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ROLL CALL

The regular meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 10:15 a.m. by President Aschkenasy.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Ms. Diane Christopher    Dr. Jim Whittaker
Mr. Tom Imeson            Mr. Jim Willis
Ms. Gail McAllister       Ms. Phyllis Wustenberg
Ms. Katie Van Patten      Mr. John Wykoff
Dr. Herb Aschkenasy

Ms. Esther Puentes, who was ill, joined the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the September 19, 1997 meeting. Ms. Wustenberg moved and Mr. Willis seconded approval of the minutes. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT
Thank you to OIT

President Aschkenasy thanked President and Mrs. Wolf for their hospitality the evening before. He observed, “I want to congratulate the Board on its wisdom in securing the house for the president of OIT.”

Board Committees

Dr. Aschkenasy indicated that he wanted to establish several committees. The Board members assigned to the Eastern Oregon University Search Committee are:
   Gail McAllister, Chair
   Esther Puentes
   Jim Whittaker

Chancellor Cox indicated that he had received the list of nominations from the constituent groups at EOU and would be naming the other members of the Search Committee in the coming week.
A working committee to study State System funding and budgeting was named. Members are:
   Tom Irneson, Chair
   Diane Christopher
   Katie Van Patten
   Jim Whittaker

A second working committee to study Board governance and structure is:
   Jim Willis, Chair
   Gail McAllister
   John Wykoff
   Phyllis Wustenberg
   Esther Puentes

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT
OIT Meetings

The Chancellor echoed President Aschkenasy's comments regarding the visit to OIT and the optimistic and enthusiastic attitude reflected on campus. He indicated that he had spent the last day and-a-half meeting with constituent groups at OIT to get a sense of their opinions regarding an interim president. Ms. Christopher joined him for those meetings on Thursday.

"I am pleased to tell you," Chancellor Cox continued, "that during the course of my visits with the groups, the overwhelming recommendation was that we appoint Dr. Martha Ann Dow, currently provost, to be interim president as of January 1. During the business portion of the Board meeting, I will enthusiastically make that recommendation to you as well. The support for this decision from the community, the campus, and her colleagues at other institutions was overwhelming."

Institution Accreditations

It was pointed out that President Reno from SOU was not in attendance at the Board meeting because the team from the Northwest Association was on campus for their accreditation visit. The Chancellor and several members of the Board had an opportunity to meet with representatives of the team as well.

The Chancellor indicated that the UO had also received the final report of its accreditation review and that he would be reporting on it at the November meeting. "It was also a marvelous report. There were some concerns expressed that I think we can take to heart
because they really speak to all of our institutions in terms of fitness in some areas and general overall funding questions. OIT is scheduled for its accreditation next fall," the Chancellor observed.

Rep. Nancy Peterson

The Chancellor indicated, since the Board was meeting in southern Oregon, that it was appropriate to note that memorial services were held this past week on the SOU campus for former Representative Nancy Peterson of Ashland who passed away after a battle with cancer. The Chancellor remarked that, "Nancy Peterson was as firm a friend of public higher education and access as the Oregon Legislature has ever seen. It is a tragic loss and on behalf of the Board, I extend my personal and our collective condolences to her family."

BAS Review

Dr. Cox remarked that he and his staff had taken seriously the Board’s intention to review the present funding model. To date, he and Vice Chancellors Anslow and Clark have met with the campus leadership of six of the institutions and the other one is scheduled for next week. The purposes of these meetings are, "to get a current sense from the campuses on several items. One, how the allocation works with respect to the specific institution, how it doesn't work, and what, if anything, they would change about the model. "Then," the Chancellor continued, "we turn to a discussion of the basic principles that ought to drive any allocation model. There is remarkable consensus among the institutions on several principles and disagreement over some issues of values and weights. Vice Chancellor Anslow continues to work on an introductory paper to be used by the Board Committee on Funding and Budgeting.

"As President Aschkenasy indicated in his remarks, we have both had conversations with Governor Kitzhaber and others assisting them to further understand the current model and possible modifications they might see or wish to see emerge from our deliberations."

President’s Meeting

Chancellor Cox reported on discussions that occurred at the meeting of the Council of Presidents on Thursday. He indicated that the better part of the afternoon centered around the questions and public policy issues that have surfaced in the draft report of the Governor's Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy. "Since the report is not finished," the Chancellor said, "it is not appropriate for us to comment in detail about some of the aspects except to say that the public policy issues raised will be among the most momentous discussed in Oregon in several decades. What undoubtedly will be the most
controversial recommendations will likely center around structure and anytime you have structure discussions, it sometimes so focuses the spotlight on one idea that the rest of the recommendations and other aspects of the report don't receive any attention. I think that would be a mistake."

Continuing, Dr. Cox said, "All Oregonians ought to read carefully the report once it is final and carefully consider its implications for the future. The OSSHE System, in its present form, has served Oregon well for nearly 70 years. It got the System through the Depression and WWII, through the advent of the GI onslaught in the 1940s, the community college evolution that occurred in the 50s and 60s, and the dramatic transformation of Oregon education that represented. And higher education must continue to adapt and change. The public interest will require that we deal with and be prepared for the change coming at us at a rate beyond anything that we've ever seen. The presidents and I agreed that we will not comment until after the report is finished, delivered to the Governor, and his response is known."

Mr. Imeson, who served on the Task Force indicated that he agreed with the comments of Chancellor Cox and added, "I think the Task Force is looking at a lot of the right issues, issues that are almost more important than the specific solutions. With the different drafts that are circulating, people are keying in on pieces of solutions and whether they like them or not. I think the more important thing to do is to look at whether the right issues are being raised. Out of that, I think the issues fit neatly into the committees the Board has formed."

At its January 1997 meeting, the Board identified four overarching goals for Oregon's university system: enhancing existing quality, expanding access, maintaining reasonable cost-effectiveness, and ensuring employability. During the past Legislative session, the Legislature affirmed these objectives in Senate Bill 919, which requires the State Board of Higher Education to continue development of accountability and performance measures with indicators in the four broad goal areas. Chancellor's Office staff drafted performance indicators that were reviewed and modified by both the Presidents Council and Academic Council in June. The resulting 22 indicators were considered by the Board at its renewal session in August. The purpose of the performance indicators is the preservation and reinforcement of standards of quality, both real and perceived, of each campus and the entire System and to guide strategic decision making.
For further consideration by the Board, this report presented the proposed goals and their performance indicators, a work plan and implementation schedule, and a chart indicating the costs of data development and analysis.

The performance indicators proposed for Oregon's university system listed by goal include:

**Goal 1: Strengthen Quality of Academic, Research, and Public Service Programs**

Provide quality education to students as measured by results of nationally normed examinations that assess general education and academic majors at each institution (in all fields in which national examinations are available). Additional measurements of quality will be used.

- **Customer Satisfaction.** Proportion of customers (students, graduates, parents, employers, clients) who say they are satisfied with the quality of OSSHE education and services received.

- **Successful Completion.** Proportion of OSSHE undergraduates who complete in four, five, and six years by gender, race/ethnicity/entering ability, age, and transfer status.

- **Quality of Graduates.** Proportion of OSSHE baccalaureate graduates who meet or exceed established knowledge and skill levels at end-of-program.

- **Professional Standards.** First-time pass rates on professional licensure examinations compared to national norms when available (e.g., law, accounting, engineering, pharmacy, medical imaging).

- **High Quality Research Programs.** Total OSSHE research and other sponsored program expenditures by source (federal, state, private), by discipline, and by relevancy to state's economic objectives.

- **Contribution to Economic Strength.** Proportion of OSSHE faculty who play an active role in putting their expertise into practice for industry and private organizations, government and
government authorities, and community organizations, and the economic impact of institutions' programs (e.g., research), and activities (e.g., athletic contests) on the community and state of Oregon.

- **Effectiveness of Research and Public Service.** Usefulness of OSSHE research results for trade and industry, education, and social welfare and number of new inventions, developments, and spin-off companies that result from research programs and contacts to provide assistance that improves the lives and well-being of Oregon citizens.

**Goal 2: Expand Access by Students of Different Circumstances**

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

- **Student Ability.** OSSHE admitted first-time freshmen who graduated from Oregon high schools by ability group (GPAs 3.75 and over, 3.00 to 3.74, and 2.99 and less) and PASS proficiency levels.

- **Geographic Location.** Graduate and undergraduate headcount enrollment and freshman participation rate in OSSHE by Oregon county.

- **Diversity.** Students by racial/ethnic group, age, gender, and socio-economic group compared to Oregon's population and high school graduates.

- **Transfer Students.** Students who transfer from other colleges into OSSHE institutions.

- **Adults.** Students (25 and over) involved in lifelong professional upgrading provided by OSSHE (enrolled in regular programs, extended studies for credit and non-credit, and customized training programs) by discipline (e.g., business, engineering, education).
• Affordable Tuition. Price of attendance for resident undergraduates (tuition and fees) at OSSHE institutions compared to other sectors of the state (Oregon community colleges, Oregon independent colleges) juxtaposed with median family income in Oregon or student financial assistance as a percent of tuition and fees income.

Goal 3: Achieve Cost Effectiveness Appropriate to Institutional Missions

Hold and, if possible, reduce the cost of instruction not to exceed inflationary increases with a goal of being at the average of contiguous states. Further savings should be devoted to increasing faculty and/or staff salaries. Increases in unrestricted state subsidy should be used to reduce tuition further.

• Return on Investment. Average state investment per four-year degree compared to average salaries and state taxes paid by Oregonians for adults with bachelor’s degrees.

• State’s Obligation. State appropriations for public, four-year institutions per capita, Oregon compared to other states and U.S. average.

• Program Productivity. OSSHE programs with enrollment, credit-hour production, and degree productivity that is high, medium, or low compared to budgeted resources.

• Competitive Faculty Salaries. OSSHE faculty salaries compared to appropriate national peer institutions.

• Cost-savings in Administrative Functions and Processes. OSSHE cost-savings in purchasing, contracting, human resources, and facilities (hard dollars and efficiencies).

Goal 4: Enhance Employability

Through timely counseling, high-quality instruction, and bridge building to potential employers (e.g., internship, co-op research projects, etc.), institutions will assist graduates in starting careers. Success can be measured by placement rates and employer and graduate satisfaction surveys.
- **Employer Satisfaction.** Employer ratings of abilities of OSSHE graduates in general skills (think critically, express themselves clearly, and work collaboratively in the workplace) and specialized knowledge needed in an occupation (e.g., electrical engineer, chemistry teacher, accountant).

- **Success of Graduates.** Proportion who are employed and/or furthering education six to 12 months following graduation and five to ten years after completion by degree level.

- **Internships.** Proportion of OSSHE graduates who completed experiences (e.g., internship, practicum, service learning, work-study) needed to enter the workplace with the best education and training possible.

- **Oregon's Work Force.** Degrees awarded by Oregon's higher education institutions (community colleges, OSSHE, Oregon private and independent colleges) compared to job growth in selected fields (e.g., engineering, computer science, education, business, and other areas.)

**Work Plan and Implementation Schedule.**

The work plan and schedule proposed for implementing performance indicators take into account that the State Board of Higher Education must report to the Legislative Assembly each biennium on progress in implementing SB 919 along with the fiscal, physical, and technological resources necessary for implementation.

**Task 1 - Set priorities for implementation of performance indicators.**

For the four strategic goals (access, quality, cost effectiveness, employability), 22 specific performance indicators (PIs) are proposed. Of these, half lack System baseline data and many have new costs associated with collecting baseline data. Internal baselines are available for 5 of 6 Access indicators, 2 of 7 Quality indicators, 1 of 5 Cost Effectiveness indicators, and 2 of 4 Employability indicators (See Table 1). Approaches to phasing in the implementation of PIs include setting priorities for implementing the goals (e.g., implementing access indicators before employability indicators) or the indicators without considering the four goals. The criteria for prioritization could include the Board's strategic plan, state's priorities, lead-time needed to generate data, or cost of their implementation (lower cost indicators carried out before higher ticket items). The prioritization is needed
because of the complexity of initiating work groups on multiple indicators and when the estimated costs associated with implementation exceeds the resources available. Due date: November Board meeting.

**Task 2 - Develop framework for implementing PIs and clarify benchmarking phases.** Working with the Academic and Administrative Councils, staff will develop a process for setting reasonable targets for improvement. The components of the benchmarking process for PIs (i.e., "what" will be benchmarked) include what measurements will be used (for the PIs without baseline data), which external institutions will be benchmarked, and how the data will be collected and analyzed. The objective is to reach consensus about process so that the campus data can be aggregated (rolled up) into System level performance indicators. Due date: February 1998.

**Task 3 - Develop indicator teams.** Institutional representatives closest to the process being measured will be constituted to develop protocols for what will be measured, how data will be collected, and when data are due for specific indicators. Special project funds will be available from the Chancellor's Office to help defray some of the costs to institutions related to implementing performance indicators. The indicator teams will be charged according to the Board’s priority system in phases. Due date: September 1998, preceded by progress reports.

**Task 4 - Develop incentive system.** The staff will develop a recommendation to the Board for incentives for institutions that achieve their two, five, and ten-year targets. Due date: to be set in accordance with any revisions in the Budget Allocation System (BAS).

**Task 5 - Institutions report progress to the Chancellor's Office annually.** Performance indicators are designed to assess major institutional and System processes including financial indicators, product (i.e., learning, research, and service) and process quality, and other quality improvements. The data collected, recorded, and analyzed will inform the institution, the Chancellor’s Office, and the Board about ongoing results and improvements. Measurements will be done at three intervals in tracking any performance indicator: before implementation (baseline), during implementation of initiatives or strategies, and after implementation. The first progress report will include the identification of strategies or process changes that will
lead to improved outcomes for the performance indicators and any fiscal, physical, and technological resources necessary for implementing performance indicators beyond the Special Project funds in this biennium. Due date: June Council meetings.

This phase will include the setting of targets for improvement. Staff will work with institutions to identify System and institution targets (e.g., two, five, and ten-year targets) for improvement on the indicators. Campuses will report targets to the Chancellor. The frequency of data collection for repeated measurement will be identified in the protocol for each indicator (e.g., annually, biannually, every five years). Data collection is key to documenting progress towards targets and the precision of what is being measured. Performance over time is essential to understand institutional capacity for impacting results. Due date: June Council meetings.

Task 6 - Report progress to the Board. Staff will make annual reports to the Board on the progress of implementing the performance indicators at the July Board meeting. An interim progress report will be made in the first year in March 1998. Due dates: July Board meetings.

The performance indicators will be used to demonstrate that the Oregon university system is using its resources wisely and to help improve teaching and learning, the overall student experience, and administrative processes. The Oregon university system is beginning a process that will reward institutions for improvement against their own benchmarks. The success of the implementation of performance indicators depends on a clear sense of purpose for the institutions as reflected in their mission statements.

Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Clark briefly reviewed the Board’s overarching goals and the work being presented in the present document regarding performance objectives. She explained that the Board had reviewed an earlier draft of the objectives and the present materials represent a new iteration of that work.

Dr. Clark called on Dr. Nancy Goldschmidt to briefly explain the objectives. Dr. Goldschmidt began by observing that performance indicators are used with a purpose in mind and in the present case they are tied to productivity improvement. Continuing, she explained...
that the tasks that must be completed were outlined for the Board in the docket material and included: setting priorities for the goals and measurements; development of a framework and process for identifying comparitors for purposes of benchmarking; formation of teams to work on the indicators by priority, and finally development of an incentive system that will provide reasons for improvement and some rewards for succeeding. Dr. Goldschmidt reviewed the performance indicators that have been suggested.

Chancellor Cox underscored that the Board was not being asked to approve these indicators at the present time, rather Vice Chancellor Clark wanted acknowledgment that the staff work was in the right direction.

Dr. Whittaker asked a question regarding a high quality research program indicator and whether that was synonymous with research quality. Dr. Goldschmidt responded that in the past, only expenditures have been monitored and the sense was that a method needed to be determined to review the impact in Oregon of some of the research work that is presently ongoing.

Continuing, Dr. Whittaker asked if the attempt regarding quality research was to monitor aspects such as publications and scholarly journals, books, and so forth. Dr. Goldschmidt responded that the campuses informally track that sort of thing, but it is not monitored Systemwide. Dr. Whitaker responded that he thought it might be a better measure of quality than how much is spent on research. Both Chancellor Cox and Vice Chancellor Clark concurred that the information would be easily obtainable and could be added to the indicators.

President Aschkenasy indicated that his reaction was that the extent to which the indicators are output focused, the better we could document how well we are doing. "I think it is critical that we emphasize output. One advantage to a law requiring us to do this," he observed, "is that we have to report against it. I believe this is a rare opportunity to build broader bridges to the citizens by saying, 'here's where we are, here's where we've gone since the last report, and here's the value of our services.' Most people who aren't involved with the System think of outputs, whether it's a public good or a private good isn't so much the philosophical question. Rather it is that it is good."
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Dr. Goldschmidt said that an analysis had been done and the input and output indicators are fairly evenly divided.

Mr. Imeson indicated that he would like to have a discussion in November to get a sense of campus reaction to what is being recommended.

