AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/WELCOME

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   - FBAPRE Committee Meeting, February 4, 2005

3. ACTION ITEM
   a. Managerial Quarterly Report (Green) ........................................................................ 1
      Provides quarterly management reports as of December 31, 2004.

4. REPORT ITEMS
      The Investment Report is a comprehensive report on the System’s investment portfolio,
      consisting of endowment funds (both pooled and separately invested), donation funds,
      and plant funds.

   b. External Audit Management Letter Comment Update (Green) ................................. 15
      At the February 2005 meeting of the FBAPRE Committee, the System’s external
      auditors, Moss-Adams, LLP noted in their management letter the need to review the
      structure of the Optional Retirement Plan.

   c. Internal Audit Progress Report 2005 (Snopkowski) .................................................. 17
      This report provides information regarding the audit charter provisions.

5. ADJOURNMENT
REGULAR MEETING OF THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 2005
ROOM 327/8/9, SMITH MEMORIAL STUDENT UNION
PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY
(10:00 A.M. – 1:00 P.M.)

AGENDA

2. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/WELCOME

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Appendix A to be provided under separate cover
   • Regular Board Meeting, February 4, 2005
   • Special Meeting of the Board, February 18, 2005

4. REPORTS
   a. Chancellor’s Report
   b. Presidents’ Reports
   c. Provosts’ Council (Lorraine Davis, Chair)
   d. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) President
   e. Oregon Student Association (OSA) President

5. CONSENT ITEMS
   a. Authorization to Award Honorary Degrees, OSU and PSU.................................25
      OSU seeks Board approval to award honorary doctorates to Dr. David Satcher and Dr.
      Ann Streissguth at its June 2005 commencement. PSU seeks Board approval to award
      an honorary doctorate to Neal Keny-Guyer at its June 2005 commencement.
   b. PSU, Ph.D. in Applied Psychology...........................................................................29
      Portland State University seeks Board approval to offer a Ph.D. in Applied Psychology.
   c. WOU, Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art ...........................................................................31
      Western Oregon University seeks Board approval to offer a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art.

6. ACTION ITEMS
   a. Proposed Adoption of Temporary OAR 580-021-0029: Career Development Leave
      (Rawlins) ...................................................................................................................33
      This rule establishes career development leave as a policy of the OUS.
b. **Voyager Tuition Assistance (Volunteer Guard and Reserve)** (McDonald) ............... 35
   As part of a package of benefits for returning Oregon National Guard and Reserve members, the Voyager Tuition Assistance program was created by the Governor and OUS.

7. **REPORT ITEMS**

   a. **Articulation Transfer Linked Audit System (ATLAS) Update** (McDonald) ............... 39
      The Excellence in Delivery and Productivity (EDP) Working Group identified in its original work plan the need to develop a statewide web-based course articulation system that would enable students and academic advisors to determine if and how college courses taken at one college could be used to meet degree requirements at another college or university. Such a system would better support students who now enroll in multiple colleges or universities in the process of completing their college degrees.

   b. **Fiscal Year 2006 Federal Appropriation Priorities** (Clark) ................................. 41
      In a continuing effort to respond to requests from the staff of the seven-member Oregon congressional delegation, the institutions comprising the Oregon University System have submitted their federal appropriations priorities for fiscal year 2006.

8. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

   a. Standing Committees
   b. Working Groups
   c. Other Board Committees

9. **PUBLIC INPUT**

10. **BOARD COMMENTS**

11. **DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO 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 shall act for the Board in minor matters and in any matter where a timely response is required prior to the next Board meeting.”

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

    Note: All docket materials are available on the OUS website at: http://www.ous.edu/board/meetingmaterials.htm. Please contact the Board’s office at (541) 346-5795 if you have any questions regarding these materials. This agenda may be amended at any time prior to 24 hours before the Board meeting. Estimated starting times for the agenda items are indicated; however, discussions may commence, or action may be taken, before or after the suggested times. Any item on the agenda may be considered at any time out of order at the discretion of the President of the Board. During the meeting, the Board may convene in Executive Session to receive legal advice regarding any item on the agenda or for any reasons permitted under Oregon law.
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Managerial Reporting – Quarterly Management Report

Attached are the quarterly management reports as of December 31, 2004. After reviewing the Budget Projections Summary received from each university and comparing prior year results, we noted the following:

**Education and General – Limited:** Revenue collections are up 5 percent year-to-date above the prior year and are projected to be 4.4 percent above 2003-04 at year end, due mainly to the increase in tuition rates. Spending is up by 8.4 percent year-to-date and is projected to be 8.3 percent above prior year spending at year-end. The increase in spending is due largely to the timing of PERS obligation bond payments during the biennium and to a resumption of spending that was deferred due to funding uncertainties during 2003-04.

Revenue is projected to be $5.9 million, or 0.7 percent, above the Adjusted Annual Budget and spending at $2.8 million, or 0.3 percent, above budget at year-end. It appears that the revenue surplus is due mainly to collection of one-time revenues.

With the spend down in fund balance, it is not clear what portion of the excess spending above revenues is supporting ongoing operations and what portion is one-time spending. Staff will contact campuses and be prepared to report on any concerns at the Board meeting regarding Education and General and the Other Funds.

The projected June 30, 2005 ending fund balance of Education and General–Limited falls within the Board directed reserve level of 5-15 percent of Operating Revenues. The Chancellor’s Office reserve level is projected to exceed the recommended reserve level due to the transition of activities to universities and the delay of the CAPITAL Center roof repair until fiscal year 2006.

