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OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY, BALLROOM A/B
CORVALLIS, OREGON

CALL TO ORDER
The meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to
order at 8 a.m. by President Imeson.

ROLL CALL
On roll call, the following answered present:

Dr. Herb Aschkenasy            Ms. Katie Van Patten
Ms. Diane Christopher          Mr. Jim Willis
Mr. David Koch (arrived at 9:25) Ms. Phyllis Wustenberg
                              Mr. Tom Imeson

Absent: Mr. Jim Lussier (out of the country), Ms. Gail McAllister
(business conflict), Ms. Esther Puentes (business conflict), Mr. Don
VanLuvanee (business conflict)

MINUTES APPROVED
The Board dispensed with the reading of the December 18, 1998,
Board meeting minutes. Mr. Willis moved and Ms. Christopher
seconded the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. The
following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Van
Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, and Imeson. Those voting no: none.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT
Mr. Imeson expressed his appreciation to President and Mrs. Risser
and other OSU staff for their hospitality. He reviewed the visitation
from the day before, noting that the open forum held in the afternoon
was an interesting session that included faculty, staff, and students.
"It was a good day and something that we will be doing more often.
This type of visit was the result of suggestions by the Governance and
Structure Committee, and discussed at our meeting last July," he
said.

AGB Conference
Mr. Imeson encouraged Board members to attend the upcoming
Association of Governing Boards Conference, scheduled from March
27-30 in Seattle. He announced that he was asked to participate in a
panel discussion entitled The Necessity of Board Leadership for
Change.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT
Leading off his remarks, Chancellor Cox thanked former IFS
President Paul Simonds for his donation of wine to the Board dinner
the night before. "The wine we enjoyed was a gift from Paul to say
thank you’ to Board members and his colleagues for some time that I think he genuinely enjoyed and that we most certainly enjoyed with him," shared the Chancellor.

AOF Proposal
Providing a preliminary report on the Association of Oregon Faculties proposal to extend education benefits to family members of faculty, Dr. Cox said that the issues had become more involved and complex than originally thought. "I hope by the time we next meet, I will be able to provide you with some information," he indicated.

Federal Appropriations
The Chancellor said that he and Andy Clark, senior associate director of Government Relations, were scheduled to meet with the Oregon delegation in Washington, D.C. in early March to review the System’s federal initiative agenda. "This is a very different working relationship with the Oregon delegation and I think we’ve come a long way. Senators Smith and Wyden send along their unsolicited best wishes and accolades for the work being done to transform the System. It’s quite genuine,” he shared.

Central Oregon
“We are moving quickly to appoint the Regional Advisory Board for the Central Oregon project," reported the Chancellor. "I’m overwhelmed by the number of applications and nominations we’ve received," he said.

IFS Report
Chancellor Cox asked IFS President John (Jack) Cooper for his report. Following is an excerpt of his remarks:

“...I want to begin by expressing gratitude to you for your openness to the faculty and to me personally. I think that from the beginning we have had a good working relationship with Chancellor Cox and this Board, and that is not a trite or conventional observation. Faculty can bring a very useful perspective to dealing with the issues that confront you.

“The last meeting of the IFS was an extraordinary one. We convened at the State Capitol and spent part of the day lobbying members of the legislature. In the afternoon we were addressed by Senate President Brady Adams and Senator Ginny Burdick, a member of the ad hoc Legislative Coalition for Higher Education. Our message to the legislators was simple. We reminded them of the cuts that higher education had received between 1993 and 1997, and we asked that the damage be repaired as much as possible by full funding of the new budget model. We expressed our support for that model,
and asked for a continuation of the tuition freeze. It was clear that this was the right message and that we were right in delivering it.

"At our regular meeting, we spent most of our time discussing what we have observed so far concerning the implementation of the new budget model on our respective campuses. Attitudes to the new model varied considerably, from enthusiasm to anxiety. The enthusiasm came from those who liked its clarity in contrast to the BAS model, who saw that overworked departments might finally get some relief, and who believed that it would focus efforts on students and teaching.

"The anxiety came partly from the regional universities, who felt most vulnerable. Not only is it difficult for them to achieve the economies of scale that the market model encourages, but they are concerned about the way that the model gives less support for undergraduate education, which some feel that they do particularly well. It was clear, of course, from Governor Kitzhaber's original address to the Board, when he said that no institution will be allowed to fail, that the market model is not to be applied blindly. To put it simply, we fear that what should be academic decisions might be made simply for economic reasons.

"At the end of the meeting, we passed a resolution in which we summed up our support for the new funding model and our willingness to make it work consistently with the goals of the System.

"With regard to faculty salaries, I would like to mention the following: we are still in the bottom twentieth percentile nationwide for most ranks. At the last full meeting of the Board, President Frohnmayer made the point that I would like to endorse. Speaking for the University of Oregon, but, I think, by implication for all of us, he said that the good things that he hopes to accomplish will not happen without improvement of faculty salaries. He also addressed, at the same meeting, a concern that we on the faculty share, namely that the areas of responsibility and authority between institution and System need to be defined. We look forward to the results of the work of the System Strategic Planning Committee so that we can know where decisions will be made."
RESOLUTION
(Approved by the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate on January 7, 1999)

WHEREAS, the faculty in the Oregon University System provides value to Oregon in carrying out their teaching, research, and public service responsibilities to the students and citizens of the state; and

WHEREAS, the rapidly changing nature and complexity of society and the economy require increasingly higher levels of education for Oregonians to productively contribute to the livability of our state; and

WHEREAS, Oregon's employers have increasingly found it necessary to augment the workforce available in Oregon by recruiting educated workers from outside of our state's boundaries; and

WHEREAS, the State of Oregon drastically reduced state funding for the public universities, forcing tuition increases of 80 percent upon resident Oregon students; and

WHEREAS, debt loads for students of Oregon's public universities have increased dramatically during the 1990s, hampering graduates' ability to pursue graduate studies or start businesses; and

WHEREAS, the Governor, the Oregon business community, and the Oregon University System have recently approved and implemented important reforms to address the future of higher education in Oregon; and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned reforms promote stability and ensure quality and access to higher education, basing state funding decisions on student enrollments;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate of the Oregon University System is united in supporting full funding of the budget model as proposed by the Oregon State Board of Higher Education to:

1) Increase access to higher education for Oregon residents;
2) Preserve and enhance the quality of the learning experience for university students;
3) Expand higher education offerings to meet critical needs of the state;
4) Encourage collaboration and partnerships with Oregon's community colleges and the private sector.
5) Ensure adequate funding for each institution to carry out its mission; and
6) Enable each institution to attract and retain excellent faculty.

EOU/OIT Accreditation Reports

Offering his final remarks, the Chancellor noted that staff are in the process of summarizing the reports of the recent accreditation visits for EOU and OIT. "I know that Vice Chancellor Clark and Presidents Creighton and Dow would be more than happy to respond to questions from Board members after you've had a chance to read those. We will give you the summary digest, and you have access to all of the other materials and recommendations, should you want them," he said.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

President Imeson reported that the Executive Committee reviewed the goals and objectives for President Risser and Chancellor Cox at its February 18 meeting. Also discussed was the independent audit report as conducted by Deloitte and Touche. Mr. Imeson indicated that representatives from Deloitte and Touche would also be on hand to discuss their findings later in the meeting.

Explaining to the Board why the issue of Institutional Advisory Bodies was not included on the docket as indicated, Mr. Imeson said that since several Board members who had a strong interest in the subject could not attend the meeting, he was unwilling to bring the issue to the floor for a final vote.

Continuing, he said, "I'm beginning to wonder whether we actually need to formally adopt something anyway. What I recently circulated was a proposal stating that at the request of the president of an institution, the Chancellor would create an advisory committee for that institution. I think that we are able to do that, absent of general policy, if we let it be known to institutions that we are happy to respond to requests like that. The concern I have, frankly, is that I know a number of institutions are looking at doing various things on their own, and I don't want anything this Board is doing or not doing to be perceived as an obstacle to their doing that. It's important that presidents have the autonomy to set up what they need to have in the
advisory area, and I think the message from the Board is that we are here to be supportive of that. If there are things we can do or that the Chancellor can do to help that, and if people want to have something that has the blessing of the Board, then I think that's something we ought to do. When we have other Board members here at our next meeting, we can have further discussion about the issue."

Chancellor Cox confirmed that he could, in fact, receive requests from presidents to form advisory councils and report back to the Board. President Imeson said that would be the case.

"Is it also to suggest that if they want to appoint an advisory body themselves, without the Chancellor appointing, they could do that as well?" asked Ms. Christopher. "Absolutely," said Mr. Imeson.

POST-TENURE REVIEW

Background

In 1973, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education approved an Administrative Rule requiring each institution to develop and implement post-tenure review policies. This action was the culmination of a six-month Board committee study that supported post-tenure review as one way to provide internal and external (i.e., public) accountability.

During the 1990s, the increased pressure nationally for accountability in higher education has resulted in post-tenure review being the focus of discussion, policy development, and even legislation in some states. For example, in December 1997, then-Governor Romer (Colorado) issued an executive order requiring the governing board of each state-supported higher-education campus to adopt a policy for conducting post-tenure reviews at least every five years. Texas adopted legislation mandating such reviews every six years.