(No Board action required)
Table 1
Status of Data Collection Efforts for OSSHE Performance Indicators
Fall 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>New Biennial Costs (est)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Satisfaction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Completion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Graduates</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Standards</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Programs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of Research/Public Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Ability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Location</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Students</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (age 25 &amp; over)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>absorb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State's Obligation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Productivity</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>absorb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>absorb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Savings</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>absorb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Satisfaction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success of Graduates</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$ 28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>$ 12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>absorb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated New Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status of Measurements:
✓ Baseline system-level data already maintained
X Data maintained by one or two campuses only
N Need to develop measurements
IFS President Paul Simonds addressed the Board:

"The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate held its first meeting of this school year at Eastern Oregon University on October 3rd and 4th. We thank President Gilbert for hosting our meeting and Gail McAllister for joining our Friday afternoon session. Grattan Kerans, Sen. David Nelson and Rep. Bob Jensen also joined us for a round table discussion of this past Legislative session and the prospects for the next one. The faculty recognize that good progress has been made in gaining support around the state for higher education but we are also concerned that we should do better than we have. Financial support for K-12 education in Oregon is in the top 20 percent of states while that for the State System is in the bottom 20 percent. Somehow we need to approach equity with the rest of public education in Oregon.

It is not too early for us to develop a strategy for the next Legislative session. We will invite the other faculty organizations to join us in planning within the next few meetings of the Senate. It is too early in the process to lay out specifics but we hereby offer to join in the preliminary planning and to participate with the Board in presenting OSSHE's case at the next session. We specifically offer our services in explaining the quality programs OSSHE has in its various institutions.

As another element in developing OSSHE's case for 1999-2000, IFS is joining with the Academic Council in an extensive survey of post-tenure review across the System. We developed part of the questionnaire at this meeting and submitted it to the Academic Council. While we have already collected information on the official structure of post-tenure reviews, we want to know how they have worked in practice: what rewards are provided for good to excellent performance, what assistance and mentoring are available for strengthening faculty performance, and what remedies are applied when performance is less than adequate to various degrees.

Governor Kitzhaber has urged cooperation between all segments of higher education in Oregon, the Board has moved ahead on engineering as an interinstitutional program, and the push is on for developing guidelines for broad postsecondary policy and articulation. We would like to participate in the process. There is a long list of
interinstitutional cooperations that have given the faculty experience in articulating disparate elements of higher education in Oregon. Some have worked well and provide models of success for future efforts, others have failed to develop their full potential, giving us lessons on how to improve. Here is a short list that shows the range of such cooperations:

1. For many years, SOU and UO Special Education programs cooperated, allowing students to complete their standard special education endorsement at the UO and their Master's degree at Southern. It was discontinued when Southern was able to offer their own standard but it was a great success in interinstitutional cooperation.

2. PSU, SOU, UO, and WOU cooperate in offering statewide Ed-Net courses toward the standard special education endorsement, making this mandatory continuing education requirement accessible to outlying areas.

3. The "Oregon Collaborative for Excellence in Preparation of Teachers," supported by an NSF four-year grant (Marjorie Enneking of PSU, director) includes faculty in mathematics, physics, biology, chemistry, computer science, geology, engineering, and education drawn from all community colleges and four-year public and independent colleges.

4. Master of Public Health is a statewide program involving PSU, OHSU, and OSU with tracks in health education and promotion and health administration.

5. Manufacturing Engineering uses facilities and faculty from PSU and OSU and is taught through interactive TV with reception centers throughout the state.

6. The Oregon Executive MBA is offered at the Capital Center with the degree awarded by UO.

7. The Ph.D. in Bioanthropology is based on the Ph.D. degree in Anthropology at the UO and has participating faculty at PSU, OSU, and SOU in addition to those at the UO.

The faculty already have experience in removing the barriers to interinstitutional education. We know some of the pitfalls and have successes. We can move toward a seamless
higher education in Oregon with the lessons we have learned from these and many more such programs by incorporating the faculty experiences in developing these existing programs.

Finally, IFS adopted its schedule of meetings for 1998 and extends an invitation to Board members to join us in our hearing meetings of Friday afternoon."

5-6 December 1997, Portland State University
6-7 February 1998, Western Oregon University
3-4 April 1998, University of Oregon
5-6 June, 1998, Southern Oregon University
1-2 October 1998, Oregon State University
4-5 December 1998, Oregon Health Sciences University

Executive Summary

The charge to the Solution Team on Access, Transfer, and Community Colleges was to address the principle of a "barrier-free" admission and transfer process to enable students to achieve their academic goals. Partnering with the community colleges to provide baccalaureate capacity and access was also a topic to be explored.

The Solution Team pursued a student-centered agenda in examining policies and practices that would facilitate smoother intersector movement for students. The following five major categories emerged in the course of the Solution Team's deliberations:

1. Credit acceptance between institutions, which is the heart of student concerns;
2. Access strategies for students;
3. The transfer process;
4. Effective communications to the students and among institutions; and
5. The development of comprehensive, collaborative student services.

The challenge for the development of a collaborative system that would enable a "barrier-free admission and transfer system" will be to formalize an infrastructure to lead and maintain coordinated efforts. Under each of the five major areas above, several recommended actions were identified that would support the goals of access, transfer, and collaboration. The priorities include:
1. Credit acceptance practices should continue to be reviewed. Guidelines for acceptance of credit for prior learning should be established. Additionally, the Joint Boards Articulation Commission (JBAC) should examine the problems associated with professional/technical courses regarding transferability and student expectations. Finally, various alternative modes of earning credit such as advanced placement, college high, accelerated baccalaureate, and other "early options" should be jointly developed by an intersector group.

2. Student access strategies should include continued support for the intersector Web site ("ONE") to facilitate the delivery of information to students. In addition, the development of a centralized repository for catalog and schedule information for the community colleges and OSSHE institutions would be desirable. Considerable resources would be needed for this initiative, however.

3. Transfer articulation information for students should be facilitated through an "Articulation and Transfer Forum." The currently-published Articulation Hotline List has been maintained through JBAC efforts. This document contains the names, institutional affiliations, and phone numbers of appropriate contact people on community college and OSSHE campuses. However, information regarding programs and courses could be communicated more effectively and in a more timely manner. An electronic discussion group ("Articulation and Transfer Forum") should be established for the dissemination of this information.

4. Communication between OSSHE and the community college sector should be enhanced and supported. A statewide faculty conference on proficiency-based education last spring should be followed with additional conference opportunities. The OSSHE Director of Community College Articulation should coordinate closely with the Office of Community College Services in order to facilitate intersector communications and special projects for collaboration.

5. Comprehensive, collaborative student services should be available to students. Effective and innovative financial aid practices and co-admission policies should be inventoried, and model agreements for services should be developed. This information should be widely distributed to community college and OSSHE partners.
Introduction

This document, presented in six major sections, is the final report of the OSSHE Solution Team on Access, Transfer, and Community Colleges. This first (introductory) section describes (1) the formation of this Solution Team; (2) the charge that guided group deliberations; (3) the major issues initially identified by the group; and (4) a description of other groups working on these issues. The following five sections outline the priority policy issues discussed as well as the recommendations that emerged in some of the areas. The broad policy areas addressed are (A) credit acceptance; (B) student access strategies; (C) transfer; (D) communications; and (E) comprehensive/collaborative student services.

Solution Team Formation and Its Charge

The OSSHE Solution Team on Access, Transfer, and Community Colleges emerged as one of 17 such groups in the third phase of the State System’s strategic planning initiative launched in 1995. (Solution Team members are listed at the conclusion of the Report.) The charge from the Chancellor and the Board to this Solution Team was to:

Develop a barrier-free admission and transfer process to enable students to achieve their academic goals. Partner with the community colleges to provide baccalaureate capacity and access.

From the beginning, the Solution Team focused on students and worked toward recommendations to facilitate smoother intersector movement by minimizing unnecessary barriers.

Solution Team Meetings and Group Process

The Solution Team met several times between October 1996 and April 1997 to identify and discuss the range of issues most relevant to its charge. After identifying the problems, issues were prioritized, other groups working on the same issues were consulted, and final recommendations were developed.

Major Issues

An interim report of this Solution Team was presented to the Board in October 1996. At that time, the Solution Team reported the following needs:
1. The need for consistent understanding about the standards and assessment processes for proficiency-based education, namely the CIM and CAM (K-12), PREP (community colleges), and PASS (OSSHE);

2. The need for understanding the changing educational environment whereby students move in and out of institutions and/or enroll simultaneously in two or more community colleges and/or baccalaureate-granting institutions;

3. The need for "academic maps" so students can more easily acquire information for planning careers and accessing appropriate academic programs;

4. The need for student support services, which can be effectively linked between and among all institutions, both secondary and postsecondary;

5. The need for faculty to work more cooperatively in the development of curriculum and strategies for assessment. Among other needs are the creation and sharing of professional development opportunities for faculty;

6. The need for school-to-work articulation plans; and

7. The need to promote the development and implementation of accountability mechanisms for learning experiences outside the traditional classroom setting.

**Related Groups Addressing the Issues Examined by the Solution Team**

A variety of other groups have been kept informed about this Solution Team's activities and their input has been actively solicited. Among these groups are the OSSHE Academic Council, the community college Council of Instructional Administrators (CIA), the Joint Boards Articulation Commission (JBAC), and the JBAC's Student Transfer Committee. The Solution Team has inventoried the works in progress of these other groups and integrated recommendations from them into the policy recommendations found in the following sections of this report. The Solution Team developed a formal relationship with the JBAC, being adopted by that body as an ad hoc subcommittee.
Discussion of Issues and Recommendations

The Solution Team — a diverse group of community college, OSSHE, K-12, independent college, and private sector representatives — utilized an iterative process to identify problematic areas, prioritize the issues, and develop thematic areas for policy recommendations. In both large- and small-group settings, Solution Team members brainstormed ideas, generated successive lists of issues, and revised those lists as discussion generated and illuminated more ideas. The five sections ("A" though "E") outline the areas that dominated discussion. Within each of the five major categories, sub-topics are listed and explained. In this report, the goal of the Team was to keep the description of these topics concise, to address which general policy directions may be desirable, and to identify, where possible, the resources to follow up on our recommendations.

A. Credit Acceptance

The theme of credit acceptance goes to the heart of transfer student concerns. The question students ask is: "Will the credits earned at one institution be accepted at my transfer institution?" This topic merited much discussion at Solution Team meetings. Some of the details of this theme are discussed below.

- Credit for Prior Learning

Discussion: Granting academic credit for prior experiential learning is recognized by the Commission on Colleges, Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges, and guidelines for granting such credit appears in the Accreditation Handbook. Policies and procedures must be documented and monitored by institutions. Several institutions currently offer credit for prior learning, though the credits earned at one institution do not necessarily transfer to another. The Solution Team engaged in considerable discussion about whether OSSHE and the community college system should work toward common guidelines in this area. In general, members accepted the practice of granting prior learning credit, but divergent views were expressed about transferability. The Solution Team agreed that there is need to seek common ground through proficiency-based outcomes.

Recommendation(s): The Solution Team recommends that the chief academic officers of the community colleges, OSSHE
institutions, and a representative from the independent colleges work on guidelines for documenting experiential learning as it relates to student transfer. The JBAC has also included this issue as part of their work plan.

- Professional/Technical Courses

Discussion: Professional/technical courses (previously known as vocational/technical) have become a major issue of contention in the arena of credit acceptance. Historically, professional/technical courses are generally not considered transfer courses, but the lines between what is "legitimate" as a transfer course and what is "not legitimate" have become blurred. For example, many community colleges have implemented the practice of numbering professional/technical courses with an alphanumeric designation (moving away from the old decimal numbering system). The alphanumeric system had previously been utilized only for transfer courses and this change in course numbering has resulted in confusion. Further, the definitions of what courses are "academic" (transfer) and what are "professional/technical" (non-transfer) have become less obvious in some fields. For example, some computer courses offered at community colleges have typically been thought to be professional/technical, but in recent years some have moved more into the realm of true "academic," transfer courses. Finally, one community college has allowed for the inclusion of limited professional/technical courses into the Associate of Arts/Oregon Transfer degree it offers, which then tempts a receiving OSSHE institution to "deconstruct" a student's transfer degree (disallowing some/all of the professional/technical courses from that college). The result is the transfer of less than the full 90 credit hours, which should make up the block transfer.

A specific plan that has been proposed in some quarters to address the acceptance of professional/technical courses is the adoption of a policy whereby all lower-division collegiate and selected professional/technical community college courses are accepted for transfer. Movement toward such a policy would likely be controversial, however. An alternative policy direction that might be considered is one that would call for: (a) all courses that Oregon community colleges designate as transfer courses be reflected in student documents/transcripts; (b) clarity about if and how credits transfer to each OSSHE institution be achieved, documented, and routinely updated; and (c) OSSHE institutions work toward common practices. Implementation of these or similar policies would avoid problems with determinations of what is
transferable and what is not, maximize student expectations with regard to transfer of credits, and place the focus at the baccalaureate level on what still needs to be completed for the degree.

**Recommendation(s):** As reported to the Joint Boards of Education in September 1997, the JBAC has been examining the issue of professional/technical courses for the past year. The plan for the JBAC is to continue to monitor issues that remain problematic in this area. The Solution Team concurs with the JBAC direction.

- Advanced Placement, College High, Accelerated Baccalaureate, and Other "Early Options"

**Discussion:** Various alternative modes of credit earning were discussed in terms of the implications for students (primarily high school students) who wish to have prior college credit accepted by postsecondary institutions. Oregon has no coherent policy or plan relating to expanding opportunities to students through so-called early options programs. Individual students learn of, and decide on their own about, pursuing such courses of study. Credit acceptance does not always take place in such instances and, when it does, there may be no real advantage to students in terms of time-to-degree. Coincident with the deliberations of the Solution Team was the passage of SB 919 by the 1997 Legislature, which calls upon the State System to "continue experimentation with and implementation of various accelerated baccalaureate degree models ...[which] may include but need not be limited to early entry and postsecondary options and models that are jointly developed with the State Board of Education."

**Recommendation(s):** At the September 1997 meeting of the Joint Boards of Education, a plan was approved for a study of early options programs. The Solution Team suggests that the intersector group designing this study prepare data-driven recommendations at the conclusion of their work.

**B. Student Access Strategies**

An important element of the charge to the Solution Team was to consider a "barrier-free admission and transfer process." This led the Solution Team to consider the general topic of student access in a variety of ways.
- Web Site (Oregon Network for Education [ONE])

**Discussion:** During the time of the Solution Team's deliberations, it was agreed that a common Web site for all educational sectors should be established so that students, prospective students, and all others, would have a "one-stop shopping center" on the Internet for Oregon's educational resources. This proposal was endorsed by the Joint Boards of Education at their November 1996 meeting, and was envisioned to include links to a host of Web resources in the state for the K-12, community college, and higher education sectors. Such a Web site was developed and implemented in the summer of 1997 (http://www.osshe.edu/one/), primarily through the efforts of the OSSHE Office of Academic Affairs.

**Recommendation(s):** The Solution Team applauds the efforts to implement this Web site and endorses its continuation and growth. Additional resources should be directed toward this project to develop a common course catalog and class schedule database (see below).

- Enhanced Access to Courses and Information: Statewide Catalog

**Discussion:** At the present time, students desiring course descriptions, schedules, and availability must search individual college catalogs and schedules of classes (in print and/or electronic versions) for the information they need. A central repository of this information, for both the community colleges and the OSSHE universities, seems desirable.

**Recommendation(s):** A statewide database of course information is seen as an important objective by the Solution Team, most likely as part of the ONE Web site. Resources needed for such a project would be considerable, however, and whether or not to make securing such resources a priority in the budget requests for the next legislative session merits close examination by the Board.

- Coordinated Delivery of Distance Education

**Discussion:** It is essential that OSSHE campuses and community colleges coordinate the delivery of distance education programs and courses in order to maximize accessibility for students. Many campuses are providing online courses in a variety of disciplines. These courses could be shared in degree programs provided by
several institutions. The coordination for degree-building distance-delivered courses could be facilitated through ONE or a similar entity.

**Recommendation(s):** The Solution Team encourages a statewide effort to improve telecommunications capabilities for education and establish a designated budget. Further, the Solution Team recommends that distance education opportunities be inventoried, developed, and supported through a collaborative infrastructure.

C. Transfer

Related to the theme of "transfer," the Solution Team examined the following issues.

- **Articulation Hotline List**

  **Discussion:** Up-to-date information must be readily available to students, counselors, advisors, and admission's staff when attempting to resolve issues regarding student transfer. "Who to talk to?" is a very important question. An "Articulation Hotline List" with the names, institutional affiliations, and phone numbers of the appropriate contact people on the state's two-year and four-year campuses has been available as an important resource for those having transfer questions. In the last year, the JBAC has undertaken the task of updating this list, distributing it widely, and posting it to its Web site.

  **Recommendation(s):** The Solution Team endorses the "Articulation Hotline List" as a meaningful resource and suggests that the JBAC continue updating and distributing it regularly.

- **Develop Proficiency-based Transfer Vehicles**

  **Discussion:** The implementation of a proficiency-based system for OSSHE admissions (PASS) necessitates thinking about the impact of this process on student transfer. The implementation of PREP (PRoficiencies for Entry into Programs) for community colleges applies to entry to individual programs on each campus and does not translate into action regarding OSSHE proficiency standards. The JBAC has this issue on its work plan for examination, especially as it applies to the Associate of Arts/Oregon Transfer degree.
Recommendation(s): The Solution Team recommends that this issue be considered by the JBAC at the time it deems appropriate.

