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### Discussion of a New Compact with Oregon

**Draft Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 22, 2009</td>
<td>Schedule and process  Issue Outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 28, 2010</td>
<td>Policy/Values Statements  Demography and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 25, 2010</td>
<td>Collaborative Education  Collaborative Research  Tuition Guidelines  Financial Aid Guidelines  Performance Framework  Enrollment targets  Degree targets  Campus targets  Tie to jobs and economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18, 2010</td>
<td>Improving performance (e.g., cost of degrees, time to degree)  Performance targets  Rewarding performance  Collaborations  Campus Proposals  Finances  Legislative Concept placeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 2010</td>
<td>Capital  Structure  Campus missions  Campus financial sustainability (by campus)  Tuition  Financial Aid  Finances  Ideas to Re-set Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27, 2010</td>
<td>Draft Proposal to Board  Draft to Re-set committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24, 2010</td>
<td>Final Proposal to Board  Budget Draft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaborative Education

The State Boards of Education and Higher Education have established policies and programs over the past five years designed to help students move more easily among and through the 24 public postsecondary institutions in the state. Elements of these efforts have been dual enrollment agreements, the Oregon Transfer Module, the ATLAS advising system, and the original and revised Associate of Arts—Oregon Transfer degree and its companion Associate of Science—Oregon Transfer degree. The success of these efforts has been borne out in the increased number of transfer students now attending Oregon universities and the success at which those students earn bachelor’s degrees. Further work along this line has been the newly adopted outcomes for general education that provides the framework for general education at all 24 institutions.

Simultaneously, efforts have been made to improve the clarity of the paths for high school students to enter and succeed in college. These efforts have included the alignment of advanced placement and international baccalaureate courses across all 24 institutions and the expansion of community college courses being taught in Oregon high schools. Recent OUS data show that new freshmen coming to a university with college-level work in high school (AP, IB, or college courses) are far more likely to graduate and to graduate faster than are their counterparts who come without such work.

An early element of the Resource Allocation Model (adopted by the Board and funded by the state in 1999) included extra funding for collaborative efforts across institutional boundaries (with other OUS institutions or with community colleges or with OHSU). Only a small premium for nursing students has survived repeated budget cuts over the past decade. Despite that fact, OUS campuses continue to host OHSU nursing programs and have cooperated with OHSU in pharmacy and allied health education.

The policy choice for the state is whether to continue such collaborative efforts and, if so, how. As part of a new compact with the state, could the Board require universities to continue to accept AAOT, OTM, etc.? Could the Board require the continuation of common approaches to AP, IB, etc.? How would the Board either enforce or provide incentives for such collaboration? How would this be done if the primary measure upon which funding were based became the number of degrees awarded?

Are there other areas of collaboration or commonality that could assist in meeting student success targets and fulfill PK-20 goals (e.g., common financial aid forms, financial aid information sharing, common admissions process, automatic admission based on essential skills mastery)? If so, how might they be encouraged? Should collaborations with OHSU be continued or expanded?
Related Presidents’ or IFS Principles:

a. Presidents’ Consensus Principle 1: “Continued commitment by all seven universities to work individually and in concert to meet the public higher education needs of Oregonians as defined by state law and Oregon University System (OUS) policies.”

b. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Principle E: “Public Higher Education Institutions in Oregon should function collaboratively as a unified system for the benefit of Oregon.”
Collaborative Research

One of the Board of Higher Education’s four main goals is to use university research to foster innovation for the advancement of Oregon’s economy and jobs. Oregon’s university faculty are able to compete successfully for federal funding for their research efforts. Often they turn for team members to faculty at Oregon universities other than that which employs them (including OHSU). These multi-institutional, multi-discipline, collaborative research teams have become the hallmark of many successful Oregon research proposals and have been key to the success of various Oregon Innovation Council initiatives, such as ONAMI.

In part, this success has been due to the reward structure put in place under Oregon InC which puts a premium on multi-institutional efforts on the theory that the small size of Oregon’s universities and their relatively small number of faculty members mean that Oregon institutions do not have the depth and breadth of their larger competitors in other states. The strategy has proven successful over the past several years.