Recent Oregon Activity

While the Oregon University System has a well-established history of conducting post-tenure reviews, campuses have elected to respond to this current climate of heightened public interest by reviewing their existing policies and, in some cases, revising and strengthening them. (Each OUS campus conducts annual or biennial reviews as well as the more comprehensive evaluations of their tenured faculty. It is these more comprehensive evaluations that are commonly known as post-tenure reviews.)
The current status of campus policies follows:

**Eastern Oregon University.** EOU’s recently revised policy institutes a “trigger” system that builds on the biennial professional development plan required of all tenured faculty. If this plan, which is both retrospective and predictive, signals concern in significant areas of performance, a one-year improvement plan is crafted. In the event that the plan is unsuccessfully implemented, a formal post-tenure review process begins. This triggered approach allows resources to be focused where most needed.

**Oregon Institute of Technology.** All tenured faculty are evaluated every five years. The process includes a review of the five most-recent annual evaluations, as well as faculty and student input. Outstanding faculty may be recognized for their achievement; unsatisfactory performance may result in development of a plan for improvement with specific goals, objectives, and timelines. Faculty have three years within which to attain the goals specified.

**Oregon State University.** The OSU Faculty Senate has completed its thorough review and restructuring of the post-tenure review policy and process. The previous policy did not have the outcomes of review, either positive or negative, stated in writing. Also, the policy required different timetables based on faculty rank. The new post-tenure review guidelines, approved by the Faculty Senate at the end of fall term 1998, require all tenured faculty to be reviewed at least once every five years. Each academic unit is required to have a reward policy for outstanding performance, and unsatisfactory performance results in a mandatory professional development plan with a three-year implementation timeline. Possible outcomes of continued poor performance include salary reduction and reassignment.

**Portland State University.** As one of three OUS campuses with a faculty union, the post-tenure review process is included in the collective bargaining agreement. According to the most recent contract, tenured faculty are reviewed every five years. If necessary, a professional development plan is crafted, either solely by the faculty member or jointly with the three-member evaluation committee. The formative nature of the process is emphasized in the policy.

**Southern Oregon University.** Southern's policy is contained, in part, in the faculty collective bargaining agreement and also in the SOU Faculty Constitution. Together, they require tenured faculty to be
reviewed by the department chair every three years, and by a three-member committee on alternate third years. Annual faculty productivity plans and reports are considered, as well as student evaluations; colleague input; and research, public service, and scholarship contributions. These evaluations produce feedback for the faculty member to refine their goals and objectives. The provost may reward/recognize outstanding faculty performance.

University of Oregon. Under the proposed policy, which is being considered by a University Senate committee, tenured faculty would be formally evaluated every three years — one review conducted by the department head, alternate third-year reviews conducted by a peer committee. Possible rewards for outstanding performance include base-salary increase, additional clerical/research support, and university recognition. Under both the current and proposed post-tenure review policies, unsatisfactory performance may result in reallocation of duties and professional development opportunities.

Western Oregon University. Embodied in the faculty contract, Western evaluates tenured faculty every three years. The division chair conducts the evaluation based on primary job assignment, research/scholarship, professional service, institutional service, and academic advising. If the faculty member's performance is found lacking, they receive suggestions for remediation and a timeline for implementation and re-evaluation.

Conclusions

In December 1998, the Board reviewed a preliminary report and recommendations regarding OUS post-tenure review policies. As a result of that discussion, staff made additional modifications to the proposed new Internal Management Directive and Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) amendment. Those changes (1) strengthen the language acknowledging the rigor of the process by which faculty members earn tenure and (2) clarify the Board's intentions of connecting performance to salary decisions.

A public hearing regarding the amendment of OAR 580-021-0140, Post-Tenure Review, was held on Tuesday, January 19, 1999. No one provided testimony at that hearing. The OUS Office of Academic Affairs received written comment from Sarah Andrew-Collier, president of the PSU chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Specifically, AAUP requested the
Board strike the language that links remuneration to performance (i.e., OAR 580-021-0140 (2)(c)). Also, AAUP expressed appreciation for the proposed IMDs reaffirmation of Board commitment to tenure and academic freedom, and quoted an excerpt from the national AAUP's 1998 written stand on post-tenure review, which states, among other things, that post-tenure review should not be aimed at accountability but at faculty development. Finally, AAUP comments expressed concern that certain portions of the proposed Board policy are inconsistent with the collective bargaining agreement at PSU. However, staff do not believe that any parts of the Rule conflict with the current agreement and will bargain implementation if the agreement or law require. The PSU chapter of AAUP also provided excerpts from their collective bargaining agreement that relate to review, salary, rewards, professional development, etc.

Recommendations to the Board

Based on systematic review and discussion of existing and revised post-tenure review policies and practices, the OUS Academic Council and OUS staff recommended Board action linking post-tenure review more closely with specific performance outcomes. To that end, staff recommended: (1) adding language to the existing OAR which clearly states the purposes of post-tenure review, and (2) creating an Internal Management Directive that reaffirms Board commitment to faculty excellence, tenure, and academic freedom; recognizes the rigor of the tenure-procurement process; requires a formative component in each institution's policy guidelines; and links remuneration to performance reviews.

Proposed Revision to Post-Tenure Review OAR
(note: bold text indicates additions; bracketed text indicates deletions)

Post-Tenure Review

580-021-0140 (1) Tenured faculty members shall be evaluated periodically and systematically in accordance with [plans] guidelines developed [in the] by each institution[s].

[(2) Institutional plans for post-tenure reviews shall include, but not necessarily be limited to:

(a) A statement of the objectives of faculty post-tenure review and evaluation;
(b) A statement of criteria to be used in evaluations, the nature}
and kinds of data that will be accumulated, and the method of data collecting;
(c) A designation of persons making evaluations;
(d) A designation of the frequency and regularity of evaluations;
(e) A description of the institutional plan for relating post-tenure reviews to the faculty reward system, such that appropriate recognition for excellence can be provided;
(f) A description of the institutional plan to deal firmly but humanely with situations in which the competence or the vitality and drive of a particular faculty member have diminished to such an extent that the resources of the faculty career support program are unable to provide the stimulation or help necessary to return the faculty member to a fully effective state.]

(2) The purposes of post-tenure review are to:
(a) assure continued excellence in the academy,
(b) offer appropriate feedback and professional development opportunities to tenured faculty,
(c) clearly link the level of remuneration to faculty performance, and
(d) provide accountability to the institution, public, and Board.

(3) Institutions shall develop post-tenure review guidelines in accordance with the objectives and guidelines promulgated in IMD 4.002, OAR 580-021-0135(3), and OAR 580-021-0005(3)(A).

Proposed New Internal Management Directive on Post-Tenure Review

IMD 4.002 Post-Tenure Review
Recognizing that the quality of higher education is inextricably tied to the quality of faculty, the Board reaffirms its commitment to tenure, academic freedom, and maintaining an environment that supports sustained performance in teaching, research, and service. Further, the Board recognizes the rigorous, multi-year review process to which probationary faculty submit prior to the awarding of tenure, as well as the numerous ways in which tenured faculty performance is reviewed thereafter (e.g., student ratings of instruction, peer review of scholarly work, competitive sponsored research grants, juried exhibits and artistic performance). Nevertheless, for the purposes of more comprehensive review after tenure has been conferred and in accordance with the purposes stated in OAR 580-021-0140,
each institution shall develop post-tenure review guidelines, which shall be filed with the Chancellor's Office. Institutional guidelines shall include, but not be limited to:
(1) a statement of post-tenure review objectives;
(2) a statement of criteria to be used in evaluations, the nature and kinds of data that will be accumulated, and the methods of data collection;
(3) a designation of persons making evaluations;
(4) a designation of the frequency and regularity of evaluations;
(5) a description of the institutional plan for relating post-tenure reviews to the faculty reward system, so that annual salary-adjustment decisions (i.e., increase, no increase, decrease) will reflect the results of performance evaluations;
(6) a description of appropriate formative opportunities (e.g., professional development plan, faculty career support program [IMD 4.001]);
(7) a description of the institutional plan to deal firmly but humanely with situations in which a faculty member's competence or vitality have diminished to such an extent that formative opportunities are unable to sufficiently stimulate or assist the faculty member's return to a fully effective state. Any personnel actions for cause shall be implemented in accordance with OARs 580-021-0320 through 580-021-0470.

Board Discussion and Action

Vice Chancellor Clark indicated that, in response to Board comments in December, some minor revisions had been made to the proposed OAR amendment and new IMD. Dr. Clark summarized the OAR and IMD. "There is clearly an emphasis on post-tenure review in the enhancement and support of career development of faculty. Also, the importance of tenure and academic freedom is reaffirmed and the rigorous process by which faculty gain tenure is recognized. Finally, there is an explicit linkage made between post-tenure review and rewards and remuneration. The IMD clarifies that salaries could be adjusted downward as well as upward as a result of post-tenure review processes. Subsequent to Board approval, Dr. Clark anticipates returning in early summer to report on the status of campus post-tenure review policies as they relate to new Board requirements.

Ms. Wustenberg asked if student opinions regarding capacity of the instructor are taken into account. Dr. Clark confirmed student
evaluations of faculty were conducted on a regular basis and that there are also requirements for routine review of courses on each campus. "That kind of information is very much a part of annual reviews, pre-tenure reviews, and post-tenure reviews," explained Dr. Clark.

Dr. Aschkenasy expressed concern for the career support aspect of post-tenure review policies, because it may allow faculty to work unsatisfactorily beyond the time they receive an inadequate review. Vice Chancellor Clark responded that there are 14 additional Board OARs relating specifically to termination and other sanctions for cause. "If a faculty member is found to be grossly incompetent or grossly negligent, or has committed felonies or a host of other acts of that nature, the administration could move to the termination-for-cause process or other sanctioning-for-cause processes." Vice Chancellor Clark offered to compile and summarize these OARs for the Board.