The projected June 30, 2005, revenues and expenditures for the Education and General–Limited Program are within the general fund and other funds limitation authorized by the Legislatively Adopted Budget (LAB).

**Auxiliary Enterprises:** The Projected ending fund balance of $164 million is comparable with the Adjusted Budget. Ending fund balance reserves run at a higher percent of revenues because capital assets are recorded in these funds. If capital assets, net of the related debt, were removed from the net asset balance, the reserve level would approximate 14 percent.

**Designated Operations, Service Departments, and Clearing Funds:** The Projected ending fund balance of $19 million is comparable with the Adjusted Budget. Ending fund balance reserves run at a higher percent of revenues because capital assets are recorded in certain of these funds. If capital assets, net of the related debt, were removed from the net asset balance, the reserve level would approximate 15 percent.
Staff Recommendation to the Board:
Staff recommends that the Board accept the Budget Projections Summary for December 31, 2004. The next management reports for the quarter ending March 31, 2005, are scheduled to be presented to the Board in May 2005.

(Board action required.)
## Oregon University System Budget Projections Summary

**As of the Quarter Ended December 31, 2004**

**For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005**

### COMBINED OUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(in thousands of dollars)</th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>% of</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Since</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Budget 6/30/05</td>
<td>from Adj.</td>
<td>Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EDUCATION & GENERAL - LIMITED

- **Beginning Fund Balance**
  - **State General Fund**: 165,621, 53% of Actual, 55% of YTD
  - **Tuition & Resource Fees, net of Remissions**: 289,714, 70% of Actual, 69% of YTD
  - **Other**: 46,535, 50% of Actual, 53% of YTD

- **Total Revenues & Transfers In**: 504,903, 61% of Actual, 60% of YTD
  - **Personal Services**: (300,481), 47% of Actual, 46% of YTD
  - **Supplies & Services**: (66,432), 40% of Actual, 39% of YTD
  - **Capital Outlay**: (10,756), 53% of Actual, 52% of YTD

- **Total Expenses & Transfers Out**: (388,276), 46% of Actual, 45% of YTD
  - **Personal Services**: (269,503), 47% of Actual, 46% of YTD

- **Ending Fund Balance**: 85,261, 88,322, 96,653, 8,331

#### AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES

- **Beginning Fund Balance**: 166,345
- **Total Revenues**: 142,389, 57% of Actual, 53% of YTD
- **Expenditures & Net Transfers**: (120,110), 47% of Actual, 42% of YTD

#### DESIGNATED OPERATIONS, SERVICE DEPARTMENTS, CLEARING FUNDS

- **Beginning Fund Balance**: 20,945
- **Total Revenues**: 49,245, 55% of Actual, 56% of YTD
- **Expenditures & Net Transfers**: (53,870), 59% of Actual, 52% of YTD

#### Change in Fund Balance:
- **% Operating Revenues**: 10.2%, 10.8%, 11.7%
- **% Operating Revenues**: 61.8%, 65.7%, 63.6%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th></th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>% of YTD</td>
<td>% of Actual YTD</td>
<td>LAB Budget</td>
<td>Adjusted Budget</td>
<td>Projected 6/30/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDU &amp; GEN - LIMITED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variances from Adj. Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>12,236</td>
<td>12,409</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition &amp; Rm Fees</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12,984</td>
<td>12,619</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>14,848</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25,798</td>
<td>25,761</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>(11,228)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>(25,921)</td>
<td>(25,921)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Add/Ded</td>
<td>(577)</td>
<td>(1%</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(575)</td>
<td>(575)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>3,349</td>
<td>3,349</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Rm</td>
<td>(2,855)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>(7,093)</td>
<td>(7,093)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Add/Ded</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>3,349</td>
<td>3,349</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATED OPERATIONS, DEPTS</td>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>(212)</td>
<td>(212)</td>
<td>(212)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Rm</td>
<td>(406)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>(1,330)</td>
<td>(1,330)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Add/Ded</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>556</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>(212)</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>-15.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES AND ASSUMPTIONS:**
(1) Compensated Absence liability was booked in designated operations and has been moved to the individual funds, particularly E&G.
Oregon University System  
Budget Projections Summary  
As of the Quarter Ended December 31, 2004  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>% of Prior Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>% of Actual YTD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EDUCATION & GENERAL - LIMITED**

**Beginning Fund Balance**

- **State General Fund**: 7,829 (52%) 54% 14,660 14,925 14,925 0
- **Tuition & Resource Fees, net of Remissions**: 7,104 (67%) 62% 10,632 10,526 10,526 0
- **Other**: 675 82% 80% 804 823 823 0

**Total Revenues & Transfers In**

15,608 59% 58% 26,096 26,274 26,274 0

**Total Expenses & Transfers Out**

- **Personal Services**: (9,648) 46% 44% (21,138) (21,047) (21,047) 0
- **Supplies & Services**: (1,966) 36% 40% (4,328) (5,119) (5,119) 0
- **Capital Outlay**: (213) 26% 68% (636) (816) (816) 0
- **Transfers Out**: (23) 33% 13% 6 (70) (70) 0

