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ROLL CALL

The 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  Mr. Tom Imeson
Mr. Jim Lussier        Ms. Gail McAllister
Dr. Jim Whittaker      Mr. Jim Willis
Ms. Phyllis Wustenberg Dr. Herb Aschkenasy

Mr. John Wykoff joined the meeting at 10:30 a.m. and Ms. Katie Van Patten at 10:45 a.m.

Mr. Imeson and Dr. Whittaker left the meeting at 12:30 p.m., because of scheduling conflicts.

Absent: Ms. Esther Puentes (business conflict).

MINUTES APPROVED

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the January 16, 1998 meeting of the Board. Ms. McAllister moved and Mr. Lussier seconded the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, Lussier, McAllister, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

Mr. Wykoff and Ms. Van Patten were out of the room at the time the vote was taken.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

President Aschkenasy thanked President Bernstine for his hospitality during the Board’s visitation to PSU. “I thought the presentation this morning was terrific,” he added.

PSU Visit

CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

Chancellor Cox concurred with President Aschkenasy on the visitation activities. “I found last night exciting and this morning exhilarating. It reminds us why we’re in this business in the first place — to make that kind of difference in the lives of people,” he said.
Introductions

Dr. Cox introduced two new OUS staff members. Dr. Diane Vines, presently with California State University, will assume the role of Vice Chancellor for Corporate and Public Affairs and Board Secretary. Ms. Jan Jackson, formerly of the University of Oklahoma, is the new budget director working in the Eugene Chancellor's office.

"I feel blessed that we have attracted two very extraordinary new people. I urge you to meet and welcome them," he said.

President Risser to Asia

Dr. Cox announced that OSU President Risser was preparing to depart on a trip to Asia with the Governor. "We envy him that trip and I will expect a full report when he returns," he remarked.

Budget and Finance Committee Report

Chancellor Cox asked Mr. Imeson for a Committee report, since it was necessary for him to leave early.

Mr. Imeson reported that the Budget and Finance Committee had been gathering much information as well as reviewing the current BAS model. He added that at a recent meeting, members of the Governor's task forces on Access and Higher Education and the Economy spoke about their work and the recommendations that have a bearing on the budgeting and financing of the System. "I think there are some ideas out of this work that are consistent with the direction given to us by the Governor," he commented.

He went on to say that an issue has also been raised about program costs. "We're moving to look at how you make decisions based on program costs. In their words, it is not an inappropriate thing to look at using state money to subsidize programs that the State and/or the Board feel are important," he explained.

Mr. Imeson mentioned also that the Committee is looking at program duplication. He said eventually it is something that the institutions need to consider. "My own view is that this will develop a more collaborative model because when you're competing, you're also needing to think hard about where you're placing your money, and sometimes it's better to buy something from someone who already has it," he said.

He concluded by saying that Committee members are putting in a great deal of time and effort, and staff have been superb in the support they've provided.
Chancellor Cox shared that the Committee on Board Governance and Structure was scheduled to meet immediately following the Board meeting. Then, in March, both Committees will convene and look for connecting points and the points of disagreement still left to be resolved.

The Chancellor reported that he, along with Mr. Lussier and Ms. McAllister, met with a group in Bend to discuss the possibilities of providing postsecondary opportunities in central Oregon. "The discussion is healthy and positive. What appears to be emerging is a 'three-legged stool.' First, the community college, continuing to provide those essential services; second, the University Center and moving up to the next level of development in terms of resident faculty and a broader program; and the third, possibly a private venture that would be a contractor," he summarized.

Mr. Lussier added that he is a member of the University Association of Central Oregon, the steering committee overseeing this process. He said that the group is advocating for services in all of central Oregon, not just the Bend area, and is currently undergoing needs identification studies.

Ms. McAllister mentioned that she has been impressed with the willingness of people to communicate in the process and sensed a feeling of moving forward because of it. "An important aspect of this is in addressing the needs of this particular area of the state and not tailoring delivery as it has been in the past, but truly looking at the students' needs," she concluded.

Chancellor Cox added that conversations are underway with Southwestern Oregon Community College in Coos Bay. "That's another area of the state that is not well served, in terms of baccalaureate and postbaccalaureate services. The goal is to create something like the University Center in Bend." Furthermore, he mentioned recent conversations between OUS and WSU/Vancouver aimed at opening some new opportunities. "There are some very interesting things that could occur on the Washington side of the river by the time we meet next," he said.

The Chancellor shared comments from the Executive Summary of the accreditation of SOU, while congratulating President Reno for an
exceptional report. "The commendation of SOU for the spirit and quality is evidenced by the programs in the community," he concluded.

IFS Report

Following is an excerpt of President Yates' remarks:

"The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate had a very interesting meeting two weeks ago at Western Oregon University. We began with an inspired effort by Vice Chancellor Anslow to illuminate us on how the current BAS model works. It is my understanding that we received an abbreviated version of the information given to the Board's Committee on Budget and Finance. What struck us was that two things need to be done to improve the model: simplification (for understandability) and more money (so the model can work).

"The first factor was one of the primary reasons you are considering changing the BAS model: the Governor's task force, the Governor, Legislators, the public, even you — need to be able to understand better what taxpayers and students are buying. But the second factor is equally important: the current BAS model is funded at about 70 percent of what the model itself says is needed to run the enterprise. So a new accounting procedure that assumes only current funding levels will still leave the Oregon University System severely handicapped in trying to perform its mission.

"Also at our meeting were Senator Cliff Trow and Representative Lane Shetterly. Each had some nice things to say about the value of higher education, and urged faculty to better acquaint themselves with Legislators in the coming months. Our last guest on Friday was Board President Aschkenasy. He shared with us some of his thoughts on the directions of the OUS in the coming months and years. We really appreciated his taking time to be with us, and hope that many of the rest of you can join us at future meetings.

"On Saturday, the IFS met jointly with the Association of Oregon Faculty (AOF), and representatives from the Oregon Student Association (OSA), and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Grattan Kerans, from the Chancellor's Office, also joined us. The purpose of our meeting was to look ahead to the next budget cycle: your
recommended budget to the Governor, the Governor’s recommended budget to the Legislature, and the Legislature’s final 1999-2001 budget. We all agreed on the importance of starting early and, as much as possible, to focus on a simple, broadly shared agenda. To that end, the IFS passed the following Resolution:

_We, the faculty of the Oregon University System, urge the State Board of Higher Education to include in its 1999-2001 budget request to the Governor monies to freeze student tuition and raise faculty salaries to the midpoint of their institution’s national comparators._

"While one effect of education is greater employability among graduates and better prepared workers for Oregon's industry, that effect is not the only or indeed the principal purpose of education. It is worth remembering that most college graduates do not have careers that match their undergraduate majors. This does not mean that their education was not useful for their careers or — even less — for their lives. Surveys of alumni show a high level of satisfaction with the value received in their education. Overemphasis on employability as a goal of higher education can distort its function. We are in the business of educating citizens and not simply training employees.

"The funding of higher education has been, especially at the three large universities, very much helped by faculty research. While research is not incompatible with teaching, indeed college-level teaching requires that faculty complement it with scholarship, it is a truism that the time spent on getting outside funding is time not spent on teaching. Thus, the aim of greater self-funding by our research faculty is at least in competition with the aim of improved access for students to faculty.

"Finally, we must record our objection to the simplistic application of the market place model to higher education. To an extent, we have always responded to market forces as expressed by the needs and interests of our students. The employment market is, however, constantly changing. To adapt education too closely to current needs of employers would find us unprepared for the future. Universities' important role of maintaining a range of intellectual disciplines has often
meant that they have had expertise and programs in place that support new social and economic developments when they arise. The reservoir of knowledge maintained and increased by traditional colleges and universities is drawn on as society's needs change.

"I would now like to close with: as we continue to improve what we do and how we do it, let us not forget that the most relevant market concept that can be applied to higher education is investment. Higher education is an investment in people. It is also society's most lasting way of investing in itself. Sadly, our culture has evolved steadily toward a shorter-term, more selfish outlook. We must not let that short sitedness deter us from promoting the value of higher education. And we must redouble our efforts to convince Oregonians and Oregon's government to make the higher education investment."

AUTHORIZATION TO AWARD HONORARY DOCTORATES, PSU

Staff Report to the Board

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

Portland State University

Portland State University requested authorization to award honorary doctorates to Robert G. Miller and Donna E. Shalala at its June 1998 commencement.

Robert G. Miller

Robert Miller, president and chief executive officer of Fred Meyer, Inc., has made significant contributions to PSU, and the state of Oregon as a whole. He has been a staunch supporter of PSU. He has worked widely in the community, participating in a number of
organizations. Miller has also built a highly successful company that is a productive economic generator and service provider for many communities throughout Oregon and beyond.

Miller is one of the industry executives who, in 1993, helped create PSU's School of Business Food Industry Management Program, and has served on the Program's executive committee since its inception. He has been an active participant in all fund-raising efforts, and PSU believes that, without Miller's support, the Program would not be endowed and would not be on its way to achieving national recognition for its innovative approach of working with food processors, manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers.

Miller's retailing career began in 1961 as a clerk. From that time, he rose steadily until he reached top executive levels. In 1991, he joined Fred Meyer, Inc., in Portland, Oregon, as chairman of the board and chief executive officer. When Fred Meyer merged with Smith's Food and Drug Centers (1997), Miller was named president and chief executive officer of the combined companies, and will serve in that capacity when the acquisition is completed.

Miller is a member of the board of directors of PacifCorp, SMG II Holdings Corporation, Oregon Business Council, The Fred Meyer Challenge, Oregon Independent College Foundation, Oregon Public Broadcasting Foundation, Oregon Health Sciences University Foundation, and the United Way (where he also served as chair).

Donna E. Shalala

Donna E. Shalala, U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services, has been a scholar, educational administrator, and public servant for her entire career. After obtaining her bachelor's degree in 1962, she served in the Peace Corps in Iran until 1964. She earned her Ph.D. in 1970 and, from 1975 to 1977, served as director and treasurer of the Municipal Assistance Corporation. Shalala has been a director of the American Stock Exchange, TIAA-CREF, and M&I Bank of Wisconsin.

A leading scholar on the political economy of state and local governments, Shalala has held tenured professorships at Columbia, City University of New York (CUNY), and Wisconsin. As Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison (1988-1993), she was the first woman to head a Big-Ten university. Prior to that, she served as
President of Hunter College at CUNY for eight years, and as Assistant Secretary for Policy Development and Research at the Department of Housing and Urban Development during the Carter administration.

Shalala was confirmed by the U.S. Senate in January 1993 to lead the federal government's principal agency for protecting the health of all Americans and providing essential human services. Programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and virtually all of the federal welfare and children's programs are administered through this agency. Under her leadership, the Department's focus has shifted to the everyday needs of all Americans.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended Board authorization to Portland State University to award an honorary doctorate to Robert G. Miller and Donna E. Shalala at its June 1998 commencement.

Board Discussion and Action

President Bernstine briefly outlined the reasons for awarding the honorary degrees. He mentioned that Dr. Donna Shalala is scheduled as the keynote speaker at PSU's June commencement.

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

Background

It is Board policy to approve admission requirements for each academic year in February of the preceding calendar year. This schedule is necessary for institutional planning, program implementation, publications, and timely notice to prospective students.

Admission Policy Update

Transition to a Proficiency-based Admission System: Beginning with the admission policy adopted by the Board for 1996-97, OUS projected a transition from the traditional grade- and subject-based admission standards to a proficiency-based admission standards
system (PASS). A projected schedule for this policy transition begins on page 15 of the full admission document in the supplemental section of the docket. (Copies are on file in the Board's office.)

Admission Policy Changes for 1999-2000

Admission policy, as currently approved by the Board for the 1998-99 academic year, will continue without change for admission to the 1999-2000 academic year.

Financial Impact Statement

The continuation of the current admission policy for the 1999-2000 academic year is not expected to have a significant financial impact on OUS campuses. However, the cost of the continued development of the proficiency-based admission standards system is significant. It is being borne by federal and private philanthropic grants, as well as allocations from the OUS Chancellor's Office budget.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended (1) that the 1998-99 general admission policy be continued for the 1999-2000 academic year; and (2) that staff continue to work with Oregon schools and the Oregon Department of Education on the transition from the traditional admission policy to the proficiency-based admission standards system (PASS).

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Shirley Clark explained that because OUS is in a holding pattern regarding traditional entrance requirements, she was not recommending any changes. Dr. Clark stated that, "I'd like to focus on our transition planning — we have been in that mode for some time with respect to converting to the proficiency based admission system. But our recommendation for admission standards for 1999-2000 would be that we continue to stay where we are. In the supplemental materials we have provided is information that covers everything regarding resident and non-resident students, new students, transfer students. We do send this along with a letter to all Oregon schools. The material is also on the Web," she concluded.
Dr. Aschkenasy observed that it appeared the requirements of the PASS project are significantly higher than what is currently the case. Dr. Clark concurred that was accurate and went on to say that OUS is leaning into that harder all the time, and will gradually be moving into the PASS environment in close alignment with the Oregon Department of Education as high schools bring the CIM/CAM online.

Mr. Imeson moved and Ms. McAllister seconded the motion to approve the admission policy as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, Lussier, McAllister, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.
## Admission Requirements: 1999-2000 Academic Year

### FRESHMAN ADMISSION
(Residents and Nonresidents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>CIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00*</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Requirements - 14 Units (4-English, 3-Math, 2-Science, 3-Social Studies, 2-Second Language)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT I / ACT Scores**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSFER ADMISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>CIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA Residents</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA Nonresidents</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission Consideration for Applicants with 2.00+ GPA and AA Degree from Oregon Community Colleges</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum College Hours Required</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Applicants Must Meet Specified Course Requirements</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
<td>Yes***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In courses taken to satisfy the subject requirements. Students below the 3.00 HSGPA must submit a portfolio with specified, additional documentation.

** Minimum SAT I scores are not required but score results must be submitted and may be used for alternative or selective admission.

*** Courses Required: OSU, UO – one writing course beginning with WR 121; college algebra or above, or the equivalent of Math 105. All Institutions – two years of same high school-level second language or two terms of a college-level second language or acceptable performance on approved assessment options. American Sign Language (ASL) is acceptable in meeting the second language requirement. Second language requirement applies to transfer students graduating from high school in 1997 and thereafter.
The Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS) project was established by the Board of Higher Education in July 1993, in response to an agreement entered into at that time between the Board of Higher Education and the Board of Education. The purpose of the agreement was to clarify and define the relationship between the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM), Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM), and college admission. Without such clarification, the two education systems would tend, over time, to be organized around different measures of learning — K-12 around benchmarks and performance standards, higher education processes around grades and Carnegie units. The goal of PASS was to create a means for admitting students based on demonstrated proficiency, thereby allowing students to move continuously through the education system based on their performance.

During fall 1993, PASS involved more than 200 higher education and high school faculty in the process of developing the necessary proficiencies. In January 1994, the Board of Higher Education positively received a report on the results of this process. OUS faculty and administrators, and public school educators, provided additional input and review during spring 1994. That May, the Board endorsed the proficiencies as the basis for admission to System institutions for in-state public school students applying fall term 1999.

In 1995, the legislature passed HB 2991, which aligned CIM requirements very closely with the proficiencies already developed by PASS. This bill also moved back the implementation of the CIM to the 1998-99 school year. The State Board of Education decided to phase CIM implementation, beginning with requirements in math and English for 1998-99, adding science in 1999-00 and social sciences in 2000-01. The arts and second languages were required in 2001-02 and 2002-03 respectively, but were established as areas where each school district could set its own required level of student performance.

Given this change in the CIM implementation timeline, PASS also modified its implementation plan, adopting a phased implementation schedule to begin in 2001 and continue through 2005 — two years after each CIM requirement was put into place. This adaptation, along with refined policy and clarified procedures for out-of-state applicants, was reviewed by the Board of Higher Education in February 1996.
This report briefly summarizes key aspects of PASS development and implementation, summarizes school reform implementation as it relates to the System goal of proficiency-based admissions by 2001, and offers recommendations that do not require Board action, but that can guide staff efforts over the coming year and reassure Oregon high schools of the Board’s commitment to proficiency-based admissions.

Current Status of PASS Implementation

This year, in 30 partnership high schools, PASS has focused on identifying examples of student work that represent proficient performance and developing the means to verify collections of student work for proficiency purposes.

Important collaborative efforts with the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) have centered on the articulation of the ODE content standards (grades 3, 5, 8, 10, 12) and the PASS college admission proficiencies. The results of this effort have received a first reading by the Board of Education. The aligned standards are scheduled for adoption at the Board of Education's March 1998 meeting, with statewide distribution in April. These aligned standards will remove one of the major concerns educators had, that multiple sets of standards would be applied to the schools by different agencies. Oregon teachers and students will be the first in the nation to have one set of standards that extend from kindergarten through college admission.