Ms. Wustenberg asked about the AAUP's national policy statement indicating that post-tenure review should not be aimed at accountability, but at faculty development. "I would suggest that perhaps it ought to say it is aimed at accountability as well as faculty development. We need to have them perceive that we hold them accountable." Dr. Clark said, "Clearly we have taken a different position here than that AAUP statement. There's much debate about that statement across the country as well."

Dr. Aschkenasy observed that this process was part of the changes being implemented in the System that resonates with the citizens and their representatives. "We're getting a reception in the legislature that we haven't had for a long time. I think this is an issue not unrelated to that—we need to work towards better performance, on the one hand, but also a better way of communicating improved performance to our fellow citizens."

Referring to the recently released OUS report entitled Faculty Work and its Results, Dr. Clark shared that it was, for the most part, intended for a legislative audience. "This is the third time we've produced this report. It explains the work of faculty in considerable detail and provides outcome types of measures. That kind of reporting needs to be mined to be able to share positive news stories to the public about specific faculty activities," she said.
Ms. Wustenberg moved and Ms. Christopher seconded the motion to approve the item as submitted. On roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, and Imeson. Those voting no: none.

ADMISSION POLICY FOR THE 2000-01 ACADEMIC YEAR

Background

It is Board policy to approve undergraduate admission requirements for each academic year in February of the preceding calendar year. The 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, the Oregon University System (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 (on file in the Board's office).

Admission Policy Changes for 2000-01

Admission policy, as currently approved by the Board for the 1999-2000 academic year, will continue without change for admission to the 2000-01 academic year. However, projected transition to the PASS admission system has been revised to reflect and accommodate the implementation of educational reform in Oregon's schools. Support for the development of PASS continues to be borne by a combination of external grants and the Chancellor's Office budget.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended (1) that the 1999-2000 general admission policy be continued for the 2000-01 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 Clark reviewed the item, noting that traditional admission requirements remained stable for entering undergraduates. However, she said that the development of the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS) project was carefully aligned with the schedule and content of Oregon’s school reform efforts regarding the CIM/CAM. “We expect to have PASS fully implemented for students entering in 2004-05. We will be running parallel admission systems until we are fully converted,” she explained.

Chancellor Cox reported that he recently met with Superintendent Bunn. “I’m very encouraged by the commitment of energy that he is personally making to advancing this agenda,” he said.

Mr. Willis moved and Ms. Christopher seconded the motion to approve the item as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, and Imeson. Those voting no: none.
### Admission Requirements: 2000-01 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRESHMAN ADMISSION</strong> (Residents and Nonresidents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 Grade Point Average (HSGPA)</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>OIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA of 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 of 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>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 set, 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) meets the second language requirement. Second language requirement applies to transfer students graduating from high school in 1997 and thereafter.
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 ensure the award honors distinguished achievement and outstanding contributions to the institution, state, or society. Criteria and procedures for selection must be forwarded to the Chancellor for approval and, when approved, filed with the Secretary of the Board. Institutions are required to forward their recommendations for honorary degrees for the Board’s approval 90 days before the date for awarding the degrees.

Oregon State University

Oregon State University requests authorization to award honorary doctorates to Anne H. and Paul R. Ehrlich, Paul G. Hawken, and Admiral James D. Watkins at its June 1999 commencement.

Anne H. and Paul R. Ehrlich

Anne and Paul Ehrlich were among the first scientists to effectively communicate to the public the implications of scientific research in such areas as environmental degradation and overpopulation. Together, they have produced an enormous body of important work and taken public stands on diverse issues critical to the quality of human life, including the preservation of biodiversity and endangered species, the hazards of chemical pollution, the search for racial justice, and the dangers of nuclear winter.

The Ehrlichs’ scientific collaboration began in the 1950’s with research on butterflies as a test system for answering key questions about biological classification, ecology, and evolution. To date, they have written more than 30 books. Paul Ehrlich’s 1968 book, The Population Bomb, was labeled a wake-up call on the issue of overpopulation for an entire generation. The 1977 book, Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment, has been called a template for environmental education. More recently, the Ehrlichs have been publishing a series of newsletters, using science to debunk myths about humans’ relationships with the environment.

Currently, Anne Ehrlich is the associate director of the Center for Conservation Biology at Stanford University. Paul Ehrlich is the Bing
Professor of Population Studies and a professor of biological sciences at Stanford. They were honored last year with the 25th annual Tyler Prize for environmental achievement for their significant contributions—collectively and individually—to population biology, ecology, and evolution.

Paul G. Hawken

Paul Hawken has been instrumental in a growing revolution in the corporate world—a movement that combines successful business practices with environmental awareness and responsibility. His own business background reflects this stance. In 1966, Hawken created Erehwon Trading Company, which was the first natural foods company in the United States. In 1979, he founded Smith & Hawken, a garden and horticulture products catalog and retail store that not only is financially successful, but also has been cited as being one of the most environmentally innovative companies in the United States.

Hawken has shared his beliefs widely. His national best-seller, *The Ecology of Commerce*, has been translated into more than a dozen languages, and his 17-part PBS series, “Growing a Business,” illustrates how an increasing number of companies, such as LL Bean and Ben & Jerry’s Homemade Ice Cream, thrive while being good citizens. In 1994, Hawken founded the U.S. version of The Natural Step, an organization created to share frameworks of understanding about sustainable development. The group’s teachings focus on the scientific principles and comprehensive understanding of the requirements for life on earth, and how individuals, companies, and organizations can maintain and enhance those requirements.

Hawken’s activism extends beyond corporate boundaries. In 1965, Hawken served as a volunteer on the staff of Martin Luther King, Jr., in Selma, Alabama, and was press coordinator for the March on Montgomery.

Admiral James D. Watkins

Admiral James D. Watkins has a long history as a successful military leader, public servant, educator, and advocate for research. While in the U.S. Navy, Watkins became a four-star admiral and reached the
Navy's highest position—Chief of Naval Operations. His naval career, which spanned four decades, took him around the world and turned him into something of an activist. Among other things, he spoke out against the decline of the American educational system and the growth of international terrorism.

Admiral Watkins also became involved in another cause: AIDS. In 1987, Watkins was appointed chairman of the Presidential Commission on the Human Immunodeficiency Virus Epidemic and submitted the commission’s final report, which led to the establishment of a more enlightened federal AIDS policy.

In 1989, President Bush appointed Watkins as the sixth Secretary of Energy. During his four-year tenure, he led the development of the first comprehensive National Energy Strategy; implemented policies based on conservation and renewable energy resources; restructured the Department of Energy to emphasize environmental protection, safety, and health; and spearheaded a move to fund a five-fold increase in appropriations for environmental clean-up.

Most recently, Watkins has been an advocate for research and education in the marine sciences. He is president of both the Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc. (an organization of the ten leading oceanographic institutions in the world) and the Consortium of Oceanographic Research and Education, Inc. (an historic partnership of public and private organizations united to advance knowledge and learning in ocean sciences).

**University of Oregon**

The University of Oregon requests authorization to award an honorary doctorate to Helmuth Rilling at its June 1999 commencement.

**Helmuth Rilling**

Well-known in Oregon for serving as artistic director and conductor of the Oregon Bach Festival, Helmuth Rilling has a long history of significant musical contributions in Oregon, the United States, and internationally. Rilling has been artistic director of the Oregon Bach Festival in Eugene since its inception in 1970. The festival is one of the most expansive and critically acclaimed stagings of the composer’s works in America.
Prior contributions include founding the Gächinger Kantorei in 1953–54 and its permanent instrumental partner, the Bach Collegium Stuttgart, in 1965. In 1957, he became music director at the Gedächtniskirche in Stuttgart, a position he still holds today.

After studying with Leonard Bernstein in New York in 1967, Rilling became professor of choral conducting at the State Music Academy in Frankfurt, a post he held until 1985. He also conducted the Frankfurter Kantorei there until 1981.

Teaching has always been a central focus of Rilling’s work, and the educational programs at the core of the Oregon Bach Festival mirror his beliefs. The festival’s close link with the University of Oregon enabled Rilling to establish the conducting master class, Discovery Series, and other programs there; his success led to invitations to work at Indiana, Temple, Iowa, St. Olaf, Baldwin-Wallace, and Westminster Choir College.

Rilling is the director of the International Bachakademie Stuttgart, which he founded in 1981. Together with the teachers and ensembles of this institution, he has conducted Bach academies all over the world, in such cities as Buenos Aires, Cracow, Prague, Moscow, Budapest, and Tokyo. After several successful Bach academies in Santiago de Compostela (Spain), the Real Filharmonia of Galicia was founded there in 1996, with Rilling as its chief conductor.

A believer in the power of music to cross political and ethnic boundaries, Rilling’s many honors include being the first German conductor to conduct the Israeli Philharmonic in that country and being invited to conduct the musical portions of Germany’s official reunification ceremonies. In 1994, the International Bachakademie Stuttgart was awarded the UNESCO Music Prize, and the following year, Rilling received the Theodor Heuss Prize for advancing reconciliation and international understanding.