**Total Expenses & Transfers Out**

(11,850) 44% 43% (26,096) (27,052) (27,052) 0

**Fund Additions/Deductions**

- **Projections**

**End of Year**

2,714 2,714 2,714 0 0

**AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES**

**Beginning Fund Balance**

7,252 7,252 7,252 7,252 0 0

**Total Revenues**

3,342 49% 34% 6,279 6,783 6,783 0

**Total Revenues**

(3,373) 50% 41% (6,279) (6,783) (6,783) 0

**Fund Additions/Deductions**

(112) 0% 0 0 0 0

**End of Year**

7,252 7,252 7,252 7,140 0 0

**DESIGNATED OPERATIONS, SERVICE DEPARTMENTS, CLEARING FUNDS**

**Beginning Fund Balance**

(223) (223) (223) 0 0 0

**Total Revenues**

206 35% 47% 458 591 591 0

**Total Revenues**

(108) 18% 36% (458) (591) (591) 0

**Fund Additions/Deductions**

761 48% 761 761 761 0

**End of Year**

(223) (223) 0 538 761 761

**NOTES AND ASSUMPTIONS:**

- **Variance between projected and adjusted budget is primarily due to allocation of compensated absences**

---
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Oregon University System
Budget Projections Summary
As of the Quarter Ended December 31, 2004
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual % of Prior Yr.</th>
<th>Budget PROJECTED</th>
<th>Projections 6/30/2005</th>
<th>Variance△Since</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(in thousands of dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; GENERAL - LIMITED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>67,754</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>124,482</td>
<td>127,034</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Resource Fees, net of Remissions</td>
<td>77,089</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>114,364</td>
<td>114,716</td>
<td>115,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26,899</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59,136</td>
<td>53,309</td>
<td>55,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues &amp; Transfers In</td>
<td>171,742</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>297,982</td>
<td>295,059</td>
<td>298,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>(105,564)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>(234,673)</td>
<td>(224,162)</td>
<td>(6,567)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>(28,657)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>(61,555)</td>
<td>(63,113)</td>
<td>5,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>(5,417)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>(9,178)</td>
<td>(8,262)</td>
<td>(1,405)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>(5,051)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>(385)</td>
<td>(6,757)</td>
<td>(5,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses &amp; Transfers Out</td>
<td>(144,688)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>(305,791)</td>
<td>(295,059)</td>
<td>(302,294)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>3,719</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>(7,809)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>74,658</td>
<td></td>
<td>74,658</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>40,090</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>79,807</td>
<td>68,468</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers (32,522)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>(79,807)</td>
<td>(72,530)</td>
<td>(74,151)</td>
<td>(1,621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>(185)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(185)</td>
<td>(185)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>74,658</td>
<td></td>
<td>69,770</td>
<td>(980)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>(5,868)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,868)</td>
<td>(980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>103.1%</td>
<td>100.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATED OPERATIONS, SERVICE DEPARTMENTS, CLEARING FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>10,841</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,841</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>15,363</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>29,566</td>
<td>29,241</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers (15,219)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>(29,566)</td>
<td>(30,011)</td>
<td>(29,979)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>(199)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>(199)</td>
<td>(199)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>10,841</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,955</td>
<td>9,904</td>
<td>(51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>(886)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(937)</td>
<td>(51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES AND ASSUMPTIONS:
(1) Net of nonresident undergrad enrollments projected to be 0.65% over, and resident undergrads 1.16% under, budgeted levels.
(2) $1.2 million attributable to one-time events (sales, insurance claims, rebates); remainder reflects conservative revenue budgeting practices in departments.
(3) Reflects salary and benefit expenses for net 98 additional academic and professional faculty hires since 12/31/03 (3.3% headcount increase).
(4) $4.9 million used to meet financial aid obligations under remission cap; $1 million represents all other net activity including timing of redistributed Ecampus earnings.
(5) Primarily attributable to new faculty start-up equipment expenses.
(6) Net of $6.5 million unbudgeted transfers to plant fund for construction projects, $1.5 million benefit cost subsidy from PEBB and $500K debt service in Capital Outlay.
(7) Housing and Dining revenue is $525K over budget due to higher retention; Student Centers revenues are down $558K, Student Health up $97K, and Athletics up $0.75 million.
(8) Compared to budget: Housing is $917K over ($500K depreciation, $417K remodeling projects); Student Centers $269K under; and other auxiliaries net $147K under budget.
(9) Athletics is over budget by $1.119 million due to unplanned Bowl ($750K) and student aid ($369K). Athletic expenditures will be funded by gift revenues at fiscal year end.
(10) To be covered by fund balance (Housing) or gift funds (Athletics) at fiscal year end.
(11) Reallocations of compensated absence liability was not included in adjusted budget.
## PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>% of YTD</th>
<th>Prior Yr.</th>
<th>% of Prior Yr.</th>
<th>LAB Budget</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>Variance Since</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION &amp; GENERAL - LIMITED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>30,306</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56,055</td>
<td>57,544</td>
<td>57,544</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Resource Fees, net of Remissions</td>
<td>86,568</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>100,470</td>
<td>99,538</td>
<td>99,556</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>10,362</td>
<td>9,368</td>
<td>10,179</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>2,801</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>2,866</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues &amp; Transfers In</strong></td>
<td>103,481</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>166,896</td>
<td>169,251</td>
<td>170,145</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>(58,801)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>(133,224)</td>
<td>(134,314)</td>
<td>(134,750)</td>
<td>(436)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>(11,259)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>(30,494)</td>
<td>(31,213)</td>
<td>(30,316)</td>
<td>897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>(1,672)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>(4,722)</td>
<td>(4,762)</td>
<td>(5,378)</td>
<td>(616)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>(1,213)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>(5,152)</td>
<td>(5,866)</td>
<td>(5,866)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses &amp; Transfers Out</strong></td>
<td>(72,945)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>(173,592)</td>
<td>(176,145)</td>
<td>(176,300)</td>
<td>(155)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>15,813</td>
<td>15,615</td>
<td>10,977</td>
<td>(466)</td>
<td>(4,901)</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>(6,696)</td>
<td>(6,894)</td>
<td>(5,866)</td>
<td>(5,866)</td>
<td>(5,866)</td>
<td>(5,866)</td>
<td>(5,866)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>% of YTD</th>
<th>Prior Yr.</th>
<th>% of Prior Yr.</th>
<th>LAB Budget</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>Variance Since</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>19,868</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27,945</td>
<td>45,258</td>
<td>44,782</td>
<td>(476)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers</td>
<td>(18,225)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>(27,945)</td>
<td>(43,772)</td>
<td>(43,759)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>11,443</td>
<td>10,977</td>
<td>(466)</td>
<td>(4,901)</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td>(466)</td>
<td>(316)</td>
<td>(316)</td>
<td>(316)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DESIGNATED OPERATIONS, SERVICE DEPARTMENTS, CLEARING FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>% of YTD</th>
<th>Prior Yr.</th>
<th>% of Prior Yr.</th>
<th>LAB Budget</th>
<th>Adjusted Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>Variance Since</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>9,168</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14,963</td>
<td>16,553</td>
<td>16,685</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers</td>
<td>(15,960)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>(14,963)</td>
<td>(17,753)</td>
<td>(17,194)</td>
<td>559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>(181)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>(181)</td>
<td>(316)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,065)</td>
<td>(690)</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES AND ASSUMPTIONS:

1. The Fall Term 2004 actual enrollment was down slightly from projected. However, the elimination of the plateau has generated a slight increase of revenue which off-sets the slight decrease in enrollment.

2. The prior year's compensated absence liability adjustment to Other Fund Types was not reflected in the Adjusted Budget.

3. PEBB Subsidy Payment was not anticipated in the Adjusted Budget.
## Year-to-Date Actual vs. Budget

### Southern Oregon University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>% of Actual</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>% of Prior Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>% of Prior Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD Actual</td>
<td>% of YTD</td>
<td>Prior Yr.</td>
<td>% of Prior Yr.</td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
<td>6/30/2005</td>
<td>% of Prior Yr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION &amp; GENERAL - LIMITED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>3,258</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>7,609</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14,247</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>14,620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Resource Fees, net of Remissions</td>
<td>14,186</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>21,458</td>
<td>14,620</td>
<td>20,414</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues &amp; Transfers In</strong></td>
<td>23,076</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>37,230</td>
<td>35,991</td>
<td>37,230</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>(13,913)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>(30,671)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>(30,364)</td>
<td>(530)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>(2,284)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>(6,011)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>(5,202)</td>
<td>(179)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>(304)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>(521)</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>(425)</td>
<td>(90)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>(377)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(264)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses &amp; Transfers Out</strong></td>
<td>(16,878)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>(37,230)</td>
<td>(35,991)</td>
<td>(37,230)</td>
<td>(1,095)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>(822)</td>
<td>(822)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(790)</td>
<td>(790)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(790)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Auxiliary Enterprises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>% of Actual</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>% of Prior Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>% of Prior Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>10,434</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18,963</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18,021</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>18,021</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers</td>
<td>(9,318)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>(18,963)</td>
<td>(18,021)</td>
<td>(17,785)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(185)</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,110)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(790)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Designated Operations, Service Departments, Clearing Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>% of Actual</th>
<th>Prior Year</th>
<th>% of Prior Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>% of Prior Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5,164</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4,497</td>
<td>3466</td>
<td>(131)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers</td>
<td>(2,460)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>(5,164)</td>
<td>(4,497)</td>
<td>(4,366)</td>
<td>(131)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes and Assumptions:
1. E&G Tuition & Resource Fees: Tuition & modified plateau increases are offsetting current year enrollment decline.
2. E&G Personal Services: Increased anticipated spending due to strategic initiatives, administrative strengthening, and faculty collective bargaining commitment.
3. E&G Transfers: Majority of transactions involve transfers that are internal to E&G funds, resulting in a nominal impact overall.
4. All Fund Groups: Fund Additions/Deletions: Primarily the result of the policy to redistribute the Compensated Absences Liability across all funds groups.
5. Auxiliaries: Increase due to recording the asset value for completion of Cox Hall addition, compensated absences liability reallocation, and transfers to reserves.
6. Auxiliary revenues: Decreased occupancy and reduced incidental fee revenue due to current year enrollment decline.
# Oregon University System
## Budget Projections Summary
### As of the Quarter Ended December 31, 2004
#### For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005

**UNIVERSITY OF OREGON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>% of</td>
<td>Projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LAB</td>
<td>Adjusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; GENERAL - LIMITED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>17,807</td>
<td>17,807</td>
<td>17,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>31,822</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Resource Fees, net of Remissions</td>
<td>104,492</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11,889</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues &amp; Transfers In</td>
<td>149,044</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>(86,329)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>(15,681)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>(1,709)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>(1,433)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses &amp; Transfers Out</td>
<td>(105,152)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>17,553</td>
<td>18,715</td>
<td>23,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance</td>
<td>(254)</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>5,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES**

|                     |                      |        |              |              |       |
|                     |                      |        |              |              |       |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 61,996              | 61,996 | 61,996       | 0            | 0     |
| Total Revenues      | 57,740               | 64%    | 55%          | 113,480      | 7,333 |
| Expenditures & Net Transfers | (45,990) | 51% | 38% | (113,480) | (12,040) |
| Fund Additions/Deductions | 13,481              | 0%     | 0%           | (4,478)      | 0     |
| Ending Fund Balance  | 61,996               | 61,996 | 61,767       | (229)        | 0     |
| Change in Fund Balance| 0                    | 0      | (229)        | (229)        | 0     |
| % Operating Revenues | 54.5%                | 68.5%  | 63.2%        |              |       |