The assessment system for the benchmarks and CIM is also being aligned so that the tests students take and work samples teachers score will yield data that are useful for demonstrating readiness for admission. Analysis of state tests in math and reading is proceeding to determine appropriate scores for college admission. Similarly, PASS staff are collaborating with ODE on the development of scoring guides that can be used both for CIM and PASS. When this work is complete, Oregon students will be able to use the results of work samples to help meet proficiency requirements, as well as test scores.

The Proficiency Transcript Report (PTR) form was completed and piloted this fall. This form will be used by students to report their proficiencies when they apply to a System institution. Schools beyond the 30 partnership sites are being encouraged to become familiar with
this form now in anticipation of much wider use beginning 2001. An
electronic version of the PTR has also been developed in prototype
form and is being field tested.

Current Status of Reform Implementation

Few high schools currently award a CIM. This is natural, since they
await ODE guidance regarding certain critical elements of the
assessment system. High schools are planning in earnest for the CIM
this year since their current freshmen will be the first group to attempt
to earn the CIM. This means that much of the teaching and
preparation will take place during the sophomore year, in immediate
anticipation of the CIM, which, ideally, is awarded around age 16.

Clearly, this group of students will not have had the benefit of being
prepared over a multi-year period to meet standards. Many of these
students will have difficulty meeting the proficiency standards if the
instructional program does not prepare them for several years first.
High schools are currently in a compliance mode; they are
determining what they have to do to meet legal requirements and
State Board of Education administrative rules and policies. They have
not yet transformed their structure and teaching methods to
emphasize proficiency standards. Therefore, it seems unlikely that
students from these high schools will perform at a much higher level
than current applicants.

At the same time, approximately 30 Oregon high schools enrolling 40
percent of the state’s high school students have been directly involved
with PASS for as long as three-and-a-half years. Many of the teachers
in these schools are highly capable of marking student work using
proficiency standards developed by PASS and have proven to be
adept at teaching to these standards in ways that students view as
more positive and challenging than comparable non-PASS classes.
Other high schools beyond this group also have done considerable
curriculum revision in this direction as well.

In addition to intensive work with Oregon high schools, PASS Director
David Conley has been actively involved in two key groups charged
with interagency implementation of school reform. The
Implementation Team is composed of personnel with lead
responsibilities for implementing reform in state education agencies
and key private organizations, most notably the Oregon Business
Council. The School Transformation Advisory Council was appointed
by the Governor and chaired by the Governor's liaison on school reform, Jean Thorne. Through these groups, PASS maintains a visible presence and offers tangible support to school reform implementation.

**Probable Next Steps in Implementing PASS**

- *Continue the current strategy to make a gradual transition from grades to proficiencies.* Applicants from in-state public high schools will be admitted based either on grades or proficiencies, when they qualify either way. This approach will give Oregon high schools a period of time in which to make a transition to performance-based measures of achievement and will reduce parent and student anxiety during this transition period. This strategy will also allow OUS to conduct comparative research to determine how students admitted by each method perform.

- *Consider grades as supplemental information after 2005.* Grades can provide valuable supplemental information that will help determine effort and study habits, and be used for research purposes as well. Individual students will not be required or expected to provide grades, but neither will they be restricted from doing so.

- *Reinforce the System's commitment to proficiencies by working with high schools over the next few years to support their ability to produce Proficiency Transcript Reports for all OUS applicants by 2001.* If all in-state public high school applicants submit a PTR in addition to a regular transcript beginning fall 2001, high schools will more clearly understand the need to adapt their practices to report student proficiency. The PTR also contains a place to record scores on state CIM tests and CAM career-related learning standards. By 2005, OUS expects to have a completely electronic admissions process (the prototype of which has been developed). It will then be much easier to keep track of and utilize more complex, multidimensional data on student performance, both for admissions and research purposes.

- *Explore the establishment of incentives for students who apply with proficiencies from now through 2005.* Incentives will help encourage Oregon's best students to pursue proficiencies, thereby helping System institutions retain more of the state's best and brightest while simultaneously encouraging high school teachers
and counselors to actively encourage students to demonstrate proficiency. Incentives might include:

- scholarships or tuition reductions;
- placement into advanced classes;
- guarantee of no redundant work;
- preference for honors programs; and
- awarding of college credit for performances that exceed admission levels (once such levels are designed and approved by OUS faculty).

- Transmit an annual report to ODE enumerating the number and proportion of students demonstrating proficiency from each Oregon high school. OUS can support school reform by publicly recognizing high schools that have done the most to implement proficiencies each year. Such recognition will encourage those who take the first steps toward expecting that their students demonstrate proficiency.

- Encourage OUS admissions officers to identify and resolve issues that arise from these policies. Campus admission officers are adept at identifying both the potential opportunities and the problems in a proficiency-based admission system. They have taken the leadership in further defining its implementation within OUS. They clearly possess the ability to resolve many potential problems and to anticipate numerous issues that will not be apparent to others.

This report is consistent with previous reports and representations to the Board regarding the pace and scope of proficiency-based admission standards implementation. A similar report to the Board in February 1997, stated that the rate at which the OUS would move to a proficiency-based admission model would take into account the degree to which high schools were adopting standards-based educational programs in response to the CIM and CAM. Given the modest rate of change evident in Oregon high schools, it seems prudent to provide sustained support of the state’s efforts to implement performance standards and assessments at grades 3, 5, 8, 10, and 12 that articulate fully with PASS admission proficiencies.
Board Discussion

Dr. Clark introduced PASS Project Director David Conley, who in turn, briefly introduced 25 Chilean administrators who joined him at the meeting. "I recently received a grant from the Chilean Ministry of Education; these administrators were selected from a national competition to study for a term at the UO."

Dr. Conley summarized the key issues in his report. In particular, he noted that this transition to PASS represents a clarification of expectations for students that will ultimately increase students' success. He continued by saying that PASS standards are not arbitrarily being set independent of what is occurring in the public schools. "We don’t intend to create a set of standards that are different and higher in the absence of the public school system," he assured.

Dr. Aschkenasy asked what would happen to PASS if the public schools do not accomplish implementation of the CIM/CAM on time, or the standards people are led to expect. Dr. Conley replied that PASS would not be implemented and added that, "This is a partnership; it is not the higher education system driving reform. Nor is it simply responding to whatever the K-12 system decides to do. It is an interrelationship between the two systems and an interdependence," he concluded.

Dr. Conley then mentioned that Oregon is the only state in the nation to have a fully aligned set of standards, so that a student, on any level in the education system, knows what is expected to go onward in the system and what is expected for admission at the universities. PASS staff are also working collaboratively with admissions officers from around the country, making students’ ability to transfer out-of-state, if they so desire, a smoother process. He concluded that a proficiency transcript report has been developed and is being reviewed by the admissions officers, in an effort to gain further support for the project’s goals.

Dr. Aschkenasy questioned the possibility of two separate sets of standards, since OUS already has particular standards that not everyone from high school is able to meet. Dr. Conley admitted that was possible, but added that two assessment systems would not be feasible, as schools would strongly resist the testing that would go along with it.
Ms. Christopher asked what the relationship was with community colleges. Dr. Conley said that he felt they were behind OUS in development work, but added that he didn't think they were terribly uncomfortable with accepting what is being developed on certain levels. "On the whole, the community college system understands we're investing more time and effort, and looking at our work critically," he observed.

The OUS Japanese Language Project provides a model for how higher education can be supportive of the efforts of K-12 schools. Funded by federal and private grants totaling $900,000, the Project demonstrates how a field of study can retool to meet the challenge of high standards. The "Oregon Model" was recently recognized by educators from around the world who gathered in Portland for the International Conference of Standards-based Approaches to Japanese Language Education.

Key features of the Oregon model are:

- clear, specific standards;
- a simple, reliable assessment of student performance;
- close cooperation between schools and universities, both public and private; and
- grass-roots professional development for teachers.

The model has been used by other second languages in Oregon. Now, with the receipt of a $147,100 grant from the Nippon Foundation, groundbreaking research and development work in applied Japanese language studies will continue and the model will be disseminated nationally. In coming months, Project staff will present this work to teachers in Louisiana, North Carolina, Hawaii, Missouri, and at a national conference in Washington, D.C.

**Board Discussion**

Dr. Carl Falsgraf, director of the OUS Japanese Language Project, said that this project is considered an exemplar of how standards based systems can be implemented.

He then outlined what he felt were the three most notable accomplishments of the project over the past year.
1) The project proved that moving from a traditional grade-based system, to a system that focuses on student performance, can be accomplished.

2) The project has created a model for other language instruction.

3) Oregon has been named the national leader in developing new curriculum and assessment tools for second language instruction.

Ms. Wustenberg asked at what age a child is most receptive to learning Japanese. Dr. Falsgraf responded that with any language, the earlier the better. He mentioned that in Oregon, there are 45 high schools and ten elementary schools that teach Japanese; he wished it were the opposite, but added that the project supports and works closely with schools on the creation of programs at the elementary level.

TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION

Introduction

What do we know about transfer and articulation? First, that they’re not the same thing. Transfer is defined as the process for reviewing and admitting applicants to undergraduate programs who have previous college work. Articulation is the process whereby two or more institutions align courses and/or programs. Second, these are not just Oregon issues, but are receiving widespread national attention. According to a 1996 report by the National Center for Education Statistics, only about 37 percent of the students who earn a baccalaureate degree do so from the school at which they first matriculated. Third, student movement between and among institutions is not necessarily linear (e.g., two years at a community college followed by two years at a university). Several recent studies document the multiple patterns of student movement in their pursuit of higher education (e.g., Kearney et al., at a large public Midwestern university, 1995; Kinnick et al., at PSU, 1997). Fourth, an increasing array of postsecondary educational providers and delivery modes further challenges our ability to provide for the smooth movement of students through their postsecondary experience.

1. OUS transfer students must have completed a minimum of 24-35 credits of acceptable college-level work. The hours required vary among institutions. (Students with fewer college credits are admitted as first-time freshmen. This does not mean their incoming credits are not accepted.)
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And, finally, educational reform (both nationally and in Oregon) and higher expectations by prospective employers are moving higher education away from traditional evaluation by course credits and contact hours to evaluation based on proficiency and specific outcomes.

Direction of State Leadership

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education, Governor Kitzhaber, and the Oregon Legislature have all targeted improved transfer and articulation as key educational priorities. Following is a summary of recent actions.

Board of Higher Education. In late 1996, the Board formed a Solution Team on Access, Transfer, and Community Colleges. As part of its Systemwide strategic planning, it was charged with developing a barrier-free admission and transfer process to enable students to achieve their academic goals, and partnering with the community colleges to provide baccalaureate capacity and access. The Solution Team recommended action in several areas: credit acceptance; student access strategies; transfer, communication; and comprehensive, collaborative students services.

Governor Kitzhaber. The Governor’s Task Force on Higher Education and the Economy report (12/97) encouraged “all Oregon institutions of higher learning to form alliances to serve the needs of Oregon learners.” The Governor’s Task Force on College Access report (8/97) called for a “level of transfer much more general than that offered by the Associate of Arts/Oregon Transfer degree” (AA/OT); a Web site and toll-free phone number to increase communication; and transfer agreements. In December 1997, Governor Kitzhaber reiterated to the Board his strong commitment to higher education access, stating that no Oregonian should be “left out by reason of geography, economic, racial or ethnic background, time constraints, or avoidable logistical problems.” His goal is to achieve “complete program transferability among community colleges and universities, as well as facilitating transferability issues with private and out-of-state schools.”

Oregon Legislature. During the last legislative session, two bills in particular address the need for intersector progress toward solving transfer and articulation problems. HB 2387 directs the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education to “jointly develop a plan for the transfer of credits between community colleges and state
institutions of higher education” and to submit this plan for approval at the next legislative session. SB 919 directs the two boards “to develop policies and procedures that ensure maximum transfer of credits between community colleges and state institutions of higher education."

The Oregon Context

Current Perspective. Myriad postsecondary educational choices currently exist, creating a staggering number of possible educational pathways for students. OUS and its partners need to be prepared to receive these students. In 1995-96, there were 3,706 postsecondary education institutions in the United States (Andersen, 1997). OUS currently offers 321 baccalaureate degree programs. In 1996-97, more than 3,000 new students were admitted to OUS undergraduate programs from Oregon community colleges alone, and an additional 2,258 students were admitted from 742 different out-of-state institutions.

OUS and its partners have tackled transfer and articulation problems through a number of avenues. Among the most notable are the AA/OT degree; common course numbering; the development of comprehensive course equivalency tables that are accessible on the Web; the K-16 Web page “ONE”; and numerous OUS-community college partnership arrangements, such as the University Center in Bend.

Issues regarding credit transfer continue to be at the heart of higher education’s challenge. Non-application of credit may occur for any number of reasons, such as:

- the receiving institution limits the number of professional-technical courses it accepts;
- the course in question is college preparatory (i.e., remedial);
- the credit was granted on the basis of prior learning (experiential) and not considered equivalent to offerings at the receiving institution;
- the course was taken at a nonaccredited institution; or
- the student received an unsatisfactory grade.

Realistically, some problems will always be beyond the ability of higher education to address (e.g., additional coursework required due to a student changing his/her major).
Future Perspective. Education is changing, throughout the nation and in Oregon. As a result, the transfer/articulation picture is growing in both scope and complexity. Some important elements of the new context follow.

- As more out-of-state providers enter the Oregon educational market, placebound students will be able to "attend" non-Oregon institutions. Electronically delivered coursework will provide time-bound and placebound students with more educational opportunities from a variety of providers. As a result, student transcripts for transfer will become more varied and complicated.

- One of the biggest changes underway in education in the nation is the concerted move to outcomes-based education. Educational sectors are being asked to define learning goals, standards, and outcomes of courses, programs, and degrees.

- The educational emphasis on outcomes extends to performance indicators approved by the Board (11/97). An access indicator calls for measuring the effectiveness of transfer programs (e.g., the proportion of transfers of total enrollment, the graduation rate of transfer students) and will produce data to track the progress made.

- Students no longer move lockstep through a predetermined high school curriculum, but have opportunities for more individualized and accelerated academic programs. Articulation strategies such as co-enrollment and early admission will demand increased attention from higher education providers.

- Public accountability and "customer" expectations will continue to grow in importance in this state, as elsewhere. Oregonians want to see evidence that the public sector exhibits a market orientation and works effectively with other sectors in providing students a rich array of programs and services.

Next Steps

Although the scope and complexity of transfer and articulation issues are daunting, OUS and its partners are resolved to create the most seamless process possible. Changes in the future context — and others yet to be identified — suggest that transfer and articulation initiatives need to foster a "co-evolving" of the educational sectors and
economy to meet the needs of higher education's varied customers. The following proposed policy and strategic actions affirm the System's commitment to advance transfer and articulation initiatives within current and emerging contexts, with an emphasis on relationships between OUS and the community colleges.

Policy and Principles

_The goal of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education is for Oregonians to have maximum academic program articulation and transferability._

To that end, the Board endorses the following assumptions and guiding principles:

1. Responsibility for successful student transfer and articulation is shared among OUS, community colleges, K-12, students, and independent and other educational providers; cooperation and collaboration are essential.
2. Broad curricular diversity among the OUS institutions and community colleges creates a dynamic tension when trying to resolve problems of articulation.
3. OUS institutions, as well as intersector groups (e.g., Joint Boards Articulation Commission) are actively addressing problems that arise in transfer and articulation processes.
4. Communication is fundamental, both among educational providers and with students.
5. Transfer and articulation agreements may be constructed at many levels (e.g., system to system, institution to institution, program to program) and for any number of reasons (e.g., regional partnerships, workforce needs).
6. Transfer and articulation initiatives must be structured enough to guide action, yet flexible enough to allow for student, societal, and educational change and evolution.
7. Initiatives should be informed by sound research.
8. Initiatives should reflect the increasing move by all levels and sectors of education to outcomes- and proficiency-based learning and admissions processes.
9. Transfer and articulation initiatives are not limited to curricular alignment alone and, consequently, should be responsive to student service needs (e.g., timely and accurate advising, financial aid).
Strategic Actions

To implement the policy and principles, the Board of Higher Education directs the Chancellor's Office and the System campuses to take specific action in the following areas:

1. Co-admission/co-enrollment programs. Develop additional co-admission and co-enrollment programs for eligible students who begin their postsecondary education on community college campuses and who plan to complete their baccalaureate program at the partnering OUS institution. By enabling timely relationships with students through such programs, degree completion has a better chance of success.