D. Communication

An issue that repeatedly surfaces with respect to facilitating articulation and effective student transfer is communication: more information communicated in a more timely matter is critical.

- Chancellor’s Office Liaison with Community Colleges

Discussion: In keeping with the theme of communication between OSSHE and the community college sector, the Solution Team was pleased to learn that, early in 1997, the OSSHE Office of Academic Affairs created a position entitled "Director of Community College Articulation." Jim Arnold, previously Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, was appointed to that position and has served since then as an ex-officio member of the Solution Team.

- Hotline Listserv

Discussion: Institutions from both postsecondary sectors agree that information regarding changes in programs and courses could, and should, be transmitted more effectively than happens at the present time. Currently there exists an "Articulation Hotline" list (in print and electronic/Web versions, see above) that contains the names, institutional affiliations, and phone numbers of the appropriate individuals on each campus who handle articulation and transfer issues. This information may be used by either staff or students when attempting to resolve a transfer issue. It is believed that more effective communication is desirable and possible.

Recommendation(s): An "articulation and transfer" electronic communications network (e.g., a listserv, perhaps with a title along the lines of "Articulation and Transfer Forum") should be implemented so that interested staff could subscribe to and post the latest developments on their campuses for others to take note of and react to. The OSSHE Office of Academic Affairs, specifically under the direction of the Director of Community College Articulation, should take the lead on this recommendation -- and should coordinate closely with the Office of Community College Services.
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- Academic Council (OSSHE)/Chief Academic Officer (CC) Meetings

Discussion: Many of the issues pertaining to articulation and transfer are closely linked with curricula; the academic officers of the community colleges and OSSHE institutions are directly affected by changes in policy regarding transfer and articulation and should be involved in policy development and implementation. Regular dialog between the academic officers of the two sectors would seem to be healthy in maintaining relationships and facilitating communication regarding changes in programs, courses, and institutional philosophies and cultures.

Recommendation(s): The Solution Team encourages the continuation of regular joint meetings between the academic officers of the two sectors. (Note: One such meeting is scheduled on October 16, 1997, at OIT.)

- Faculty Discipline Meetings

Discussion: This issue parallels the need for communication at the senior academic officer level. Transfer issues and problems can be the result of miscommunication, lack of communication, or lack of understanding of the programs and courses offered by "the other sector." If faculty members from the same discipline at the community colleges and OSSHE institutions can meet from time to time, working relationships can begin and/or be enhanced. With faculty members developing understanding and trust, students involved in the transfer process will benefit. One recent example of effective faculty-to-faculty interaction and dialog was the statewide conference on proficiency systems, hosted by OSSHE in Eugene in May 1997, and attended by faculty members representing all OSSHE and community college campuses. This highly-rated event generated much awareness on the part of faculty regarding ongoing changes toward proficiency-based models of education and gave everyone an opportunity to meet and begin to develop working relationships.

Recommendation(s): Department chairs, deans, and senior academic officers at OSSHE institutions and community college campuses should create and encourage additional opportunities for intersector faculty meetings.
Inventory of Partnerships and Compilation of Data Profiling Student Progress

Discussion: The Solution Team believes that it would be valuable to compile an inventory of partnerships currently in existence between OSSHE institutions and community colleges to serve as a repository of success models to facilitate more effective transfer and articulation efforts. Furthermore, the Solution Team expressed a desire that data systems could/should be developed/enhanced to enable the sectors to profile student movement through the sectors. The creation and continuation of central information sources upon which those involved in articulation and transfer could draw would assist more effective communication efforts.

Recommendation(s): The Solution Team endorses and recommends the continuation of the Intersector Data Exchange efforts (a cooperative program to share data about students) initiated by OSSHE and the Office of Community College Services. The integration of various databases of these offices in the past two years has allowed the JBAC to examine much more information than was previously available. The development of an inventory of partnerships, and expanding the database exchange and development efforts, would require additional resources to implement. The consideration of a budget request in this area may be appropriate.

E. Comprehensive, Collaborative Student Services

A major issue is how to be responsive to students who move in and out of institutions and/or enroll simultaneously on two or more campuses. In this age where many students effectively view all of postsecondary education as a "system," an optimum learning environment should include student support services that are linked effectively between institutions. Students need appropriate advising, career guidance, and an opportunity to acquire academic and financial planning/advising that supports a "seamless" transition between institutions.

Support Advisors and Counselors

Discussion: Advisors and counselors need to have current information about articulation agreements and programs at all the
institutions in order to provide optimum advising services to students. Counselors and academic advisors need to have ready access to information and contact persons. This can be accomplished through electronic media, including the Web and electronic mail groups.

**Recommendation(s):** The Solution Team recommends that the JBAC encourage the networking of counselors and advisors, and supports the efforts of the OSSHE Office of Academic Affairs in sponsoring an annual conference for community college advisors and counselors to discuss transfer issues.

- "Seamlessness of Services" (especially financial aid)

**Discussion:** The major student service that merits ongoing review is financial aid. This area presents many challenges in terms of meeting the federal regulations, while following accreditation policies and providing optimum student services. The Solution Team discussed developing co-admission processes, including procedures for transferring tuition and financial aid between campuses.

**Recommendation(s):** The Solution Team recommends that community colleges and four-year institutions develop partnership models to include seamless student services, specifically addressing the areas of tuition and financial aid for students who are concurrently enrolled.

- Co-Admission Task Force

**Discussion:** Several community college/university partnerships are in place (or are developing) to facilitate movement of students between institutions. The strategies include developing co-admission agreements to provide coordinated student and academic services for jointly enrolled students. Consortium agreements for federal financial aid disbursement, library services, advising services, and mutual faculty development opportunities are being completed among several partners for the academic year. In addition, coordinated outreach and orientation efforts are being planned. Several pilot partnerships are currently being developed with funding from the Regional Access Initiative.

**Recommendation(s):** The Solution Team recommends a "Co-Admission Task Force" be established, with representatives from several community colleges and four-year institutions, to develop
common guidelines for dual admission. This task force would also share information in order to provide models for other partnerships.

Conclusion

This report has described the work of the Solution Team over the past year, has discussed many issues covered in the deliberations, and, finally, made several recommendations. As the work of this body comes to a close, we acknowledge that there is much left to do to make the educational sectors more "seamless." Articulation efforts and agreements between OSSHE institutions and community colleges need to continue — and we must continue to seek to make the transfer process easier for students. Students are, after all, what we are about — and the Solution Team continually reminded itself of this student focus during its deliberations. This report is issued as OSSHE, the community colleges, the Joint Boards of Education, and the JBAC, develop a response to HB 2387 passed by the 1997 Legislature. This legislation calls for the development of a "plan for the transfer of credits between community colleges and the state institutions of higher education," that must be submitted to the next legislative session for approval prior to February 1, 1999. If the legislature does not approve the plan so developed, a plan of action has been spelled out for us. To adequately address the concerns of the legislature, and to facilitate ongoing articulation and transfer efforts, we believe the recommendations made here will provide some guidance. Many Solution Team members continue to represent the interests of the Team, of students, and of the Board of Higher Education by remaining as members of the Joint Boards Articulation Commission, charged by the Joint Boards to coordinate the writing of the plan for the 1999 legislative session.
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Board Discussion

Chancellor Cox, in introducing the Solution Team report, reminded the Board of the charge given to the Team: "what could we do to remove barriers, make easier and facilitate access and transfer between community colleges and State System institutions?"

Provosts Martha Anne Dow (OIT) and Roy Arnold (OSU) provided an overview of the recommendations of the Solution Team. Dr. Dow thanked the committee for the amount of time and thoughtful deliberations that had gone into the work of the Team. She specifically expressed her appreciation to Jim Arnold of the Chancellor’s Office for his assistance in arranging meetings and preparing the final report. “During the time of the Solution Team work, I was pleased that we had the participation of so many sister institutions, both community college and higher education, and the Board through the participation of Diane Christopher,” Dr. Dow added.

President Aschkenasy remarked that the pace of movement on the issues of articulation and transfer seemed “glacial” to him. Dr. Dow concurred and added that was one of the overriding sentiments during
the work of the Team. However, she pointed out that in actuality, much has been accomplished and the Joint Boards has also taken some actions to continue the forward momentum.

Dr. Arnold added that some excellent pilot work is occurring already with three regional partnerships: EOU with two community colleges; SOU with Rogue Community College; and, OIT with the newly approved community college district. "These partnerships are having to confront for the first time, very specifically, differences in tuition rates, financial aid issues, and so forth. Their work will be very useful for all of us across the System."

Dr. Aschkenasy assured the Chancellor and the Solution Team that the Board was in full agreement with the recommendations of the Solution Team.

In closing, Vice Chancellor Clark added that she did not want to "leave the impression that the System has nothing in place relative to transferability. We have had in place for seven or eight years now a block-transfer agreement that has worked very well. We are still deliberating issues that are at the margins of a very solid working agreement.

"The other challenge is around professional/technical or vocational education courses that were not intended for academic transfer into upper division courses. More and more, as we move to proficiency-based and outcomes-based education, we ought to be able to devise means of determining whether students in those curricular programs meet the outcomes, even if the courses don't match," she concluded.

Mr. Imeson thanked the Solution Team for a very good piece of work.

(No Board action required)

POLICY:
PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS

The policy regarding presidential searches was last revised at a special meeting of the Board of Higher Education on January 29, 1997. As the Board prepares for a presidential search at Eastern Oregon University, the policy has once again been reviewed. There are only minor changes are suggested as noted below.

The policy, with proposed changes, follows. (NOTE: Strikeout denotes deletions; underline and italics denote proposed additions.)
PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCESS

(Adopted by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, Meeting #535, March 21, 1986, pp. 122-130; amended Meeting #560, February 17, 1988, pp. 64-70; Meeting #570, October 21, 1988, pp. 564-570; Meeting #581, October 20, 1989, pp. 457-463; Meeting #623, October 22, 1993, pp. 500-508; Meeting #627, April 22, 1994, pp. 130-136; Special Meeting, January 29, 1997, pp. 41-50. The process approved by the Board is presented below in narrative form. See also discussion, Meeting #558, December 18, 1987, pp. 602-609.)

Introduction

The following policy outlines the process to be followed in the search for and selection of presidents for Oregon's seven public four-year colleges and universities. The purpose of the policy is to assure that the selection of institutional presidents is carried out in a clearly understood, timely, and effective manner. In designing the presidential search process, the State Board of Higher Education was guided by its Internal Management Directive 1.020(1), which provides that: "The Chancellor shall make recommendations to the Board, in which rests the sole power of decision, concerning the selection, appointment ... of Presidents...." In developing this policy, the Board has considered many factors including the traditions for selecting presidents in Oregon, institutional needs, resources, and leadership requirements. Particular attention was given to the difficult and frequently competing need for balancing guaranteeing candidates' confidentiality to keep them in the search process and the desirability of having candidates meet a broad cross-section of the campus community. This policy on the presidential search process was first adopted by the Board on March 21, 1986, and was modified on February 17, 1988, October 22, 1993, April 22, 1994, and January 29, 1997.

The Board

When it becomes necessary to hire a president, the Board, in consultation with the search committee, will review the current position description, modify it, as appropriate, and develop a statement of preferred qualifications. At the Board's direction, the Chancellor will, using the position description and preferred qualifications, initiate the procedures provided in this policy to identify candidates for consideration by the Board.
The Search Committee

A single search committee shall be responsible for assisting the Chancellor and the Board by identifying and recruiting possible candidates for the position of president. The Board retains the sole responsibility for the selection of institutional presidents. The direct costs of the presidential search shall be borne by the institution.

Members of the search committee shall be appointed by the Chancellor after consultation with Board leadership. The search committee shall be composed of three Board members, four faculty members, one student, one administrator (and, at the larger universities, one dean), one classified or unclassified employee, a community member, and an alumni representative. The president of the Board shall recommend members of the Board to serve on the search committee. The appropriate faculty body or bodies of the institution shall be asked to nominate eight persons to the Chancellor, who will choose four to serve. The other four faculty members will be designated as alternates, to be called on only if those designated members are unable to serve on the search committee. Similarly, the president of the student body shall be invited to nominate two students, with one being chosen to serve and the other designated as an alternate. Administrators will be asked to nominate two campus administrators, typically deans, directors, or vice presidents, one to be named to the committee and one to serve as an alternate (at the larger universities, four will be nominated — two administrators and two deans). Classified or unclassified employees will nominate two individuals, one of whom will serve as alternate. The community representative and alumni representative will be selected after the Chancellor consults with institutional officials and the alumni organization. The Chancellor, in consultation with institutional officials, may appoint an at-large community/alumni representative.

In selecting members of the search committee, the Chancellor shall be mindful of having a diverse committee, especially from gender and cultural perspectives. Participation on a search committee is an extremely time-consuming commitment. Once presented with information on the search timeline, hours required, and level of confidentiality required, committee members will be asked again if they are willing (and able) to make the required commitment.

The president of the Board may serve ex-officio without vote. Unless a public meeting is announced, however, no quorum of the Board may be present at any search committee meeting. The president
should retain the degree of detachment that will enable the exercise of impartial leadership through the final selection process.

The Chancellor and an affirmative action officer appointed by the Chancellor shall serve as consultants to the committee and may attend its meetings.

The Chancellor, in consultation with the president of the Board, shall appoint one of the Board members to serve as the committee chair. The chair shall convene all meetings of the committee. In order to keep the names of the candidates confidential, only the chair of the search committee or a designee shall speak on behalf of the committee to the press or others concerning the progress of the search.

Chancellor’s Designee Liaison

The Chancellor shall appoint a vice chancellor or top-level staff person who shall serve as liaison among the Board, the Chancellor’s Office, the search committee, and the institution. The designee from the Chancellor’s Office shall serve as a nonvoting ex-officio member on the committee and will assist in identifying the campus search coordinator, interpreting Board policy relative to the search process, and assure that assuring the search process moves along in a timely manner.

The Search Coordinator

The Chancellor’s designee, in consultation with the search committee chair, the president of the institution, and the Chancellor, will appoint a search coordinator who will coordinate all staffing for the search committee. The duties will include: (1) handling all search committee meeting logistics, including making appropriate arrangements for the visits of candidates; (2) preparing correspondence for the committee and the chair; (3) maintaining the records and files and keeping minutes of search committee meeting. Although not a voting member of the search committee, the coordinator and the Chancellor’s designee are expected to attend the search committee meetings.

The Charge

The Chancellor shall give the search committee a written charge describing the committee’s responsibilities and authority. The charge should include an approximate date for the committee to submit its
nominations to the Chancellor, the number of candidates to be recommended, and the information the committee should provide on each candidate.

The Responsibilities of the Search Committee

1. **Review Statement of Qualifications**

   The search committee, after consulting with the Board in the development of a position description and statement of qualifications, should review the Board's position description and statement of qualifications and recommend any modifications. The committee shall invite comments from concerned groups and individuals (faculty, students, administrators, alumni, members of the community, etc.). The committee chair shall then consult with the Board regarding any search committee recommendations for changes. Based on the comments received, the Chancellor's designee will finalize the position description and statement of qualifications.

   The statement of qualifications, along with the institution's mission statement, excerpts from the Board's Administrative Rules and Internal Management Directives concerning the authority and responsibilities of the president, and other descriptive materials about the institution should be sent to all nominees and applicants for the position.

2. **Solicit Nominations and Applications**

   Based on material received by the search committee from the Board, a vacancy announcement shall be prepared by the coordinator and approved by the search committee. At a minimum, it shall appear in at least two weekly issues of the Chronicle of Higher Education, and one issue each of Black Issues in Higher Education and Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education. Nominations shall be sought aggressively from institutional faculty and students, other State System presidents and personnel, regional and national educational leaders, regional and national educational organizations, and other leaders in the community, state, and nation.
Advertisements for the position shall include a deadline for the submission of applications and nominations. The search committee, in consultation with the Chancellor's designee, shall decide the deadlines for the receipt of materials needed by the committee to assure its screening of candidates who meet the deadline.

3. Screen

The task of the search committee is to recommend to the Chancellor three to five people, any one of whom would be satisfactory to the search committee to be the next president of the institution.

The screening process is divided typically into five stages. The first screening consists of reviewing applications and nominations and identifying those that meet the minimum qualifications for the position.

The second stage of the screening process involves a more thorough review of those candidates who meet the minimum requirements for the position. The goal at this stage is to narrow the list of candidates to 15-20 candidates (referred to as the quarter-finalists) who will be given careful consideration by the committee.

The third stage is critical for the success of the process. The search committee needs to collect a great deal of information about the remaining 15-20 quarter-finalists and, at the same time, assure that the names of the candidates remain confidential in order to keep them in the pool. At this stage, the committee may talk to the candidates, talk to references, send one or more members to visit candidates, or if necessary, invite candidates to meet the campus search committee. The goal at this stage is to identify a group of 8-10 semi-finalists who will be invited to Oregon for interviews.

The fourth stage occurs when the semi-finalists are invited to Oregon for interviews. The search committee shall be responsible for the visit. At this stage it is important to protect the confidentiality of the candidates by keeping meetings as private as possible. Typically, each candidate will be
interviewed by the search committee, a campus screening committee, the Chancellor, and a limited number of other people who can assist the search committee with its evaluation of the candidate.