**DESIGNATED OPERATIONS, SERVICE DEPARTMENTS, CLEARING FUNDS**

|                     |                      |        |              |              |       |
|                     |                      |        |              |              |       |
| Beginning Fund Balance | 6,373               | 6,373  | 6,373        | 0            | 0     |
| Total Revenues      | 19,112               | 58%    | 51%          | 32,761       | (1,370)|
| Expenditures & Net Transfers | (16,783) | 51% | 47% | (32,761) | (601) |
| Fund Additions/Deductions | (458)               | -49%   |              | (458)        | (458)|
| Ending Fund Balance  | 6,373               | 6,373  | 6,373        | (2,429)      | 0     |
| Change in Fund Balance| 0                    | 0      | (2,429)      | (2,429)      | 0     |
| % Operating Revenues | 19.5%                | 19.4%  | 12.5%        |              |       |

**NOTES AND ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Housing income up due to increased fees and occupancy. Athletics income up due to increased gift revenue. Both amounts were not anticipated when the projected budget was compiled in May 04.
2. Housing increased expense reflects increased occupancy. Student Activities increased expense reflects increase in number of enrolled students. Athletics increased expense reflects increase in student aid.
3. The student recreation center building was previously booked in the Investment in Plant fund. It is correctly booked in the appropriate auxiliary fund. Included in the net transfer is the building and associated depreciation and liability.
**Oregon University System**  
**Budget Projections Summary**

**As of the Quarter Ended December 31, 2004**  
**For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2005**

### WESTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>% of Actual</td>
<td>YTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>% of Prior Yr.</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION &amp; GENERAL - LIMITED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>9,392</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>7,711</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Resource Fees, net of Remissions</td>
<td>12,425</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>18,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues &amp; Transfers In</td>
<td>20,811</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>34,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>(13,745)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>(31,671)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>(2,285)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>(5,503)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>(1,158)</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>(2,344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>(750)</td>
<td>115%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses &amp; Transfers Out</td>
<td>(17,938)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>(39,438)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>9,090</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>(5,417)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>(4,761)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of % of</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>% of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>LAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>9,090</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>7,312</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers</td>
<td>(7,608)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>(14,720)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>(148)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>(148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>9,090</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DESIGNATED OPERATIONS, SERVICE DEPARTMENTS, CLEARING FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of % of</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>% of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>LAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers</td>
<td>(2,690)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>(3,105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES AND ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Tuition and fees decrease of $808K is due to reduced projected enrollment.
2. Other revenues is anticipated to increase by $627K due to administrative cost recovery.
3. Transfers were budgeted on a "net" basis.
4. Personal Services is projected to decline by $875K due to conservation measures and not filling vacancies.
5. Services and supplies also is projected to decline by $647K due to conservation measures and timing of various planned physical plant maintenance issues.
6. Changes within the funds' categories of additions and deletions is primarily due to compensated absences liability.
7. Disk space for campus-wide servers in excess of $600K were purchased and resold through our centralized service IT resale department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANCELLOR’S OFFICE</th>
<th>Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YTD Actual</td>
<td>YTD Budget</td>
<td>Adjusted Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in thousands of dollars)</td>
<td>% of Prior Yr.</td>
<td>% of YTD</td>
<td>% of Prior Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION &amp; GENERAL - LIMITED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>12,196</td>
<td>12,196</td>
<td>12,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State General Fund</td>
<td>5,881</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Resource Fees, net of Remissions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues &amp; Transfers In</td>
<td>6,293</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>(3,437)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; Services</td>
<td>(2,410)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers Out</td>
<td>(1,749)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses &amp; Transfers Out</td>
<td>(7,596)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>7,805</td>
<td>4,256</td>
<td>5,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance</td>
<td>(4,391)</td>
<td>(7,940)</td>
<td>(6,327)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>(545)</td>
<td>(545)</td>
<td>(545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers</td>
<td>(220)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>654%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>(545)</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>1,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>-64.5%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATED OPERATIONS, SERVICE DEPARTMENTS, CLEARING FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>162%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures &amp; Net Transfers</td>
<td>(245)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Additions/Deductions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>186%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Fund Balance</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Fund Balance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(263)</td>
<td>(263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Operating Revenues</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>4800.0%</td>
<td>4800.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES AND ASSUMPTIONS:
(1) Capital Center roof repair delayed until next year. Funds designated from OCATE/OCECS reserves. Spend down of fund balance is due to CO reorganization, not ongoing operations.
(2) Negative beginning fund balance due to capitalization of the Capital Center in mid-year. Only debt was booked at the beginning of the year.
(3) Designated Operations were Academic Affairs programs that are phasing out.
Annual Report on Investments – Year Ended June 30, 2004

The System’s annual Investment Report (with corrections), which is included with the supplemental materials (on file with the Board’s office), was prepared by the Chancellor’s Office pursuant to Internal Management Directive 6.130. The Investment Report is a comprehensive report on the System’s investment portfolio, consisting of endowment funds (both pooled and separately invested), donation funds, and plant funds. The information within the Investment Report is summarized below.