2. Articulation agreements. Support the development of articulation agreements between individual institutions within the array of educational service providers in the state. As the explosion of distance education, alternative format, and Web-based courses and programs from multiple educational service providers continues, formalized arrangements will facilitate an orderly flow of students from campus to campus. The new major regional partnerships have strong potential for meeting educational access needs.

3. Additional block transfer degree. Work with the community colleges to develop a block transfer Associate of Science (AS) degree that would better fit students whose goals are to transfer to OUS programs in the sciences, health sciences, engineering, and other technical fields (and where the current AA/OT degree does not align with the baccalaureate major requirements).

4. Baccalaureate degree outcomes. Establish the learning outcomes expected of a student graduating with a baccalaureate degree. Ease of transfer should eventually result if the focus is on the learning outcomes a student is able to demonstrate, rather than the course credits accumulated. Building on the work of PASS and other outcomes-based initiatives, a Systemwide task force, with participation from the community colleges, will be charged with identifying baccalaureate degree outcomes and their application to the transfer process.
5. Course equivalency information systems.
   - Uniformly compile, regularly update, and widely distribute information regarding course equivalencies (between OUS institution courses and community college courses). Those System institutions presently lacking this capability should make it a priority for the next admission cycle. Publishing information on the World Wide Web, with a user-friendly interface, is the preferred distribution method. Contact persons at each institution should be identified for students, advisors, counselors, or others needing assistance in finding and interpreting the equivalency information as published.

   - At the System level, a standard course-equivalency information system should be created that builds on the efforts already in place at the campus level. Such a comprehensive data system would enable students and advisors to determine the relationship between all community college courses and similar courses offered at OUS institutions. Resources to accomplish this strategic action should be sought.

6. Discipline-based problem solving. Convene and conduct periodic meetings among faculty in the same disciplines in community colleges and OUS institutions to discuss issues of mutual concern and to resolve problems. The Joint Boards Articulation Commission (JBAC), the Academic Council (OUS), and/or the Council of Instructional Administrators (community colleges) should sponsor such faculty forums. For example, faculty must resolve transfer issues related to similar (or the same) courses offered at the upper-division level in OUS institutions that are offered at the lower-division level in community colleges. Resolutions are required that do not disadvantage (e.g., with respect to upper-division credit requirements) transfer students who have earned credits in the community college courses.

7. Professional-technical courses. Reach agreement between OUS institutions and the community colleges about how professional-technical courses and programs are defined and then operationalize transfer policies and procedures consistent with those definitions. Further, expand institutional policies and practices that facilitate student transfer from professional-technical programs into compatible and/or complementary baccalaureate programs.
8. **Research agenda.** Establish a focused research agenda to inform the transfer and articulation policy agenda, and current and future strategic directions. Examples of such research questions should include (but are not limited to): (1) What happens to the large number of AA/OT graduates who apparently do not transfer to an OUS institution? (2) What are the highest-demand programs for students transferring into OUS institutions? (3) How much time do students transferring in with an AA/OT, and/or other associate degree take to earn a baccalaureate degree? (4) What are the comparative success rates of students with different patterns of pursuits of the baccalaureate degree?

9. **Institutional responsibilities.** Recognize that every institution bears an administrative responsibility for implementation and oversight of matters affecting transfer students. Each campus should review its capacity to respond to student problems and concerns, and make improvements as needed. (The Web-based JBAC Articulation Hotline provides links to the campus contacts who are responsible for transfer student issues.)

10. **Communication, course sharing, and articulation.** Develop, in cooperation with the ONE (Oregon Network for Education) project, a Web-based common college catalog of distance education courses available from Oregon and partner institutions. Establish a “Common Course Marketplace” comprised of those distance education courses for which credit would be accepted at any participating Oregon institution. Resources to accomplish this strategic action should be sought.

11. **Early options programs.** Develop, with the Joint Boards, policies that support new and/or expanded partnerships among OUS, community colleges, and high schools to better serve “college-ready” high school students in early college programs and expedite student progress toward a college degree.

12. **Intrasystem transfer issues.** Resolve “internal” (OUS institution to OUS institution) programmatic transfer issues. For example, students transferring upper-division credits from a System program that is not professionally accredited are sometimes required to repeat courses when moving to a program that is professionally accredited. Professionally accredited programs should work with “sending” programs to develop learning outcome-based ways to assure that transfer credits meet the specifications
of their curriculum. Where this is unacceptable to accreditation groups, work to accommodate the demonstrated learning outcomes of transfer students.

13. Intersector transfer plan. Work with the JBAC and its action teams to respond to the requirements of HB 2387, presenting an effective intersector transfer plan to the 1999 Legislature.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board adopt the proposed policy, guiding principles, and strategic actions on transfer and articulation. In addition, staff recommended the Board direct staff to work with campuses to establish timelines for implementation of these strategic actions, and report annually on progress made on student transfer and articulation issues.

Board Discussion and Action

Dr. Clark began an overview of the docket item, saying that her staff had been working for years on the issues. She added that the Governor stated in his goals very clearly that he desires complete transferability between community colleges and OUS. Chancellor Cox mentioned that this particular report stems from the Solution Team report presented to the Board at the October 1997 Board meeting.

Dr. Jim Arnold, OUS director of community college articulation and policy associate, reviewed the key points, including:

- nearly 750 institutions are represented in the transfer data from students coming from out-of-state;
- Approximately 17 percent came to OUS from community colleges;
- Four community colleges are the primary feeders to OUS (as far as community college transfers are concerned): Chemeketa, Lane, Mt. Hood, and Portland Community Colleges;
- Oregon community colleges represent 42 percent of total transfer activity; and
- In 1996-97, 48 percent of transfer students were admitted as residents.
President Aschkenasy asked if there were full transferability of credits, would the percentage of students increase. Dr. Clark responded that it was difficult to know without knowledge of what the obstacles were for students. "I think it's reasonable to think that we would have additional students, which would be the goal of a policy that's more generous with respect to transferability," she concluded.

Dr. Arnold said that most research indicates that once a student enrolls in a four-year institution, he/she graduates with a bachelor degree at essentially the same rate as students who began their education on the four-year campus.

Mr. Lussier questioned if there were a way to calculate how much of a transfer problem is created by students that are at a community college in a two-year program with a desire to move on versus people not taking specific courses, then deciding to transfer. Dr. Clark said she felt that needed to become part of the research agenda. Further, she said that the community colleges are interested in working with OUS staff on many of the issues presented. "They have an enormous breadth of missions; the admissions programs are only a part of what they do," she stated.

UO President Frohnmayer asked if there were any data on the 48 percent of students admitted as residents from out-of-state. Are they the sons and daughters of residents who are coming back home, or are they students who came from another state, took a few years of college, then came to Oregon and established residency? Dr. Arnold replied that there was really no way of knowing that, but the impression is that, for the most part, they are the sons and daughters of residents.

Mr. Willis asked about common course numbering. Vice Chancellor Clark explained that common course numbering exists in the lower division courses, but it is not a strategy that covers everything. "While people agreed on the numbers, they didn't necessarily agree on the content," she observed. Dr. Arnold added that he felt the concept had been taken as far as it was meant to go in Oregon. "That is why we have to look at course equivalencies. There are many people monitoring this activity, and we can actually use this information to assess what is roughly equivalent to what. We are in an evolutionary period as far as this issue is concerned," he summarized.
Mr. Willis commented that his preference would be to have this information reported more than just annually. "This is one of the areas that the Governor was pretty direct on; he said that he'd like to work toward accomplishing transferability, not just improving. I think we ought to pay closer attention to that," he observed.

Mr. Willis motioned and Dr. Whittaker seconded the motion to approve the proposal as written. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, Lussier, McAllister, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

Transfer Student Data

The following data further illuminate the context in which this policy document has been developed.

- In 1996-97, 42 percent of all new college transfer students came from Oregon community colleges and 31 percent came from out-of-state colleges (see Table 1).

- Of the 2,258 students transferring into OUS institutions from out of state in 1996-97, 1,086 (48 percent) were admitted as residents. All together, these students came from 742 different institutions.

- Annually, about 3,000 newly admitted undergraduate students transfer to an OUS institution from Oregon community colleges. Of that number, about 500 (17 percent) have earned the AA/OT degree.

Table 1
New Admitted OUS Undergraduate Transfers by Educational Source: 1996-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other OUS Institutions</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Community Colleges</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Oregon Colleges</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Colleges</td>
<td>2,258</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,276</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: OUS Institutional Research Services*
Portland Community College, Lane Community College, Mt. Hood Community College, and Chemeketa Community College account for two-thirds (67 percent) of the community college transfer students to OUS institutions (see Table 2).

- OSU, PSU, and UO receive 83 percent of the community college transfer students each year (see Table 2).

- Of the total OUS undergraduate enrollment in 1996, about 17 percent (7,800 students) were Oregon community college transfers. At the time of their admission, about one-fourth had earned an AA/OT.

- In 1996-97, Oregon community colleges awarded 2,031 AA/OT degrees, up from the previous two years (1,867 in 1994-95; 1,781 in 1995-96). (See Table 3.)

### Table 2

New Admitted Undergraduate Transfers from Oregon Community Colleges
By Oregon Community College, to OUS Institution
Base and Extended Enrollment,* Academic Year 1996-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountain</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Oregon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemeketa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatsop</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn-Benton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Hood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Oregon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Valley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umpqua</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>3,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes non-admitted students and postbaccalaureate non-grads
Source: OUS Institutional Research Services, 1996-97 ERAN-05 report
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>1994-95</th>
<th>1995-96</th>
<th>1996-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountain</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Gorge</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemeketa</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clackamas</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clatsop</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn-Benton</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hood</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Coast</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Oregon</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillamook Bay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Valley</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umpqua</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,781</td>
<td>2,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OUS Institutional Research Services

Recent Campus Activities

For several years, OUS institutions and community colleges in the state have been working together to forge partnerships and undertake new initiatives to facilitate a smoother transition for students as they migrate across institutional boundaries. This section describes recent efforts (meant to be illustrative, not all inclusive).

Eastern Oregon University

- **Regional Partnership: Financial Aid.** Eastern has consortial financial aid agreements with a number of community colleges that facilitate joint enrollment and transfer, and is presently developing a new agreement that will permit all financial aid administrative work to be located at the home institution. Called "The Oregon Model," it will first be implemented with the Eastern Oregon Collaborative Colleges Center (EOCCC), which involves EOU, Treasure Valley Community College (TVCC), and Blue
Mountain Community College (BMCC). The model permits a student's home institution to contract with other institutions for the coursework not offered at the home campus.

- **Course Equivalencies on the Web.** Eastern has complete course articulation tables showing how courses from most other Oregon institutions would transfer to EOU. Also available is complete information on courses and degree requirements for every academic program at Eastern.

- **"Other-Campus" Programs.** For more than a decade, EOU has delivered baccalaureate programs on the BMCC and TVCC campuses. Eastern's teacher preparation programs are delivered on the campuses of Central Oregon Community College and OIT. And, in collaboration with other universities, Eastern delivers the Tri-State General Agriculture degree to BMCC and TVCC.

**Oregon Health Sciences University**

- **Articulation: Nursing.** In 1993, the OHSU School of Nursing, in collaboration with the Directors of Associate Degree Nursing Programs in the state, developed, for RN students with an associate degree, an articulation pathway to facilitate their matriculation into the baccalaureate nursing program. Students are awarded credit for lower-division courses that are similar to those taught at the junior year of the baccalaureate program. Students may also earn credit for experiences they have had as registered nurses.

- **Articulation: Emergency Medical Services.** In 1997, the OHSU Emergency Medical Services (EMS)/Paramedic Education program established an interinstitutional agreement with Chemeketa Community College (CCC) so that graduates of OHSU's paramedic program could attain an Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) degree. Graduates receive a joint OHSU/CCC degree.

- **Articulation: Medical Technology (MT).** In 1997, an articulation policy was developed by OHSU's MT program, in collaboration with Portland Community College's (PCC) Medical Laboratory Technology (MLT) program. A few features of the policy include: MLT students with an associate degree may transfer up to 110 credits toward the baccalaureate degree; credits for upper-division courses may be awarded based on student transcript assessment;
and, by review of portfolio and with accrediting agency approval, students will not be required to repeat rotations of clinical experiences obtained in the MLT program.

Oregon Institute of Technology

- **Regional Partnership.** OIT is engaged in a collaborative partnership with Klamath Community College (KCC) and PCC. (In this arrangement, the newly formed KCC contracts with PCC for program accreditation and infrastructure services.) OIT and KCC work together under an agreement providing for coordination of general education services, cross-registration services, and tuition equalization on selected courses. The institutional partners have resolved such difficult issues as differences in admissions standards, residency for tuition purposes, FTE reporting, tuition and fee differences, billing procedures, student confidentiality, and student services for shared courses.

- **Articulation: Software Engineering Technology.** OIT is also engaged in an articulation agreement with PCC for students intending to transfer from the PCC software engineering technology program to the OIT program. PCC students are given full credit for all selected courses listed in the agreement.

Oregon State University

- **Joint Admission.** A joint admission program between OSU and Linn-Benton Community College (LBCC), to be implemented fall 1998, will allow students to be co-admitted and co-enrolled at both institutions. Discussions are underway for a similar program with Southwestern Oregon Community College (SWOCC).

- **Course Equivalencies on the Web.** OSU has articulation tables of coursework, including baccalaureate core courses, from almost all Oregon public and private two-year and four-year accredited colleges and universities on the Web. This database provides students, advisors, and others with a ready source of information on how courses will transfer to OSU.

- **Communications.** A new Transfer Recruiting Coordinator (teamed with the OSU Transfer/Articulation/Processing Coordinator) has been named to increase and improve communication with
community colleges. In addition, an OSU Transfer Brochure, accompanied by articulation tables, catalogues, and open house/visitation schedules, has been distributed to the community colleges.

- **Easing Transfer.** Revisions are being made in the OSU Academic Regulations to allow students to transfer professional-technical courses more easily, and in the admission policy as it relates to repetition of courses and use of nondegree coursework for transfer admission.

**Portland State University**

- **Partnership.** In January 1997, PSU and Clackamas Community College (CCC) entered into a partnership agreement that promotes the successful movement of students between the two institutions. The arrangement has led to the creation of collaborative student support services, including joint student recruitment, co-admissions, integrated advisement and orientation, financial aid consortium agreements, and shared library and technological support services. Currently, 75 students are co-admitted to both institutions. Additionally, the agreement has integrated curricular offerings, enhanced faculty collaboration, and improved program articulation. PSU is actively involved in establishing similar partnerships with other community colleges in the metropolitan area.

**Southern Oregon University**

- **Regional Partnership.** SOU and Rogue Community College (RCC) have developed policies and procedures so that students can register for courses in Medford at either institution's registration centers. Staff are cross trained to use registration software and to answer questions about both RCC and SOU. Staff also spend time on site at the other's location, helping out during busy times. The two institutions have agreed to policies on student advising, testing for placement in math and writing courses, and have a financial aid agreement covering students co-enrolled at both institutions. Consistent with their intensive collaborative efforts, SOU and RCC share classrooms, science labs, and computer labs in Medford. The campuses have developed schedules that cross list courses so students can easily see all the
offerings by both SOU and RCC (in the Medford area). A pilot project with a shared staff member helping to strengthen Native American programs at both institutions is in progress.

University of Oregon

- **Preparation for Transfer.** During winter and spring terms, UO and Lane Community College (LCC) jointly teach a course at LCC for students who plan to transfer. Prospective transfer students are given an introduction to processes, services, and physical facilities at UO. Each May, UO hosts a special orientation program targeted toward Oregon community college students who intend to transfer to UO in the fall. The program includes meeting with an adviser and class registration.

- **"Other-Campus" Program.** Planning is underway to offer the UO General Science major collaboratively with Central Oregon Community College (COCC) under the auspices of the University Center. All required coursework would be available in Bend.

Western Oregon University

- **Partnership: Admission.** A joint admission agreement with Chemeketa Community College (CCC) has recently been reached so that students are co-enrolled at WOU as they enter CCC. A special fast-track admission process has been implemented at Western for any CCC student completing an AA degree in computer science, fire service, or criminal justice. A similar fast-track enrollment and registration system is being developed for CCC graduates in teacher education.

Other Intersector Activities

In addition to the previous examples, other ongoing intersector activities demonstrate the increasing seamlessness of the educational sectors. Examples of these follow.

*The PASS Project.* OUS has been working collaboratively with high schools and the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) to develop new performance-based admission standards. This system, known as the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS), is unique in the nation. PASS is organized around a series of standards specifying what students need to be able to know and do to succeed in college. Students demonstrate these skills via tests, common
performance assessments, and bodies of evidence their teachers
score using common statewide criteria. Currently 30 high schools —
enrolling 40 percent of the high school students in the state — are
participating in the piloting activities.