Rilling is a guest conductor with most major orchestras in Eastern and Western Europe, Asia, Canada, and the United States. He has commissioned composers such as Krzysztof Penderecki, Arvo Pärt, and Robert Levin. He considers himself a friend of the great Romantic composers and has uncovered and performed rare choral works. But
the benchmark of his career has been intensely personal interpretations of Bach's cantatas, and he is completing recordings of the entire works of J.S. Bach, to be released in 2000 in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of Bach's death.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended Board authorization to Oregon State University to award honorary doctorates to Anne Ehrlich, Paul Ehrlich, Paul Hawken, and James Watkins, and to the University of Oregon to award an honorary doctorate to Helmuth Rilling at the June 1999 commencements.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Christopher moved and Ms. Wustenberg seconded the motion to approve the nominations as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, and Imeson. Those voting no: none.

In a continuing effort to respond to requests from the staff of the seven-member Oregon Congressional delegation, the Oregon University System has compiled a Federal Appropriations Priorities List for 1999. A single priority document, forwarded by the Chancellor, enables Congressional delegation members to address a clear set of stated campus appropriation objectives.

As House and Senate committees begin deliberations on the Federal government's fiscal year 2000 budget, the document also prepares congressional staff to deal effectively with specific campus appropriation requests.

The 1999 federal priority list has been developed along the same lines as the list presented in 1998. Each OUS institution bears responsibility for the development of the rationale, background material, executive summary, and identification of a likely federal funding source for the institution's "Top Three" priorities. Participants who have been enlisted for the discussion, and the selection of the projects, have remained 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 during the first week of March.

**About the appropriations process...**

Institution presidents request annual appropriations in their budgets submitted the first Monday in February of each year. In support of the president's appropriations requests, agencies submit justification materials to the House and Senate Appropriations committees. These materials provide considerably more detail than is contained in the President's budget and are used in support of agency testimony during Appropriations subcommittee hearings on the President's budget.

Congress passes three main types of appropriations measures. Regular appropriations provide budget authority to agencies for the next fiscal year. Supplemental appropriations provide additional budget authority during the current fiscal year when the regular appropriation is insufficient or to finance activities not provided for in the regular appropriation. Continuing appropriations provide stop-gap (or full-year) funding for agencies that have not received a regular appropriation by the start of the fiscal year.

In a typical session, Congress acts on more than 16 appropriations measures, including 13 regular appropriations bills and at least two supplemental appropriations measures. Because of recurring delays in the appropriations process, Congress typically passes one or more continuing appropriations each year. The scope and duration of these measures depend on the status of the regular appropriations bills and the degree of budgetary conflict between the President and Congress. In some years, a continuing appropriations measure has been turned into an omnibus measure for enactment of regular appropriations bills. For example, the Oregon State University Distance Education Alliance
($3 million) and Portland State University's Oregon Institute of Public Service and Constitutional Studies ($1 million) were both funded in last year's Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

By precedent, appropriations originate in the House of Representatives. In the House, appropriations measures are originated by the Appropriations Committee (when it marks up or reports the measure) rather than being introduced by a Member beforehand. Before the full Committee acts on the bill, it is considered in the relevant appropriations subcommittee (the House and Senate Appropriations committees have 13 parallel subcommittees). The House subcommittees typically hold extensive hearings on appropriations requests shortly after the president's budget is submitted. In marking up their appropriations bills, the various subcommittees are guided by the discretionary spending limits established by the BEA of 1990 and the allocations made to them under Sections 302 or 602 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The Senate usually considers appropriations measures after they have been passed by the House. Hearings in the Senate Appropriations subcommittees generally are not as extensive as those held by counterpart subcommittees in the House. When the Senate (either in committee or on the floor) changes a House-passed appropriations measure, it does so by inserting consecutively-numbered amendments. The conference to resolve differences in the measures passed by the two chambers considers each of the numbered amendments. Congressional action on a measure is not complete until both the House and Senate have successfully disposed of all numbered amendments.

The basic unit of an appropriation is an account. A single unnumbered paragraph in an appropriations act comprises one account and all provisions of that paragraph pertain to that account and to no other, unless the text expressly gives them broader scope. Any provision limiting the use of funds enacted in that paragraph is a restriction on that account alone.

Over the years, appropriations have been consolidated into a relatively small number of accounts. It is typical for a federal agency to have a single account for all its expenses of operation and additional accounts for other purposes such as construction. Accordingly, most appropriation accounts encompass a number of
activities or projects. The appropriation sometimes mandates specific amounts to particular activities within the account, but the more common practice is to provide detailed information on the amounts intended for each activity in other sources (principally, the committee reports accompanying the measures).

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board approve the 1999 federal appropriations requests as submitted.

Board Discussion and Action

Mr. Andy Clark, senior associate director of Government Relations, reviewed the notebooks distributed shortly before the meeting. "It mirrors our efforts of last year to inform the Congressional delegation in a very clear and concise manner what federal appropriations campuses would be seeking this fiscal year," he said. "All requests are very much in line with the mission of each institution," he noted.

Pointing out that monies would be requested for the new Central Oregon University Center, Mr. Clark shared that it was timely to seek federal funding for a project of this nature, because a similar program was approved in last year's Higher Education Reauthorization Act.

Commenting on the President's budget for fiscal year 2000, Mr. Clark said that the centerpiece of it is what the administration calls the 21st Century Research Fund. At $38.1 billion, it represents a $1.2 billion increase over fiscal year 1999, with the largest increase in basic and applied research. "This applies to many OUS requests. When there are overall increases in the applied and basic research budgets of the federal agencies, it creates more opportunity, not only for congressionally mandated funding, but also for agency-peer reviewed competitive funding opportunities," explained Mr. Clark.

"I think this is significant," said President Imeson. "When I was in the Governor's Office about 12 years ago, we attempted to compile a state and federal agenda. It was difficult working with the System because institutions didn't seem to want to talk to each other about priorities. I think it was frustrating for the Congressional delegation to have to deal with that. It's an important thing for the System to recognize how far we've come," he concluded.
Mr. Willis concurred, saying, "It's helpful for the System to come together and present its agenda."

Mr. Willis moved and Dr. Aschkenasy seconded the motion to approve the requests as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, and Imeson. Those voting no: none.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>APPROPS. BILL</th>
<th>LIKELY AGENCY</th>
<th>PROPOSED ACCOUNT</th>
<th>$ AMOUNT REQUEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Oregon University</td>
<td>(A) Regional Ag., Health, and Life Sciences Building</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$3.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Oregon Technology Center</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$3.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Geographical Information System</td>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation</td>
<td>$170,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>(A) Intelligent Infrastructure Technology</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$5.4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Micro-Technology-Based Energy and Chemical Systems</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$4.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) National Family Policy Assessment Center</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$2.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>(A) The University District</td>
<td>VA/HUD/Independent Agencies</td>
<td>Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$4 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Creating the Library of the Future</td>
<td>Labor/HHS/Ed</td>
<td>Institute of Museum and Library Services - Related Agency</td>
<td>For carrying out subtitle B of the Museum and Library Services Act</td>
<td>$1.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Native American Center</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>(A) Southern Oregon Science Center</td>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Southern Oregon Center for the Visual Arts</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>(A) Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$2.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Integrative Information Science Initiative</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>(A) Special Education Teacher Training Initiative</td>
<td>Labor/HHS/Ed</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Spanish Language Institute for Legal Services Professionals</td>
<td>To be Determined</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>Mixed Source</td>
<td>$347,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon University System</td>
<td>(A) Central Oregon University Center</td>
<td>Labor/HHS/Ed</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>Higher Education, Title III, Strengthening Institutions, Authorized Activity Pursuant to: Section 311 (20 U.S.C. 1057)</td>
<td>$3.5 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESOLUTION
REGARDING
CLASSIFIED
INFORMATION
FOR THE U.S.
DEPARTMENT
OF DEFENSE,
PSU

Staff Report to the Board

The Industrial Security Manual issued by the U.S. Department of Defense requires that owners, officers, and executive personnel of corporations and regents or trustees of colleges and universities whose employees have access to classified material in the course of working on Department of Defense contracts delegate to others the authority for fulfilling the requirements of the Industrial Security Manual and exclude themselves from access to classified information.

The resolution recommended for adoption is that which is required by the Manual.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, current Department of Defense directives contain a provision making it mandatory that the university president, and all principal officers or officials who are specifically and properly designated by the Board as the managerial group with the authority and responsibility for the negotiation, execution, and administration of classified contracts, meet the personnel security clearances requirements established for a contractor's facility security clearance; and

WHEREAS, said Department of Defense directives permit the exclusion from the personnel clearance requirements of certain members of the Board and other officers, provided that this action is recorded in the corporate minutes.

NOW IT IS FURTHER DECLARED that the president, and all principal officers or officials who are specifically and properly designated by the Board as the managerial group with the authority and responsibility for the negotiation, execution, and administration of classified contracts, at the present time do possess, or shall be processed for, the required security clearance; and

BE IT RESOLVED that in the future, when any individual enters upon any duties as president, as one of the principal officers or officials who are specifically and properly designated by the Board as the managerial group with the authority and responsibility for the negotiation, execution, and administration of classified contracts, such individuals shall immediately make application for the required security clearance; and
The program would be effective spring term 1999, and the OUS Office of Academic Affairs would conduct a follow-up review in the 2004–05 academic year.

Board Discussion and Action

Dr. Aschkenasy moved and Ms. Wustenberg seconded the motion to approve the request as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, and Imeson. Those voting no: none.

