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The Oregon Student Association has opposed previous proposed legislation that went too far in the pursuit of the needs of a single university without careful consideration for the value of a system.

System vs. Institutional Boards
Here are some examples of positive functions of a statewide system that cannot be accomplished in the same way with an institutional board:
- Vet invaluable and costly capital construction projects
- Limit competition between universities
- Advise on campus matters which might affect the state, from a regional and professionally diverse set of board members.
- Coordinate with K-12 and community colleges on a regular basis to provide an in depth knowledge of what it takes to get a student through a degree. Transfer and articulation agreements should be protected by a statewide system. OUS has the expertise to move us to 40-40-20 that an individual campus could not accomplish on its own.
- Provide a holistic statewide mission. A system has a mission of moving the state toward our goals together and providing access for all Oregonians, as opposed to an institutional board focused on its own day to day operations.
- Negotiate system wide salary and benefit packages
- Seek out economies of scale in the purchasing of services and thus resulting in a lower cost to students
- Share data and survey of students

OSA Institutional Board Principles
Students value:
1) Tuition set by a statewide governing board that is more aware of the needs of all Oregonians and with the help of the Oregon legislature takes a statewide approach to addressing affordability.
2) A statewide governing board that can evaluate the duplication of programs, limit unnecessary costs, and direct postsecondary education in Oregon to the benefit of all institutions and all Oregonians.
3) A statewide governing board that hires and fires university presidents and holds institutions accountable to providing affordable education to Oregonians.
4) A statewide governing board that can analyze the effect of private donations and hold institutions accountable to their public mission.
5) A governing structure that works to increase access to postsecondary education for underrepresented communities.
6) A postsecondary education system that strives to educate as many Oregonians as possible.
7) A postsecondary system that amplifies the voice of all institutions when advocating for state funds and limits competition between institutions.
8) A postsecondary education system that strives to increase academic quality at each institution and takes into account the research capacity of each different institution.
9) Finally, public funds should be directed whenever possible towards instruction and student services.