The campus screening committee is advisory to the search committee and shall be selected by it. At this stage of the search process, it is important to increase the number of campus people who meet and interview candidates. The screening committee shall consist of six faculty members, three department heads, three deans or directors, two students (one of whom should be a graduate student, if appropriate), a senior academic administrator, and a representative from the classified or unclassified service personnel. The search committee shall seek nominations for the campus screening committee from appropriate campus organizations. In selecting members of the screening committee, the search committee shall be mindful of having a diverse committee, especially from gender and cultural perspectives. The chair of the screening committee shall be appointed by the search committee.

The role of the screening committee chair will be to convene and prepare agendas for meetings of the screening committee, act as convener for the interviews with candidates, and assure that a final report of recommendations is prepared from the screening committee to the search committee. At an organizational meeting of the screening committee, three major topics will be covered:

a. Critical importance of confidentiality;
b. The role of the screening committee as advisory to the search committee. Members are prohibited from making contacts with candidates and his/her references; and
c. The form of the report of recommendations to be prepared for the search committee.

The complete files of the semi-finalist candidates will be made available to the screening committee as it prepares for the interviews. The screening committee should provide the search committee with a written evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of all of the semi-finalists it has interviewed within
24 hours of the final interview. The report shall not rank order the candidates. The chair of the search committee may choose not to accept the report if the procedures are not followed. Once the report has been made, the work of the screening committee is finished.

During the fifth and final stage, the search committee will identify three to five finalists and prepare the report to the Chancellor regarding the finalists.

4. Recommend

Following the Oregon interviews, the search committee shall recommend three to five finalists to the Chancellor. The search committee’s recommendations should be accompanied by a detailed report on the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate, especially in terms of the desired qualifications for the position. The report may include summaries of the evaluations of the campus screening committee and other individuals and groups who provided information about the candidates to the search committee. The recommendations from the search committee shall be unranked.

Campus Visit and Board Selection

When the Chancellor receives the search committee’s recommendations and report, the following events will occur:

- Times will be set for the finalists to be interviewed by the Chancellor and the Board, and for a planned visit with campus constituents.

- The campus will receive at least a five-working-day notice of the times of the campus visits of finalists.

- The Chancellor shall interview the committee’s finalists prior to release of a public announcement of the names of candidates to be interviewed by the Board. The Chancellor shall have the authority to narrow the field of candidates, but could do so only after consultation with a majority of the search committee. In no case could he/she add names to the list of finalists. The Chancellor has the authority to rank the candidates to be interviewed by the Board.
Names of the finalists will be released to the press 24 hours before they are to arrive on campus to meet with faculty, administrators, students, and interested community and alumni members.

Campus representatives will be responsible for conveying information from these meetings to the Chancellor through the campus search coordinator.

Following the Board's interviews with the finalists, the Board shall meet in executive session to rank the nominees in priority order and to direct the Chancellor to negotiate with the Board's first choice. If the first choice does not accept the Board's offer, the Chancellor shall seek further advice from the Board before contacting the second choice.

When the Chancellor has negotiated an acceptable appointment, the Board shall hold a special or regular meeting, which is open to the public, to vote on the selection of a president.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended approval of the changes to the Presidential Search Policy.

Board Discussion and Action

Chancellor Cox indicated that the Board was being asked to approve minor editorial changes in the Policy on Presidential Searches.

Ms. Christopher, who has participated in the last three presidential searches, indicated that at the conclusion of each presidential search, Board members and staff meet with members of the campus Search and Screening Committee to determine if there are changes in the policy that should be made.

“I want the Board to understand that every recommendation that comes from a prior search is shared with the next Search Committee,” Ms. Christopher added. “The policy before you today lays the foundation and it has been our experience that it is a good process. The suggestions from PSU have been included in your packets. I am not sure that you would want to include these suggestions in the policy — they are more appropriate for consideration in the timeline and procedures document that a search committee uses.
"I believe from the PSU Search Committee there was unanimous agreement that there were several things we absolutely needed to do differently. But for us to prescribe how these should be done in the next search would be inappropriate. But they do provide guidance. The one question raised in the document from PSU that you need to consider for the policy is whether to say that the ‘Board retains the ultimate (not the sole) responsibility’ for the selection of institution presidents."

The Chancellor urged the Board not to make that change. President Aschkenasy added that it is already difficult for campuses to understand the concept that the Board selects the presidents.

Ms. Christopher added that "members of the PSU Screening Committee would have preferred to be a part of the discussions that resulted in naming the finalists forwarded to the Chancellor. If the Board did not approve the entire Screening Committee being involved, then they urged at least one member of the Screening Committee be privy to the Search Committee discussions to share these confidences with the other members of the screening committee."

Mr. Willis asked Ms. Christopher her opinion of this recommendation and she indicated that it is fine in its present form. Chancellor Cox added that there is a distinct difference in function between the Screening and Search Committees. "The Screening Committee is very important because it provides a way for the rest of the Search Committee to validate their thinking and to test how they would fit in with the dynamics of the campus," the Chancellor explained.

Ms. Christopher indicated that the people who were on the Search and Screening Committees at PSU had done a remarkable job. "Our deliberative meetings were inspiring. I think the campus visit structure for the finalists needs some change. Both committees felt that they should have continued to be used in a very real way in the final visits of the candidates, and they were not. Once the Search Committee was finished, another group on the campus took over and I think there was some breakdown in the process."

Ms. Wustenberg added that it cannot be emphasized enough that any one of the candidates a search committee forwards to the Chancellor and then to the Board must be acceptable to the Committee.
"Secondly," she continued, "we must emphasize over and over that it is the Board's responsibility to chose the president, not the campus or the Search Committee. We cannot make these two points enough."

"One of the things the Governor said to the Board," Mr. Willis observed, "is that he saw his coming to the Board and laying out his agenda as a way to help to start to build a bigger picture away from institutional needs. I think that the policy we have before us is consistent with that."

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

**Background**

The Board's policy on Presidential Search Process specifies that the Board will review the position description for the president prior to beginning a search. This position description will be used as a starting point for the Search Committee and from it criteria for selection will be developed. The following draft position description has been submitted by Eastern Oregon University.

**Position Description**

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education invites applications and nominations for the position of president of Eastern Oregon University (EOU). As the Chief Executive Officer of the University, the president serves under the general directions of the Chancellor according to the policies set by the Board.

Eastern Oregon University is a four-year, multipurpose, regional university with approximately 1,800 campus and 900 off-campus students. The University serves as the educational and cultural resource of eastern Oregon and offers a variety of liberal arts and professional majors. EOU has extensive, highly successful outreach programs with 12 student service centers located throughout its region and on the campuses of other institutions. Of the degrees awarded by Eastern, 20-30 percent are to external students. Fundamental to Eastern's philosophy is that these extended programs be offered by its own core faculty. Strong on-campus programs are the base for external programs.
EOU is involved in a network of collaborative degree programs with other universities and hosts complete degree programs offered by other institutions, and is currently expanding its collaborative effort with two regional community colleges. Eastern is Oregon's pilot institution for the Western Governor's University. The University supports a major economic and community development effort and hosts state and regional agencies and organizations.

The campus is located in LaGrande, a town of about 12,000 located in the heart of the Blue Mountains of northeastern Oregon. With its four seasons, pleasant climate, and recognized quality of life, it is an area that offers excellent opportunities for outdoor recreations.

Qualifications:

1. An earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree, record of scholarship, creative work, or professional distinction, and faculty experience.

2. Demonstrated evidence of significant achievement and experience in teaching, research, and service.

3. Record of commitment to and understanding of affirmative action and equal educational and employment opportunity.

4. Demonstrated commitment to high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs and to the fundamental values upon which such programs are based — free inquiry, and the development, studying, testing, and communications of ideas and new knowledge.

5. Understanding of the unique mission of a rural, regionally-focused University.

6. Proven ability to represent the University and to interact effectively with students, faculty, staff, alumni, Board, business leaders, legislators, institution presidents, and the public in order to develop programs and relationships essential to the continued success of the University.

7. Demonstrated commitment to the importance of a student-centered environment for both campus and extended programs.
8. Demonstrated record of leadership essential for the management of an institution with a complex network of collaborative programs.

9. Demonstrated interest in the delivery of academic programs through the use of telecommunications technology.

10. Demonstrated understanding of rural issues and challenges.

11. The ability to secure external funding.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board approve the draft position description for the president of Eastern Oregon University.

Board Discussion and Action

Chancellor Cox reported that he and Dr. Thompson had visited EOU and had preliminary discussions about the desired qualifications for the next president of the institution. President Gilbert and his staff have taken the information and drafted the position description under consideration by the Board. The Chancellor called specific attention to items five, nine, and ten, which speak directly to EOU's unique mission.

Mr. Imeson observed that he worries about "absolute" qualifications, including the one that indicates that candidates should have faculty experience. "I think that will normally be the case, but I can think of circumstances, including people who have been nominated, whose experience technically could have been as a visiting professor but not real faculty experience."

There was discussion among Board members about using the term "preferred" qualifications rather than "required" qualifications. Melinda Grier, director of Legal Services for OSSHE, advised the Board that the position description could say "preferred" but the way it is currently written, they are stated as qualifications and "the Committee will use them to screen out those who do not meet them since they will not have met the minimum qualifications. If you prefer, you can make all or some of them preferred, but the Committee is going to be limited by whatever you choose."
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Ms. Grier advised that the qualifications can be weighted and the screening would be done that way.

Ms. Wustenberg moved that the staff recommendation be adopted with the addition of the word “preferred” placed before the qualifications. Ms. Christopher seconded the motion. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

Chancellor Cox observed that rarely has there been such broad-based community and campus support for an interim appointment. He recommended that the Board appoint Dr. Martha Anne Dow interim president of OIT, to become effective January 1, 1998.

Mr. Imeson moved and Mr. Willis seconded the motion to appoint Dr. Martha Anne Dow interim president. On roll call, the following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

Chancellor Cox recalled for the Board that SB 504 passed in the last Legislative session and was approved by the Governor. This bill amounted to a commitment to approach a targeted investment of engineering funds in a new and different way. “The funds allocated to this support was $5 million for the next biennium, not the $10 million that was requested in the beginning,” the Chancellor explained.

One aspect of the Bill was the appointment, by the Chancellor, of an Engineering and Technology Industry Council composed of representatives of industry statewide, with a predominance in the metropolitan and Willamette Valley area. That group, chaired by Don Van Luvianee of the AEA and ESI in Beaverton, has been working on a recommendation. The Chancellor indicated that although a great deal of work has gone into writing, reviewing, and approving a set of recommendations, they are not yet completed.

“What I can tell you at this point,” Chancellor Cox indicated, “is that there are three areas for priority. The first is a Master’s in Software Engineering. It is the first time we have had three public institutions and one private collaborate in this way. On the other end of the continuum, there is a serious industry concern for technology and technician education and the Industry Council will recommend that there be funding to advance the OPT for Co-Op effort at OIT and
expand technician education at the community college level to some extent, particularly in the Portland area. The Council has also moved to address the need for graduate professional and continuing education, again particularly in the metropolitan area.

"I would request that I have a few days in which to review the proposals and have them ready by Tuesday. Further, I would ask that the Board empower the Executive Committee to meet next week to act on the recommendations so that we can be prepared to deliver the appropriate documents to the Department of Administrative Services by noon on Monday, October 27.

Mr. Imeson moved and Mr. Willis seconded the motion to authorize the Executive Committee to act for the Board on the recommendations of the Engineering and Technology Industry Council. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

**Background**

Under the current Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) provisions, ORP investment companies are required to return contributions to OSSHE when a participant fails to designate specific investment vehicles. Securities Exchange Commission regulations permit investment companies to hold funds for only 90 days before investing them according to participant directions. When the funds are returned to OSSHE, they must be put in a forfeiture account where earnings must be calculated separately for each participant’s fund. This requires extensive staff work.

Since the inception of the ORP, campus benefits officers have expended considerable time with ORP participants to complete the application process and designate specific investment vehicles. New enrollees continue to fail to designate specific investment vehicles. A number of participants’ contributions to the ORP are in excess of the 90-day holding limit and require action by OSSHE.

After a review of available alternatives, the Retirement Committee, established by the Plan, has developed means to correct this problem, requiring a Plan amendment and resulting in regular notice to participants who have not designated a specific investment vehicle. As proposed in the amendment, the funds of a participant who fails to designate a specific fund vehicle within 90 days of the initial
employer contribution will be directed to a fixed income account offered by the participant’s designated Fund Sponsor. In addition to the communications to participants from OSSHE regarding the need to designate a specific investment vehicle, participants will receive account statements from the Fund Sponsor indicating that the participant’s investment is in a fixed income account. Additionally, the Plan amendment will allow OSSHE to meet federal requirements without undue administrative costs.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended that Section 4.2 of the Optional Retirement Plan be amended as follows:

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

4.2 Funding Vehicles

Participant Accounts shall be invested in one or more Funding Vehicles selected by the Participant.

If a Participant does not, within 90 days of the initial Employer contribution, notify the Fund Sponsor, in a manner designated by the Fund Sponsor, of his or her Funding Vehicle selection, the Fund Sponsor shall [return the contributions made on behalf of the Participant to the Employer until such time as the Fund Sponsor is successful in obtaining a valid written selection from the Participant] invest, at the direction of the Plan, the contributions made on behalf of the Participant in a fixed income account. Neither the Employer, the Board, the Retirement Committee, nor the Trustee will be liable for the selection or the investment results of any Fund Sponsor or Funding Vehicle.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Anslow reminded the Board that it had approved an Optional Retirement Plan. The item under consideration now is to amend the plan to allow for a default procedure if a participant did not declare what they wanted to do with their investments. As the Plan is currently written, the funds would come back to OSSHE and the proposal is to have these funds returned to a fixed account. This would avoid the necessity of OSSHE setting up an individual account.
Mr. Imeson moved and Ms. McAllister seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister Puentes, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

OSSHE TECHNOLOGY PROJECT

Staff Report to the Board

Overview

In the last two years, OSSHE's basic backbone network for a major portion of information and telecommunications services (called NERO) has changed from an engineering research enterprise to an important utility serving several Oregon organizations and purposes. Its continuance is threatened due to lack of funding. This recent development, along with rapid advancements toward the second generation of a national electronic system, provide the impetus to approach the Emergency Board in November for funding the first of three segments to stabilize and advance this statewide communications and educational delivery structure. The three funding segments include:

1) Oregon Wide-Area Network (OWEN)
2) State Workforce Training/Educational Opportunity
3) Improved Infrastructure for Technology Delivery Systems

These critical needs are driven by several considerations:

- Oregon's technology program implementation efforts need to be focused. Oregon's universities, including Oregon Health Sciences University and private research institutes, could take on this responsibility in order to serve the needs of the many public and private constituencies in the state. A set of actions and implementations should occur now, and not wait until the year 2000 or beyond.

- NERO, which was formed and funded via federal research grants, has been instrumental in forging together Oregon's networks, including the Department of Administrative Services (OR-Net), the Oregon Public Education Network (OPEN), and the Oregon State System of Higher Education, into a new partnership informally called OWEN (Charts I-A, B, and C -- all
charts referred to are on file in the Board's office). The federal
grant funds which supported NERO ended last year, and an
infusion of funds to stabilize and move forward with OWEN is
needed.

• In order to provide expanded access to learning programs in
K-12, the community colleges, and to remote parts of the state,
technological infrastructure and courseware must be de vel oped and in place.

• At the national level, federal funding proposals are under
consideration for the development of Internet2 (Chart II), which
will be a high-speed, broadband, national network initially
limited to 15 to 20 research university sites and which will form
eventually the basis of the next generation of applications for
major research, teaching, learning, and innovation. The
Internet2 consortium consists of 100+ top research univer s i ties, including, as charter members, Oregon State University
and the University of Oregon. An early market entry oppor t unity exists for those states which serve as the original connect ing points for the second generation of the national electronic
highway.

If this current effort to increase funding for technological advancement
fails to gain support, the individual campuses will improvise where
possible. In reality, however, this opportunity to come together and
advance communications development to serve public and private
needs in all regions of Oregon will be postponed until some future
economic crisis or major service failure prompts action. In this event,
the state will have missed a narrow window of opportunity for
Internet2 connection, with its prospective economic benefits.

The Information Technology Revolution

In recent years, electronic communications have become increasingly
important to all sectors of American life, including higher education
services. New digital technologies are changing the way instruction
and research are conducted and have become indispensable tools for
teaching, learning, and scholarship in most disciplines. Over the past
decade, the network development partnership among federal
government, R&D agencies, the university community, and private
industry has contributed to the creation of a whole new economy
surrounding the Internet.
Further advancements in these network technologies will allow the United States to sustain its leadership in research and technology transfer, educational opportunity, medical care, and quality of life. Yet, the Internet revolution is only in its adolescence.

Continued investment in both basic and applied research in networking is vital if this technology is to meet the expanding information and communications needs of 21st century American society. Stated briefly, the "one size fits all" Internet currently operating must be overhauled to support a greater range and variety of entertainment, commercial, research, and educational uses. Both "low end" and "high end" services are needed and should be available in the marketplace with prices and costs that are appropriate to the intended uses.

Internet2/Next Generation Internet (NGI)

The Internet2 effort will bring focus, energy, and federal, state, and private resources to the next level of development. The project will establish a prototype of the next generation Internet and use the prototype environment to develop a new family of advanced applications to meet emerging requirements in research, teaching, and learning.