This strategy is aided by the policies of the Board and of the Board’s Research Council to encourage multi-institutional and multi-disciplinary research. This has led not just to collaborative funding proposals but, also, to the way that facilities and equipment are funded and shared. Oregon’s overall approach has been recognized recently by the Milken Institute as providing this state with a competitive advantage over other states seeking to build future economies based on technology.

In a new compact with the state, would the Board and the state wish to continue to encourage such collaboration and, if so, how would this be done? Would policies and rewards be structured to help ensure this multi-institution cooperation? If so, how?

Related Presidents’ or IFS Principles:
  a. Presidents’ Consensus Principle 1: “Continued commitment by all seven universities to work individually and in concert to meet the public higher education needs of Oregonians as defined by state law and Oregon University System (OUS) policies.”
  b. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Principle E: “Public Higher Education Institutions in Oregon should function collaboratively as a unified system for the benefit of Oregon.”
Tuition Guidelines

1. Should the Board even have a set of tuition guidelines or should each university be free to adopt its own tuition independently (just as each of Oregon’s community colleges may do now)?

2. If the Board does enunciate guidelines, should it first determine its overall approach (such as high tuition-high financial aid, low tuition-low financial aid) or should it permit its framework to evolve in a different fashion?

3. If the Board chooses to adopt tuition guidelines, what might they be?

4. Example of possible general guidelines for resident undergraduate tuition and fees:
   a. Tuition and fees shall continue to be combined
   b. What is the starting point for each campus? (current, premium, or market)
   c. Tuition rates charged by campuses could increase by the sum of:
      (1) Rate of inflation or rate of growth in Oregon household income plus
      (2) Per-student reduction in-state funding plus
      (3) 30% of increase to be diverted to need-based grant aid
         Example:
         Current rate: $7,000 per year
         3% inflation: $210
         10% state cut: $346 (based on 2009-10)
         $556
         Increase for aid $239
         New rate: $7,795 per year (with $239 of that to be used for need based grants)
   d. Aid amounts from prior years’ remissions must be sustained
   e. Tuition rates always shall be discounted by 1% for increased efficiency and cost control
      (Effect in example would be to reduce the rate from $7,795 to $7,717)

5. Program tuition
   a. High cost premium
   b. High market value premium
   c. Would income from these sources be used to reduce general tuition?

6. Premium tuition or quality surcharge or other mechanism to permit improvements in faculty salaries, reduced class sizes, more opportunities for internships or undergraduate research, etc. Should such premiums be permitted, for what purposes, and using what approval process?

7. Use of tuition to pay for capital (directly or via debt service). Process and limitations, if any.
8. Graduate, nonresident, and international student tuition
   a. Should Board have an interest or policy?
   b. If so, should such tuition be market-based?
   c. Remission for state goals? (Who pays for remission?)

9. Continuing education, off-site, and other tuition: should the Board have any policies?

10. What process would the Board want to mandate or encourage for each campus and what involvement would students and other stakeholders have in that process? Would such a process be required even if the Board did not have any other tuition guidelines?
In order to ensure that every qualified Oregonian has an opportunity to attend and succeed in every OUS university:

1. 30% of any resident undergraduate tuition increase above the growth in average/median family income must be used for need-based grant aid
   a. Kept by campus generating tuition?
   b. Centralized at OUS and reallocated to campuses based on student need (UC model)
   c. Centralized at OSAC and reallocated to OUS students based on need
   d. Centralized at OSAC and reallocated to all OOG students based on need
   e. Change distribution of state funds to account for lower tuition generating capability of campuses serving lower income students

2. Would there be similar requirements for program tuition for high-cost or high-market value programs?

3. Should the Board not require any need-based aid, relying on the state instead?

4. What about graduate tuition and remissions?

5. Merit aid?

6. Is 30% the right number?

**Issue:** What about differential ability to pay of student bodies at different campuses? (Data from 2007-08 suggest about a 40% difference among the incomes of Oregon dependent students on financial aid at different OUS campuses.)
Note: Targets for Future Years are being established this spring through regular Board performance measure process.