As of June 30, 2004, total OUS investments (funds available for investment) had a combined market value of $293 million, summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Funds (both Pooled and Separately Invested)</td>
<td>$62,837,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Donation Funds</td>
<td>44,801,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Funds</td>
<td>185,472,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$293,111,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total Pooled Endowment Fund (Fund) return for fiscal year 2004 was 16.0 percent, which out-performed the policy benchmark return of 15.7 percent. The Fund’s allocation to large-cap equities (BGI Alpha Tilts Fund B) returned 17.8 percent, which lagged its benchmark (S&P 500 Stock Index) return of 19.1 percent for the first time in five years. The Fund’s allocation to small/mid-cap equities (Batterymarch) returned 28.4 percent, which lagged its benchmark (Russell 2500 Index) return of 32.2 percent for the first time since its purchase in ’00-01. The Fund’s allocation to foreign equities (T. Rowe Price Foreign Equity) returned 24.1 percent, which lagged its benchmark (EAFE Index) return of 32.3 percent for the fourth straight year. The Fund’s allocation to fixed income (Western Asset Core Plus Bond Fund) returned 2.7 percent, which outperformed its benchmark (Lehman Aggregate Bond Index) of 0.3 percent. The ten-year average return for the Fund was 9.9 percent compared to the policy benchmark return of 9.5 percent. During the FY 2004, $2.4 million was distributed from the Pooled Endowment Fund to the universities for spending.

U.S. Treasury Notes and FNMA Securities in the Current Donation Funds and Plant Funds earned between 1.75 percent and 5.35 percent until they were called or matured. Other funds invested in the Oregon State Treasury Short-Term Investment Pool earned an average of 1.28 percent.

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Board accept the 2004 Annual Report on Investments as presented.
External Audit Management Letter Comment Update

**Background:**
At the February 4, 2005, meeting of the Board’s Finance, Budget, Audit, Personnel, and Real Estate Committee, the System’s external auditors, Moss-Adams, LLP noted in their management letter the need to review the structure of the Optional Retirement Plan (Plan). The auditors noted that the System Controller, who is also a trustee of the Plan, supervises the other trustee of the plan, as well as one of the four Retirement Committee members. Moss-Adams recommended that employees who are appointed as trustees or members of the Retirement Committee be independent of each other to the extent possible and consideration be taken with regard to their positions within the organization. Subsequently, the trustees of the Plan met with the chair of the Retirement Committee and System legal counsel to review the audit comment and develop an action plan to implement the auditor’s recommendations.

**Action Plan:**
The System plans to contract for trustee services for the Plan. Staff believes that it is more efficient and effective for the trustee duties to be carried out by a contractor who regularly performs such duties for similarly structured retirement plans. Benefits to the System and participants of contracting for these services include:

- Fiduciary responsibility is distributed more broadly, reducing the possibilities for potential conflicts of interest;
- Time consuming administrative functions, including preparing consolidated asset and income statements and processing receipts and disbursements are delegated to an institution specializing in providing these services;
- The trustee role is delegated to an institution specializing in providing trust services, minimizing the possibility that a trust responsibility could be overlooked, thereby exposing the plan sponsor to penalties, or even jeopardizing the plan's tax-qualified status;
- Since assets are controlled by a corporate trustee, plan participants receive an extra degree of protection that plan assets will be used solely to pay benefits to participants and beneficiaries, and reasonable plan expenses.

The cost of the trustee services (which would be negotiated as a part of the contracting process) is not expected to exceed $100,000 annually. These costs would be borne by the Plan and funded from plan contributions forfeited due to participants terminating employment prior to vesting. Net forfeitures have averaged over $450,000 for each of the calendar years 2001, 2002, and 2003. The Plan does not currently pay for the trustee services performed by the System.

Plans call for the RFP for trustee services to be issued in March and for contract execution and the transfer of these responsibilities to be completed by the close of the current fiscal year. Transferring the Plan trustee responsibilities to a contractor will eliminate the potential conflict of interest condition noted by the auditors.
Internal Audit Progress Report 2005

Background:
As outlined in the Oregon State Board of Higher Education Audit Charter, the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (the Board) has oversight responsibility to ensure that Oregon University System (OUS) management is performing their duties of financial reporting, ensuring effective and efficient internal controls, and complying with laws, regulations, and ethics. This report provides information regarding the following audit charter provisions:

- The Oregon State Board of Higher Education shall review, at least semi-annually, the results of Internal Audit recommendations and follow-up procedures. More frequent meetings will be held as deemed necessary.

- The Oregon State Board of Higher Education shall approve the Internal Audit Division's annual audit plans and budget.

The Board shall have and exercise all other powers, as it shall deem necessary, for the performance of its duties.
### Reports Issued from August 2004 through January 2005:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Type</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled</td>
<td>EOU</td>
<td>Computing &amp; Telecom Services</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Extension Service</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OIT</td>
<td>Facilities Operations</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Advisory/</td>
<td>CO and UO</td>
<td>Administrative Overhead and Fund Balances</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Irregularity</td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Athletics Track and Field Travel</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>Athletics Equipment Room Complaint</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSU</td>
<td>University Place Complaint</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Transportation Services Complaint</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Department of Fisheries &amp; Wildlife Complaint</td>
<td>Needs Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-ups</td>
<td>SOU</td>
<td>RVTV</td>
<td>75% compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UO and OSU</td>
<td>Budget Monitoring</td>
<td>100% compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSU</td>
<td>Purchasing (II)</td>
<td>100% compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ratings** – The rating relates to selected financial, compliance, and operational areas tested. The rating is NOT a global performance rating. All issued reports contain management’s written response indicating adequate steps are being taken to address any internal control issues noted.