Regular Meetings of Chief Academic Officers. At least once a year,
the chief academic officers of System institutions and the community
colleges convene to discuss intersector matters. Agenda topics have
included transfer policy issues, distance delivery of courses and
programs, the development of a common Web page (Oregon Network
for Education — ONE) for all educational sectors, and the
partnerships that continue to evolve.

Discipline-based Faculty Meetings. A recent National Science
Foundation grant program, administered by PSU, will convene
meetings of faculty in math, sciences, and teacher education from all
educational sectors — K-12, community colleges, and higher
education.

Joint Boards Articulation Commission. The Joint Boards Articulation
Commission (JBAC) has recently formed seven "action teams" in
areas relating to transfer and articulation. The aim of the JBAC is to
develop recommendations in these areas for Joint Boards'
consideration and toward further clarification of transfer credit
planning called for in HB 2387. The areas under consideration are:

- **Credit for Prior Learning.** Individual postsecondary institutions
  have varying policies regarding the granting of academic credit for
  experiences obtained outside the traditional classroom
  environment. Often, credit granted for such experience does not
  transfer between institutions and students are confused by the
differences in institutional credit-granting practices.

- **Early Options.** A variety of options are available to high school
  students who wish to pursue college-level work during high school.
  Practices regarding acceptance of such credit for transfer are not
  uniform. A study of current policies and practices regarding the
  early participation of high school students in college courses and
  programs has already been endorsed by the Joint Boards. This is
  intended to lead to a determination of the need for a more
  standardized early options program in the state. The study,
  conducted by the OUS Office of Academic Affairs, is well along,
  and a final report to the Joint Boards is anticipated in summer
  1998.
• Professional-Technical Courses. Courses of this nature are vocationally oriented and traditionally have not been considered in the mainstream of courses that are "college transfer." The demarcation between "professional-technical" and "college transfer" courses is not as clear as it once was. Additionally, in recent years, many Oregon community colleges have revised the numbering system for their professional-technical courses (an alpha-numeric numbering system the same as for transfer courses), leading to some confusion regarding what is intended to be college transfer coursework and what is considered professional-technical. Many System institutions limit the number of professional-technical credits accepted as elective transfer credits, frustrating student transfer efforts. A policy regarding the inclusion of professional-technical credits as electives in the block transfer AA/OT degree has been a neglected area. The JBAC Student Transfer Committee is currently developing its recommendations.

• Data and Information Tracking. Much progress has been made in recent years toward the sharing of student data between the Office of Community College Services and the Oregon University System. We are now able to track, better than ever before, the movement of students between systems. The action team will suggest improvements to the arrangements already in place.

• Seamless Student Services. For students to move easily between an Oregon community college and a System campus, better integration of student services is needed. Such services include (but are not limited to) advising and counseling, registration, and financial aid. An action team will recommend ways to facilitate student movement between sectors.

• Proficiency-based Education. With the advent of school reform in Oregon, OUS developed a Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS). The community colleges have been working on a proficiency model for entry into specific programs (PREP). How these two admission strategies will relate is the focus of this action team.

• Joint Boards Articulation Agreement of 1993. An agreement approved in 1993 by the Joint Boards of Education, sets out principles guiding articulation between the community college and
higher education sectors. The agreement needs revision to reflect current realities, such as the exponential growth of distance education efforts.

Sources


Introduction

The proposed Oregon University System Interinstitutional Student Exchange Program will enable undergraduate students regularly enrolled in one Oregon University System (OUS) institution to pursue up to one complete academic year of study at another OUS institution without requiring a formal transfer. This program will allow students to access opportunities on another campus that may not be available on their home campus. All OUS institutions will participate. Additional costs for the exchange to the students and the institutions will be marginal.

The proposed program will enhance existing exchange and co-enrollment options for OUS students. For example, OUS and its institutions have numerous study abroad arrangements. OUS students may co-enroll in Oregon community colleges. Furthermore, students at several OUS universities may enroll for up to a year to participate in the National Student Exchange Program (NSE) that operates in 149 institutions in 47 states and three territories. The proposed program will extend opportunities within the System for
enrolled students who qualify. Procedures for the proposed program are patterned after the proven NSE processes. Each OUS campus will designate an exchange coordinator to administer the program and coordinate issues of eligibility, registration, transcripting, and financial aid.

**Proposed Program Guidelines**

Implementation will proceed according to these general guidelines:

**Student Eligibility**

To participate in this program, a student must be:
- an admitted and enrolled full-time undergraduate at any OUS institution;
- in good academic standing (2.5 GPA or better, or as determined by the host institution); and
- a sophomore or higher in class standing.

**Limitations**

The following limitations apply:
- participation may not exceed a maximum of three terms;
- individual student exchanges are subject to approval by the host institution;
- course work must be approved by the home institution's academic advisor; and
- summer sessions are excluded.

**Procedures**

The following steps will be followed in administering this program:
- Each OUS institution designates its own Exchange Coordinator.
- Interested students contact the Exchange Coordinator on their home campus.
- Exchange Coordinators certify the eligibility of applicants.
- Exchange Coordinators notify the prospective host institutions of names of students.
- Host institutions arrange for exchange students to preregister with class standing cohorts.
Tuition and fees are assessed at the host institution's rates. They are paid at the home institution and then forwarded to the host institution. Student residency is determined by the home institution.

Financial aid is administered by the home institution.

Enrollment of students and grades are recorded at the host institution.

Student ID cards are issued by the host institution.

Use of grades toward the GPA is determined by the home institution.

Participation in the Oregon University System Interinstitutional Student Exchange Program does not preclude participation in other exchange programs.

Program Review

The proposed Oregon University System Interinstitutional Student Exchange Program has been reviewed positively by both the Student Affairs Council and the Academic Council for implementation for a four-year pilot period. In its fourth year, the program should be evaluated as a basis for continuation or closure.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommended that the OUS Interinstitutional Student Exchange Program be implemented for a four-year pilot period beginning with fall term 1998. Staff further recommended that a review of the program be conducted in 2001-02 as a basis for making a recommendation to the Board regarding program continuation.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. McAllister questioned how many students this program would affect annually. Dr. Arnold replied that there had been a variety of estimates, from a dozen students to several hundred. Vice Chancellor Clark added that there is a national trend with this type of exchange program.

Ms. Wustenberg moved and Ms. McAllister seconded the motion to approve the program as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Imeson, Lussier, McAllister, Van Patten, Whittaker, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.
RECRUITMENT
AND
RETENTION OF
HIGH-ABILITY
STUDENTS IN
THE OREGON
UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM

In response to interest expressed by members of the Board, staff has prepared a brief report on the recruitment and retention of Oregon residents of high academic ability. For background purposes, selected comparative information on high-ability students is provided. In addition, campus representatives will describe the variety of efforts undertaken to attract and retain high-ability students and respond to questions from the Board.

The comparative profile of high-ability students from Oregon includes: post-high school plans; enrollment; entering academic characteristics; freshman academic performance; fields of study; and retention and graduation. "High-ability" students are defined as those who entered as first-time freshmen with a high school grade point average (HSGPA) of 3.75 or higher. In each profile category, all students from Oregon are compared to high-ability students from Oregon. Nonresident students and international students are not included in the information that follows.


Each year, Oregon high school juniors are asked, in a statewide survey, to indicate their first choice of college. Oregon public universities and out-of-state colleges are the most frequent first choices of students overall, with out-of-state colleges the most frequent first choices of high-ability students. Typically, students with the best academic records consider the broadest range of colleges to attend (Table 1).

Table 1
First Choice of College by the Oregon High School Classes of 1990 and 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>3.75+ Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon University System</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Independent</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Institution</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Community College</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College Enrollment of the Oregon High School Class of 1995

The most recent information on the actual college enrollment of Oregon high school graduates is found in the OUS study of the Oregon High School Class of 1995, "Where Have All the Graduates Gone?" This study showed that 60 percent of all students and more than 90 percent of high-ability students in the graduating class attended a two- or four-year public or private college, in or out of Oregon, the fall following graduation. The remaining graduates opted for work, the military, or other pursuits.

Oregon’s public universities and community colleges together account for the largest proportion of college enrollments of the Class of 1995. Forty-nine percent of the high-ability students attended an Oregon two- or four-year college: Oregon University System (OUS) institutions (27 percent); Oregon independent colleges (11 percent); and Oregon community colleges (11 percent). Out-of-state colleges enrolled 42 percent of the high-ability group (Table 2).

Table 2
College Enrollment of Oregon Class of 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>3.75+ Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon University System</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Independent</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Institution</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Community College</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Percent of Class of 1995 to College</td>
<td>60% *</td>
<td>91% *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The remaining 40 percent of all Class of 1995 graduates and 9 percent of the high-GPA graduates pursued an activity other than college the fall following graduation.

Source: Office of Institutional Research Services, "Survey of Oregon High School Class of 1995 — Where Have All the Graduates Gone?"
OUS Enrollment of Oregon New Freshmen: 1996-97 Academic Year

Just over one-half of all new Oregon freshmen in OUS enrolled at OSU and the UO in 1996-97. More than two-thirds of the high-achieving freshmen (3.75+ HSGPA) enrolled at those institutions, with OSU enrolling the higher number. As a proportion of the freshman class (Oregon students only), OSU, EOU, and UO enrolled the highest percentages of high GPA students at 27 percent, 25 percent, and 21 percent respectively (Table 3).

Table 3
OUS Enrollment of Oregon New Freshmen:
1996-97 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>3.75+ Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon University</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>76  25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>36  14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>427 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>92  13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>65  9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>346 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>104 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5,966</td>
<td>1,146 19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Entering Academic Profile of Oregon New Freshmen: 1996-97 Academic Year

The entering academic profile — HSGPA and SAT combined scores — of Oregon new freshmen in 1996-97 by institution and Systemwide is displayed in Table 4. Differences in entering HSGPA between all students and high-ability students are also reflected in SAT score comparisons. More than 40 percent of the high-ability students had SAT combined scores in the 1200-1600 range, compared to 20 percent of students overall with scores in that range.
### Table 4
Oregon New Freshman Class of 1996-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HSGPA</th>
<th></th>
<th>SAT V + M</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.75+</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>3.75+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon University</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>1,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Freshman Academic Performance of the Oregon Freshman Class of 1996-97**

The first-year college GPA of high-ability Oregon freshmen exceeds that for all freshmen from Oregon, 3.28 to 2.69. High-ability men outperform their counterparts from Oregon, 3.26 to 2.60; women, 3.29 to 2.76.

**Field of Study Preferences: OUS Freshman Class of 1994-95**

The pattern of field of study preferences for high-ability students shows more similarities than differences when compared to all students. Higher proportions of high-ability students choose engineering and biological sciences, and a lower proportion chooses social sciences (Table 5).
### Table 5
Field of Study Preferences at Junior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Students *</th>
<th>High-Ability Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Forestry/Environmental</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Journalism</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Oregon resident undergraduate students only.

Source: Office of Institutional Research Services, "Entering Freshman Retention Study: Class of 1994-95"

**Cumulative College GPA of the Junior Year: OUS Freshman Class of 1994-95**

At the junior year, the cumulative college GPA of high-ability students (3.38) is greater than that of all students (2.92).

**Retention and Graduation Rates for Oregon Freshman Classes of 1994-95 and 1989-90**

A recent two-year retention study of the Oregon Freshman Class of 1994 showed a consistently higher retention rate for high-ability students across all OUS institutions than for their all-student comparators (Table 6).
Table 6
OUS New Oregon Freshman Class of 1994: Two-Year Retention Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>3.75+ Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon University</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research Services, "Entering Freshman Retention Summary: Fall 1994 Entering Cohort"

The graduation rate study of the OUS Freshman Class of 1989 at the end of a six-year period, from 1989-90 through 1995-96, showed higher graduation rates for high-ability students than for their all-student comparators (Table 7).

Table 7
Graduation Rates for OUS New Oregon Freshman Class of 1989-90 Six Years Later

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>3.75+ Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon University</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Institute of Technology</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Research Services, "Retention, Attrition, and Graduation of OSSHE Freshmen Entering Fall 1989"
OUS Academic Scholarship Programs to Recruit and Retain Oregon's High-Ability Students

Since the 1980s, Systemwide and institution-specific academic scholarship programs have been developed to attract and retain Oregon's most academically able students. Presidential Scholarship programs (funded at the campus level) were first established in 1985, followed by the Freshman Minority Scholarship program in 1987 and the Junior Minority and Oregon Laurels Scholarship programs in 1990. (Currently, the Minority and Laurels scholarship programs have been revised under the OUS Educational Diversity Initiative.) At present, these programs provide tuition-waiver academic scholarships to about 3,500 enrolled students. OUS also provides need-based supplemental tuition grant support to more than 5,000 Oregonians.

These programs have been carried forward at their planned, fully-funded level during the period of fiscal stringency that began in 1991. For the 1997-98 academic year, almost $10 million in OUS-authorized tuition waivers and more than $4 million in supplemental tuition grants are allocated to OUS institutions.

Scholarship programs have contributed to the enrollment of higher-ability students in OUS. From 1989-90 to 1996-97, there was a 42 percent increase in the enrollment of high-ability new freshmen from Oregon as defined in this report.

Summary

Oregon's most academically able students (as defined by high school grade point average) continue on to college at a much higher rate than for all Oregon high school graduates. Their selection of college shows a preference for four-year institutions, with out-of-state colleges leading. Within Oregon, OUS institutions enroll the largest share of the state's high-ability students.

Once enrolled in System institutions, high-ability students show better academic performance, retention, and graduation than their all-student comparators. The addition of System and campus scholarship programs since the mid-80's correlates positively with the enrollment and persistence through graduation of Oregon's high-ability students.
Board Discussion

Dr. Clark indicated that several high-ability students from OUS institutions were prepared to speak to the Board about their experiences. Following introductions, she asked representatives to come forward to discuss programs, and to answer questions from Board members.

Dr. Bruce Shepard, provost of EOU, stated that the primary way to attract these students is to offer money, in the form of merit-based scholarships. Personal contact is also a priority at EOU. Collaborative projects with faculty also seem to be a draw, he said.

Because many of the higher-ability students at EOU are first generation college students, much time is spent determining their motivations and keying in on those to continue challenging them.

OIT Interim President Dow endorsed Provost Shepard's comments. She added that OIT programs have built-in rigor, and that the Laurels Scholarships have enabled the institution to raise the skill level of students it is attracting. Dr. Dow then introduced Carla Meeuwsen, a student in the Laser Optical Engineering Technology program.

Ms. Meeuwsen shared that the program is highly intensive, yet the instructors know the students' names, which makes her feel important, and thereby helping her to be successful. OIT has a 98 percent placement rate, and everyone in her class has received job offers.

OSU Provost Roy Arnold briefly reviewed programs offered at that institution. Of particular note was the success of the University Honors College, which has helped OSU attract more high achieving students. It is a unique model, in that it is a concurrent enrollment with any academic major or program. When asked if there was any thought to expanding the program, Dr. Arnold said that he felt some, but not substantially. "We want it to be an honors college and program," he said.

Next, Provost and Dean of Faculty Sarah Hopkins-Powell spoke on behalf of SOU. Her focus was on the colloquium enhancement sections. All freshmen are enrolled and high achieving students are placed in the E-Section (enhancement). These E-sections have the
same curriculum as the others, but there are additional readings, writing, and have a greater emphasis on critical thinking. She shared that the instructors feel these students need to be pushed harder.

UO Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs John Moseley said that the UO has increased its efforts to attract high achievers. One successful program is the Robert Clark Honors College, which now enrolls 600 students. In its efforts to serve additional high achieving students, the university has also introduced the Honors Track program, which is a track within the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and each of the professional schools.

Dr. Moseley introduced Betsy Cogan, a student in the Honors College. Ms. Cogan shared that she chose to attend the UO "because the Honors College enables me to have the experience of a small liberal arts college, and still conduct scientific research a large university with good equipment can afford. I think you cannot go out into the world, at least in the sciences, with no idea of how to do research," she concluded.

Mr. Michael Cihak, vice president for student affairs and enrollment management at WOU, said high ability students are contacted early on by faculty. The other attraction is scholarships, and institution representatives contact them personally if a student applies for merit based funding.

He added that WOU has an honor's program that is both rigorous and challenging. The university also offers a student support system to aid in the transition of students as well as make them feel they have a home on campus.

Dr. Michael Reardon, provost at PSU, reminded the Board that the honor's program is nearly 30 years old. "One of the things we look for is students who have a clear notion of continuing on to graduate or professional education," he said. He then spoke briefly about the Washington Internship Program and asked one of its recent graduates, Jason Ward, to speak.

Mr. Ward explained the program in greater depth, and more precisely what his experience was. He said that what surprised him most was how prepared he felt to deal with the activities and it was gratifying for
him to know that he was attending an institution that could provide the kind of experiences that are comparable to larger and more prestigious institutions.