Staff Report to the Board

PSU proposes to offer a fourth specialization—Special and Counselor Education—in their existing Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership. Currently, this doctoral program has three tracks: K-12, postsecondary education, and curriculum and instruction. All tracks build on a common core of coursework in policy, organization, and research. This fourth specialization, which utilizes an integrated services model, also requires 12 credits of internship, a comprehensive exam, and a dissertation. Students will acquire interdisciplinary experience and knowledge about both special education and counselor education, and graduates from this program will be able to assume leadership roles in local school districts and community agencies (e.g., school district administration, community mental health agencies).

There is a significant and growing need for this type of program. In 1994, the Oregon Department of Education and PSU conducted a survey of 62 special education administrators throughout Oregon. Fifty-one percent of the respondents indicated interest in such a program and acknowledged the need for further training in special education and counselor education administration. In addition, the Teacher Standards & Practices Commission has listed both of these as personnel shortage areas.

This program is unique in the System, in both its applied nature and particular combination of professional emphases. Doctoral programs (Ph.D.) in special education offered at the UO are intended primarily to meet the need for university instructors and researchers. Because this program is located in Portland, it would meet a critical need of
working, placebound students. Courses are scheduled during late afternoon and evening hours to accommodate the needs of employed, part-time students. It is anticipated that six students will be admitted per year.

Current resources—faculty, library holdings, and facilities—are sufficient to offer this program; no new resources are needed. An external review team found this to be a "meaningful and high-quality program . . ." that "would have a high probability of success." The OUS Academic Council has also reviewed this program proposal and supports its implementation.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board authorize Portland State University to establish the specialization "Special and Counselor Education" in their existing Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, effective winter term 1999.

Board Discussion and Action

Dr. Aschkenasy moved and Ms. Wustenberg seconded the motion to approve the request as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, and Imeson. Those voting no: none.

UPDATE ON THE PROFICIENCY-BASED ADMISSION STANDARDS SYSTEM (PASS)

Background

The impetus for the Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS) emerged from a Joint Boards meeting in July 1993. Proficiency standards were approved by the Board of Higher Education in 1994 as the eventual method of undergraduate admission for Oregon-resident applicants to all OUS campuses. This ensures alignment between reforms occurring in Oregon public schools and university admission requirements.

Key Events

During the past year, PASS has continued its activities in two primary areas: aligning with the standards and assessments developed by the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) for the Certificates of Initial and Advanced Mastery, and defining more precisely the performances students must demonstrate to be college eligible via proficiency.
BE IT RESOLVED FURTHER that the following members of the Board and other officers, shall not require, shall not have, and can be effectively excluded from access to all classified information in the possession of Portland State University, and do not occupy positions that would enable them to affect adversely corporate policies or practices in the performance of classified contracts for the Department of Defense or the User Agencies of the National Industrial Security Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Imeson</td>
<td>Board President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Christopher</td>
<td>Board Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Aschkenasy</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Koch</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Lussier</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail McAllister</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Puentes</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don VanLuvianee</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Van Patten</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Willis</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis Wustenberg</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended the Board adopt the following resolution regarding access to classified information related to the Department of Defense material.

Board Discussion and Action

Dr. Aschkenasy moved and Ms. Wustenberg seconded the motion to approve the request as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Christopher, Van Patten, Willis, Wustenberg, and Imeson. Those voting no: none.

M.S., APPLIED PHYSICS, OSU

Staff Report to the Board

Oregon State University proposes to offer the M.S. degree in Applied Physics, effective spring term 1999. Applied physics has been a significant area of concentration within the existing M.S. in Physics major; the proposed program recognizes the current and future trend
in the application of physics. The only other similar OUS academic program is a major in applied science with physics as an emphasis area, currently under development by the University of Oregon. UO supports OSU’s proposed program.

Employment prospects for graduates of traditional physics programs have changed over the past decade. State and federal budgetary restrictions, coupled with increased international economic competition, have resulted in fewer research and academic job opportunities. To be viable in the current and projected job market, scientists must have broader training. The purpose of this terminal degree is to develop such scientists with sufficient breadth and flexibility. Examples of employment options for graduates of this program include project engineering and software engineering in technical fields such as optics, electronics, and computers.

Students in this program will be required to complete a set of core physics courses (12 credits); a general practical laboratory and computer skills component (9 credits); a research component (project or thesis; 3–12 credits); an applied area of concentration in optical physics, materials science, computational physics, or environmental physics (15 credits); and electives (0–6 credits). An internship component is being developed as well. Students attracted to this program will likely have baccalaureate degrees in physics, engineering, mathematics, or computer science. It is anticipated that five to ten students per year will pursue this major.

Because this program reflects growth in an emphasis area within the current M.S. degree in physics, current personnel, facilities, equipment, and reference sources are adequate to support this program. No new courses need to be developed and no additional resources need to be sought.

The proposed program has been positively reviewed by the appropriate institutional committees and the OUS Academic Council. The requirement for an external review of the program was waived because it does not represent a significant new graduate major.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board authorize Oregon State University to establish a program leading to the M.S. degree in Applied Physics.
Aligning the Standards

In the area of aligning with ODE standards and assessments, PASS and ODE agreed upon a set of aligned content standards that extend from grade 3 through college admission. Oregon is the first and only state in the nation to have aligned its standards in this fashion. As students work toward meeting the benchmarks set at grades 3, 5, and 8, along with the requirements for the Certificate of Initial Mastery, they will be able to see how their efforts relate to university admission requirements. In most cases, as students attain higher levels of performance on ODE standards, they meet or are close to meeting PASS proficiency requirements.

PASS has developed the means to translate state multiple-choice assessment scores so that they can be used to demonstrate proficiency in specified areas. Work continues in determining how best to use results from state writing assessments and math problem-solving tasks. The goal is to create a fully aligned assessment system that guarantees students who achieve the CIM—and, eventually, the CAM—will be able to use the data from those assessments to meet most PASS proficiency requirements.

Defining Performance Standards

The other primary area of PASS activity has been its work with Oregon high schools to identify realistic student performance standards and to teach teachers how to score student work. The proficiency criteria developed by PASS serve as the basis for this scoring. With the help of a three-year, $1.45 million grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts that was awarded in September 1998, PASS has been able to expand its efforts to 55 Oregon public high schools. These schools enroll nearly half the high school students in the state and are widely distributed geographically. Each school has identified a math teacher and an English teacher who agree to use PASS proficiencies to score the work for 30 to 60 students this year. These 110 teachers meet four times during the year to score student work, compare assessments, and receive direction from PASS staff.

The net effect of these efforts will be that between 3,000 and 6,000 students will have their work scored using PASS proficiencies this year. Some subset of these students will apply and be accepted to OUS institutions. Information on the content areas in which the students have been certified as proficient will be forwarded along with
their regular transcripts. This allows OUS time to understand the relationship between grades and proficiencies and to follow the progress of students admitted with evidence of proficiency.

**Working with High School Counselors and OUS Faculty**

PASS is holding a series of meetings around the state for high school counselors to gain their input on how best to transcript proficiency scores. These Counselors' Forums also help counselors learn more about PASS.

PASS regularly involves faculty members from OUS institutions in these activities. They attend all the meetings at which student work is scored; review the judgments of high school teachers by participating in Calibration Institutes that are held at each OUS campus; and serve as members of campus-based Implications Teams that identify the implications of proficiency-based admissions for each campus. In addition, admissions officers continue to play an important consultative role, advising on the Proficiency Transcript Report, working with counselors, and making presentations to prospective students and their parents to explain proficiency-based admissions.

**Coordinating and Implementing CIM, CAM, and PASS**

PASS continues to be implemented in coordination with the timelines for the CIM and CAM. The first CIMs are being awarded to sophomores this school year. This means that two years from now, in fall 2001, OUS applicants will have the option of using PASS proficiencies to meet certain subject-area requirements. Following the full implementation of the CAM during the 2004-05 school year, applicants will be expected to present evidence of proficiency beginning in the fall of 2005. This extended transition period gives high schools time to adapt to the use of proficiencies. It also minimizes the impact on schools' ongoing operations by allowing them to extend training and curricular redesign over a multi-year period.

**Next Steps**

PASS will continue to work closely with ODE to coordinate standards and assessments, particularly as the CAM assessment system is developed. Next year, in addition to the math and English teachers from each school, a science teacher will also be involved. The
number of students who are certified as proficient will increase as more high school teachers use proficiencies with more students. The PASS newsletter will be distributed regionally and nationally, updating interested parties in the progress being made and the activities that are planned.

PASS continues to be the national model for proficiency-based admissions. This role is reflected in the interest that other states have in PASS. In May, PASS is sponsoring an Admissions Officers’ Consortium for admissions officers from throughout the nation. Most of the admissions officers represent American Association of Universities (AAU)-level institutions. The goal of this meeting is to continue to ensure that PASS is supported by such institutions and that students with PASS proficiencies can apply without difficulty anywhere in the nation. A number of universities and university systems have provided written assurances that the PASS proficiencies are entirely acceptable for admission purposes, and that they support the development work being done by PASS. These letters are available for viewing on the PASS Web site: <http://pass-ous.uoregon.edu>.

Board Discussion

Vice Chancellor Clark said that the PASS project has thrived for the past five years and she anticipates it running at least another five years to full implementation of the new admission standards. She went on to announce that PASS staff recently sought and received a very significant competitive grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts in Philadelphia, totaling almost $1.5 million, which required some match from OUS and the Oregon Department of Education.

“What is really new this year about the PASS activity is the field-based activity in the schools with teachers who are, with us, developing assessments. OUS faculty and PASS staff are working to verify these assessments of students,” reported Dr. Clark.