**Satisfactory** – Controls are in place and functioning effectively. (Irregularity - allegation was not substantiated.)

**Needs Improvement** – Controls exist, but some controls are not functioning and/or additional controls are needed. (Irregularity - allegation was not substantiated.)

**Unsatisfactory** – Some controls exist, but they are generally not functioning as intended and/or additional controls are needed. (Irregularity - allegation was substantiated.)
2005 Planned Audit Activities:

1. The scheduled audits to be completed by the Internal Audit Division (IAD) are based upon an annual risk assessment. The completed 2005 IAD risk assessment identified 226 auditable units at the seven Oregon University System universities, excluding the Chancellor’s Office. IAD performed a macro level risk assessment on each identified auditable unit. Industry trends, past audit experience, and management interviews all play a key role in the assessment process. The risk categories are comprised of the following:

   - Compliance Risk
   - Financial Risk
   - Strategic Risk
   - Operational Risk
   - Public Opinion/Customer Satisfaction Risk

   The purpose of the risk assessment is to determine the annual auditable units. A list of the units to be audited is outlined on pages 4 and 5 of this report. The audit units selected will be audited in financial, compliance, and operational (efficiency/effectiveness) areas relative to their missions. The audit program steps will vary by unit depending upon results of a detail audit risk survey conducted during the planning stages of the audit.

   The expected coverage may be reduced if other immediate needs such as financial irregularity reviews or other high-risk special requests are deemed of greater importance by the Board or executive management.

2. Based upon resources, IAD will complete the following information technology related assignments:

   - Auditor assistance (data retrieval and analysis)
   - Miscellaneous management advisory and financial irregularity assistance
   - Automated Banner report exception test development
**Internal Audit 2005 Planned Activities**

*The 2005 planned activities are based on ability to successfully recruit for the OSU and UO Senior Auditor positions and the regional staff auditor.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemwide and Chancellor’s Office</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned Audits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Budget Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cashiering/Cash Management and Treasury Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashiering/Cash Management and Treasury Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Limited scope reviews of selected internal control elements.*

Note: The UO, OSU, and PSU Athletics Departments will be reviewed as part of the NCAA agreed upon procedure engagement contracted to Moss Adams, Certified Public Accountants.
### Internal Audit 2005 Planned Activities (continued…)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Follow-ups</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETIC</strong></td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Agricultural Experiment Stations</td>
<td>Extended Studies</td>
<td>Fund Balance Monitoring</td>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Business Operations</strong></td>
<td>Extension Service Operations</td>
<td>College of Engineering and Computer Sciences</td>
<td>Academic Directors Division</td>
<td>Rogue Valley Community Television</td>
<td>Computing and Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Asian Languages and Literatures</strong></td>
<td>College Forests</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer and Information Science</strong></td>
<td>University Press</td>
<td>University Place</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organization Proposal:

At the September 2004 Oregon State Board of Higher Education meeting, the Internal Audit Division was asked to analyze its current staffing levels and report back at a future Board meeting. The following pages outline the existing organizational structure, the proposed structure, as well as an analysis to support the proposed structure.
Audit Benchmarking Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Type</th>
<th>OUS Revenue 6/30/04</th>
<th>*GAIN Survey Benchmark Percentage of Total Revenue</th>
<th>Cost based upon industry average</th>
<th>Cost currently incurred by OUS</th>
<th>Benchmark Variance (-) In Excess of Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
<td>$1,633,375,000</td>
<td>.1097%</td>
<td>$1,791,812</td>
<td>$696,000</td>
<td>$1,094,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State Audits</td>
<td>$1,633,375,000</td>
<td>.046%</td>
<td>$751,353</td>
<td>$1,306,223</td>
<td>($554,871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,543,165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Benchmark Data Source: The Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) Global Audit Information Network (GAIN) Survey – Public University Specialty Group

Proposed Routine Audit Coverage:
Number of Campus Auditable Units .......................226
Annual Audit Coverage for 5-Year Audit Cycle ....... 45
(Limited scope coverage with follow-up)
Auditors Needed for Coverage ................................. 9*
Note: The proposed audit coverage does not include information technology audits or audit management hours.

Full Time Equivalent Cost Proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Current FTE 6/30/05</th>
<th>6/30/06</th>
<th>6/30/07</th>
<th>6/30/08-09</th>
<th>Total Proposed FTE 6/30/09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine Audit Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus-Based Experienced Seniors Staff</td>
<td>4 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Audit Specialists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>1 1 0 1 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 2 1 4 13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Audit Costs*</td>
<td>$696,000 $155,000</td>
<td>$67,000</td>
<td>$220,000</td>
<td>$1,071,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State *</td>
<td>$1,306,223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,377,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The costs based on current assessments and not adjusted for inflation.
**Staff Recommendation to the Board:**
Routine internal audits of university and System operations is a proactive way to find opportunities to increase fiscal accountability, promote compliance with applicable regulations and policies, and identify areas for operational efficiencies. The Association of Certified Fraud Examiners’ 2004 Report to the Nation on Occupational Fraud and Abuse also outlines the use of internal audit as an effective deterrent to prevent abuse. Companies that have effective internal audit functions had reduced costs related to fraud and abuse.