PRELIMINARY PROPOSALS FOR NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

The Academic Council has favorably reviewed the following two preproposals for new academic programs:

- EOU — B.A./B.S. in Computer Science/Multimedia Studies
- UO — M.F.A. in Dance

EOU — B.A./B.S. in Computer Science/Multimedia Studies

EOU, in close collaboration with Blue Mountain Community College (BMCC) and Treasure Valley Community College (TVCC), and as part of the new regional partnership funded in the last legislative session, proposes to re-establish computer science offerings at Eastern and provide a baccalaureate program in computer science/multimedia studies. The proposed program follows the pattern at Eastern (which is appropriate for a university of Eastern’s size) of bringing together related disciplines within a single degree program rather than attempting to establish separate programs. Fully deliverable on all three campuses and by distance learning methods throughout the region, this program will have two distinct tracks with a common core. It has the strong support of the leadership of BMCC and TVCC and the involvement of their faculty. Furthermore, it is aligned with Eastern’s mission and is also a clear response to the legislatively supported mandate to increase access to higher education in the eastern region.

The traditional computer science track speaks for itself in terms of immediate applications in programming. The multimedia studies track adds a component to the degree, preparing a multifaceted graduate who is in demand across the career spectrum (e.g., media, public relations, consulting, sales). In addition, the program offers support for other majors and programs at Eastern, providing specialization and expertise for ancillary courses across the disciplines. The program would also support the general education offerings of the institution by supplying some basic courses in the “Language and Logic” category.

Evidence of need is demonstrated by the many inquiries Eastern has received in response to very limited and informal preliminary publicity concerning this proposed program. The EOU Admissions Office
reports that the most frequently asked question is whether Eastern offers a computer science program. In addition to strong student demand, this degree program would support Oregon's growing computer science industry. It would also prepare employees to work in any number of fields that utilize people who rely on computers to work out of their homes or from remote areas. Possible career options include Web page construction, consulting, data analyses and modeling in federal and state agencies with regional offices, computer sales, media, and public relations.

This program targets current and potential students who would otherwise select another major, not continue their education, or be forced to leave the area to continue their education. Current pre-engineering, business-oriented, or placebound students who are not pursuing a degree but wish to upgrade their skills are also examples of those who may take advantage of the proposed program. It is anticipated that, after two years, the program would serve ten majors per year in computer science and five in multimedia studies on campus totaling 60 majors, freshman through senior, on campus. Students at BMCC and TVCC would increase the number of students to 90.

Resources needed for the program include faculty FTE within the major, offices, upgrades to computer labs and computing capabilities, and support for the impacts that increased student numbers will have on course enrollments outside the major. These resources will be provided through a variety of means. Two permanent tenure-track positions have been created through internal reallocation. One additional fixed-term appointment will be made using Eastern Oregon Collaborative Colleges Center (EOCCC) funding. In addition, both BMCC and TVCC will add a faculty position to support this program (also funded through the EOCCC). Lab and computing upgrades would be funded through a combination of EOCCC funds and, where appropriate and recommended by a joint student/faculty committee, a portion of the technology resource fee funds. Funds have been budgeted, through internal reallocation, to cover needs for additional sections of general education courses as expected program growth affects offerings outside of the major. Space needs will be met using internal reallocation made possible because Ackerman Hall is no longer used as a laboratory school.
The program will be implemented in fall 1998, admitting freshmen into the program at that time, then phased in over a period of three years, with faculty hires also phased in. This will permit adjustments if actual enrollments differ from those anticipated.

**UO — M.F.A. in Dance**

The proposed M.F.A. will be a terminal degree, three-year program. Currently, no terminal degree in dance exists in Oregon; UO is the only degree-granting institution in the state with four-year (B.A. and B.S.) and graduate programs (M.A. and M.S.) in dance. Congruent with objectives of the National Association for Schools of Dance (the accrediting agency for dance programs in the U.S.), the proposed M.F.A. is designed to provide advanced development of:

- individual creative and scholarly talents, interests, and philosophies that can be used to expand and preserve cultural heritage;
- individuals with the potential to solve contemporary problems in the major aspects of dance and to explore and address new questions and issues;
- professional competence in the dissemination of knowledge, including logical, verbal, and written presentation of aesthetic ideas;
- scholarly competence in the organization, evaluation, and interpretation of knowledge; and
- professional competence as reflected in a significant body of artistic work.

The Oregon Employment Department projects that positions for dancers and choreographers will grow approximately 44 percent (117 in 1995 to 169 in 2005). The proposed M.F.A. will allow Oregon to respond more effectively to this need. In addition, the M.F.A. program will likely attract a higher caliber of talent who, as Graduate Teaching Fellows, will increase the level of instruction available to UO undergraduates. Graduates of UO's dance program have already demonstrated positive outcomes from their education, many of whom are employed in public and private schools, dance companies, and as independent choreographers and performers throughout the United States. This M.F.A. will enhance their career prospects.

Because of the intense nature of faculty involvement with each M.F.A. candidate, entrants will be limited to a maximum of three per year.
(nine students total at any given time). Applicants will likely be predominantly women coming out of undergraduate work or transitioning in their professional work.

Recent replacement hires have resulted in UO having a full complement of seven faculty members, all of whom are qualified to work with M.F.A. students. Consequently, the proposed M.F.A. can be implemented without significantly increasing faculty workloads. Current budgets, facilities, and library resources are sufficient to implement this program.

Board Discussion

Ms. Wustenberg asked Vice Chancellor Clark whether the B.S. in Computer Science and Multimedia Studies at EOU was a preproposal or a full proposal. Dr. Clark responded that it is a preproposal, but plans are far along, essentially satisfying the criteria for a full proposal. She added that funding for the program is being provided through regional cooperation funds granted by the legislature, intended to pull together EOU, Blue Mountain Community College, and Treasure Valley Community College and enhance access by expanding program choices.

Staff Report to the Board

The second quarter investment report of the Pooled Endowment Fund of the Oregon University System for the period October 1, 1997, through December 31, 1997, prepared by R.V. Kuhns and Associates, investment consultants, is included in the supplemental materials. (Copies of this report are on file in the Board’s office.)

Board Discussion

OUS Controller Mike Green reviewed the document distributed in the supplemental materials section of the docket (on file in the Board’s office). Overall performance is strong, according to Mr. Green, adding that he was generally satisfied with the performance.

Ms Wustenberg asked about the status of the Board’s recommendation to the Oregon Investment Council. Mr. Green said that he hoped to have that process completed by the end of the next quarter.
President Aschkenasy asked about the cost for R.V. Kuhns’ services. Vice Chancellor Anslow said that the quarterly reports ran approximately $15,000. Mr. Green then added that fees paid to the Common Fund are based as a percentage of the investment. He said that with the new investment vehicles recently approved by the Board, fees will be lower.

REPORT ON CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY: JULY 1-DECEMBER 31, 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1997-1999 Capital Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Legislatively approved: $276 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Campus projects: $232 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Systemwide: $ 43 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of campus activity through December 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 projects under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 projects await completion of fund raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 18 projects in planning &amp; design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8 projects pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Systemwide activity: Repair &amp; Renovation $11.7 million allocated to 7 campuses for 1997-98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report provided a summary account of facilities contracting activities conducted under the authority and direction of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education for the period July 1 through December 31, 1997.

The summary information provided below describes the level of capital construction activity and status of projects by campus, starting with projects originally authorized by the legislature in the 1991-93 biennium. Since project-specific expenditure limitation expires five years after legislative approval, a few of these projects have been preauthorized in subsequent biennia. Following the summary information, highlights of construction activity related to campus-specific projects are provided.

Detailed information on all projects is provided in Attachment I, which is included in the supplemental materials to the Board (copies are on file in the Board’s office). The attachment includes the amount of
unexpended funds for any approved projects still open as of December 31, 1997. The amount of unexpended funds does not take into account any amounts billed by contractors and not paid by that date or any amounts encumbered but not yet paid.

**Status of Projects Authorized by the Legislature Through 1997**

Of projects originally authorized by the legislature for the three biennia from 1991-1997, ten were completed during this reporting period, eight are nearly complete, and six remain on hold by the respective campuses. All completed projects were for auxiliary enterprises; six housing projects were completed that will better serve the students, adding necessary capacity on several campuses. Those projects were located at EOU, OSU, SOU, and UO.

The 1997 Legislature and Emergency Board authorized 34 campus-specific capital projects for both academic and auxiliary use and eight Systemwide project categories including capital repair/renovation, safety improvements, classroom modernization, ADA improvements, seismic inventory, and seismic improvements. Three campus projects are under construction, five campus projects are on hold pending completion of campus fund-raising campaigns, eight projects are on hold pending resolution of various issues, and the remaining 18 projects are in various stages of planning and design.

**Highlights of Campus Projects**

**Eastern Oregon University**
EOU completed construction of the new residential student housing project and opened Fall 1997 with full occupancy. This new facility will house up to 96 students in 24 suites, designed to serve as Learning Centers for student integration into University life. The campus is planning a dedication and naming ceremony in May 1998.

**Oregon Institute of Technology**
OIT has completed the $194,000, 2,760 square foot Child Care Center authorized by the 1993 Legislature. The campus is in the process of finalizing an RFP to contract with an operator for the facility and plans to have the facility open and fully functional in Fall 1998. The Child Care Center will provide affordable child care for up to 34 children of students, faculty/staff, and community members. This project was financed with Article XI-F(1) bonds to be repaid from the student building fee debt service reserve.
Oregon State University
After two years of construction, OSU's Valley Library project is within budget and on an extended schedule. Expenditure limitation for this project was authorized in the 1993 and 1995 Legislative sessions. Completion of the $40 million remodel and five-story 147,000 square foot addition is scheduled for December 1998. From late 1997 to the completion date in 1998, the new addition is scheduled to be occupied on an as-completed basis.

OSU received authorization for four projects in the 1997-1999 biennium, of which two were for academic-related facilities. Of those projects, two are under construction and one is in pending confirmation of receipt of federal grants.

Construction is underway on the Forest Ecosystem Research Laboratory located on the eastern side of campus near Peavy Hall. This project was authorized by the 1995 Legislature and received additional expenditure limitation in 1997. The contract manager/general contractor for this $18 million, two floor, 97,200 square foot facility is in the process of awarding subcontracts. The Warehouse Addition Project is under construction and will provide the Housing Department with appropriate shop and warehouse space. The Residence Hall Renovation project is in the design phase for renovation of Hawley Hall this biennium. The project includes upgrading/replacing plumbing, electrical, and other infrastructure and seismic upgrades. The Hatfield Marine Science Center Fisheries Building Project is on hold pending confirmation of receipt of federal grants.

Portland State University
The 1997 Legislature approved a $29.21 million expenditure limitation for the Urban Center project. However, the University is currently requesting Board approval to seek additional project expenditure limitation in the amount of $4.06 million from the Emergency Board of the Legislature in April. This would bring total project expenditure limitation to $33.27 million. PSU is moving the project carefully through design and plans to begin construction of the five story Urban Center building in June 1998.

During 1997, the University made significant electrical engineering improvements at the Fourth Avenue Building (US West facility). The Board acquired 117,000 square feet of this 195,000 square foot facility in 1996 to relocate and consolidate space for PSU's School of
Engineering and Applied Sciences. To date, the University has relocated electrical and computer engineering labs and research space from the Portland Center for Advanced Technology building to this facility, providing that program with a larger space, state-of-the-art computer facilities and more capacity.

The University is in the process of assessing all elevators (34) across campus to meet the new State of Oregon Elevator Code and to meet ADA standards. Three classroom modernization projects are under construction as out-of-date teaching and research facilities are modernized and updated to incorporate new instruction technologies.

Southern Oregon University
SOU completed construction of the Family Housing project at the Old Mill Village. This project was funded from the Adult Student Housing 1992 legal settlement. The new addition provided 35 additional family housing units. Since 1990, the University has constructed a total of 165 family housing units at Old Mill Village. The campus currently has a total of 206 family housing units.

The SOU Foundation has launched a major fund raising campaign to raise $5.6 million of private donations for its Center for the Visual Arts (approved by the 1997 Legislature). This $11.24 million project will add instruction capacity in the Visual Arts, a key academic program area for the University. This project will also upgrade substandard instruction space in seven separate facilities.

University of Oregon
In 1997, the UO achieved a major milestone by completing construction on the second and final phase of the Spencer View family housing replacement project at the former UO Amazon housing site. This phase of construction provided the University an additional 132 units of student family housing.

Construction is underway on the William W. Knight Law Center, the first phase of the three-phase $36 million Campus Development project. Initial site work has been completed and the steel skeleton structure of this facility provides a dramatic backdrop to Hayward field. The new Law Center is scheduled to open in January 1999. The second phase of the project involves renovation of the existing Law School, Grayson Hall, to provide additional core academic space for the College of Arts and Sciences. The final phase will include an addition to Gilbert Hall, which houses the College of Business.
Construction is continuing at the Erb Memorial Union to remodel and upgrade existing student services including food service, dining, and recreation areas. Near Autzen Stadium, construction is progressing on the Indoor Practice Facility, which is expected to be completed in September 1998.

Western Oregon University
The 1997 Legislature approved a $3.485 million expenditure limitation for the Werner College Center Remodel and Addition, Phase 2 and $5.725 million expenditure limitation for the new Library project. Both projects are in the design phase and will enter the construction phase soon. During 1997, the University completed construction of Phase I of the Werner College Center Remodel and Addition project. Final inspection has occurred and occupancy is expected in February 1998. Phase 2 of this project is expected to begin in March 1998 and will provide 7,800 square feet of added space to the east end of the Werner College Center, the bookstore will be expanded, a food service outlet will be added, and the exterior of the building will be remodeled to make it fully ADA accessible. Other remodeling will provide fully accessible ADA restrooms on all floors, add meeting room space, retrofit the HVAC system for all floors in the remodeled area, provide space for additional self-supporting activities, resolve building leaks due to deficient patio construction, and remodel offices to accommodate additional student services moving into the building.

In addition to major projects such as those listed above, there are many smaller projects and numerous capital repair/deferred maintenance projects underway at all the campuses.

Board Discussion
Vice Chancellor Anslow reported that all activity is on schedule and within budget.

RESOLUTION FOR THE SALE OF ARTICLE XI-G & ARTICLE XI-F(1) BONDS [Amendment]

Staff Report to the Board

Background. The 1997 Legislative Assembly authorized the Board of Higher Education to issue general obligation bonds, in specified amounts by fiscal year, with the proceeds to be used to finance capital construction and facilities repair and renovation projects in higher education. These bonds were authorized under two sections of the Oregon Constitution, Article XI-G and Article XI-F(1).
House Bill 5036, Chapter 556, authorized a maximum issuance of $34,299,500 of Article XI-G bonds and a maximum issuance of $136,000,000 of Article XI-F(1) bonds for the 1997-1999 biennium. However, the legislation also limited the amount of bonds that could be sold in each fiscal year, such that for 1997-1998, no more than $18,000,000 of Article XI-G and $57,000,000 of Article XI-F(1) bonds could be sold.

Request for Board Authorization to Issue. On November 21, 1997, the Board authorized issuance of $39,930,700 in bonds, as part of a sale currently planned by the State Treasurer for February 1998. Of this amount, a total of $14,114,500 is requested in Article XI-G and $25,816,200 in Article XI-F(1) bond authorization.

Due to historically low bond rates, staff recommended that campuses submit for approval selected projects that would otherwise be bonded in a later period, but are ready for construction at this time. Below are explanations of the additional bond financing requests.