* Designates a targeted measure. Other measures are for illustration. Performance on all measures is discussed in presidential evaluations each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Credit Enrollment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Undergraduate Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Retention at Institution*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Retention within OUS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate within OUS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Satisfaction*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Success</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Degrees Awarded*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees in Designated Areas*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Research Expenditures*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Assets</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Compensation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Enrollment</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate Yield</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Student Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Achieving Oregon HS Grads</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Diversity</td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D in Science/Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Service Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Student Grad Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Salaries Compared to Peers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Economic Development Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College Transfer Completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance—existingperformanceframework—feb10
**Performance Framework—OUS Total**

**WHAT WOULD THE STATE PAY FOR?**
(Operating and Capital Funds)

(Edited 2/23/2010)

These examples may be adjusted after completion of portfolio work on mission and programs now underway in Provosts Council and due for discussion with Academic Strategies Committee in March and April.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RAM fundable enrollment (OUS target and campus target)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Total Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. RAM fundable enrollment*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Enrollment by program/level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 1st generation enrollment*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Transfer enrollment*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Credit in high schools*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Enrollment—Students of Color*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Rural Students*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Students in dual enrollment agreements*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. First time freshmen*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Retention—transfer students*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Retention—students of color*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Retention—1st generation*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Time to degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. First time freshmen*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Transfer students*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Students of color*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 1st generation students*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Total degrees (OUS target and campus target)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Engineering degrees (special funding target)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Health care degrees (special funding target)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Teaching degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Teaching degrees: math, science, bi-lingual, etc. (special funding target)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (special funding target)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employment/continuing enrollment of grads (OUS target and campus target)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Externally funded research (OUS target and campus target for certain campuses)
   a. Federal research $
   b. Private research $

7. Technology transfer/economic development
   a. IP to Oregon companies (reported to state)
   b. Companies started (reported to state)
   c. Jobs created (reported to state)

8. Affordability
   a. Cost per student*
   b. Cost per student compared to national average
   c. Institutional and institution-related financial aid*
   d. Tuition restraint*
   e. Average debt load for new graduates who received aid*

9. Faculty salaries and total compensation*

10. Private donations*

11. Capital

12. Deferred maintenance* (report to state)

13. Diversity
   a. Student enrollment*
   b. Faculty*
   c. Staff*
   d. M/WESB/DBE Contracting* (report to state)

Note: Items in bold are those suggested for state compact. Campuses may be rewarded by Board for performance on items denoted with asterisk but no targets will be set. Items with special funding targets may receive additional funding from state or Board. Items reported to state do not carry funding. This possible framework is suggested merely to organize thinking and discussion.

These are examples of categories. Others must be developed for the statewide public services.

Question: Would specific state investments be tied to each category?
Question: How would funds be distributed by category to each campus?
Question: Would campuses be required to enroll a certain number or percentage of Oregon students?
Question: What about campus public services?
Question: How would goals be allocated to campuses and how would performance be rewarded?

Question: How would collaboration (with other OUS universities, with OHSU, with Oregon community colleges, and with Oregon K-12) be measured and rewarded?

Question: If we could have just four key measures, what would they be?

Issue: Simplicity

Governance—performance framework-feb19a
Campus Enrollment Targets

Some Questions

1. Should campuses have targets or should targets be for OUS only?

2. If campuses have targets, on what basis should campus enrollment targets be set?
   a. Current methodology and targets
   b. Current proportion of OUS enrollment at a university as related to 40% goal
   c. Amount of expected or actual state funding
   d. Other

3. Should targets be established for (and, if so, how):
   a. Total enrollment
   b. Resident enrollment
   c. Undergraduate and graduate enrollment
   d. Lower division/Upper division, masters, doctoral, and professional enrollment
   e. Enrollment by underrepresented or targeted groups
   f. Enrollment of transfer students
   g. Dual enrollment with high schools or community colleges
   h. Enrollment in programs of need to state

4. What should be time frame?
   a. Upcoming biennium
   b. 6 years
   c. 15 years to 2025

5. Is there funding awarded for enrollment or just for degree completion? If for enrollment, on what bases and in what proportion of either cost of education or of state funding share between degree attainment and enrollment? (Currently, universities are funded (for residents and selected nonresidents) based on completed credit hours by discipline and level. No distinction is made by type of fundable student that recognizes other differences in cost to educate.)