“Dr. David Conley, project director, receives numerous national opportunities to tout the direction in which PASS is moving, and though it’s sometimes a somewhat risky position to be out front, I do want to say, with considerable pride toward our staff, they really are out front,” Dr. Clark observed.
UPDATE ON THE OUS JAPANESE LANGUAGE PROJECT

Background

The OUS Japanese Language Project was launched with a three-year, $500,000 grant in 1994 to create a model of standards-based education. This goal has been realized. Other languages have followed the Japanese model in developing standards and assessments consistent with CIM and PASS requirements. This success enabled the Chancellor's Office to attract additional outside funding to help Japanese teachers implement the pedagogic and curricular changes implied by the new standards.

Project Update

The Project has evolved into a research and development center. Persuaded that ongoing research and development is the proper province of the campuses, the Chancellor's Office negotiated with campuses interested in housing such an enterprise. In September 1998, the Japanese Language Project moved to the University of Oregon campus under the new name of the Center for Applied Japanese Language Studies (CAJLS).

The mission of the Center remains to support teachers' efforts to help their students reach CIM and PASS proficiency levels. The impact of this work continues to be felt in other disciplines within Oregon and in the second language teaching community nationwide. The Center has dispatched speakers to 12 states in the past year to disseminate the Oregon Model.

Key aspects of this model include:
- clear, concise performance standards;
- rigorous and reliable assessments;
- teacher-centered professional development; and
- technology-based teaching aids.

The reason for success has been a close alliance of K-12 and postsecondary faculty. OUS provided the leadership, but practicing teachers have created the nuts and bolts of this successful model of standards-based education. Relying almost exclusively on outside funds, which it continues to attract, CAJLS has demonstrated that K-16 cooperation is not just a lofty ideal, but an effective way of doing business.
Board Discussion

Dr. Clark reported that the project, which is in its fifth year, continues to flourish. "We have partially spun off this year, to where we feel the project will receive very important intellectual support from the faculties in the UO Japanese language area and the linguistics program," she said.

Background

To obtain a better understanding of the results of earning a degree from one of Oregon's public, four-year institutions, the Oregon University System (OUS) completed a study of its recent graduates. The target population for this study included graduates awarded baccalaureates during the academic year 1996-97. OUS awarded slightly more than 9,000 bachelor's degrees in 1996-97. More than 3,200 bachelor's degree completers returned surveys for an overall response rate of 38 percent. (Copies of the full report are on file in the Board's office.)

Findings

OUS baccalaureate recipients were attached to the labor force soon after graduation.

About 90 percent of the class of 1996-97 were in the labor force soon after graduation (74 percent "employed," 12 percent "employed and enrolled," and four percent "unemployed and looking for work"). In addition, eight percent were "enrolled," and almost two percent "were not looking for work."

Graduates with a bachelor's degree in professional fields—business, computer science, education, engineering, and health-related fields—were more likely to find entry-level work in their field of study, find full-time work, and earn higher wages. More graduates in arts and science fields—biological sciences, mathematics, humanities, and social sciences—pursued additional education and were employed part-time.

Nearly three-fourths of OUS bachelor's graduates found employment in Oregon.
About 74 percent found employment in "Oregon," 15 percent in "California or Washington," ten percent "elsewhere in the United States," and one percent "outside the United States."

More than eight out of ten of OUS's recent bachelor's graduates were employed in professional and managerial jobs, and the majority in the private sector.

- 62 percent in the private sector
- 17 percent in education (public or private)
- 10 percent in government
- 6 percent in nonprofit organizations
- 5 percent self-employed

About 30 percent of these baccalaureate recipients said they were continuing their education.

The vast majority of these were enrolled in a formal program—14 percent in "graduate school," three percent in "professional school," three percent in "post-baccalaureate programs," and only one percent in "community colleges." About seven percent said they participated in "seminars or workshops," and two percent said "other educational experiences." Those with degrees in arts and sciences fields had a higher continuing enrollment proportion than graduates in professional fields.

The 1997 median earnings reported by OUS bachelor's graduates was $27,948.


The choice of both major and occupation are significant factors in determining a graduate's earnings. Graduates in computer science and engineering earned twice as much as graduates in the biological sciences, social sciences, humanities and fine arts, mathematics, and physical sciences.

On average, female graduates employed full-time earned less than their male counterparts. The median income for female graduates employed full-time was $25,079, compared with $31,242 for male
graduates employed full-time. In the higher-earnings bracket, only 15 percent of female graduates employed full-time reported earning $35,000 or more soon after graduation, compared with 36 percent of male graduates.

Many OUS graduates gained practical experience as part of their degree program.

About 57 percent of all 1996-97 bachelor’s graduates completed an employment-related experience in an off-campus setting, compared with 51 percent of the 1994-95 bachelor’s graduates. These experiences included paid and unpaid internships, student teaching, community projects, and cooperative work experiences. Courses provided opportunities for applying knowledge to problems for many graduates.

OUS graduates reported high satisfaction with their educational experience.

Almost two-thirds rated the quality of education received at their institution as “excellent” or “very good.” Recent graduates strongly believe that what they learned in college had been helpful in attaining their goals of employment or furthering their education. Two-thirds also said they would “choose the same OUS university again.”

Board Discussion

Dr. Nancy Goldschmidt, senior policy associate for Academic Affairs, reviewed the findings in the study. Mr. Imeson asked if there was any comparison made with median salaries between graduates and non-graduates. Dr. Goldschmidt said that median salaries for graduates were roughly 75 percent higher. Chancellor Cox commented that kind of information might be useful as a benchmarking tool. Dr. Goldschmidt shared that staff are working on a study that will look at the differential for Oregonians and OUS graduates.

In explaining some of the findings, Dr. Goldschmidt said that a major component to keep in mind while conducting data analysis is that many students who complete their baccalaureate studies intend to immediately enter a graduate or professional school, rather than seek employment.

One of the important things learned in this study, reported Dr. Goldschmidt, is that there are “outcome” differences based on
BACKGROUND

To obtain a better understanding of the results of earning a degree from one of Oregon's public universities, the Oregon University System (OUS) completed a study of its recent advanced degree completers. The target population for this study included graduates awarded master's, first-professional, and doctoral degrees during the academic year 1996-97. OUS awarded slightly more than 3,000 advanced degrees in 1996-97. More than 1,100 advanced degree completers returned surveys, for an overall response rate of 39 percent. (Copies of the full report are on file in the Board's office.)

FINDINGS

OUS advanced degree recipients were attached to the labor force soon after graduation.

About 97 percent of the class of 1996-97 were in the labor force soon after graduation (85 percent "employed," eight percent "employed and enrolled," and nearly four percent "unemployed and looking for work"). In addition, only three percent were continuing their education exclusively, and less than one percent "were not looking for work."

Nearly three-fourths of OUS advanced degree recipients found employment in Oregon.

About 73 percent found employment in "Oregon," 13 percent in "California or Washington," 13 percent "elsewhere in the United States," and one percent "outside the United States."

About 96 percent of OUS's recent advanced degree recipients were employed in professional and managerial jobs, and the largest proportion were employed in educational organizations.

- 49 percent in education services (public or private)
- 32 percent in the private sector
- 11 percent in government
- 3 percent in nonprofit organizations
- 6 percent self-employed
Slightly more than one out of five advanced degree recipients were continuing their education.

About half were enrolled in a formal program—11 percent in “graduate school,” less than .5 percent in “professional school,” one percent in “post-baccalaureate programs,” and less than one percent in “community colleges.” About eight percent said they participated in “seminars or workshops,” and two percent said “other” educational experiences. Compared with the bachelor’s graduates, fewer advanced degree completers continued in formal programs immediately following graduation. Those with degrees in biological sciences, humanities and fine arts, mathematics, and social sciences had a higher continuing enrollment proportion than graduates in professional fields (with the exception of engineering graduates).

The 1997 median earnings reported by OUS advanced degree completers employed full-time was $36,046.

The choice of both major and occupation are significant factors in determining a graduate’s earnings. Graduates in business, computer science, and engineering reported median salaries of at least $50,000, compared with the low $30,000s reported by graduates in architecture, biological sciences, humanities and fine arts, and physical sciences.

On average, female graduates employed full-time earned less than their male counterparts. The median income for female graduates employed full-time was $33,638, compared with $41,525 for male graduates employed full-time. In the higher-earnings bracket, only 12 percent of female graduates employed full-time reported earning $50,000 or more soon after graduation, compared with one-third of male graduates.

Many OUS graduates gained practical experiences as part of their degree program.

Nearly 70 percent of all 1996-97 advanced degree recipients completed an employment-related experience in an off-campus setting. These experiences included paid and unpaid internships, student teaching, community projects, and cooperative work experiences.
OUS graduates reported high satisfaction with their educational experience.

Almost 65 percent rated the quality of education received at their institution as "excellent" or "very good." Recent graduates strongly believed that what they learned in college had been helpful in attaining their goals of employment or furthering their education. More than 60 percent also said they would "choose the same OUS university again."

Board Discussion

Dr. Goldschmidt segued her baccalaureate presentation to the advanced degree completers. She noted that this population remained in Oregon at about the same proportion as those who earned baccalaureate degrees. However, approximately 13 percent more advanced degree completers participated in an off-campus internship program.

Reminding Board members of a study from a couple of years ago that surveyed advanced degree completers five and ten years after graduation, Dr. Goldschmidt said that a similar study is planned for baccalaureate degree completers to determine if notable gaps in income continue to exist further out.