First and foremost, Internet2 creates and sustains a leading edge network capability for the national research community. Secondly, Internet2 directs network development efforts to enable a new generation of applications to exploit fully the capabilities of broadband networks, media integration, interactivity, and real-time collaboration, to name a few. This effort is considered essential to distance education, life-long learning, and related projects.

Within a year, the Internet2 project has grown to include more than 100 research universities and is now concentrating on detailed engineering of the prototype network facilities and of the applications development environment. Initial operations are expected in the latter part of 1997. This means that important determinations about the primary participants in the Internet2 project are occurring now.

Major Internet2 hub sites will be called gigapops. Each high-capacity (giga) point of presence (pop) will be an integral part of the Internet2 backbone. The key characteristics are:
Only gigapops will have direct access to Internet2 facilities; other entities will access them by passing through the gigapop.

Only a small number of universities will be selected as initial sites.

To be eligible, a university must be a vBNS (very high speed Backbone Network Service) site.

Portland would be the most logical site for Oregon's gigapop (Chart III).

In February 1997, President Clinton announced the administration's Next Generation Internet initiative and stated three goals:

1) Connect universities and national labs with high-speed networks 100 to 1,000 times faster than today's Internet.

2) Promote experimentation with the next generation of networking technologies.

3) Demonstrate new applications that meet important national goals and missions: Higher speed, more advanced networks will enable a new generation of applications that support scientific research, national security, distance education, transportation, environmental monitoring, and health care.

The fiscal year 1998 federal budget proposes support for technologies that ensure America benefits from the revolution in information technology. Investments in computing and communications R&D are increased to $1.1 billion, including a three-year, $300 million Next Generation Internet initiative.

Oregon's Participation

High-speed, high bandwidth networks for delivery of integrated voice, data, and video technologies in the 1990s have created a dynamic worldwide learning environment. The "university without walls" concept is becoming a reality. Information technology and various distance education scenarios have opened up higher education access to rural America, physically challenged citizens, working single heads of households, and a growing population of life-long learners. In the past five years, one of the most significant changes in higher education instructional delivery nationally and in Oregon has involved
modification of traditional courses using technology with a goal of actively engaging students in learning, enhancing student/faculty interaction and communication, and extending campus boundaries and courses to under-served populations throughout the state. All the campuses of the Oregon State System of Higher Education have developed, in some form, new courseware offerings which incorporate the use of multimedia, the Internet, and various distance education technologies. However, these course offerings are limited, and there is no overall shared electronic curriculum being developed as a statewide resource for OSSHE institutions and the community college system.

The Perspective from Outside: Industry, States, and Private Education

At the same time, Oregon's high technology and electronics industry is in dire need of a well-trained workforce, to the point of identifying the lack of technology education programs as the "Achilles Heel of Oregon." The Oregon Technology Benchmarks Conference in a report on the state of the high-tech industry, observed that "workforce availability remains a critical challenge to sustain growth" and "the shortage of qualified employees is driving up operating costs." The report states, "it is apparent that the industry needs to continue to work closely with K-12 and higher education to improve the flow of workers into this high-paying industry."

Private, for-profit organizations are providing higher education services nationwide through distance education technology, including online courseware. For example, the University of Phoenix offers graduate and undergraduate degree programs to working professionals around the West. Duke, Cornell, Harvard, Stanford, California State, the Big Ten, and other institutions are mounting similar programs. In contrast, Oregon's public universities are offering only a sampling of undergraduate and graduate degree programs via distance education or the Internet.

Other states have invested substantially in computer networking, courseware development, and infrastructure, with the notable standouts being North Carolina ($170 million) and Washington ($52 million). In Oregon, however, technology investments within higher education have been funded substantially, if not primarily, by students. The student investment in technology enhancements exceeds $14 million per biennium.
PROPOSAL SPECIFICS:

A statewide, multi-agency, multi-purpose Telecommunications Project

Priority 1:

OWEN - Oregon Wide-Area Network
(NERO - New Directions)
$3 million

Priority 1(a); $1.5 million: Maintain existing OWEN implementation of high-speed, high capacity communications connections among the OWEN participants and to the Internet. The current configuration allows aggregation of demand and consolidation of management which is very cost-effective for the state's participants.

Priority 1(b); $1.0 million: Extend similar "last-mile" connections to additional Distance Learning Centers. Under-served rural and urban areas will have greatly improved potential for employment training and economic development.

Priority 1(c); $500,000: Design, develop, and implement advanced network technologies such as Internet2 and very high speed Backbone Network Services (vBNS) under the sponsorship of OWEN. These technologies will position Oregon to compete for federal research grants and develop commercial and technological investment opportunities.

Background

This proposal provides additional funding necessary for the telecommunications circuits, engineering support and operation, coordination, and basic infrastructure for the following partners in the Oregon Wide Area Network (OWEN): OPEN (Oregon Public Education Network), which serves all the K-12 Educational Service Districts in Oregon; the Oregon Department of Administrative Services; the Oregon Health Sciences University; along with all seven campuses of the Oregon State System of Higher Education. An invitation has been extended to Oregon's community colleges to join the partnership. Additional funding is needed to replace monies previously provided through the federal grants which established NERO. Those grants have now expired. The biennial Baseline Budget for continuance of NERO/OWEN operations, Priority 1(a), would be as follows:
Expense Budget

Staff 4.75 FTE  $620,000
Equipment: network & workstations 180,000
Services & supplies (including travel) 250,000
Communications circuits 1,200,000
ED-NET baseline (MOU with DAS) 310,000

Total Biennial Expenses  $2,560,000

Revenue Available
OSSHE administrative computing  $420,000
Chan Ofc - special support  200,000
DAS  100,000
OPEN  300,000

Total Current Biennial Revenues ($1,020,000)

Priority 1(a): Unfunded;
Request for State Support  $1,540,000

National and statewide alliances are essential if Oregon is to establish
stronger technology industry partnerships, to continue needed federal
research collaboration and extension services, and to provide cost-
effective aggregation of communications services.

Priority 1(b); $1.0 million — Rural Populations

This proposal provides a higher speed connection to the Eastern
Oregon University campus in La Grande and provisions to implement
a "last mile" high quality connectivity for rural Distance Education
Centers to provide better access for students in OSSHE programs
such as masters programs in education, physical sciences, nursing,
and social work as well as a wide range of undergraduate programs.
Possible locations for enhancing and initiating Distance Education
Centers which could be connected under this approach include:

Eastern Oregon:
* Baker City
* Burns
* Ontario
* Pendleton
** John Day
** La Grande
** Milton-Freewater
** The Dalles
Coast:
  * Astoria
  * Newport - Hatfield Center
  ** Brookings
  ** Coos Bay/Charleston - OIMB, SWOCC

Valley:
  * Corvallis - OSU
  * Eugene - UO
  * Portland - PSU, OHSU, OGI
  * Salem - DAS

Central Oregon:
  * Pine Mountain Observatory
  * St. Charles Medical Center
  ** Bend - COCC

Southern Oregon:
  * Ashland
  * Klamath Falls - OIT
  * Medford
  ** Grants Pass

* = Existing under NERO
** = New areas not now served

Under-served Urban Populations

As with rural Oregon, there are several Portland metropolitan educational areas which could benefit greatly from having access to high-speed data connectivity for interactive educational data and video applications. Partnerships between PSU and the Northeast Portland schools, the Washington County Public School System, Clackamas Community College, Mt. Hood Community College, and the OIT Metro Center, among others, need "last mile" high-speed data and video connectivity to support instructional delivery, student advising, teacher training, and to provide access to a range of adult continuing education and non-degree professional development training options.

Priority 1(c): $500,000 — Advance Network Technologies

This proposal includes the installation of an additional vBNS site under the sponsorship of OWEN. It enhances use of high-capacity
communications services in Oregon, such as frame relay, ATM, and SONET, and provides seed money and the impetus to enable Internet2, vBNS, and gigapop design and development, which is required for Oregon to participate. OWEN provides consolidated Internet connectivity and inter-partner electronic communications in an extremely cost-effective manner. By consolidating network capabilities, this design allows advanced computing and networking capabilities to be made available to many users throughout Oregon.

This additional installation provides a variety of research activities and instructional delivery services which would not be possible, or would be very limited, without this high-capacity communications environment, including:
- High-performance computing in physics, electrical engineering, computer science, etc.
- Northwest Alliance for Computational Science and Engineering (NACSE) participation
- Interactive video communications for instruction and research
- Multi-media based instruction
- Web-based instruction research -- access and courseware distribution techniques
- Remote access to very large databases
- Access to and control of telescopes, robots, biomedical research
- Parallel Tools Consortium
- Mobile computing research -- continuous wireless network access
- Visualization research -- oceanography, forestry, atomic structure, map-based fields
- Digital library and multi-media access and search techniques

Priority 2:

Workforce Training / Educational Opportunity
$1.0 Million
Electronic Curriculum and Courseware Development

This proposal defines the critical resources necessary to develop a statewide, content rich, multidiscipline electronic curriculum which would include courseware in the liberal arts and sciences, business, engineering, education, urban/public affairs, social sciences, architecture, and accelerated degree completion programs to be shared among all institutions. Of the requested $1 million, $600,000 would be earmarked for faculty training and development, including
support services to faculty in the course redesign process; $400,000 would be designated to fund 40-60 new and existing courses (depending on course complexity) which will be accessible electronically to students and faculty throughout Oregon.

During 1996-97, a total of 257 courses were delivered by a variety of technologies such as EdNet to over 3,360 distance learning students from Coos Bay to Ontario. Much growth has occurred in Bend as well as southern and eastern Oregon. With additional courses and delivery modes accessible on a statewide basis, the number of students served in the state could triple over a five-year period.

Priority 3:

Improved Infrastructure
$470,000 Per Annum Debt Service (FY 1998-99)
($3.2 Million Certificates of Participation)

This proposal makes necessary investments in upgrading campus backbone network equipment and infrastructure to leverage the emerging networked based resources and more fully support teaching, research, and public service efforts requiring quality of service from the OWEN network.

The seven OSSHE institutions are only marginally prepared to meet high technology classroom teaching protocols. Every campus should modify a few traditional classrooms for distance education delivery. The proposal targets renovation and upgrade of 13 lecture halls in OSSHE into high technology electronic classrooms with multimedia resources, Internet access, and distance education send/receive capacity. The cost estimate per classroom is $250,000, totaling $3.2 million for 13 classrooms.

OSSHE proposes to finance this portion of the proposal by issuance of short-term (seven-year) tax-exempt Certificates of Participation (COPs). With issuance of $3.2 million in FY 1997-98, OSSHE is requesting state funds of $470,000 per year ($940,000 per biennium) to pay debt service starting in FY 1998-99.

Benefits to Oregon

The advantages of a statewide engineered network include an aggregation of demand for buying telecommunications circuits, routing of data traffic regionally in an efficient manner, and gaining
efficiencies of scale in sending and receiving information to and from the global Internet. OWEN is Oregon's educational and state government internet provider. The level of connectivity now enjoyed by Oregon's educational institutions is as important to these OWEN partners as are other utilities such as water, sewer, and electricity.

In addition, the "network of networks" extends access to rural, sometimes remote, areas and increases Oregonian's access to experts and consultants in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, business and economics, specialized facilities such as state libraries, museums, laboratories; state training and education programs; and national education resources. OWEN will also serve as the impetus for accelerated deployment of remote access services. In Oregon, such applications could be utilized by state agencies, such as Corrections, Military Affairs, or the Department of Transportation to conduct agency business.

This investment is critical to the continued participation of Oregon schools in Internet2 and Next Generation Internet planning at the federal level. This network represents the next step for Oregon, incorporating the newest developing technologies into a delivery design reminiscent of the original Oregon Education Network and NorthWest Net. This is a once in a decade opportunity. The State missed the last opportunity when NorthWest Net originated in Oregon in 1984 but due to lack of funds was sold to the Northwest Academic Computing Consortium (NWACC) at University of Washington. Between 1985 and 1995, NorthWest Net served as one of the eight hubs for the emerging Internet1. In 1995, with the privatization of NSFnet (the Internet) NorthWest Net was sold, resulting in millions of dollars and thousands of high-paying jobs for Washington. The presence of NorthWest Net during the critical years of Internet development contributed to Washington's rapid economic and technical growth. The same can happen in the Silicon Forest of Oregon, with visionary action by state government in supporting OWEN.

In conclusion, this proposal has significant policy implications for Oregon. It allows us to achieve three state goals:

1) Enhance public services to the state by improving regional access.

2) Capitalize on potential federal matching money, to fuel the continued growth of Oregon's high technology industry.
3) Improve access to education by Oregonians by matching investments made by Oregon students in technology, which strengthens state government’s commitment to contain the price of education.

As Oregon meets the challenge of designing and implementing ways to integrate technology into our daily lives, we must at the same time, plan and prepare for future technological changes that are not yet clear. Just as higher education was instrumental in the beginning of the information revolution, it can and should continue to be a pivotal partner in its evolution.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board approve the overall proposal for funding of a statewide, multi-agency, multi-purpose Information and Telecommunications Project and authorize the Chancellor to present these funding proposals, following the listed priority order, to the various governing groups, including the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management Technology (JLC-IMT) and the Emergency Board of the Legislature, for the development of networking, workforce training/educational opportunity, and infrastructure in the state of Oregon.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Anslow reviewed the statewide information and telecommunications project presented for Board approval to enable the Chancellor to present it to the Emergency Board and other governmental boards involved in considering amendments during this budget cycle.

"The reason for the emergency on this proposal," Mr. Anslow explained, "is to fund what has been known as NERO, which was funded several years ago under the leadership of Vice Chancellor John Owen. The project began as an engineering experiment at OSU and eventually, in the last 16-24 months, moved out to become more of a utility. This utility serves organizations including the Department of Administrative Services, OSSHE administrative services, and is reaching out to the K-12 OPEN program."
"There has been a shift from experimental research funded essentially by NASA and other federal grants. These grants have diminished or have been discontinued and the program now is bigger than it was before and is becoming increasingly important."

Mr. Anslow highlighted that another important need is to bring focus to all telecommunications and telecom projects and, perhaps, energy to it by organizing other working partners — the Governor’s core group, Department of Administrative Services (DAS), and perhaps the community colleges. “So, we are trying to both stabilize the current NERO project, move it to what has been called OWEN, and connect with national efforts," Mr. Anslow explained.

The Chancellor and the vice chancellors have had numerous conversations with DAS and a partnership has developed at the technical level. Mr. Anslow indicated that there is a "glimmer of hope that if this proposal is forwarded to the Emergency Board in November some aspects might be funded. DAS appears willing to work with OSSHE to forward the plan."

Chancellor Cox added that there is understanding that OSSHE might not be successful in this Emergency Board cycle, but part of the rationale for moving forward is to raise awareness in Oregon about what must be done to move in this arena. If there isn’t adequate funding, OWEN will have to be shut down since the bills can no longer be paid.

Mr. Willis asked what the competition was in these fields and the odds that Portland might be selected as a site. Mr. Anslow responded that "the competition is heavy. The University of Washington has a good base, and there are multiple sites in California. The competition is fierce, but unless we put this proposal forward, we will have to move to Berkeley individually."

President Aschkenasy added that "this is clearly an important activity but as Mr. Anslow has pointed out there is a lottery coming up that costs $3 million to buy a ticket. What is the cost if we win?"

Mr. Anslow observed, "In my terms, 10-15 years from now, if history repeats itself, 30-50,000 high paying jobs in new industries we haven’t thought of yet.

"What we are asking the Board to approve today is the staff recommendation authorizing the Chancellor to present these funding
proposals within the listed priorities to the various governing groups. Under the new rules, there is a joint Legislative Committee on Information Management Technology and we will be meeting with the forum that has been energized by the Governor, and then the Emergency Board. My advice from DAS has been to concentrate on the first $3 million, although we do have a commitment to present the entire proposal."

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

B.A./B.S. IN WOMEN'S STUDIES; REVISE CERTIFICATE PROGRAM, PSU

Introduction

Portland State University requested authorization to offer the baccalaureate degree in Women's Studies, effective fall 1997, which will replace the existing undergraduate certificate program. The certificate program would remain in place at the post-baccalaureate level.

PSU has offered a program in women's studies for 20 years. Student demand continues to increase, and a major in women's studies will allow students to concentrate their undergraduate work to an extent not possible with a certificate. PSU expects a significant proportion of these students will pursue a double major (women's studies and a traditional discipline). The unique mix of faculty specialties and community opportunities provides rich internship and practicum experiences for the students. Current resources are sufficient to support this program.

The academic field of women's studies emerged in the late '60s and early '70s and continues to be a stable, vibrant field. According to the National Women's Studies Association's most recent Directory of Women's Studies Programs (1990), there were 621 programs in the U.S., 187 of which led to a bachelor's degree. Originally, women's studies focused on the re-examination of scholarly work across the disciplines, identifying omissions related to women. While this effort to integrate women's experiences 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. Women's studies includes the analysis of the economic status of women and the effect of institutional structures and policies on women's class position.

Employment prospects and graduate/professional school opportunities are good for graduates of this program. As outlined in more detail in the background paper (September 1997 Board docket), graduates of similar programs are successfully employed in a wide variety of fields, including journalism, business, education, medicine, social service provision, public administration, and law.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

The Board-approved mission (1991) states that PSU is to provide access "to a quality liberal education for undergraduates...especially relevant to the metropolitan area." Community service is emphasized in PSU's mission.