6. What about retention? Should there be targets and rewards for that? Would they be by group (freshmen, transfer students, students of color, first generation students, etc.)?

Related Presidents’ or IFS Principles:
   a. Presidents’ Consensus Principle #1: “Continued commitment by all seven universities to work individually and in concert to meet the public higher education needs of Oregonians as defined by state law and Oregon University System (OUS) policies.”
   b. Presidents’ Consensus Principle #2: “Establishment of a state-funding floor per student to ensure that state contributions do not continue to decline. Funding would be
provided as long as the universities meet relevant, measurable performance goals and would be based on student enrollment.”

c. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Principle A: “Any restructuring of Public Higher Education must improve the education of all Oregon students.”

d. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Principle E: “Public Higher Education institutions in Oregon should function collaboratively as a unified system for the benefit of Oregon.”

Governance—enrollment targets—feb19
Campus Degree Targets

Some Questions

1. Should campuses have targets or should targets be for OUS only?

2. If campuses have targets, on what basis should campus degree targets be set?
   a. Current methodology and targets, trended to meet 40% goal
   b. 50-year and 15-year patterns, trended to meet 40% goal
   c. Current proportion of OUS degrees awarded by a university as related to 40% goal
   d. Other

3. Should targets be established for:
   a. Total degrees
   b. Degrees by level (B.A./B.S.; M.A./M.S.; Ph.D.; professional)
   c. Degrees by discipline (currently some campuses have targets for engineering, computer science, teacher education) (other possibilities include health care)

4. What should be the time frame?
   a. Upcoming biennium
   b. 6 years
   c. 15 years to 2025

5. Should funding for degree target achievement be tied also to employment/employability or admission to and attendance at graduate school of graduates?

6. Which institution counts the graduate that starts at another university? At a community college? Are rewards and targets shared? Issues of clarity.

7. What about students who are less well prepared or are members of an underrepresented group? Does their success carry a premium?

8. Is there a distinction in Oregon’s policy and institutional rewards between Oregon citizens and nonresidents?

9. What is the balance between rewarding performance and rewarding effort and how does this ensure opportunity and success for Oregonians? (Consider the relative costs and success likelihood of educating the 4.0 high school gpa, 2100 SAT student who comes in with 50 college credits from AP/IB/dual enrollment versus the English Language Learner from a low income family who meets minimum admissions criteria at the least selective university.)
Related Presidents’ or IFS Principles:

a. Presidents’ Consensus Principle #1: “Continued commitment by all seven universities to work individually and in concert to meet the public higher education needs of Oregonians as defined by state law and Oregon University System (OUS) policies.”

b. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Principle A: “Any restructuring of Public Higher Education must improve the education of all Oregon students.”

c. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Principle C: “Any restructuring plans of Public Higher Education must strengthen the values that these individual Public Institutions bring to Oregon.”

d. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Principle E: “Public Higher Education Institutions in Oregon should function collaboratively as a unified system for the benefit of Oregon.”

Governance—degree targets—feb19
Some Questions

1. Should all campuses have research requirements and research targets?

2. Should all campuses be required to undertake and rewarded for performing externally funded research and providing specific economic development outcomes from that research?

3. For any campus required to seek or rewarded for performing externally funded research, what measures should be used?
   a. Externally funded research expenditures (total and/or average by faculty member)
   b. Income from patents, royalties, copyrights and private partnerships
   c. Patents and disclosures
   d. Number of Oregon start-ups/spin-offs/joint ventures
   e. Employment in Oregon at spin-offs/start-ups related to OUS research
   f. Private sector or federal jobs/payroll in Oregon related to OUS research
   g. Connection to state economic development initiatives
   h. Other

4. Should collaborative research involving multiple universities in Oregon be recognized and rewarded and, if so, how?

Related Presidents’ of IFS Principles:
   a. Presidents’ Consensus Principle #1: Continued commitment by all seven universities to work individually and in concert to meet the public higher education needs of Oregonians as defined by state law and Oregon University System (OUS) policies.”
   b. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate Principle C: “Any restructuring plans of Public Higher Education must strengthen the values that these individual Public Institutions bring to Oregon.”

Governance—research targets—feb17