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Residence Hall Renovation - Article XI-F(1) Bonds Requested: $3,882,000
This project was approved by the Board in November 1997 for inclusion in the spring 1998 bond sale in the amount of $1,595,000. The campus proposes to increase the issuance amount to cover the entire project cost. Funds from this bond sale will permit the development of a master plan and early renovation plan for a six-building quadrangle. In addition, complete construction drawings will be developed for one residence, Hawley Hall, a 66,076 gross square foot building. Funds from this sale will permit construction of the project to upgrade plumbing, electrical, and other infrastructure and seismic requirements.
Meeting #671—Minutes

February 20, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total expenditure limitation authorized</th>
<th>$3,595,000 (Article XI-F(1) bonds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project reserve contingency</td>
<td>$287,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure limitation plus project reserve contingency</td>
<td>$3,882,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond term</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of repayment</td>
<td>Housing auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Master plan and construction drawings for 1 building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated occupancy date</td>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorization</td>
<td>Chapter 584, Section 2(5)(b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sackett Residence Hall Fire Alarm System - Article XI-F(1) Bonds Requested: $470,000

Sackett Hall was built in 1948. It is a 161,487 square foot facility with a marketable capacity of 262 rooms. The existing battery-powered smoke detectors are not code-compliant; the Fire Marshal has notified OSU that the situation must be corrected. Proceeds from this sale will fully fund the project costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total expenditure limitation authorized</th>
<th>Not required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond term</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of repayment</td>
<td>Housing auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Planning, design, construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SYSTEMWIDE

Classroom Modernization, Part 2 Article XI-F(1) Bonds Requested: $1,500,000

The legislature approved expenditure limitation for specific projects focusing on academic classroom and laboratory modernization, including technological enhancements for on-site and distance learning in facilities and in circumstances where Article XI-F(1) bonds
are permitted. The CAPITAL Center and OIT Metro Center are two facilities where space may be leased to other educational entities whose lease payments could be used as an appropriate source for debt service repayment. Certain gift-and-grant funded projects may also qualify.

| Total expenditure limitation authorized | $6,000,000 (Article XI-F(1) funds) |
| Bonding request, February 1998         | $1,500,000                           |
| Bond term                               | 15 years                             |
| Debt service repayment source           | Various                              |
| Estimated occupancy date                | Various                              |
| Authorization                           | Chapter 584, Section 2(1)(c)         |

Bond issuance costs estimated at two percent will be charged against each project for which bonds are sold under this sale. While the Board's bond counsel will review the bond sale to determine its eligibility for tax-exempt status, in accordance with IRS regulations, at present there are no private uses contemplated in this sale that might affect this tax-exempt status.

If approved by the Board, the new total bond issuance is $44,272,900 including $30,158,400 of Article XI-F(1) bonds and $14,114,500 of Article XI-G bonds. Table A shows the revised and total figures.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended that the Board: 1) find that the projects for which Article XI-F(1) bonds are proposed meet the self-liquidating and self-supporting requirements of Article XI-F(1), Section 2, of the Oregon Constitution; and 2) adopt the following resolution authorizing the sale of Article XI-G and Article XI-F(1) bonds.
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, on November 21, 1997, this Board adopted a Resolution authorizing and requesting the Oregon State Treasurer to issue bonds in accordance with state laws and for the projects identified therein; and

WHEREAS, it is now appropriate to add to the projects identified in the former Resolution to take advantage of current interest rates and construction seasons; NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY the State Board of Higher Education of the State of Oregon as follows:

Section 1. Article XI-F(1) Projects. Table A, referenced in Section 2 of the prior Resolution, is hereby amended to read as follows:
### Table A

#### Article XI-F(1) Projects Recommended for Spring 1998 Bond Sale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article XI-F(1) Projects</th>
<th>Estimated Bond Cost, with 2% Issuance Cost</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIT: Residence Hall Restroom</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT: Residence Hall Improvements</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU: Residence Hall Renovation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,595,990</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3,882,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU: Warehouse Addition</td>
<td>$555,000</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSU: Sackett Res. Hall Fire Alarm</strong></td>
<td><strong>$470,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU: Smith Memorial Center - Phase I</td>
<td>$3,110,000</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO: Recreation and Fitness Center</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO: National Zebrafish Center</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOU: Werner College Center</td>
<td>$3,485,000</td>
<td>30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide: Miscellaneous Building Fee</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide: Small Capital Projects</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systemwide: Classroom Modernization, Part 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,567,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Issuance Costs: 2% of Total</td>
<td>$596,289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$591,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL XI-F(1) Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,866,289</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,158,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revised requests*
Section 2. **Other Action.** All other terms and conditions of the prior Resolution, accept as herein amended, are ratified and confirmed and remain in full force and effect.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Vice Chancellor Anslow reviewed the proposed amendments, stating that current low interest rates are the reason for the request before the Board.

Ms. McAllister asked for clarification on the issuance of XI-F(1) bonds versus XI-G for the Metro Center modernization. Mr. Anslow explained that the planned lease agreement with Clackamas Community College, where a payback of the bonds would occur over the next seven years, put this project in the XI-F(1) category.

Mr. Lussier moved and Mr. Wykoff seconded the motion to approve the bond sale amendment. Those voting in favor: Directors Christopher, Lussier, McAllister, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

Note: Mr. Imeson and Dr. Whittaker had prior business engagements, and were absent the remainder of the meeting.

**Summary**

The University of Oregon sought Board approval to commence with the next phases of additions and alterations to Allen Hall and to request Emergency Board authorization for a $1.2 million expenditure limitation. The multi-phased project, which eventually will modernize the entire building, will accommodate the needs of the School of Journalism and Communication. The phases covered by this request will provide the School with a resource room, large seminar/conference room, offices, a new entrance and lobby, and new landscaping. This portion of the project will be funded entirely with gifts, all but $100,000 of which currently are in hand.

**Staff Report to the Board**

The opportunity for this project began when the University's printing operations moved from the ground floor of Allen Hall to an off-campus location, allowing the School of Journalism to expand into the space. In fall 1995, the School and the University worked with Boucher
Mouchka Larson Architects of Portland to develop a comprehensive plan for the building, including a remodel of the entire ground floor.

The need for this expansion is a result of continuing enrollment growth in the School of Journalism and Communication. Classes are currently at capacity with approximately 1,050 majors. During 1996-97, the School generated 20,696 student credit hours and that number continues to grow. Both the number of Journalism and Communication majors and pre-majors and the number of student credit hours generated by the School have increased steadily in the 1990s.

In addition to the pressures created by increased enrollment, advances in technology made the School's facilities outdated and insufficient. The teaching mission of the School is increasingly dependent on technology and on creating interactive, project-driven applied learning experiences for Journalism students. Earlier phases (Ia and b) of the Allen Hall renovation project consisted of constructing television and radio studios and new student services centers in the western portion of the ground floor. These components began to address the School's need for space to properly instruct students in the use of contemporary technology and for modernizing the outdated facilities in broadcast journalism.

The School is already seeing positive recruiting results from the new electronic media center, student lounge, and student services center. Prospective students are favorably impressed and indicate that the facilities are a major factor in their decision to attend the School. Furthermore, for the first time in the School's history, all of the School's faculty, Graduate Teaching Fellows, and studio and editing facilities are housed in Allen Hall. Completion of the resource room and the remainder of the Allen Hall renovation project is essential to maintaining current enrollment patterns of attracting the best students to the School of Journalism and Communication.

The phases that are the subject of this request (Phases Ic, d, e, and f) will increase the building's current 38,383 gross square footage, adding a new 1,100-square-foot building entry on the ground floor, to efficiently connect the two portions of the lower floors with each other and with the rest of the building, and build landscaped plazas.
connecting the new entry to the campus. This design moves the entrance of the building to the east side, creating a more accessible point of entry to the building from University Street into the natural quad area formed between Pacific, Columbia, Friendly, and Allen Halls.

The most critical component of these phases will be renovation of current space to provide a 1,400-square-foot resource room, which will create new space designed for study, meetings, and student research. In the last five years, a number of courses have been developed that require substantial writing, research, and design projects. As the School's curriculum increasingly becomes project-oriented, with great emphasis on team and individual projects, space is needed for student meetings and team conferences, and students need greater access to computers and computer networks. The resource room will meet all of these needs.

Additionally, construction of the resource room will make possible the conversion of the existing reading room on the second floor of Allen Hall into a new presentation classroom, which will meet an important need in the School's curriculum for a classroom designed for public speaking and presentations.

Phases II and III will include the remodeling of Allen Hall's upper floors and are not a part of this request.

Funding for the work requested is in hand or pledged. All of the gifts are dedicated gifts to the School's building fund. The building fund includes several major gifts (greater than $25,000) and a number of smaller ones. As of December 1997, the University had $1.1 million collected.

Work will begin with the construction of the resource room during summer 1998, and the other components of this request will follow as designs are completed and as pledges arrive.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff requested that the Board approve the University of Oregon Allen Hall Renovation project (phases 1c, d, e, and f) and authorize the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration to seek authorization from the State Emergency Board for an Other Funds expenditure limitation of $1.2 million for the project. Staff also recommended that the Board
authorize the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration to approve proceeding with bid solicitation to renovate the facility when the University demonstrates that adequate gift funding has been secured to fund the project as designed and is available for expenditure.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Upon review of the intended projects, Dr. Aschkenasy asked Mr. Anslow how much enrollment has increased recently in the School. While unsure of the exact figure, Mr. Anslow did say that the number of majors enrolled was just over 1,000.

UO President Frohmayer explained that the School of Journalism and Communication is a nationally ranked program and one of the most sought after at the UO. "It is selective and enjoys very high standards. It's clear that it is an outmoded facility," he concluded.

Ms. Wustenberg moved and Mr. Lussier seconded the motion to approve the proposal as submitted. Those voting in favor: Directors Christopher, Lussier, McAllister, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

**Summary**

Portland State University requested Board authorization to seek necessary approvals from the State Emergency Board, to proceed with the construction of the Urban Center, Phase I. Specifically, the University requested the Board approve, and seek Emergency Board approval for, the following:

1. Project Construction: Approve a request to authorize the expenditure of funds for construction of the Urban Center, Phase I—to consist of: (a) the 123,000 gross square feet (gsf) East Wing/College of Urban and Public Affairs; (b) the 13,000 gsf West Wing/Distance Learning Center; (c) the 1,200 gsf PSU Transit Center; (d) the 22,000 gsf of the PSU Portion of the North-South Plaza; (e) the PSU portion of the Tri-Met transit

1. The Urban Center, Phase II, was the name given to the acquisition and development of the former US West building, approved by the Board Executive Committee in March 1996 and the full Board in April 1996. The Emergency Board approved the project at its April 12, 1996 session.
improvements/Montgomery Street improvements; (f) relocation costs for a business whose site is being taken for the West Building and Transit Center; and (g) approval to continue further fund-raising for furnishings and equipment for the East and West Buildings, beyond those required to construct the facility.

2. Increased Size of the Project: Approve an increase of the project's total gsf from 100,000 gsf to 133,200 gsf primarily to accommodate additional retail space for an expanded PSU Bookstore and additional academic space.

3. Increased Total Expenditure Limitation: Approve an increase in the total project expenditure limitation from $29,210,000 to $33,270,000, a net increase of $4,060,000.

4. Request for Emergency Fund Monies: Approve a request to the Emergency Board for $3,500,000 of Emergency Fund monies, described in a budget note in Oregon Laws 1997, Chapter 871, to construct the academic space included in this project.

5. Report to the Legislature: Consonant with Legislative requirements in Oregon Laws 1997, Chapter 584, Section 12b (2), approve the preparation of a report by PSU on the status of "other revenues received for the project" (gifts, grants, federal, and local agencies funds); this is a condition for the issuance of Article XI-G bonds.


7. Increased Article XI-F(1) Bond Expenditure Limitation: Approve a request to increase the expenditure limitation for Article XI-F(1) bonds from $3,480,000 to $6,090,000, an increase of $2,610,000, required because the combined need exceeds the limitation by fund source (including the reserve contingency) for this project.
The needs for the various approvals listed above arise from four interrelated factors — increased space needs, a funding plan that ties the funds raised for each sub-element solely to use in that element, a shortfall in full funding to construct the East Wing, and the necessity to obtain timely construction approval to meet the needs of the project partners and to begin construction soon so as to avoid a further escalation in construction costs.

Staff Report to the Board

The 1997 Legislative Assembly reauthorized the Urban Center, Phase I project with a limitation of $29,210,000. This project was to encompass 100,000 gsf of academic space for the College of Urban and Public Affairs and a public plaza. The Urban Center was intended to be the gateway between PSU and its University District and Portland’s downtown. It was seen as a catalyst for the development of the University District. (The Board of Higher Education approved the University District vision plan in 1996, having been adopted by the Portland City Council in April 1995.)

Increase in Space Need. During the past 18 months of fund-raising and project development, the size and cost of the project have grown. The growth has been due primarily to the requirements by PSU’s partners for program-related additions, for nominal funding matches to obtain federal grants, or for additional space for income-generating activities to repay Article XI-F(1) bonds. Thus, the project as now proposed encompasses an additional 33,200 gsf of space, consisting of approximately 10,000 gsf of retail space in the East and West Buildings, 22,000 more gsf of academic space, and a new 1,200 gsf transit information center. The project now totals 133,200 gsf of space, including 107,000 gsf of academic space, a new 1,200 gsf transit center, and 25,000 gsf of retail space. Exhibit A is a site plan of the proposed project. Exhibit B is an artist’s rendering of the East and West Wings and the PSU plaza. (Both Exhibits are included in Board member’s supplemental materials. Copies are on file in the Board’s office.)

As displayed on Table A, the gsf has grown as a result of the following:

- **East Wing.** The East Wing has grown by about 12,000 gsf of academic space and about 7,000 gsf of retail space for the PSU Bookstore and related retail operations. The academic
space is needed to fully consolidate the College of Urban and Public Affairs from seven locations and provide the space and equipment needed to meet a diverse array of program requirements. The expanded space for the PSU Bookstore replaced an earlier plan to include underground parking, which proved to be too expensive for "self-supporting" operations at $15,000 per space.

- **West Wing.** The academic space has expanded by about 10,000 gsf as a consequence of the requirement by the Economic Development Administration (EDA) to create a clear and separate presence for the Distance Education Center, rather than to retain it within the walls of the East Building. In addition, there is about 3,000 gsf of retail space in the West Wing. The increased gsf associated with the new wings is due to a new foundation, entry/lobby, restrooms, additional roof area, and related plan adjustments. EDA is expected to award a grant that will cover half the costs of the total facility.

- **Transit Center.** The transit information center was not included in the budget plan as approved by the Legislature, and thus was not part of the total gsf approved. It is planned to be 1,200 gsf, as a necessary complement to the Tri-Met Transit Project. The center will greatly benefit PSU by providing ticket machines, maps, and other kinds of transit information in a convenient location. It will be entirely gift and grant funded.

**Increase in Project Expenditure Limitation and Funding.** Associated with increased space requirements are necessary additions in either expenditure limitation or funding.

- **East Wing.** The East Wing/College of Urban and Public Affairs, requires both funding and the expenditure limitation associated with that fund source. The original 1996 request by the Board to the Legislature included $7,865,000 of General Fund and $7,865,000 of Article XI-G Bonds. Although the Article XI-G bonds were eventually approved, the $7,865,000 of General Fund monies was not; instead, the Legislature shifted the funding burden of this element to gifts and Article XI-F(1) bonds. Despite successful securing of funds for the overall project, funds for each element are tied strictly to that specific
element and are not fungible. Thus, the core academic space in the project is not fully funded, without the $3,500,000 of requested Emergency Fund monies.

PSU has undertaken creative efforts to reduce the construction cost of the building. About $1,000,000 of costs have been reduced through a value engineering exercise. Some $1,500,000 of private donations have been raised for this project — an unusually successful fund-raising effort for a relatively young, urban campus. Financing of the building’s $4,500,000 energy plant is being finalized — this amount will remain in the construction budget, but will be provided by the energy service provider. Some $2,900,000 of requirements for modern furnishings, improved finishes and equipment will only be added to the building if additional gifts can be raised. However, because the space to be built is for academic purposes, state funds appear to be the only remaining viable option for the remaining core.

- **Transit-Related Projects - Article XI-F(1) Bonds.** An additional $1,300,000 of Article XI-F(1) bond expenditure limitation is required for transit-related efforts. All of this need is associated with the Tri-Met Transit Mall expansion and PSU’s role in it as a partner. The $7,500,000 Tri-Met Transit Mall expansion has received a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant of $6,000,000, to be matched by $500,000 each from PSU, Tri-Met, and the City of Portland. PSU’s total project cost has been modified and increased to meet its obligation to provide this matched funding. PSU also is required to carry out nominal construction (parts of the North/South Plaza, a public information Transit Center, and of the Montgomery Street improvements) as a portion of the overall project. Relocation costs associated with moving a business from a building to be demolished also are required.

None of these transit-related contributions involves the use of state funds — either Article XI-G bonds or General Fund monies. The relocation costs and a portion of the Montgomery Street improvements, totaling $1,250,000 in Article XI-F bonds, will be repaid from parking revenues and lease payments. The remaining $1,740,000 of increased transit-related funding requirements will be covered entirely from federal or local contributions or contracts with PSU.
In sum, then, the project budget has been increased by $4,060,000, to $33,270,000. If approved, two-thirds of the total funding will be from non-State funds; one-third (the amount dedicated solely to the academic program in the East and West Buildings) will be from existing approved Article XI-G bonds and the Emergency Fund monies. The total $33,270,000 funding consists of the following:

- $4,250,000 of federal grants and contracts;
- $7,065,000 of donations (private gifts and local government grants; $2,850,000 remaining to be raised);
- $7,865,000 of Article XI-G bonds;
- $6,090,000 of Article XI-F(1) bonds;
- $3,500,000 of Emergency Fund monies; and
- $4,500,000 of Other Funds.