The proposed program aligns with PSU's mission on both counts. An undergraduate education in women's studies is a relevant liberal education, providing a foundation for lifelong learning. In addition to refining critical thinking skills and gaining a broad general knowledge base, students will develop an appreciation of the impact of gender on culture, institutions, social relationships, and personal experience, and learn to integrate that knowledge in real-life settings. Numerous community agencies and organizations benefit from the involvement of women's studies faculty and students, and many of these relationships date back more than a decade.

2. Evidence of Need

Student Interest. Enrollment in women's studies courses has almost tripled over the past five years. An average of 15 students annually have graduated with certificates, and many of them would have preferred to major in women's studies. A survey of students enrolled in two core courses and one women's studies elective course found that more than 50 percent would "definitely" major and another 23 percent would
"consider" majoring if a baccalaureate degree was available. PSU expects to graduate 10 to 15 students per year in the first few years and to graduate at least 20 to 25 students annually by the end of five years.

Portland Community College also offers lower division women's studies courses. Transfer students may apply those lower division credits toward their major requirements at PSU.

Regional, Statewide, and National Need. The PSU women's studies program has long-standing relationships with many governmental and nonprofit organizations that utilize students and graduates in their service delivery and community education work. Some of these organizations are: Healthy Start, All-Women's Health Services, Multnomah County Community Action Agency, and the Oregon Commission on Women. The population in Oregon (and in the Portland metro area particularly) is increasing, and it's anticipated that the fastest-growing jobs will be in the areas of health, education, and social services. While women's studies is not a vocational program, many students do find employment in these areas, utilizing skills developed both through their formal education and through their internships and community-based learning experiences.

Discussions regarding the U.S. workforce of the future signal rapid changes in character (i.e., diversity in terms of gender, race, and culture) and shifting lifetime employment patterns. Attention to gender and multicultural issues are central aspects of the women's studies curriculum and will prepare students especially well to work in numerous career settings.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

Core Program

The proposed core program will be structured to provide a multidisciplinary core curriculum, experiential learning opportunities, and individualized courses of study.

Core Curriculum. Emphasis in the core program will be on the development of critical thinking skills and an appreciation for the range of theoretical frameworks and methodologies present in contemporary feminist scholarship. Courses will
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incorporate the diversity of women’s experience with attention to race, class, and sexual orientation, as well as gender. The required core program will be 32 credits: 24 classroom hours and 8 hours in experiential learning (i.e., practicum, internship). Only two new courses (Gender and Critical Inquiry, 4 credits; Experiential Learning Seminar, 1 credit) will need to be developed. Examples of existing courses within the core program include:

- Women and Gender in America — two courses that cover the economic, political, and social experience and influence of American women from the colonial era to the present.
- History of Feminism in the U.S. — focuses on the shaping of modern feminism as a diverse body of questions, ideas, and experiments in American life. Themes include political equality, the emergence of sexual politics, issues of race and difference, women workers and class conflict, the civil rights movement and gender struggles, and feminist internationalism.
- Feminist Analysis — draws on examples of the interpretive frameworks and research strategies utilized in contemporary feminist scholarship. Students will be introduced to a range of theoretical and methodological approaches while learning to identify the choices that scholars make in carrying out their work.

Practica/Internships. An integral part of the core program is the experiential learning requirement. The women’s studies program has long been committed to building lasting collaborative partnerships with community agencies, and these experiences provide valuable services, assisting agencies in reaching their community goals. Often these student experiences are stepping stones to careers. The proposed degree program will increase the proportion of women’s studies graduates who find employment directly through their undergraduate education.

In 1996-97 alone, student internships and practica reached across many areas such as:
- grief counseling at the Mother Oaks Child Center for Healing;
- crisis intervention with Portland Women’s Crisis Line;
- community education with Oregon Housing Now, and;
- mentoring with the Insights Teen Parenting Program.
Individual Program. For the individual component of the proposed program, students (in consultation with their women's studies advisor) will design an emphasis based either in a discipline or in a theme that crosses disciplines. A discipline-based emphasis will consist of five courses (20 credits) in a department or program outside women's studies — two of which will familiarize students with that discipline's materials and approaches and three of which are to be either cross-listed with women's studies or approved by the women's studies advisor in their discipline. A theme-based emphasis will consist of five courses that together form a coherent multi-disciplinary approach to a subject. All of the courses are to be cross-listed with women's studies or approved by the student's women's studies advisor. At least one course in either type of emphasis must be writing intensive.

Senior Capstones

In their senior year and in fulfillment of PSU's general education requirement, women's studies students participate in interdisciplinary capstone courses, which specifically address many of the Oregon Benchmarks as identified by the Oregon Progress Board. One example is the partnership with Healthy Start (HS) of Clackamas County. Created to help county families meet the increasingly difficult demands of parenting and in response to the Oregon Benchmarks, this agency (as well as the state) needs data about how well they are reaching the benchmarks. In the past, PSU women's studies students have (1) evaluated client satisfaction with the HS program and (2) assessed the knowledge of local policymakers (i.e., mayors and council members) about family issues in their area. The results of their work have been used in program planning, outreach, and state-level administration. Future planned projects with HS include evaluation of its family-support worker program and development of a children's health program.

Capstone opportunities during the 1997-98 academic year include:
• a collaborative research project with Steps to Success, a welfare-to-work program in North Portland;
• work with the Portland YWCA as part of an interdisciplinary research team to explore the relationship of the YWCA to the city's changing social, demographic, and economic environment; and,
working with the Northwest Portland Indian Health Board. Students will be expected to (1) assess the prevalence of breast and cervical cancer among Native American women in Oregon, (2) identify barriers to screening and treatment, and (3) design programs to reach and screen underserved and at-risk women.

Faculty

Two current tenure-track faculty will be primarily responsible for the core program. One professor, who has served as the PSU Women’s Studies Coordinator since 1982, has administered the program, developed the curriculum, and established and maintained working relationships with other departments and programs, as well as community organizations. She has published in women’s studies journals, and several of her articles have been reprinted in collections used for undergraduate and graduate courses. The other faculty member will be responsible for the three-course core U.S. women’s history sequence. A 1993 graduate of Princeton University with a Ph.D. in history, she has developed courses in U.S. women’s history and is currently finishing a book.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. No new faculty will be required for the proposed program. Currently, 30 tenure-track faculty teach electives in women’s studies. In past years, resources to “buy out” faculty time from their home departments or to hire adjuncts have been contributed on an ad hoc basis by the dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. These monies, sufficient to cover four sections per year, will be moved in order to regularize their availability to the program.

Staff. No new staff are required for the program. PSU expects the number of students in the program to remain fairly stable in the early years since current students seeking a certificate will be shifted over to the major. Additional students who may be attracted to the program will not be in such large numbers in the first four years that they cannot be served through existing staff resources.

Library, Facilities, and Equipment. The field of women’s studies is well-supported by the PSU Library. Because the
certificate program has been in place for more than 20 years, appropriate books and journals have been purchased regularly. In addition, the multidisciplinary aspect of the field means that resources from other disciplines may also support women's studies, consequently providing greater overall strength in library resources for the program.

The program currently has sufficient facilities and equipment to support the major. No other facilities or equipment needs are anticipated.

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 Portland State University to establish a program leading to the B.A. or B.S. in Women's Studies and to revise the existing certificate program to be post-baccalaureate only, effective fall term 1997, with a follow-up review of the program to be conducted by the OSSHE Office of Academic Affairs in the 2002-03 academic year. The proposal would be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the November Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Clark reminded Board members that they had received a briefing paper in September on the history of the field of women's studies. The program, as proposed, will be ready for implementation in a few months.

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

B.A./B.S. IN ETHNIC STUDIES, UO

Introduction

The University of Oregon requested authorization to offer a program in Ethnic Studies leading to a baccalaureate degree, effective fall 1997. The preproposal was presented to the Board in April 1997. In
addition, the Board received a background paper in September covering the history, scope, and outcomes and employment oppor-
tunities for graduates of ethnic studies programs in other U.S. colleges and universities.

UO's proposed ethnic studies program is interdisciplinary and is devoted to the investigation of the social, cultural, and historical construction and experience of ethnicity for the four systematically underrepresented groups in the U.S. (African Americans, Asian Americans, Latina/o Americans, and Native Americans). As an element of American identity that cuts across disciplinary categories, ethnicity requires a mode of study that draws on the humanities and the social sciences, as well as fields such as cultural studies. Moreover, ethnicity must be addressed both historically and comparatively. In that spirit, the participating faculty of the program is an open roster of scholars committed to giving students a wide range of approaches to this challenging topic.

The UO program is designed to be comparative rather than ethnic specific. Among the program's goals are "to convey knowledge and understanding of ethnicity in the United States and to help students learn their opportunities and responsibilities as citizens in an increasingly multicultural nation." Students who major in ethnic studies will be encouraged to complete the requirements for a minor in another designated field. This secondary focus would enable students to combine substantial work in an area of traditional academic specialization with the major's emphasis on cross-cultural knowledge. Three new full-time faculty will be needed for full implementation of this program. One, hired in the first year, would also serve as program director. The other two faculty members would be hired the second year.

All course offerings are in place with the exception of some 200-level courses that would need to be developed. The College of Arts and Sciences and the Provost's office have committed resources to support the program.

**Staff Analysis**

1. **Relationship to Mission**

   The University of Oregon's mission, approved by the Board in September, stresses its commitment to providing quality undergraduate liberal arts education, to diversity, and to the
"development of a faculty and student body that are capable of participating effectively in a global society." The proposed major will provide a locus through which these goals can be realized. Ethnic studies has been described by the University of Colorado, Boulder, as a "broad liberal arts education for the 21st century." Such a program acknowledges the diverse composition of the country and the increasing need for citizens who understand and are sensitive to the issues inherent in a pluralistic society.

The UO needs to participate in the ongoing national discussion of issues related to race, ethnicity, and race relations. A long-term goal is to use the proposed major to attract and hire scholars of national stature in ethnicity. The presence of such scholars will further the UO's commitment to guide positive change in Oregon and the nation.

2. Evidence of Need

Workforce Need. The September background paper on ethnic studies described the growing racial and ethnic pluralism in the U.S. generally, and in the workforce specifically. Regardless of the nature of the business or profession, workers will need to be knowledgeable and skilled in communicating with a broad range of people. A degree in ethnic studies can provide that foundational understanding. Well-established programs of ethnic studies in other colleges and universities report positive outcomes for their students who earn degrees in ethnic studies. Graduates report finding employment in such areas as education, social services, public policy, community organizations, business, medicine, and law.

Institutional Need. There is broad student support of and demand for an ethnic studies major at the University. The Associated Students of the University of Oregon have made the creation of an ethnic studies major one of their chief priorities. Overall student support at the University crosses racial and ethnic boundaries. And, if the enrollment patterns of other institutions hold true for the UO, European Americans will constitute at least 50 percent of the students in ethnic studies classes.

It should be noted that currently, all UO students must complete two courses (six-credit minimum) to meet the Multicultural
Requirement for a baccalaureate degree. This requirement has been an important step toward addressing the need for the University to diversify its curriculum. The proposed program would strengthen those offerings.

Community Need. The proposed program has received community support from such groups and organizations as:
- the nine federally recognized Tribes in Oregon;
- the Centro Latino Americano; and
- the Eugene-Springfield Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

3. Quality of the Proposed Program

Curriculum. The core curriculum includes the following:
- Introduction to Ethnic Studies (8 credits) — designed to introduce majors to the fundamental issues confronting the four major underrepresented ethnic groups in the U.S. Topics may include the construction of group identities, the patterns of migration, and the strategies of resistance.
- Two courses that concentrate on the social, historical, and/or cultural experience of a specific group (e.g., Introduction to the Native American Experience).

In addition, a core of other ethnic studies and approved cross-listed courses, and a capstone seminar are required. Students have the option of an honors track, as well.

The proposed program is interdisciplinary both in the core curriculum and faculty. Currently, participating faculty are from comparative literature, English, history, international studies, law, and theater arts. Furthermore, courses related to and supportive of the ethnic studies core curriculum are offered through most departments and programs in the College of Arts and Sciences and participating professional schools. Collectively, the core and support courses constitute a coherent program of study.

Faculty. The proposed ethnic studies program is committed to maintaining the highest standards of scholarship. All of the core faculty hold doctorates in their home disciplines, and each brings to the program innovative scholarship and methodologies, as well as years of experience in pedagogical and
curricular matters related to ethnic studies. Current faculty will provide about 75 percent of the coursework for ethnic studies. New courses with specific focus on ethnic diversity are being created across the University as new faculty are hired, and faculty in traditional disciplines have begun to do research in affiliated areas (e.g., cultural studies, post-colonial studies, comparative culture studies). The core faculty in the ethnic studies program will be responsible for advising students of the offerings available from term to term, since these offerings change as faculty in various colleges add new courses and revise existing ones.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. It is anticipated that three full-time faculty will be required to fully establish the program, one of whom will be program director. The University had intended for the new program director to be in place by fall 1997. However, that search has had to be re-opened because the first applicant pool was too small. The budget assumes that the faculty member will have a nine-month appointment and will be paid a stipend. The other two faculty members will be at the assistant professor rank, have nine-month appointments, and will be hired in the second year of the program.

This program is a high priority for the University. The new faculty lines will be lodged in existing disciplinary departments, with dedicated responsibilities in ethnic studies. Money has been committed jointly from both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Provost's office. Some reallocation has already occurred, with funds being committed to pay for the adjuncts, graduate students, departmental faculty, and classified staff that support the ethnic studies curriculum at its current level.

Library, Facilities, and Equipment. Currently, the UO library has approximately 17,000 titles directly related to ethnic studies materials. Moreover, the library subscribes to 7 of the 14 leading journals focusing on multicultural interests or ethnicity and 32 of the 68 ethnic studies scholarly journals and publications of general interest. The greatest area of weakness is the library's holding of ethnic newspapers (7 of 126 titles). An estimated $5,000 to $7,000 would be needed to acquire the relevant books, journals, and newspapers.
The current office space has been designated as temporary. Remodeling plans have been submitted to the Physical Plant in the event that ethnic studies is permanently assigned to that location. If so, two additional offices, with furniture and equipment, would be required. Remodeling and equipment expenses would be met through normal budgeting processes.

No federal funds or other grants are required to launch the proposed program. However, it is anticipated that the program director would engage in actively seeking supporting funds for research and scholarships.

**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 the University of Oregon to establish a program leading to the B.A. or B.S. in Ethnic Studies effective fall term 1997, with a follow-up review of the program to be conducted by the OSSHE Office of Academic Affairs in the 2002-03 academic year. The proposal would be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the November Board meeting.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Vice Chancellor Clark observed that the Board had received a background paper on the status of ethnic studies in September. George Pernsteiner, vice provost for resource management, indicated that the UO is basically moving from a minor in this program to a major. The UO is in the process of searching for a new program director who, in turn, will hire the additional faculty members by next year.

Ms. Puentes asked for additional information regarding the program being comparative, not ethnic specific. Mr. Pernsteiner remarked that the program design focuses on the experiences of four groups within the United States: Native Americans, African Americans, Latino Americans, and Asian Americans. The comparative nature means that there is not specialization in any single one of these groups but rather study across them.
Ms. Wustenberg moved and Ms. Puentes seconded approval of the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Puentes, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

B.A./B.S. IN COMMUNITY CRIME PREVENTION STUDIES, WOU

Introduction

Western Oregon University requested authorization to offer the baccalaureate degree in Community Crime Prevention Studies (CCPS), effective fall 1997. The preproposal was presented to the Board in October 1996.

Community crime prevention studies is a specialty within the field of criminal justice. Criminal justice traditionally has dealt with the areas of law enforcement, the courts, and corrections. Each of these emphasis areas is broad based and includes history, theory, organization and behavior, practical application, and future trends. Each also contains a component relating to community crime prevention although, in an academic setting, it is often handled in a tangential manner.

Successful implementation of crime prevention incorporates the efforts of multiple groups and organizations (e.g., schools, civic groups, churches, health departments). Consequently, the study of community crime prevention is inherently interdisciplinary, extending beyond the traditional areas of criminal justice. The CCPS curriculum will be comprised of criminal justice core courses integrated with courses in the social sciences. Graduates of the proposed program will be prepared to develop, implement, and manage crime prevention programs in Oregon and other parts of the U.S. WOU will also work with community colleges to deliver community policing workshops and CCPS courses, as well as provide in-service education to professionals around the state. With the exception of $4,660 recommended for the library, no new resources are required to support this program.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Mission

WOU’s mission, approved by the Board in 1996, emphasizes specialized preparation in public service careers and professional development provision. The proposed program clearly aligns with both
of these goals and builds on the established criminal justice programs, which currently have 400 undergraduate majors and 30 graduate students.

2. Evidence of Need

**Context.** The need for a program in community crime prevention is apparent. The amount of money being spent incarcerating delinquents and criminals is growing to record levels, both in Oregon and throughout the nation. In June 1996, 719 youth were incarcerated in Oregon's juvenile institutions. The Oregon Youth Authority estimates that, this fall, the number will be up to 1,050. The state is currently expanding the capacity of the two correctional institutions for youth and is in the process of building four regional facilities for youthful offenders. The cost? $35,000 per bed.