Dr. Aschkenasy asked why nearly two-thirds of advanced degree completers were employed in the public sector. Dr. Goldschmidt responded that it was primarily because of the education degrees and their employers, the public schools.

"Are there any wide variations among institutions in the numbers you've shown us today?" asked Mr. Imeson. Dr. Goldschmidt indicated there were variations in median salaries, yet consistency among disciplines.

"What about overall satisfaction?" continued Mr. Imeson.

"Satisfaction is very high in all fields, but you see some slight variations. The question is whether it's statistically significant. We sent the survey to all graduates, and those who were interested responded, so there may be some response bias," explained Dr. Goldschmidt.
Dr. Aschkenasy asked about the frequency of these types of reports. Dr. Goldschmidt said that recent graduate surveys will be conducted every other year on a Systemwide basis. The survey of alumni five and ten years after graduation will be conducted on an alternating basis every five years.

Background

Knowledge is our business.

The mission and goals of public higher education are anchored in service to the state's society and economy. The business of higher education is knowledge. Faculty work on three interrelated activities pertaining to knowledge:

- Teaching—facilitate and evaluate student learning and development, disseminate knowledge through teaching and scholarship;
- Research—create or produce new knowledge, artistic performances, discoveries, or products through research and development; and
- Service—apply knowledge through service and technical assistance to address societal needs.

Faculty effort committed to these activities varies by field of study and university mission.

Experienced faculty are the most important asset in the OUS portfolio.

The majority of OUS students are taught by regular, full-time faculty. Of the 3,203 ranked instructional faculty, three-fourths are full-time; nearly 70 percent are full or associate professors, and more than two-thirds are tenured. Women comprised 31 percent of the faculty and nine percent indicate that they belong to a minority racial/ethnic group.

Since 1995, the teaching workforce has shifted slightly toward graduate assistants teaching fewer class sections and adjunct faculty teaching more. When all credit enrollment (including continuing education) is taken into account,

- Ranked instructional faculty taught nearly 74 percent of OUS class sections in 1997 compared to 78 percent in 1995.
Graduate assistants taught four percent of all OUS class sections in 1997 compared to seven percent in 1995.

- Adjunct faculty and administrators taught 22 percent of all OUS class sections compared to 15 percent in 1995.

Teaching is the major focus of faculty.

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

OUS faculty are productive.

The faculty produced 2.4 million student credit hours in 1997-98 (up slightly from 2.3 million in 1995-96).

- On average, OUS ranked faculty who taught in fall 1997 were assigned 10.5 course credit hours per term, including extended enrollment students and credit (and 10.4 credits per term when extended enrollment is excluded).
- When all faculty who provided instruction are included, the average course credit hours per term rises to 12.1 (and 11.7 credits per term when extended enrollment is excluded).

As a result of instruction, over 12,500 students completed degrees in 1997-98.

Newer approaches.

A number of OUS initiatives address faculty productivity and effectiveness, including the establishment of an incentive fund from 1995 to 1997 to accelerate demonstration projects. More than 30 campus projects were supported, primarily in the areas of greater technology use in instruction and reforming the undergraduate curricula. Most projects involved collaboration of two or more campuses and represented cross-disciplinary approaches at the campuses.

To meet diverse student needs, campuses increasingly offer a range of instructional formats (e.g., quarter, weekend, evening, day-long, individualized studies, modularized one- or two-credit courses shorter than a full-term duration) in various locations. Technology is
increasing the flexibility within which instruction can be "packaged" to better serve students. Faculty are demonstrating these new "outreach" methods.

OUS faculty attract millions in new resources to Oregon.

Total revenues from gifts, grants, and contracts have grown steadily over the past ten years. Sponsored research expenditures in 1996-97 totaled $173.4 million. Average revenue per full-time faculty member from federal grants and contracts was $72,179. Three out of four dollars for scientific and research equipment at OUS institutions come from federal sources.

Public service addresses pressing needs.

Public service activities enable faculty and staff the opportunity to use their knowledge in real-life settings for Oregon's citizens, businesses, local governments, and students of the Oregon University System. The benefits to Oregonians touch all areas of life: family, health, business, financial, educational, and recreational. Research at OUS's universities proves its worth, in part, by service to Oregon, the nation, and the world.

- Hundreds of highly specialized services are offered by laboratories and clinics associated with the professional schools (e.g., Early Intervention Services, Institute of Aging, Hatfield Marine Science Center, Violence and Destructive Behavior).
- Many of OUS's public services are provided through statewide and regional initiatives (e.g., Extension Service, Small Business Institutes, Center for Population Research and Census, Resource Center for the Deaf and Hearing Impaired).
- Other services are offered through partnerships with other community organizations (e.g., Oregon Police Academy and Oregon Military Academy to help train police and Oregon military personnel, Summer Music Camp for at-risk youth in the Portland Metropolitan Area).
- Other community services are provided through a variety of public attractions such as museums, galleries, library collections, lectures, performances, observatories, athletic facilities and events, and conferences.

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

Board Discussion

Although none of the Board members had a specific question regarding the report, Dr. Aschkenasy observed, "I am gratified that all of these issues address quality in one way or another—the quality of the entering freshman, for example, and the quality of the graduates—I think this is terribly important, and I’m glad to say we’re focusing on it. I compliment the UO for implementing the merit-based scholarship program, which makes it clear that we value high achievers. The fact is that this sends a message to people of this state that it matters what you’ve accomplished in high school."

SEMI-ANNUAL AUDIT REPORT

Staff Report to the Board

The Internal Audit Division's Semi-Annual Audit Report, included in the supplemental materials, summarized internal audit activity for the six-month period July 1998 through December 1998. A brief description was provided for each report conducted during the six-month period, as well as a status report on the 1998-99 Internal Audit Plan. This report was submitted to the members of the Board, the Chancellor, and to the State of Oregon Department of Administrative Services. (Copies are on file in the Board’s office.)

Board Discussion

Mr. Marv Wigle, director of the Internal Audit Division, reported on the positive effect of auditors becoming more visible on campuses and assisting staff in improving processes, procedures, and business practices. "People have been extremely receptive to having us help them incorporate what we think are appropriate and sound business practices," said Mr. Wigle.

Continuing, Mr. Wigle observed, "This process has given our staff a sense of making a constructive contribution to the System and feeling appreciated, which is not something that’s a normal condition of an auditor."

Mr. Wigle said that a Systemwide report that summarizes the audit trends would be distributed in the near future. "We will send it to the departments that have not yet been audited (600 out of 750) so they
will have a sense of what we’re looking for, and should give them an opportunity to examine some of their practices,” said Mr. Wigle.

Vice Chancellor Anslow indicated that an upcoming project for the Board will be to identify policies and procedures related to auditing practices and the appropriate delegation of responsibilities.

INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT

Staff Report to the Board

OUS financial statements for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1998, have been audited by Deloitte & Touche, LLP, Independent Public Accountants. The engagement of Deloitte & Touche was authorized and monitored by the State of Oregon Division of Audits. The auditors have concluded, except for the effects of such adjustments, if any, as might have been determined to be necessary had they been able to examine evidence regarding year 2000 disclosures, that the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of OUS.

In addition to the financial statements, Deloitte & Touche provided the following:

• a management letter, which includes comments, recommendations for improvement in internal controls, and OUS responses to those recommendations;
• reports on compliance applicable to each major federal award program, which include the schedule of expenditures of federal awards, comments and recommendations for improvement in related policies and procedures (which includes OUS responses to those recommendations), and the status of prior year findings; and
• a letter communicating certain matters of interest to the Board regarding oversight of the financial reporting and disclosure process.

Copies of all documents have been previously mailed to Board members and are on file in the Board’s office.

Board Discussion

Mr. Don Riggs, a partner from Deloitte and Touche, explained that, for the record, the audit report was considered “qualified” as opposed to “unqualified” as indicated in the original docket materials. Mr. Riggs cited a 1998 technical bulletin issued by the Government Accounting
Standards Board, which required government entities to disclose in their financial statements the progress made related to Y2K compliance. "The accounting profession, for the most part, is taking the position that the information is not auditable. There's no way for us to know how far along or what the ramifications of the year 2000 incident will be until the year 2000 and beyond. The opinion is qualified for that regard. In all other respects, the audit was fine," reported Mr. Riggs.

Another significant point made by Mr. Riggs was that the System was required to mark its investments up to market value from cost, resulting in a $14 million increase in investments.

Staff Report to the Board

At the December 18, 1998, Board meeting, Mr. Robert Mc Cleary, representing the Officers at Risk (OAR) at Portland State University, presented a request during the public input session for the Board to consider the re-titling of the position designation of the current "University Public Safety Officers" to that of "University Police." He told the Board that giving this designation would make their job easier, as well as safer for themselves and the campus. Further, he stated that the designation as "University Police" would properly identify the officers for what the work actually entailed.

The OAR also prepared and presented to the Board considerable materials to justify their request.

Past Reviews of the Issue

The issue of having University Public Safety Officers become "Police Officers" has come before the Board of Higher Education on several occasions over the years. The Board of Higher Education has proposed legislation on occasion to improve the authority of the University Public Safety Officers.

- In 1987, HB 2420 became effective, which empowered the Board to commission 20 "special security officers" who would have "probable cause arrest authority." Note: all prior legislative history implies that no security officers may carry firearms.