Changes in the PSU Project Funding Over Time. This large, complex and multi-tiered project has, of necessity, shifted over the long period of its development. Table B outlines how the funding alignments have shifted from the project as proposed by the Board in 1996, through the 1997 Legislative approval to the current request. The major shifts that have occurred may be summarized thus:

- The 1996 submission of $29,200,000 included a request for $7,865,000 of General Fund monies for this project, but the 1997Legislatively approved project shifted these funds to gifts and Article XI-F(1) bonds.

- The 1996 submission and the 1997 approval of $29,200,000 carried the $5,000,000 FTA grant in the PSU budget. This element was removed from PSU and shifted to the Tri-Met budget (because of Tri-Met’s greater experience in managing a civil engineering/transit project of this scale).

- The 1998 project request of $33,270,000 includes a $5,000,000 reduction (for the FTA grant), yet an increase of $4,000,000 above the 1997 approved level. The project costs shifted by a combined total of $9,000,000 as follows:

  First, although $5,000,000 of grant funds from the FTA for the Transit Mall expansion was shifted from the direct PSU project budget to Tri-Met, some $3,650,000 of costs directly attributable to PSU remained to be covered. To
compensate for these costs, the Portland Development Commission, the Portland Transportation Department, and Tri-Met donated $2,900,000 of funds for three PSU projects: the Transit Center ($500,000), North Plaza ($1,900,000), and Montgomery Street Improvements ($500,000). The balance of $750,000 is associated with relocating a tenant from a building to be demolished to a new PSU site. PSU will dedicate the lease payments from this tenant to cover these relocation costs.

The second element is that the $4,060,000 increment above $29,210,000 is associated primarily with additional retail space ($1,400,000) and furnishings and equipment for the final building ($2,900,000). Lease income will cover the former and fund-raising will be sought for the latter.

- Finally, costs for a larger West Wing increased the project ($1,000,000), funded both by leases of retail space and Article XI-G bonds.

Limited Interchangeability of Funding Project Elements
Despite shifting funds from project element to project element, the agreements concerning the matching fund requirements from the partners involved in the non-state funded elements did not enable those funds to support the East Wing project. The lack of funding fungibility is an important element in understanding why the need remains for $3,500,000 of Emergency Fund monies, even as the budget has shrunk in several areas, and grown again in all other areas.

Schedule and Timing
It is necessary to obtain construction and funding approval as soon as possible to avoid additional costs associated with delay, and to coordinate the project’s construction with Tri-Met. If approved by this Board and further approved at the Emergency Board meeting in April, the project would be able to complete mass excavation for the entire
project site, construct foundations and basement walls, and begin the concrete superstructure of the East and West Wings prior to the rainy season. Construction bids obtained prior to that season are expected to be advantageous. Tri-Met’s project cannot proceed until this project is approved, as the two are integrally linked.

Prior Approvals

The Academic Program. The 1997 Legislative Session approved funding and construction of the Urban Center, Phase I project in Chapter 584, Section 2(4)(j). The project then called for a 100,000 gsf academic building space, which would permit the consolidation into a single building of the College of Urban and Public Affairs, which ranks among the top five such programs in the nation. It includes the Mark O. Hatfield School of Government, the School of Urban Studies and Planning, the School of Community Health, plus a dozen centers and research institutes: Among the latter are the Center for Population Research and Census and the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies. With 500 undergraduate major and 600 graduate degree students, and 69 faculty FTE, the College is one of PSU’s most important academic enterprises.

State-of-the art “distance learning” classrooms were included as a major component of the project. Programs from the new Distance Learning Center will feed through PSU’s television services located on the PSU campus in Neuberger Hall, which has the capability of providing transmission via cable lines and satellite links. These types of classrooms are increasingly needed to provide access to PSU’s curricula to those in off-site locations, or nontraditional students pursuing their studies via the Internet or cable satellite, and are now to be housed in their own separate wing of the facility.

The Role of the Project in the City of Portland University District Plan. Because of its importance in redeveloping the downtown area, its location on the public transit lines and its planned public amenities, the Urban Center, Phase I was also conceived as a project of particular importance to greater Portland. Funding involved extensive public partnerships with three federal agencies, two local agencies, and an intensive capital development campaign. The City of Portland viewed it as a catalyst for local housing construction, neighborhood economic growth, and general revitalization of the south downtown, as embodied in the University District plan adopted by the city in April 1995, and by the Board of Higher Education in 1996. In furtherance
of this role, Portland sought and was awarded a $2,000,000 HUD grant for the planning and design of urban revitalization activities within the City; this grant subsequently was delegated directly to PSU for its planning of the Urban Center Phase I project.

In addition, a fundamental element of the greater Portland project was the $7,500,000 FTA funded expansion of the Tri-Met Transit Mall. It was planned in parallel with the Urban Center, Phase I project, such that the two projects were to be closely integrated, both in design and funding.

The Urban Center, Phase I has, from the beginning, been conceived as a unique partnership among PSU, Tri-Met (the regional transportation entity for Multnomah, Washington, and Clackamas Counties), the Portland Development Commission, the Portland Transportation Department, three federal agencies, the PSU Bookstore (a private cooperative), and major donors to the College of Urban and Public Affairs. Each of these entities has provided significant resources to this project, either as a direct contribution to the Urban Center or through the associated transit and public space improvement serving it.

The Funding Approach. In 1997, the Legislature approved an overall limitation of $29,210,000, to employ $7,865,000 of Article XI-G bonds, $3,480,000 of Article XI-F(1) bonds, and $17,865,000 of Other Funds. The Other Funds were to consist of $7,865,000 of gifts to match the Article XI-G bonds and $10,000,000 of federal funds.

Funds from gifts and federal and local governments, were permitted to be placed in a project donation account in the State Treasury, to be considered as General Fund money for the purposes of meeting the match requirements to issue Article XI-G bonds. The Board of Higher Education was restricted from issuing any of the bonds for the project until the total amount of other revenues, including federal funds identified for the project in the expenditure limitation, had been received by the Board; however, this restriction was amended to permit the sale of the bonds after reporting to the Emergency Board on the total amount of other revenues received prior to the request to issue bonds.

A budget note to Senate Bill 5523 (1997 Legislative Session) was added stating that:
"On or after November 1, 1998, the Department of Higher Education may request an Emergency Fund allocation of up to $3.5 million, for purposes of constructing the Portland State University, Urban Center Phase I. The Subcommittee expects that the Department will include identification of other revenues (including federal funds) secured for the project, so that along with the requested allocation, the Department has sufficient funding to complete the project, or to fully complete a portion of the project."

Finally, in November 1997, PSU was asked by the Education Subcommittee of the Emergency Board to provide a general overview of the history and purposes of the project, the academic need for the project, and its role in the Portland City Master Plan. At the November meeting, the leadership of the Emergency Board indicated its willingness to consider such a request in advance of November 1998, if appropriate.

**Project Details**

The seven elements of the projects include:

- **East Wing/College of Urban and Public Affairs (119,000 gsf).** The building, at the north end of the site, will contain 97,000 gsf of classrooms, seminar spaces, faculty offices, and related academic space. The structure will be seven stories in height and will overlook a handsome public plaza at the center of the Transit Mall Expansion. The remainder of the space, 22,000 gsf, will be used principally to house the PSU Bookstore. Total cost of this academic facility is $22,895,000, to be split funded — 50 percent from the State of Oregon Article XI-G bonds and General Funds and 50 percent from a combination of a federal grant, gifts, Article XI-F(1) bonds, and an energy service contract with Johnson Controls. Construction begins June 1998 and the facility is scheduled to open January 2000.

- **West Wing/Distance Learning Center (13,000 gsf).** This facility houses five fully-equipped distance education classrooms in 10,000 gsf of academic space. Another 3,000 gsf of space is being provided for ground-level retail, as required by the City of Portland. Construction begins November 1998 and the facility will open January 2000. Funding is 50 percent by a $2,000,000 grant from the federal EDA, 25 percent from
private gifts and Article XI-G bonds, and the remainder by funds contributed by Portland Development Commission to the North Plaza element (see below), but having elements that contribute to this facility (entry ramps, landscaping, etc.).

- **PSU Transit Center (1200 gsf).** Attached to the West Building and facing the Plaza, will be a 1,200 gsf facility devoted to transit information, trip planning, and other transportation services. It will be located at the site of the busiest transit stop in the Tri-Met system. At a cost of $535,000, it is entirely funded by a contribution from the Portland Development Commission and a contract to PSU from the FTA via Tri-Met.

- **PSU Portion of North-South Plaza.** The North Plaza is PSU's portion of an extensive pedestrian thoroughfare and public garden, to include a South Plaza, central fountain, and outdoor gathering space. It is to be located at the foot of the two wings of the Urban Center, between the East Building and the existing PCAT building opposite. The design of the plaza and the Urban Center buildings accommodates the proposed South-North light rail, whose alignment would curve through the plaza. This PSU portion of the cost — $2,190,000 — is entirely funded by the Portland Development Commission, although a portion of the costs is carried in the PSU Transit Center project above.

- **PSU Portion of Tri-Met Transit Improvements.** Central to the final joint project is the $7,500,000 expansion of the downtown transit mall, funded 80 percent by the Federal Transit Administration. As a requirement for the grant, PSU, the City of Portland, and Tri-Met were each required to provide $500,000 in match funding. The Montgomery Street Transit-Related Improvements element constitutes the physical manifestation of PSU's contribution, to be provided via Article XI-F(1) bonds, repaid from parking revenues. The funds will go toward the replacement and landscaping of sidewalks surrounding the entire block, plus the incorporation of the Montgomery Street right-of-way between Fifth and Sixth Avenues into the Plaza.
Meeting #671—Minutes

February 20, 1998

- **Relocation Costs for an Existing Building.** A small building at the site must be demolished and the tenant relocated. Costs for relocation are $750,000. Funds will be repaid using Article XI-F(1) bonds, repaid by a lease from the relocated business, which will lease space in a PSU facility.

- **Furnishings and Equipment.** Carried as additions or alternates in the construction budget, this element represents $2,850,000 of gift opportunities to provide upgraded or new furnishings, equipment and finishes in the College of Urban and Public Affairs.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

Staff recommended that the Board approve the request by PSU for authority to increase the size of the Urban Center, Phase I, project to 133,200 gsf. Staff further recommended the Board authorize the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration to request State Emergency Board approval for: an increase in total project expenditure limitation to $33,270,000; $3,500,000 of Emergency Fund monies; submittal of a report prepared by PSU to the Emergency Board on the status of "Other Revenues" for the project; a request to issue $7,865,000 of Article XI-G bonds; an increase in Article XI-F(1) bond expenditure limitation to $6,090,000; and construction of the project under its current configuration and as reported herein.

**Board Discussion and Action**

Vice Chancellor Anslow reviewed highlights of the proposal, as an extensive presentation had taken place earlier in the day.

President Aschkenasy said that he had two concerns about the project: 1) the increased capacity for educating people and the level of tuition OUS would expect to incur; and 2) the number of "players" in the project. "We ought to be playing some 'what if' games, if some of the potential partners don't show up, just as if the transit mall doesn't materialize," he observed.

Mr. Anslow conceded that it is a very complex undertaking, but all indications from the partners have assured staff that the project is
ready to go. The next step, however, is to gain the E-Board’s support for the $3.5 million being requested in this proposal. Vice Chancellor Anslow praised the many people who have worked on this project, stating that now they are “in the home stretch.”

Ms Wustenberg asked about the $4.5 million listed as “Other Funds.” Mr. George Pernsteiner, PSU vice president for finance and administration, said that the $4.5 million is the energy service provider contract. He went on to explain that through a competitive process, PSU located an agency (Johnson Controls) that would install and operate all electrical and mechanical systems. PSU will then pay them over 20 years for the installation, plus they will manage the energy in the building. “We’re trying this out for two reasons: 1) to get the $4.5 million; and 2) to test out very modern building management systems. We’re very excited about this contract,” he concluded. Mr. Anslow concurred that this type of alliance is going on nationwide in an effort to bring utilities into new locations.

Ms. Wustenberg moved and Mr. Willis seconded the motion to approve the proposal. The following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Lussier, McAllister, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. The following voted no: none.
Table A

Changes in GSF Proposed for Urban Center, Phase I by Sub-Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As approved 7/97</th>
<th>Proposed 2/98</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST BUILDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Space</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Space</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST BUILDING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSIT CENTER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>133,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B - Part I

Changes in Funding Sources and Uses
Proposed for Urban Center, Phase I,
by Sub-Element
(in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subelement</th>
<th>Requested July 1996</th>
<th>Approved July 1997</th>
<th>Requested February 1998</th>
<th>% of Total Budget, by Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAST WING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Urban &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal HUD Grant</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Gifts</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>6,795</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Development Commission</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Energy Service Provider Contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-F(1) Bonds</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,980</td>
<td>4,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-G Bonds</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>6,980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund/Emergency Fund</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$ 21,330</td>
<td>$ 20,140</td>
<td>$ 22,895</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST WING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal EDA Grant</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td>$ 2,500</td>
<td>$ 2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Development Comm</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Gifts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-F(1) Bonds</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article XI-G Bonds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,560</td>
<td>$ 3,070</td>
<td>$ 3,550</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT CENTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Devt Comm</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm Contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRI-MET NORTH/SOUTH RAIL</strong></td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSU NORTH PLAZA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Adm</td>
<td>$ 0</td>
<td>$ .500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Development Comm</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>2.190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Met (Match to FTA)</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$ .320</td>
<td>$ 1.0</td>
<td>$ 2.190</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested July 1996</th>
<th>Approved July 1997</th>
<th>Requested February 1998</th>
<th>% of Total Budget, by Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSU PORTION OF TRI-MET/ Montgomery Street Improvements</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELOCATION</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FURNISHINGS AND EQUIPMENT for East Bldg</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL ELEMENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29.210</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29.210</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33.270</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B - Part II

**Changes in Funding Sources and Uses**

**Proposed for Urban Center, Phase II,**

**by Funding Source**

*(in millions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As Requested July 1996</th>
<th>As Approved July 1997</th>
<th>As Requested February 1998</th>
<th>% of Total Budget, by Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL FUNDS</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$4,250</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATIONS</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE XI-F(1) BONDS</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,480</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTICLE XI-G BONDS</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER FUNDS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALL SOURCES</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33,270</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Oregon Institute of Technology sought Board approval to renovate 13,628 square feet of the OIT Metro Center. If approved, the Board would authorize the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration to seek authorization from the State Emergency Board for an "Other Funds" expenditure limitation for the issuance of $1,250,000 of 15-year term Article XI-F(1) bonds on behalf of OIT. Approval of this project will permit OIT to remodel all the remaining undeveloped Metro Center space, of which approximately 6,000 gross square feet (gsf) will be leased to Clackamas Community College (CCC) for its educational programs. Under the proposed new lease with CCC, the community college will continue to share approximately 5,000 gsf of classroom and lab space with OIT, bringing its total shared space (new and remodeled) to approximately 11,000 gsf.

The Board of Higher Education acquired the Metro Center on behalf of the Oregon Institute of Technology in 1991. At present, OIT occupies 41,843 gsf of this 55,471 gsf building, which is located in the southeast Portland metro area. The OIT Metro Center presently offers degree completion programs in Manufacturing Engineering Technology, Electronics Engineering Technology, Industrial Management and Management Information Systems. In fall 1997, OIT Metro Center enrolled 204 students in credit courses, 138 of whom were degree-seeking students. In cooperation with its other education and training partners (CCC, EOU, and local industry), an additional 200 students attend classes at the facility.

The current four classrooms have design capacity for approximately 120 students; the seminar room will accommodate 54 students; and each of the four labs has capacity for 16-18 students. At present, classrooms are scheduled for use by CCC approximately 85 percent of the day Monday through Thursday, and 95 percent on Saturdays; OIT classes and labs are scheduled primarily in the evening, and reflect a higher usage rate for these periods. The seminar room is used during the weekdays about 40 percent of the time for a variety of educational purposes as well as for community meetings. The laboratories are utilized sporadically throughout the week and on Saturdays.
Clackamas Community College, located in adjacent buildings, currently leases approximately 5,000 gsf of classroom space at the Metro Center to offer the Associate of Arts/Oregon Transfer (AA/OT) degree. CCC has approached OIT for the purpose of leasing approximately 6,000 gsf of additional space in order to expand technical programs that relate directly to OIT's technology programs. The CCC programs would continue to be offered primarily during the daytime, with OIT programs offered in the evenings. In addition to upgraded classroom and laboratory space, the renovation will address certain acute building repair needs such as serious roof leakage, plumbing problems, and redirecting of electrical circuits.