We cannot keep trying to build our way out of the problem. Governor Kitzhaber’s Juvenile Crime Prevention Task Force stated in its 1996 report: “The importance of community efforts to address juvenile crime prevention, to coordinate state and local efforts, and to determine the effectiveness of existing efforts is obvious. There is a continuing need to assist local communities in developing juvenile crime prevention plans, [and to] incorporate juvenile crime prevention into the State's public safety plan” (p. 7).

Crime prevention is not just an Oregon direction. As recent news reports indicate, even though Attorney General Janet Reno believes that the drop in teen violent crime rates is not an anomaly, she continues to press for prevention programs to sustain momentum. Vice President Gore chairs The President's Crime Prevention Council, which maintains a clearinghouse and resource center, the objective of which is to further local crime prevention. The results of a 1996 Rand Corporation study suggest that prevention strategies for high-risk youth are more cost-effective than longer prison terms. The federal Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) agrees that delinquency prevention is the most cost-effective approach for reducing juvenile delinquency (*Guide for Implementing the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders, 1995*). A report funded by the OJJDP states that 41 percent fewer juveniles are referred to court a second time when there's been

Despite increased public attention and broader understanding about the benefits of prevention programs, few baccalaureate programs in the nation focus so specifically on community crime prevention per se. Although numerous professionals currently do develop and run community crime prevention programs, the need for focused education in this area is clear. Preparing people to develop and manage crime prevention programs will help the economy by 1) reducing the overall cost of crime, 2) reducing the number of incarcerated offenders, and 3) helping at-risk youth make a positive contribution through their own employment. Lowering the crime rate will also improve the quality of life for all citizens.

3. **Quality of the Proposed Program**

**Core Program**

The core program consists of a common curriculum (18 credits), practicum (12 credits), criminal justice electives (15 credits), and social science electives (27 credits). Students completing this course of study will understand:

- the conditions under which crime can be prevented at the community level;
- what actions, programs, and policies are successful in preventing crime;
- the extent to which such efforts have been successful in the past; and
- how to differentiate more-effective from less-effective community crime prevention programs.

**Core Curriculum.** The core curriculum will provide the foundational knowledge needed by all students in the program. Some of those courses are:

- Introduction to Community Crime Prevention — study of the history, philosophy, and theory of crime prevention; survey of research and programs in the U.S.
• Integrated Services in Community Crime Prevention — overview of policies and programs to promote, develop, and evaluate the effectiveness of integrated systems of support for troubled youth.

• Special Studies in Community Crime Prevention — advanced study on special topics focused on youth and family, problem solving, team building, organizational behavior, and program development and evaluation.

**Practicum.** All students will be required to complete a full-time, 12-credit-hour practicum with an agency in the field. Criminal justice faculty will also develop some paid internships for select students.

The practicum (400 clock hours in the senior year) is designed for students to test and apply theory in real-life settings and to gain overall knowledge of agency operation, organization, administration, and role. Participating agencies include city and county police departments, the Oregon State Police, adult and juvenile parole and probation offices, and adult and juvenile correctional institutions at the county, state, and federal levels.

**Electives.** Students will work closely with their advisors in determining their criminal justice and social science electives. Depending on their career goals, students may take courses oriented toward crime prevention in juvenile or adult populations, law enforcement, or corrections. Among the course choices are: criminology, juvenile delinquency, prevention and control, penology, parole and probation, and juvenile issues. For electives in the social sciences, coursework in sociology, anthropology, political science, geography, and psychology will be emphasized — again, as they relate to student interests and career aspirations.

**Employment**

One can find numerous examples of prevention efforts already underway that are potential sources of employment. Police and sheriff's departments around the country are organizing community policing programs, emphasizing police working with communities to solve crime-related problems before they become unsolvable. Criminal justice agencies are identifying positions that relate directly to the proposed program, such as community resource coordinator, community service officer, school resource officer, juvenile interven-
tion specialist, early intervention specialist, and integrated services specialist. Currently, a majority of the criminal and juvenile justice agencies have at least one position that requires skills in crime prevention.

Other employment opportunities relate to transition support programs for adults and youth released from institutions. Several such programs have developed during the past few years. These programs typically involve a contract between the Oregon Youth Authority or the Oregon Department of Corrections and a private foundation or institution. Transition support specialists help prepare inmates for their transition to the streets and provide post-release follow-up services.

Crime prevention programs targeting youth are often organized at the city and county levels. Three programs in Multnomah County, for example, are Self Enhancement, Inc., Portland Youth Redirections, and Mainstream Early Screening and Intervention. The Monitor Program and the Shelter Care Program are two examples from Polk County. Each of these programs, and others like them in cities and counties throughout the Northwest, employ the types of professionals the proposed CCPS program would prepare. In addition, many school districts have programs targeting at-risk youth, and several not-for-profit organizations (e.g., Boys and Girls Clubs, Gang Peace, Northwest Human Services) would also have need for CCPS graduates.

Faculty

Four faculty members currently on staff in WOU's Department of Criminal Justice will be responsible for teaching the required courses. A search is underway to hire a fifth faculty member (effective fall 1998). In addition to current faculty expertise in criminal justice, many other areas of their research and expertise are particularly relevant to the proposed program (e.g., juvenile alcohol and drug use, school violence, agency planning, community-oriented policing, at-risk youth, job development programs, and program evaluation). The newest faculty member, who started working at WOU this fall, worked for the California Youth Authority for more than 20 years.

Related Programs

Because of its interdisciplinary nature, the CCPS program expects to benefit from the scholarship, research findings, and expertise of
colleagues from other departments, programs, and campuses. For example:

- The Teaching Research Division at WOU has long been involved in research projects involving at-risk youth and the transition of youth from the training schools to the community. It is also involved in developing integrated services for troubled youth.
- The Board on Public Safety Standards and Training (BPSST) Academy, located on Western's campus, is an invaluable resource for WOU criminal justice faculty and students. Besides housing the Oregon Community Crime Prevention Institute with a library of resources on crime prevention, BPSST is also the home of the Western Regional Community Policing Resource and Training Center, which is designed to develop and deliver community policing training and technical assistance to eight western states.
- UO's Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior studies the conditions and factors related to the development and prevention of violence among children and adolescents.
- PSU's Administration of Justice program, which offers baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral degrees, focuses on the major problems of crime and delinquency.

4. Adequacy of Resources to Offer the Program

Faculty. No new faculty (beyond the fifth specialist being sought at present) will be required for the proposed program.

Staff. No additional support staff will be needed for the first four years of the program.

Library, Facilities, and Equipment. The library has a collection of materials that supports the basic needs of the criminal justice programs. Since students in the proposed program will take many of the existing courses, the library will be able to maintain a similar level of support for the CCPS major. However, in order to provide a solid level of support for the new program, an initial expenditure of $2,500 to purchase core books in community crime prevention area, and a 20 percent increase in the criminal justice monograph budget is recommended. Funding for subscriptions to an additional eight core journals is also recommended ($700/year).

In addition to WOU's library, resources at the Western Regional Resource Center for Community Crime Prevention are available to students and faculty.
No additional resources for facilities or equipment are required.

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 Western Oregon University to establish a program leading to the B.A. or B.S. in Community Crime Prevention Studies, effective fall term 1997, with a follow-up review of the program to be conducted by the OSSHE Office of Academic Affairs in the 2002-03 academic year. The proposal would be placed on the consent agenda for final action at the November Board meeting.

Board Discussion and Action

WOU President Youngblood began the presentation of the program by introducing Dr. Tom Minahan who has been named interim provost. He has served at Western for the past decade as dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The program under consideration by the Board originated when Dr. Minahan was dean.

It was highlighted that the program has developed collaboratively across the state. There have been a series of community advisory councils comprised of police municipalities, citizen groups, judiciary, and academic professions who have been studying the rising problem of youth offenders in Oregon and around the country. Dr. Minahan indicated that WOU plans to seek advice and share results with the UO and PSU for additional work in violent behavior and research into criminal justice administration.

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

As a result of a complaint filed in 1990 with the U.S. Office for Civil Rights (OCR), OSSHE engaged in discussions that led to a conciliation agreement between OSSHE and OCR requiring OSSHE to review the Underrepresented Minority Achievement Scholarship (UMAS) program to ensure that it was in compliance with directives on targeted scholarships promulgated by the U.S. Department of Education. After the review, OSSHE and OCR entered into further discussions and an agreement regarding changes to be made in the UMAS program. The changes involved, first, making the UMAS program more tailored to each institution’s specific educational diversity needs rather than the current approach of evaluating Systemwide underrepresentations and, second, broadening the definition of diversity using race and ethnicity only as needed to meet educational diversity needs. Over the last few months, each institution has worked to develop a plan that will meet OCR’s requirements. Chancellor’s Office staff has met with institutions and together developed proposed changes to the Board’s tuition waiver program. The Board’s action will be reported to OCR by the November 1 deadline established by OCR and OSSHE. After its review, OCR will propose any modifications it believes are necessary to the proposal prior to implementation. If further changes are required, these will be brought to the Board for its approval.

Background

In 1987, the Board adopted the UMAS program to increase racial/ethnic diversity throughout OSSHE, which the Board found to be at unacceptably low levels. Under the program, high achieving students who were members of racial/ethnic minority groups whose members did not attend OSSHE institutions at a rate that would be expected based on secondary school demographics, could be awarded tuition and fee waivers. Each campus was allocated a specific number of UMAS waivers with the then-universities receiving 35 waivers per year and the then-regional colleges and OIT receiving 10. UMAS waivers were available for students matriculating as freshmen and could be awarded for up to five years. Later, the program was expanded to include students beyond those entering as freshmen.

In 1990, the U.S. Office for Civil Rights (OCR) received a complaint alleging the UMAS program violated Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights
Act because waivers were not available to white and Asian-American students. In subsequent years, OSSHE has submitted considerable information to OCR and more recently entered into negotiations with OCR. In 1994, OSSHE entered into a conciliation agreement with OCR in which OSSHE agreed to review the UMAS program to ensure it was in compliance with regulations issued by the U.S. Department of Education for scholarship programs that were targeted for racial/ethnic minorities. After completing that review, OCR and OSSHE began further negotiations regarding the changes that OCR believed were necessary to the UMAS program. In June, 1997, OSSHE and OCR reached an agreement requiring OSSHE to implement two types of changes to the UMAS program and to report the details of those changes to OCR by November 1, 1997. When the Board announced its agreement with OCR, it clarified that students enrolling in the fall of 1997 would be covered by the current program; the proposed changes would apply to students enrolling in fall 1998. Further, the Board stated that the changes could not dilute the Board’s goal of racial/ethnic diversity. The Board did not believe that any institution could achieve an educationally adequate mix if the student population were less diverse. Therefore, each institution must offer tuition waivers to at least as many students of color as currently receive them.

Proposed Changes

The agreement with OCR called for the Board’s tuition waiver program to consider the racial/ethnic identity of recipients only to the extent necessary to achieve educational diversity needs. Those needs were to be developed on an institutional basis considering the educational value to all students of interaction with a diverse student population. Also, racial/ethnic status could not be the only factor considered as an indicator of diversity. Over the past few months, institutions in consultation with Chancellor’s Office staff, have been working to develop new tuition-waiver programs that fulfill OCR’s requirements. Consistent with the Board’s and Chancellor’s Office view that institution educational diversity needs would not be met if institutions became less racially diverse and knowing that OSSHE could not increase the number of tuition waivers available, institutions have developed plans that include adjustments to, or mergers of, other tuition waiver opportunities.

Finally, the agreement calls for periodic review of the program to ensure that race, color, and national origin are considered only to the
extent necessary to achieve institution diversity needs and that the Board submit a report reflecting the results of its first review covering the 1998-99 academic year.

On August 12, 1997, institution and Chancellor's Office staff met to decide which program determinations would be made at an institution level and which would be Systemwide. The representatives agreed that the program will have one name, OSSHE Educational Diversity Initiative. Under the Educational Diversity Initiative, each campus may have a program of its own design and may describe the program in the manner it wishes. Similarly, the program may consider different factors in making awards and may offer one or more tuition waiver programs as long as it maintains its commitment to diversity. Rather than a prescribed allocation of funds for educational diversity waivers, each institution will be allocated a total amount of tuition it may waive and can allocate those funds as it chooses. This will allow campuses to make partial or full waivers based on need or to expand the number of students who receive at least some support. Similarly, waivers may be awarded to non-residents, with the understanding that non-resident recipients will still be charged nonresident instruction fees.

Representatives agreed to additional changes in the current program. Students may not take a tuition waiver with them if they move to another OSSHE school but will be evaluated based on the receiving school's educational diversity needs, with some institutions considering offering preference to recipients who meet their diversity needs. Each institution will develop its own application form with the goal of future consideration of a common form if one can be developed that will provide the information needed by each institution in evaluating applicants. Furthermore, each institution will develop its own policy for recipients who "stop-out."

The following summarizes the program developed by each institution:

**EOU**
- Combine Laurels and UMAS programs.
- Applicants will be selected from review of applicants' academic achievement and ability to contribute as a result of their talents, perspectives, and life experiences, including their racial/ethnic background.
• Awards may vary in length and will require students to maintain a minimum grade point average and full-time attendance.
• The program will be reviewed annually to evaluate achievement of goals and diversity needs.

OIT
• Combine Laurels, UMAS, and International Programs to create the Merit, Leadership, and Diversity Scholarship.
• Student applicants with a 3.00 GPA or better will be eligible for Merit awards based on an essay.
• Applicants who do not receive Merit awards will be considered for Leadership and Diversity awards as long as they have a 2.5 GPA or better based on a proposed service project.
• Recipients of Leadership and Diversity awards must perform service projects that contribute to cross-cultural learning and understanding based on a belief in the value of racial, cultural, ethnic, geographical, socioeconomic, experiential, and individual differences.
• Preference is for Oregon residents but awards are available to non-residents.
• Student recipients must be full-time, maintain minimum grade point average, make satisfactory academic progress, and, for Leadership and Diversity awards, fulfill program obligations.

OSU
• Create the Diversity Achievement Scholarship program.
• Applicants must meet OSU regular admission requirements, have minimum GPA, be U.S. citizens or permanent residents, and meet one of the diversity requirements: member of ethnic minority community, documented disability, sexual orientation, demonstrated financial need, exceptional academic achievement, or come from a secondary school with a low articulation rate to postsecondary institutions.
• Awards will be determined based on academic achievement, commitment to diversity, community service, leadership, quality of personal statement, and other factors including first generation attendee and older than average student.
• Awards will vary between one-half and full tuition and fees based on strength of application and financial need.
• Awards may be renewed based on satisfactory course load, progress, and GPA.
PSU
- Create the Diversity Achievement Scholarship program.
- Applicants must meet regular admissions requirements, have minimum GPA, and be U.S. citizens or permanent residents and explain how their personal characteristics, cultural heritage, home, school, or work experiences will contribute to a diverse student population and what they will gain from their education.
- Applicants may apply at any time during their undergraduate program.
- Awards will be determined by strength of the application and academic record.
- Awards will vary in amount and may be renewed based on satisfactory course load and minimum GPA.

SOU
- Create the Merit and Diversity Scholarship Program combining the Laurels, Presidential, and UMAS programs.
- Students may be considered for a Merit award (Laurels or Presidential) and a diversity award.
- Eligibility for Merit awards is based on academic achievement, leadership, and extracurricular activities and U.S. citizenship or permanent resident status. Merit awards are available only for undergraduates.
- Eligibility for diversity awards requires applicants to meet regular admissions requirements (minimum GPA for transfer or already admitted students), demonstrate community involvement, and contribute to cultural, ethnic, socioeconomic, geographic, educational, or experiential diversity.
- Merit awards are for a prescribed amount and may be renewed if students maintain a minimum GPA, carry a full course load, and make satisfactory progress.
- Diversity awards vary in amount and may be renewed if students maintain a minimum GPA, carry a full course load, perform service projects, meet program requirements, and make satisfactory progress.
- The program will be reviewed annually to evaluate specific educational diversity needs.

UO
- Continuation of UMAS program without former limit on number of awards.
- Increase cultural and ethnic diversity, giving priority consideration to students from environmental backgrounds that may have
inhibited them from attaining academic skills and knowledge or have discouraged them from pursuing higher education.

- Goal to build diversity through creation of ethnically and culturally diverse communities with sufficient number of students so that each community can have a visible impact on the larger campus environment benefiting all students.
- Revised goals set for ethnic minority groups and international students to allow building of communities able to interact with all students.
- Annual assessment of the effectiveness of the program.

