresno</td>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano/Latino Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State, Fullerton</td>
<td>Afro-Ethnic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State, Long Beach</td>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano &amp; Latino Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Certificate / Concentration / Option</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State, Northridge</td>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.A. &amp; M.A. projected for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State, Sacramento</td>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>• program estab. '69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 30 majors per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pan African Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State, Stanislaus</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt State Univ.</td>
<td>Native American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>goal to have master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State Univ.</td>
<td>Afro-American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State Univ.</td>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• program estab. '69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Raza Studies++</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++ Chicanos &amp; Latinos in U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State Univ.</td>
<td>African-American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican-American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Afro-American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++courses only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mexican Society &amp; Culture in the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Certificate/Concentration/Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 95 majors per year
- Program established, '69
- Proposed M.A. & Ph.D.
- Proposed major
- M.A.
- J.D./M.A.
- 50 students per year...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Maj</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Certificate / Concentration / Option</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• program estab. '69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano/Latino Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• program estab. '95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Washington Univ.</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Washington Univ.</td>
<td>American Indian Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington Univ.</td>
<td>American Cultural Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• program estab. '80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chicano Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Washington</td>
<td>American Ethnic Studies, with the following concentrations:</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 200 majors per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• African American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• program estab. '85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Asian American Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ++ emphasis through Anthropology Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chicano Studies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• American Indian Studies+++</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This is not an exhaustive listing.

Sources: Institution Web pages; phone interviews; Ethnic Studies Web pages; *Ethnic Studies in the United States* (1996)
What does a bachelor's degree in ethnic studies prepare a student to do?

- UC Davis indicates that graduates are prepared to either continue their formal education or enter employment in a variety of fields, including federal and state offices, county social services, and community organizations.¹⁰
- UCSD reports that their graduates have gone into the following fields: community organizers, education administrators, graduate school, law, medicine, public policy, social work, and K-12 teaching.¹¹

The online version of the 1996-97 Occupational Outlooks Handbook addresses the need for teachers to understand different cultures so that they can "establish rapport with a diverse student population" and adapt curriculum appropriately.¹²

Higher education has little choice but to reflect and respond to the growing pluralism in this country, and ethnic studies programs are crucial to that endeavor.¹³

"Of the 25 million people who will enter the work force in the last decade of the twentieth century, 85 percent will be women, people of color, and immigrants. The implications are enormous for any person participating in the society of the United States in whatever capacity. At a minimum, in order to make one's way economically and socially, one will be increasingly pressed to possess a functional literacy of that complex diversity."¹⁴

According to a news release from the U.S. Census Bureau (3/14/96), more than half the growth in the U.S. will be among the Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander populations. As representatives of the University of Colorado, Boulder, state on their Web page: Ethnic studies is a "broad liberal arts education for the 21st century."¹⁵

(No Board action required)

¹ Bataille, et al., 1996, p. xiii
² Hu-DeHart, 1993, p. 52
³ Hu-DeHart, 1993, p. 52
⁴ Fischer, et al., 1997, p. xiii
⁵ La Belle, et al., 1996, p. 68
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6 Ibid.
7 La Belle, et al., 1996, p. 1
8 Butler, et al., 1992, p. 38
9 Bataille, et al., 1996, p. ix
10 Career Opportunities. Available:
11 Career Alternatives. Available:
    http://dssadmin.ucsd.edu/ethnic/Career%20Opportunities.html [1997, August
    13].
12 1996-97 Occupational Outlooks handbook. Available:
13 Hu-DeHart, 1995
14 Fischer, et al., 1997, pp. xii-xiii
15 Department of Ethnic Studies. Available:
    http://strike.colorado.edu/~ethnicst/ba.html [1997, July 3].

Sources

Publishing, Inc.

Butler, J., & Schmitz, B. (January/February 1992). Ethnic studies,
women's studies, and multiculturalism. *Change*, 24, 36-41.

Fischer, W. C., Gerber, D. A., Guitart, J. M., & Seller, M. S. (Eds.).
Oxford University Press.

Hu-DeHart, E. (September 1993). The history, development, and

Hu-DeHart, E. (Spring/Summer 1995). Reconceptualizing liberal
education: The importance of ethnic studies. *Educational Record*, 76,
22-31.


**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**OHSU**

Mr. Imeson indicated that he had nothing new to report since the last Board meeting.

**Investment Committee**

Ms. Wustenberg reported that there had been a meeting of the Investment Committee at which time investment fund managers had been interviewed. The Committee is attempting to come to agreement as to whether to renegotiate and reallocate some of the endowment fund. The Committee hopes to have a recommendation to the Board in November.

**Athletic Funding and Sports Action Lottery**

Ms. Christopher reported that the Committee had its first meeting the day before the Board meeting. The purpose of the meeting had been to organize the work, agree on the questions that need to be asked, what information might be needed to answer the questions, and a timeline for completing the work.

**ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS**

Ms. Puentes reported that she and the Chancellor had attended and participated in the State Board of Education Retreat in August. She indicated that many educational stakeholders had also attended.

Ms. Wustenberg thanked the Board and the Chancellor’s Office for the flowers she received during her rehabilitation.
ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Virginia L. Thompson
Secretary of the Board

Herbert Aschkenasy
President of the Board
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