- In 1995, provisions outlined in SB 504 increased the total number of "special security officers" commissioned at OUS institutions to 50. Furthermore, these officers were allowed "stop and frisk" authority as stated in ORS 131.625.
Philosophy

Board philosophy is to avoid having a "police status" on campuses and instead use state or local law enforcement agencies to address criminal issues. The philosophy has been to integrate University Public Safety into the mission of recruitment/retention, service, and education of students, as well as the public (i.e., parents, visitors, staff, and faculty).

Conclusion

After review of the Officers at Risk request, discussions with the Council of Presidents, and numerous individual University personnel, the staff recommends that the Board reaffirm its current designation of "University Public Safety Officers." Therefore, the Officers at Risk request for consideration as "University Police" would not be supported. The Board was asked to reaffirm its recognition of the importance of all University Public Safety Officers within OUS.

Board Discussion

Mr. Koch expressed his appreciation for staff's review of the request and said that he agreed with the conclusions drawn. Other Board members concurred.

Staff Report to the Board

The Year 2000 date processing problem poses a significant challenge for OUS. The OUS endeavor consists of technical efforts to identify and remediate problem systems, management of these remediation efforts, and planning processes to ensure critical campus services and business operations will continue into the new millennium.

OUS management is aware of the Year 2000 problem and has a plan to address the key issues, with efforts both completed and underway to reduce the risks associated with this situation.

OUS initiated plans to address Year 2000 problems in 1993 when the planning process to replace the aging and non-compliant budget, personnel & payroll system began. More official efforts began in late 1996 when Year 2000 coordinators were appointed at each institution and the Chancellor's Office to organize and lead local projects.
OUS management chose an approach with centralized oversight and decentralized execution for remediation of Year 2000 problems. In this model, the Chancellor's Office provides oversight for the System and submits aggregated monthly Year 2000 reports to the Oregon Statewide Year 2000 Project Office. The institutions are responsible for identifying and remediating Year 2000 problems, and allocating resources as appropriate.

Year 2000 efforts have been guided by two overall goals: 1) to assure that all vital services affecting the health and safety of OUS students, faculty, staff and the public are protected; and 2) to see that no mission critical system fails due to Year 2000 date issues. To accomplish these goals, Year 2000 efforts have been prioritized into the following three areas:

1) **Vital Campus Services**—those services that deal with health and safety issues;
2) **Mission Accomplishment**—the provision of core mission functions of instruction, research, and public service; and
3) **Critical Business Services**—the provision for the continuation of core business service functions, administrative information systems, and the related record keeping and reporting.

The Board was provided with key planning documents developed to support the major Year 2000 efforts (the *Year 2000 Master Plan*, completed in July 1998 and the *Year 2000 Test Plan*, completed in November 1998) and a comprehensive check list of key activity areas that comprise the institutions' vital campus services. (All supplemental materials are on file in the Board's office.)

**Board Discussion**

Vice Chancellor Anslow initiated the discussion by reporting that, because of some concern over the Y2K issue, a decision was made to convene Winter Term 2000 classes at OUS institutions two days later than originally planned. "This is simply to allow for any situations that may arise in the local communities and on campuses," he said.

Ms. Marilyn Lanier, associate vice chancellor for Finance and Administration, reviewed the key issues and efforts already underway at the campus level that will reduce risk associated with the predicted effects of the Y2K situation.
In her report, Ms. Lanier noted that in January 1999, OUS successfully transitioned to its new payroll system. "We produce about 25,000 paychecks each month and they’re all now under the new system. In all of our ties to the State Treasury Department, depositors, and banks, we are relying on their statements that they believe everything will be fine," she said.

Dr. Aschkenasy asked to confirm that 25,000 payroll checks are created on a monthly basis. Ms. Lanier confirmed that to be the case, adding that many are student checks for work study positions.

Ms. Lanier explained three activities already underway to minimize the risk of the Y2K problem: 1) upgrading software, 2) workarounds (finding a way to accomplish work), and 3) testing. "Between the continuity and contingency planning, we feel that we are in reasonably good shape as we approach the end of the year," said Ms. Lanier.

"There is a wide range of what the campuses consider to be ‘readiness,’” observed Mr. Koch. “I’m wondering what kind of influence your office is having on creating a checklist within a checklist, in terms of priorities?” he asked.

Vice Chancellor Anslow responded that in his original correspondence to the institutions, he made it clear that the responsibility rested with campus administration. Mr. Koch wondered if Mr. Anslow had concerns about the variance in campus priority lists.

"I’m seeing increased attention to this, so I believe that people are preparing,” he said.

President Imeson described the status of the new budget model within the legislative process. "It’s very important for us, and this is primarily through the Chancellor and the presidents, to be engaged in the legislative process and to be able to provide information about what we can do at various levels of funding," he observed.

He stressed the importance of making sure that staff are in a position to be able to provide detailed information, and provide it in such a way where it is understood and agreed upon throughout the System. Mr. Imeson went on to say that the "hydraulic relationships" between the parts of the budgets and within specific cells has the potential to strongly impact institutions. Therefore, the Committee has reviewed various levels of transition funding.
President Imeson said that enrollment had been focused on at meetings. "I think that what the legislature would like, and I'm sure what the Governor would like, is for us to commit to enrollment levels and then manage within that. That's what we have done. Within that, we have targeted enrollment in high demand programs," he reported. Areas of special attention include engineering and teacher education. He added that the model calls for as much resident undergraduate enrollment as possible but that it limits some funding for the masters and doctorate levels for this point.

The tuition issue is one that has remained a priority from early in the budget discussions, he shared. "The numbers that we have come up with and the funding outline that has been presented to us would include an undergraduate resident tuition freeze," he said.

Continuing, he pointed out, "I think it's a fair statement that at the end of the meeting we had earlier this week, all of the institutions, represented either by their presidents or by their designees, and the Board members present, said 'yes, this does represent something we're willing to stand behind, and that we're willing to have the Chancellor, somewhere in his deliberations and discussions with legislators and others, say to them that this is what we would recommend doing at different levels. In fact, if these are the levels adopted, than this Board, when it makes it's allocation, would follow those, and of course, anything else that might be reflected in legislative deliberations.'"

Vice Chancellor Anslow said that campuses now are identifying at various levels how funds would be applied to re-capitalization, access to educational opportunities, economic development, and specifically at the System level, funds for performance funding. He explained that the Chancellor will take that information forward to legislators to describe how, under various scenarios, the incremental funds would be applied if they do become available.

Chancellor Cox commented that the proposed budget model has been transparent and understandable to all concerned. "The level of understanding among the legislative leadership that the presidents and I and Mr. Anslow met with is very clear. They understand that if you do something over here, that's additional, it comes either from the model or from enrollment. The hydraulics are absolutely transparent. One senior member of the Senate said to me, 'this doesn't just make you accountable, it makes us accountable,' which is how it should be. It's a decision we make together," he said.
Ms. Wustenberg reported that the group was prepared to name members of the Regional Advisory Board at a meeting the following week. "It's been a wonderful experience to be involved in because the enthusiasm is high and we feel strongly that we can do good work," she said.

"How large will the advisory board be?" asked Ms. Christopher. Chancellor Cox responded that it would be in the range of 9-12 people. He added that the three members appointed from the Central Oregon Joint Boards—Mr. Lussier, Ms. Wustenberg, and Mr. Le Duc—would be ex-officio members.

Ms. Van Patten said that the group met in January to discuss the regional partnerships plan. Much discussion occurred on whether proposed partnerships should be seen as venture capital or investments. Current partnerships were also examined along with where potential expansion may occur and how. The group was scheduled to convene later in the day to review another iteration of the partnership plan to be presented to Governor Kitzhaber.

Mr. Imeson said that OHSU has been stepping up its efforts to secure increased state funding. He added that managed care issues are another focus of that board.

Mr. Imeson reported the first formal meeting of the group was scheduled for February 25. He announced that the membership included himself, Mr. VanLuvanee, and Mr. Willis (alternate). Also participating are Ms. Jill Kirk and Mr. Donnie Griffin, from the Board of Education; Mr. Brett Wilcox and Mr. Jose Campos, from the Economic Development Commission; Mr. Jerome Pool and Ms. Joan Smith, trustees from independent colleges; and Dr. Bert Glandon, president of Treasure Valley Community College.

He said that the primary charges of the group are to 1) develop a workplan to increase research and development funds in the state, and 2) increase the level of technology knowledge transfer between higher education and business and industry to serve Oregon's economic development needs.

Mr. Willis explained that the Committee was in the process of devising a workplan for the coming year, and articulating the responsibilities for each standing committee.
"We recognize that the focus right now is on the budget and the work at the legislative level. We're trying to help support what happens after that and determine what kinds of policy considerations we need to be making. However, I think it's critical to point out that we can't anticipate all of the policy issues and recommendations that will need to be made at this point," Mr. Willis observed.

Mr. Imeson read the statement pertaining to delegation of authority to the Board's Executive Committee. Pursuant to Article II, Section 5 of the Bylaws of the Board of Higher Education, the Board delegates to the Executive Committee authority to take final action as here designated or deemed by the Committee to be necessary subsequent to the adjournment of this meeting and prior to the Board's next meeting. The Executive Committee may act for the Board in minor or emergency matters, subject to Board approval at the Board's April 16, 1999, Board meeting.

Ms. Patty Walsh spoke in support of Senate Bill 455, eliminating the state's authority to create a sports action lottery and to replace the revenue that is generated from a different source. (Copies of her complete testimony are on file in the Board's office.)

Chancellor Cox indicated that he and the presidents would consult with each other to review the matter more carefully.

The Board meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Diane Vines
Secretary of the Board

Tom Imeson
President of the Board