WOU
- Create the Diversity Achievement Scholarship Program.
- Applicants must meet regular admissions requirements, be U.S. citizens or permanent residents, be an Oregon resident and, if American Indian or Alaska Native, provide documentation. Applicants may be newly enrolling freshmen or transfer students who will have completed at least 24 credits by the term for which they first receive an award.
- Applicants will be selected based on their contribution to diversity considering cultural background, life and work experiences, first generation to attend postsecondary institution, strong academic achievement, and extra-curricular activities and community service. Preference will be given to those whose contribution is to ethnic and cultural diversity.
- Awards may be renewed based on good standing and progress toward baccalaureate degree and completion of the recipient’s academic program.
- Freshmen recipients must enroll in an orientation class each term of their freshman year.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended the Board adopt the Educational Diversity Initiative as described above to replace its current UMAS tuition waiver program. Staff further recommended that the proposed modifications be submitted to the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) and that the Board authorize staff to implement minor changes to the program suggested by the Office for Civil Rights, reporting such changes to the Board. In the event that OCR suggests more substantial changes, staff will submit proposed changes for Board
approval. Staff also recommended that the Board direct institution staff to assist Chancellor's Office staff in conducting the required periodic reviews, the first of which shall be presented to the Board at its July 1999 meeting.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Vice Chancellor Clark and Ms. Melinda Grier reviewed the events that led to the proposed changes. To resolve a complaint about the program, OSSHE and the OCR entered into a conciliation agreement that required OSSHE to review the program for compliance with the U.S. Department of Education’s guidelines for race-targeted scholarships. Following that review, OSSHE and OCR entered into further negotiations, which resulted in an agreement signed last June stating that OSSHE would modify the existing program. They agreed that rather than the current Systemwide approach, the program would be based on the educational diversity needs of each institution, considering race and ethnicity only to the extent necessary to ensure a diverse student population. Because resources do not exist to expand tuition waivers, each institution will be able to direct its total tuition waiver allocation as it chooses to Board-approved programs.

Ms. Puentes noted that some institutions would offer the waivers to nonresident students and wondered why this was so. Ms. Grier responded that in some instances, it has been so difficult to meet campus diversity needs from the pool of instate students that campuses believe they will be able to attract a more diverse student population by going out of state.

Continuing, Ms. Puentes asked if international students would be able to apply. Ms. Grier pointed out that some of the institutions would be combining this program with their international programs. In those instances, the international students would be able to participate. However, the cultural diversity that they would add would not substitute for the diversity contributed by those U.S. citizens who are racial/ethnic minorities.

Ms. Puentes responded, "The reason I ask is that when I work with high school students I hear that there are such great needs for Oregon students in underrepresented categories for scholarships. This is a little different from what we hear at the secondary level. I just am a little concerned."
Dr. Clark added that the System tuition waiver resources for international students has been a modest allocation compared to the overall allocations of the Laurels Program, which is really for all students and the former Oregon minority enrollment initiative. "We have always permitted, in the Laurels Program, some use of the resources for non-resident students. We have annually admonished that primarily these awards should be for Oregon students. The institutions want to recruit high ability students and the Laurels Program has been an important resource for that."

Ms. Christopher asked if the percentage of minority students at PSU was improving. President Bernstine indicated that PSU is probably the most diverse campus in the System. "However," he added, "our percentages are low. I think this new program gives us more flexibility in terms of recruiting."

Ms. Grier reminded the Board that under the proposed changes programs are not limited to racial/ethnic minorities.

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

Ph.D. IN
MATHEMATICS
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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 (September 19, 1997)

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

In July 1995, staff recommended that the Board adopt a set of guidelines that divided and lengthened the traditional process for the planning, review, and implementation of new academic degree programs. Two years of experience with the new process suggests to staff, the OSSHE Academic Council, task force authors, and others that modifications are needed throughout the academic degree program development/review/approval process. Criticisms of the length of time required by the process from campus conceptualization of a new program to Board action on a fully developed proposal is based on concerns about timeliness of response to workforce training needs and changing student interests and demands, as well as the rapidly changing marketplace in which public higher education operates. Therefore, staff seeks the Board's perspective on modifying and shortening the academic degree program planning and approval process.

It goes without saying that the goal of this effort should be to "shorten process time to market" while maintaining scrupulous attention to quality assurance, responsiveness to the state's needs, mission appropriateness, resource availability, and other traditionally important criteria for new program consideration.

To reduce time to implementation, changes are needed in the System and Board aspects of the process. However, streamlining is also needed in the collegial campus processes that are organized to carry out governance (including curricular) functions on an academic year (nine-month) calendar. While the System and the Board examine their procedures, the provosts will likewise be asked to indicate how the time used by their campus program-related processes can be reduced by 30 to 50 percent.

At present time it is not unusual for the degree program process to take from one to two or more years from conceptualization to implementation. A reasonable, achievable goal would be to implement a new degree program within one year of campus presentation of a
preliminary proposal to the Academic Council. For example, a preliminary proposal submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in time for Academic Council review in September or October and for subsequent consideration by the Board at its next meeting, then developed as a full proposal that goes through the campus process and returns for review by the Academic Council and receives approval by the Board in the spring, would be ready for implementation in the fall. Graduate program proposals require more process time than bachelor's proposals since the Board's policy requires an external review by a team of experts. Typically, scheduling the visit and obtaining the team's report adds a few months additional time.

As already provided in Board policy, under extraordinary circumstances of clearly demonstrated urgency, full program proposals may be presented to the Academic Council and, thereafter, to the Board without going through the preliminary program proposal process. This was the case with the three OIT bachelor's programs presented to the Academic Council and the Board in late spring and summer. In this case, process time from planning through approval was reduced to less than six months.

At both System and Board levels, modifications could also reduce process time while keeping in place the preliminary proposal review step requested by the Board in order to provide reactions and questions to staff and the campuses about embryonic program ideas. Alternatively, the Board could decide to forego the preliminary proposal process; eliminating this step would reduce overall process time by several months.

Presently, preliminary program proposals are considered by Academic Council within a month of their submission by the campus provost. The Academic Council meets roughly on the same schedule as the Board (nine or ten times each year). However, the preliminary proposals are aggregated for presentation to the Board about three times a year to give Board members a better scope of program planning on the campuses. Inevitably, this results in some preliminary proposals waiting in the queue for a few months at a time. If individual preliminary proposals were presented to the Board in the month following favorable review by Academic Council, process time could be shortened by 30 to 50 percent. Full proposals are presently placed on the Board's docket in the month following review by Academic Council, provided all needed information and resource commitments are in hand.
There are some qualifying notes that should be entered into the discussion. The general problem of identifying and obtaining adequate resources needed for many new degree programs delays their development and implementation for indefinite periods (e.g., software engineering, physical therapy). Joint proposals between two or more campuses usually require extensive planning time (and process time on each of the participating campuses) and may be delayed for identification of resources in support of the collaborative activities (e.g., public health, environmental sciences).

In sum, there are several steps that could be taken to streamline the process for academic degree program planning, review, and approval for implementation. These steps include asking campuses to examine and change their practices and adjusting System procedures and Board guidelines. Staff seeks your advice and direction.

Preliminary Proposals for New Academic Programs

The Academic Council has favorably reviewed the following three preliminary proposals for new academic programs:

- OSU — B.A./B.S. in Theatre Arts; B.A./B.S. in Communication; Terminate B.A./B.S. in Speech Communications
- SOU/WOU — Master of Management
- OHSU — M.S. in Neuroscience

OSU — B.A./B.S. in Theatre Arts; B.A./B.S. in Communication; Terminate B.A./B.A. in Speech Communications

OSU’s Department of Speech Communication proposes to change its current options in theatre arts and communication into B.A./B.S. degrees and to terminate the existing B.A./B.S. in speech communication. The two options have been functioning as de facto autonomous majors for a number of years and are the only two options available to speech communication majors (thus, the recommendation to terminate the speech communications degrees). In reality, there is little commonality between the two options, and this proposed action would align official policy with current practice.

Approximately 30 students currently pursue theatre arts, and OSU envisions that number will grow when students have the choice to pursue this as a full-fledged major. OSU theatre arts has a very active program with at least six productions per year. Students have
opportunities in various aspects of theatre arts (e.g., performance, stage management, lighting, and costume design). Some alumni from this program have gone on to successful careers in theatre and television.

The communication option has 230 majors and 80 minors. Students often choose communication as part of a double major (e.g., with business or engineering). Strong communication skills are needed regardless of the type of profession graduates pursue, and this program will prepare students well. Coursework is broad based and includes oral communication, small-group problem solving, communication within organizations, intercultural communication, American Sign Language, and nonverbal communication. Written communication is part of the general education requirement for all OSU students.

No new resources will be required to implement these degrees.

**SOU/WOU — Master of Management**

The proposed Master of Management will be offered cooperatively by SOU and WOU, with possible support courses from UO, OSU, and OHSU. The purpose of the program is to meet the needs of professional groups (e.g., state and local government workers, health professionals) in the southern Oregon and mid-Willamette regions. All classes will be offered outside of regular working hours and at multiple sites. Confirmation of the interest in and need for this program will be evaluated by a needs assessment currently being conducted.

The proposed program will consist of a multidisciplinary core of courses in areas of management functions and specialized courses in business, government, health and arts management, information systems, organization psychology, and communications. At SOU, faculty resources from the existing MBA will be combined with those of other participating departments. SOU's Political Science Department has offered to transfer an existing retirement vacancy to the program. At WOU, current courses will be offered in nontraditional formats and times. Combined, these actions minimize the need for additional funding.
The anticipated outcomes for graduates of the proposed program are:

- greater appreciation of the difficulties faced by managers outside their immediate field of work and study;
- skills that maximize their learning on the job and their ability to critically evaluate a broad range of alternatives; and
- increased ability to adapt to a rapidly changing work environment.

Other program goals are to increase the regional management workforce, retain talented individuals in the community, and have a sustainable partnership with area businesses and agencies.

OHSU — M.S. in Neuroscience

This is not a proposal for a program in which students would be accepted to OHSU to obtain master's degrees. Rather, it is meant to provide an alternate degree for those OHSU students in Ph.D. or M.D./Ph.D. programs who have made substantial progress toward the intended degree, but have decided to change direction. The goal of this proposal is to recognize students for the accomplishments they have made and, if they meet all requirements, to provide them with a tangible degree that may enhance employment prospects.

The proposal could have been included in the 1992 Board-approved Ph.D. in Neuroscience. All of OHSU's other basic science doctoral programs have a master's option that is utilized essentially as this one would be. While the primary objective of OHSU graduate education is the creation of academic scientists and physicians, a secondary objective can be accomplished at the same time within existing resources. Students who receive this master's degree will have fulfilled the following requirements:

- passed the core curriculum with a B average or better;
- passed a written qualifying exam;
- accomplished a useful body of research; and
- written and defended a thesis.

This differs from the Ph.D. degree, which requires a more substantial body of research and thesis, and requires passing an oral qualifying exam in addition to the written.
The master's degree will acknowledge the above accomplishments and allow qualified students to be competitive in the pharmaceutical industry, science teaching in K-12 and community colleges, biological patent law, or science writing and editing. If the number of recipients of a master's in this program is consistent with the other basic science programs, that translates into one student every two or three years. This proposal requires no additional resources.

**Board Discussion**

Vice Chancellor Clark pointed out the brief remarks at the beginning of the docket item. She reminded the Board that about two years ago the traditional process of program approval had been modified to include a preliminary proposal process. Many concerns have been expressed with respect to the length of time it takes to move a good program from an idea to actual implementation.

Dr. Clark indicated that her staff had tracked every program that has been dealt with over the past two years. She pointed out that the review process is long. "We have some preproposals brought before the Board and the process from there is ongoing. We also have some preliminary proposals presented to you a year or two ago and they haven't come back to me or the Academic Council. There are a number of reasons for this. One has to do with the campus process and another relates to the fact of new costs for programs. Often, the resource needs must be planned for and obtained before a campus can implement.

"If we want to move into implementation of these programs more quickly, we could probably cut our process time in each aspect (the institution and the System) in about half if preproposals could be brought to the Board the month after it was reviewed by Academic Council. We can ask the campuses to reduce their process time by half.

"In a climate where anyone sees that any kind of delay is a problem, we're better off to act with dispatch at all levels," Dr. Clark concluded.

The preproposals were reviewed by institutional representatives.

(No Board action required)
Introduction

Each year, staff of the Oregon State System of Higher Education provide to the Board of Higher Education analyses of student and faculty racial/ethnic diversity. This report on faculty diversity follows the report on student diversity that was presented to the Board in June 1997. This report contains data for each OSSHE institution on the ethnic distribution of full-time instructional faculty in 1996-97, and compares the data to historical distributions in OSSHE and to the ethnic distribution of full-time faculty in the U.S. as a whole. Further analysis by rank and discipline is provided, with more detailed data included in the appendices (see supplemental report; on file in the Board’s office).

Data on 1996-97 OSSHE faculty are drawn from the October 31, 1996 payroll file. Comparison data on other U.S. institutions are from the National Center for Education Statistics and reflect fall 1992 faculty data (the latest available). The analysis was prepared by the OSSHE Office of Institutional Research Services.

OSSHE Data Compared to National Data

OSSHE’s distribution of faculty by racial/ethnic group is consistent with the distribution in public universities in the U.S. overall, with the exception of African American faculty (Table 1).

- Asian/Pacific Islanders constitute 5.1 percent of full-time faculty in OSSHE, compared to 6.9 percent in U.S. research universities, 6.1 percent in doctoral universities, and 5.1 percent in comprehensive universities.

- Hispanic/Latino faculty make up 2.3 percent of OSSHE full-time faculty, compared to 2.2 percent in U.S. research universities, 2.5 percent in doctoral universities, and 2.6 percent in comprehensive universities.

- American Indian/Alaska Native faculty make up 0.5 percent of OSSHE full-time faculty, compared to 0.2 percent in U.S. research universities, 0.8 percent in doctoral universities, and 0.5 percent in comprehensive universities.

- African Americans make up 0.9 percent of OSSHE faculty overall (ranging from 0 percent at EOU, OIT, and SOU, up to...
1.8 percent at PSU). Nationwide, African Americans comprise 2.7 percent of faculty at public research universities, 3.1 percent at public doctoral universities, and 9.1 percent at comprehensive institutions.

In addition, OSSHE data reflect the proportion of faculty who declined to provide their ethnicity or for whom ethnicity was not identified; the national data do not include these categories. In OSSHE overall, the proportion in the “decline/unknown” category is 3.5 percent; at PSU, the “decline/unknown” category is 15.8 percent of the total.

**Historical Comparisons Within OSSHE**

At nearly all OSSHE institutions, the proportion of minority group full-time faculty has increased significantly since 1990-91 (Table 2). Overall, minority group faculty were 5.5 percent of all full-time faculty in 1990-91 but had grown to 8.8 percent by 1996-97, a 51.4 percent increase. In headcount figures, this represents an increase of 71 full-time faculty Systemwide — from 138 in 1990-91 to 209 in 1996-97. Both OSU and UO increased by 25 full-time minority group faculty, PSU increased by 12, and SOU increased by 10 (more than double the number SOU had in 1990-91). EOU's number remained unchanged, and OIT lost four minority group faculty.

**Analysis by Faculty Rank**

At most OSSHE institutions, the largest proportions of minority group tenure-track faculty are at the assistant professor rank, with the smallest proportions at the full professor rank (Table 3 and Figure 1). Overall, the proportion of minority group faculty is 14.6 percent at the assistant professor rank, 8.8 percent at the associate professor rank, and 5.1 percent at the professor rank. This is consistent with a pattern of increasing minority group hires at the entry level of the faculty ranks. Over time, this distribution should lead to significant increases at the associate and full professor ranks.

Detailed data by institution, ethnic group, and rank are included in Appendix 1.

**Analysis by Academic Discipline**

As shown in Table 4 and Figure 2, the largest percentage of minority group faculty overall is in the high market discipline group (11.7
percent). These disciplines include computer science, business, law, engineering and veterinary medicine. Relatively large percentages are also found in humanities/fine arts (11.6 percent), home economics at OSU (11.1 percent), and social Sciences (9 percent).

Detailed data by institution, ethnic group, and discipline are included in Appendix 2.

Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Clark introduced the report by reminding the Board that a similar report had been provided on student diversity. The faculty report is a narrowly focused report and conforms to federal reporting requirements. Dr. Clark indicated, “I want to make it clear that the report does not include administrative and professional employees of color, nor does it include part time faculty. We currently stand at about 8.8 percent of the full-time faculty representing diverse populations, which is a substantial increase from 1990-91 when it was about 5.5 percent. Overall, in real person terms, it is still a relatively modest number.” She added that the census data for Oregon shows a 10.2 percent minority population.

Mr. Imeson asked what number would be as a realistic target for achievement. Vice Chancellor Clark indicated that it would be reasonable to set a target of ten percent over the next couple of years.

Vice Chancellor Anslow provided an analysis: “If you had a three percent turnover in faculty, you would have about 70 slots coming up every year. To achieve a ten percent minority ratio, you would need 30 additional slots. Two years would be an aggressive campaign.”

Mr. Willis asked if an analysis was available for management and administrative positions. Dr. Clark indicated that those data have not been developed but could be if that was the pleasure of the Board.

(No Board action required)

Ms. Christopher reported that the Sports Action Lottery and Athletic Funding Committee had met the afternoon before the Board meeting. Data requested from the last meeting were presented and the Committee examined hypothetical distribution models. Mr. Willis had invited the athletic directors of the institutions to work together and
propose a funding model they could support. Another meeting is scheduled for early November.

Joint Boards Working Group

There was no report from the Joint Boards Working Group. However, President Aschkenasy took the opportunity to name the Board's representatives to the group for the coming year: Esther Puentes, Katie Van Patten, and (pending confirmation) Jim Lussier.

ITEMS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

Mr. Whittaker thanked President and Mrs. Wolf and all of the staff for the wonderful treatment during the Board visit. Other Board members joined in the same sentiment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Virginia L. Thompson
Secretary of the Board

Herbert Aschkenasy
President of the Board