The terms of the lease arrangement with CCC will provide OIT a source of debt service repayment on Article XI-F(1) bonds for seven years of the 15-year bond term. Bond proceeds will be sufficient to support the renovation of the remaining 13,628 gsf of undeveloped Metro Center academic space for CCC and OIT programs. Estimated annual debt service on the 15-year bonds is $117,000. The proposed lease will include an early notification provision wherein CCC will notify OIT after five years of its intentions to renew the lease for an additional seven years. In the event CCC were to decide not to renew the lease, early notification will allow OIT management a period of two years to seek new tenants. Further, the Board of Education for CCC has also approved payment of its share of utility costs ($37,000/year) and its share of funding for a maintenance and custodial position ($35,000/year) during the lease term.

When the renovation is completed (anticipated December 1998), OIT will be able to offer additional upper division technical programs necessary for students to fulfill requirements for certain baccalaureate degrees. Providing these kinds of programs at this site will permit OIT to expand its enrollment in the Portland metropolitan area in order to meet the demand for additional technology training both by students and industries in the area. This project is in accord with initiatives by the Governor and the Board to extend access to students by increasing its curriculum offering in engineering technology and other related fields, to coordinate with other Oregon University System institutions, and to strengthen partnerships with institutions of higher education outside the System, including community colleges.
In addition to the classes OIT offers at the Metro Center, the Institute offers Software Engineering Technology as well as some Electronics and Management courses at the CAPITAL Center. However, the space available at the CAPITAL Center for OIT to develop evening programs is already oversubscribed.

OIT's plans for growth at the Metro Center are in response to a growing demand in the Greater Portland metropolitan area for upper division, degree-completion programs in Computer Engineering Technology, Health and Applied Sciences. The concentration of high-tech industries around Portland offers a strong fit with the emphases OIT has in certain programs. In addition, the proximity of CCC and compatibility with their programs, contribute to locating certain programs at the Metro Center. A unique partnership is developing with CCC, specifically in fields related to manufacturing technology.

In addition, the Portland Office of Extended Studies of EOU recently relocated to the Metro Center and is cooperating with OIT to expand general education curriculum offerings and to accept prior learning opportunities as credit toward a degree.

In summary, the following OIT-sponsored bachelor degree completion programs are offered in Portland:

- Software Engineering Technology;
- Electronics Engineering Technology;
- Management Information Systems;
- Industrial Management; and
- Manufacturing Engineering Technology.

Plans for new program offerings are under consideration at OIT and may include the following:

- Masters in Computer Engineering Technology with an emphasis in ASIC design;
- Other degree completion programs in Health Technologies and Applied Sciences;
- Certificate in Technical Communications; and
- Micro Electronics/Manufacturing Engineering Technology.
The Opt for Co-op program in the Portland area will require space for offices and services at the Metro Center as well.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board approve the Oregon Institute of Technology's request to renovate approximately 13,628 gross square feet of the OIT Metro Center. Staff further recommended that the Board authorize the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration to seek authorization from the State Emergency Board for an Other Funds expenditure limitation for issuance of 15-year term Article XI-F(1) bonds in the amount of $1,250,000 for this project.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Anslow reviewed costs involved for the proposed project. He explained that the seven-year lease entered into by Clackamas Community College would essentially cover the capital and operating costs. He reminded Board members that this could be considered an access issue, as part of the goal of furthering seamless relationships with community colleges, as well as increased utilization of facilities.

Ms. Christopher motioned and Mr. Willis seconded approval. Those voting in favor: Directors Christopher, Lussier, McAllister, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

Staff Report to the Board

The Oregon University System's current vacation policy is somewhat unusual in that 176 hours are awarded at one time, each year, unlike vacation policies in other settings, whereby individuals accrue time on a monthly basis. Most employers require that an employee be at work for at least six months before vacation time can be used, and most employers set a maximum vacation leave balance. We find these patterns to be prevalent with those institutions using the automated Human Resources Information System (HRIS) that OUS has acquired.

This new approach should expand vacation planning options for employees and supervisors and should reduce the likelihood that employees will be forced to take time off at inappropriate times, rather
than losing the accumulated benefits. It will also allow for a smoother and less costly transition to an automated vacation accrual system, while providing supervisors with a better means of vacation planning.

As a transition from annual to monthly accrual, on February 28, 1998, a pro-rata amount of vacation leave for current employees will be calculated at the old rate and added to each employee's vacation balance. Employees who have worked fewer than eleven months will receive an amount based on the number of months they have been employed; the amount for all other employees will be based on the number of months since an employee's most recent anniversary date.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

After review by the Administrative and Academic Councils, staff recommended that the Board amend OAR 580-021-0030, Vacation Leave, to allow monthly accruals, with a six-month waiting period for new employees, as follows:

(Note: Underline denotes addition; brackets and highlighted text denote deletion.)

Vacations

580-021-0030 (1) Eligibility. Vacation means absence from work permitting rest and recreation for a specified period of time during which regular compensation continues. [Academic] Unclassified [staff] employees gain vacation privileges only if employed at .50 FTE or more on a 12-month appointment.

(2) Computation. Eligible [academic] unclassified employees [receive] accrue vacation [allowance] on [their vacation anniversary, which is the date on which they first completed 11 months of continuous service] a monthly basis, beginning the first of the month following date of hire [with the Department.] or on the first of the month if an employee is hired the first working day of the month. Vacation accrues on the last day of the month and is available for use the first day of the next month subject to the restrictions in Section (3) of this rule. [However, academic staff may take a prorated amount of vacation after the first six months.] A 9-month employee appointed to a 12-month contract [may count service on the most recent 9-month contract toward completion of the 11-month vacation]
anniversary requirement] may receive credit for the previous 9-month contract, on a pro-rata basis. Eligible employees (on a 1.0 FTE, with a 12-month, 1.0 FTE contract receive 176 hours of vacation [allowance on their vacation anniversary] per month; eligible employees on [less than 1.0 FTE, but] a .50 FTE or more 12-month contract [receive an allowance proportional] accrue vacation in proportion to their FTE. An employee who terminates OUS employment before completing [11 months of continuous service] the 6-month wait period receives no vacation [allowance], and is not entitled to compensation for [such allowance] vacation accrued. On February 28, 1998, eligible employees shall be credited with vacation leave on a pro-rata basis at a rate of 14.67 hours per month as if monthly accrual had begun on their last vacation anniversary date or, for those employed fewer than 11 months, on their date of hire.

(3) Wait Period and Maximum Balance [Accrual and Carry over]. Vacation [allowance] accrual is available to the [academic] unclassified employee [to] for use in the subsequent 12 month period beginning with the employee’s vacation anniversary] six months after vacation accrual begins. The vacation allowance expires at the end of the 12 month period except as follows: the institutional president or designee may approve the carry over of up to 80 hours of vacation time when staffing needs have prevented the employee from utilizing all the vacation allowance within the given 12 month period. The additional hours of vacation allowance shall expire on the employee’s next vacation anniversary. Until September 1, 1999, there will be no maximum limit on the amount of vacation leave that an employee can accrue. However, effective September 1, 1999, no employee may accrue in excess of 260 hours, and any accrued vacation leave in excess of this cap will be forfeited.

(4) Transfer. Inter-institutional/Unclassified to Unclassified. If an eligible [academic] unclassified employee transfers to another unclassified position within the Department and remains eligible for vacation [allowance] accrual [and of the break in service between appointments is 30 days or less], the employee shall transfer all accrued vacation leave to the new position [and the employee’s vacation anniversary shall remain unchanged.] However, if [the] there is a break in service [is] of more than 30 days, all accrued vacation pay will be paid off by the sending institution and [a new vacation anniversary date will be established] the employee will be considered
a new hire in the new position. Moving from position to position within the same institution shall not be considered a transfer or a break in service for purposes of this rule.

5) Classified to Unclassified Appointment. If a classified employee of the Department receives an [academic] unclassified appointment within the Department and is eligible for vacation [privileges] leave, the employee may [transfer] bring up to 80 hours of accrued vacation [time] leave; the receiving department or institution may accept up to [176] 250 hours maximum. The former classified employee shall receive cash compensation from the sending department or institution for any remaining accrued vacation [allowance] leave [not transferred]. The former classified employee may use accrued vacation without serving a 6-month wait period.

6) The accrual of vacation [allowance] leave is reduced on a pro-rata basis for the period of leave without pay, sabbatical leave and educational leave. Vacation [time] leave is accrued during other periods of paid leave.

7) Payment for Accrued Vacation [Time] Leave. [Academic] Unclassified employees are not entitled to payment for unused vacation [allowance] leave except upon termination of employment or upon transfer within the Department to another [academic] unclassified position not eligible for vacation benefits. [Academic] Unclassified [staff] employees who transfer to a classified position within State of Oregon employment are subject to applicable [OSSHE] OUS rules or collective bargaining agreements governing payment for accrued vacation. The maximum number of hours that can be paid upon termination or transfer is [176] 180 hours.

8) Scheduling and Use of Vacation Leaves. Vacation leaves are scheduled with the approval of the employee’s supervisor and should be planned cooperatively with the employee. Vacation leave should be scheduled in such a manner as to minimize disruption to the organization. Supervisors must be reasonable in allowing the use of vacation [time] leave and may not unreasonably deny vacation requests where the result would be the forfeiture of accrued vacation. For purposes of calculation, one normal work day is the equivalent of eight hours of vacation [time] leave for a full-time employee.

9) Record Keeping. Each institution is responsible for maintaining the individual records of vacation accrual and use.

10) [Alternative Plan. An institution may, upon receiving written approval from the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, use July 1 as the vacation accrual date for all eligible
academic staff.) Vacation Donation. The transfer of vacation time, for use by another employee, classified or unclassified, is not permitted.

(11) Vacation Borrowing. Employees are not permitted to borrow against vacation that is not yet accrued.

(12) Interim Provisions for Employees Moving from Management Service to Unclassified Service. Vacation leave for employees in management service on November 1, 1996, shall be provided by the policies established in this section.

(a) For those employees who were employed in management service at the time of conversion of their positions to unclassified or academic service on November 1, 1996, up to 176 hours of the employees' current vacation accrual balance shall be credited to each employee's active vacation account. Any hours in excess of 176 hours will be maintained in a reserve vacation account for the employee. Employees have 36 months, until November 1, 1999, to draw upon the reserve vacation account according to the provisions in section [(7)] (8) of this rule. An employee may be paid for any or all of the hours in the employee's reserve vacation account at the institution's discretion. On November 1, 1999, the institution will pay the employee for any remaining balance in the employee's reserve vacation account at the employee's rate of pay on that date.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection [(10)(a)] (12)(a) of this rule, if an employee's employment with the Department ends prior to November 1, 1999, the employee may receive payment for no more than 250 hours of accrued vacation time. Employees will be paid at the rate of pay they are receiving on their last day of employment with the Department.

(c) Employees who were management service employees on November 1, 1996, and who retired from the Department by June 30, 1997, will accrue vacation on a monthly pro-rata basis at the rate of 176 hours per year between November 1, 1996, and their retirement date.

(d) In the event of extraordinary circumstances, the Chancellor or designee may approve exceptions to the policy established in section [(10)] (12) of this rule.

(e) This section is repealed [January 1, 1998.] December 1, 1999.
Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Anslow explained that most organizations have a six-month waiting period before employees can begin using vacation time, whereas OUS has a one-year wait. Thus, newer employees sometimes borrow and pay back time. In an effort to eliminate that practice, and to better facilitate use of time with the new automated system (HRIS), the proposal calls for an adjustment to the monthly accrual, essentially earning time on a monthly basis.

Mr. Lussier asked if there was a policy on how the time is used. Mr. Anslow replied that there is a policy statement in the OAR saying that employees are to work with supervisors on determining the most appropriate times to take vacation leave.

Ms. McAllister moved and Ms. Christopher seconded the motion to approve the amendment to the OAR. On roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Christopher, Lussier, McAllister, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, Wykoff, and Aschkenasy. Those voting no: none.

In response to requests from the staff of the seven-member Oregon Congressional delegation, OUS has developed a Federal Appropriations Priorities List for 1998. A single priority document, forwarded by the Chancellor, will provide Congressional delegation members a guidepost to effectively address a clear set of stated campus appropriation objectives.

Moreover, as House and Senate committees prepare for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA), congressional staff resources may be better utilized to ensure that legislative attention is paid to specific campus appropriations requests in addition to the major issues raised by HEA reauthorization.

The current federal priority list was developed differently than those of the past. This year, each OUS institution was responsible for developing the rationale, background material, executive summary, and identifying a likely federal funding source for the institution's "Top Three" federal funding priorities. Participants enlisted for the discussions, and the ranking of the selected projects, were at the President's discretion.
The project summaries describe partnerships, the overall value of the project to the institutions' programmatic goals, and a rationale illustrating how the project serves long-standing or emerging statewide and regional needs. The funding priorities of each institution accurately reflect the mission of OUS in furthering aspects of instruction, research, and public service.

Chancellor Cox will present the compiled lists in a series of meetings scheduled with the Oregon Congressional delegation this month.

**Board Discussion**

Mr. Andy Clark, OUS senior associate director of government relations, reviewed the appropriations list, which was composed by institution presidents and their staff. The list, a result of a direct request from congressional delegation staff, is a different process than what has occurred historically; federal priorities would be forwarded to the Chancellor's office, then judgments would be made on what would be moved along to the delegation.

Mr. Lussier asked about that strategy and Mr. Clark's impressions of the shift from the submission of federal priorities from the Chancellor's office to the institutions. Chancellor Cox interjected that he felt it was likely an effort for more direct communication with the campuses, and added that he supported the new method of gathering information on federal priorities.

Mr. Clark further explained his role in the new OUS Washington, D.C. office, where he shares space with the Governor's lobbyist, Kevin Smith. "Kevin and I are able to share information about what the Governor is thinking in regard to his federal priorities, and I can share with him what our Board Committees are doing and how it applies to our work with the congressional delegation," he said.
### 1998 Federal Priorities List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>TYPE OF FUNDING</th>
<th>FUNDING AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOU</td>
<td>1. Eastern Oregon Regional Biological, Agricultural, and Health Sciences Program</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>1. Strengthening Institution's Program</td>
<td>Competitive Grant</td>
<td>$1,748,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Geographic Information Services</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$123,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Geo-Heat Center</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$444,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>1. Construction Funds for Completing the Environmental Computing Center</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Distance Education Alliance</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Interdisciplinary High Technology Laboratories</td>
<td>Competitive Grant</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>1. The Metropolitan Compact</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. University Studies Program</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Oregon Health Policy Institute</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOU</td>
<td>1. Acquisition and Operation of the Pacific Northwest Museum of Natural History Center</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Strengthening Institution's Program</td>
<td>Competitive Grant</td>
<td>$1,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Center for the Visual Arts</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOU</td>
<td>1. Forensics Science Institute</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Spanish Language Training Institute</td>
<td>Special Purpose Funding</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EOU Presidential Search Chair Gail McAllister reported that the search is progressing on schedule, and the hope is to name the new president by the end of April. She added that the upcoming presidential candidate visits will be different from other visits, in an effort to have ample time for all interested parties to meet with them in various ways. "Hopefully, before the next Board meeting, we'll have a press release announcing the weeks of the campus visits; the names of the finalists will come closer to the visit times," Ms. McAllister announced.

Mr. Lussier reported on the February 10 Joint Boards Working Group meeting. Topics included technology, continuing professional development of teachers, and diversity, particularly in K-12. There was also a discussion on how to resurrect issues that obviously impact how OUS and ODE systems function together. Many of these items (e.g., how K-12 prepares students for postsecondary work and the role of community colleges) will be placed on future agendas for more detailed discussions.

In Mr. Imeson's absence, OHSU Provost Lesley Hallick said that she had just come from an OHSU Board budget committee meeting; "the group seemed to approve of what we are doing," she said.

President Aschkenasy commented that he had dinner recently with Senators Bill Fisher and Neil Bryant. One of the subjects that arose was the idea of getting the state to think of subsidy in terms of the numbers of students; otherwise, there's a risk of being penalized for increasing enrollment.

Chancellor Cox noted that this was Francesca Clifford's last Board meeting. She recently accepted a position with the American Red Cross. As media/communications specialist for OUS, Ms. Clifford attended more than 60 Board meetings.

Mr. Lussier stated that there is a great deal of energy going into the University Association in central Oregon; the group is currently putting a business plan together, and the goal is to have some major development in place by the end of the century.
ADJOURNMENT  The Board meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

[Signatures]

Virginia L. Thompson  
Secretary of the Board

[Signatures]

Herbert Aschkenasy  
President of the Board