Due to the value of internal audit in assisting the campus and System management, as well as the Board in promoting accountability and enhancing creditability for the system, it is recommended the current staffing levels of the Internal Audit Division be maintained. Given current budget constraints, staff recommends adding an additional two internal audit division staff members during the fiscal year ending 6/30/06. It is further recommended a reassessment take place at the end of 6/30/06 to evaluate long term staffing goals.
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Authorization to award honorary degrees, OSU and PSU

Summary:
Board of Higher Education policy permits institutions, with the concurrence of their faculty, to award honorary degrees. Each institution proposing the award of honorary degrees has received the Chancellor’s approval of criteria and procedures for selection that ensure the award honors distinguished achievement and outstanding contributions to the institution, state, or society.

Oregon State University
Oregon State University requests authorization to award honorary doctorates to Dr. David Satcher and Dr. Ann Streissguth at its June 2005 commencement ceremony.

Dr. David Satcher has been a pioneer, a visionary, a humanitarian, and a role model throughout his entire career. One of nine children born to poor, self-educated farmers in rural Alabama, he nearly died at the age of two from whooping cough, then went on to become the first African American to hold the position of Surgeon General of the United States.

It was the lack of a vaccine for whooping cough in his rural community that nearly killed young David Satcher – and fueled his desire to improve health care for all. He was one of just three students from his high school to go on to college and he became the first African American student to earn a combined Ph.D./M.D. from Case Western University.

His medical career began in Los Angeles, where Dr. Satcher directed a sickle-cell anemia program and opened a free clinic in the basement of a church in Watts. As his practice grew, he always found time to treat the sick and injured in under-served areas of Los Angeles and Cleveland and in the immigrant communities of New York.

In 1979, he returned to the site of his undergraduate education, becoming a professor and department chair at the Morehouse College School of Medicine. Three years later, he was named president of Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tennessee, where he remained for 11 years. During that time, he was elected to the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, which cited his unparalleled leadership skills.

In 1993, Dr. Satcher was named director of the prestigious Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and simultaneously held the title of Administrator of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. For the next five years, he directed the efforts of both programs. His accomplishments were many; among them:

- He led an initiative that increased childhood immunization rates from 55 percent to 78 percent in just four years.
- He identified the need and upgraded the nation's capability to respond to emerging infectious diseases and laid the groundwork for a new early-warning system for detecting and preventing food-borne illness.
• He directed the CDC to place a greater emphasis on disease prevention and expanded the center's comprehensive breast and cervical screening programs from 18 to all 50 states.

On February 13, 1998, Dr. David Satcher was sworn in as the nation's 16th Surgeon General and served a four-year term. His pioneering ways continued. He not only was the first African American Surgeon General, he became the first person in that position to release a report on mental health, helping to remove the stigma associated with mental disorders.

He also helped lead initiatives to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in health and to reduce youth violence and teen suicide. At the end of his four-year term, Dr. Satcher received the Institute of Medicine's Sarnat Prize for promoting mental health.

When he was sworn in as Surgeon General, Dr. Satcher was quoted: "This is an American dream come true – to go from a humble farm in Anniston, Alabama, to the office of Surgeon General, to have the chance to serve the country I love, and to earn the confidence of so many leaders I honor and respect."

Until the 1970s, there was little if any knowledge or evidence that alcohol consumption by pregnant women could damage developing fetuses. It was the work of Dr. Ann Streissguth that brought the nature of Fetal Alcohol Syndrome to public light, saving or improving countless lives.

Dr. Streissguth led an interdisciplinary team that in 1973 first identified the harmful effects of alcohol use during pregnancy. During the following year, she was named principal investigator for the Longitudinal Study on Alcohol and Pregnancy, funded by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. Her research team found that nearly one in every 100 births was affected by Fetal Alcohol Syndrome or alcohol-related disabilities.

The study continued and, in 1981, the findings from her research team led the U.S. Surgeon General to make an official recommendation that women not consume alcohol during pregnancy or when planning a pregnancy.

Although the public was beginning to hear the message, the full impacts of Fetal Alcohol Syndrome were not yet revealed. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention appointed Dr. Streissguth to conduct a study on the secondary disabilities in patients with Fetal Alcohol Syndrome and related conditions. That landmark study found that:

• 94 percent of individuals who had Fetal Alcohol Syndrome suffered mental health problems
• 60 percent had disrupted school experiences
• 60 percent ended up having trouble with the law
• 50 percent experienced confinement in adolescence or adulthood
• 50 percent exhibited inappropriate sexual behavior
• 30 percent experienced personal drug or alcohol problems

The research pointed out not only the importance of pregnant women refraining from alcohol, it also spotlighted the importance of longitudinal research in pinpointing problems that may not become apparent for years.

Ann Streissguth graduated from Oregon State University in 1954 with a degree in home economics, subsequently earned a master's degree in child development from the University of California at Berkeley, and a doctorate in clinical psychology at the University of Washington. She still directs the Fetal Alcohol and Drug Unit at the University of Washington School of Medicine – a unit known worldwide for its investigations of many types of prenatal influences on later development. Among the factors studied: alcohol, tobacco, cocaine, aspirin and acetaminophen, as well as the rubella virus.

During her career, which has spanned nearly half a century, Dr. Ann Streissguth has published three books, more than 200 papers, and given more than 400 talks at conferences and meetings throughout the world. She has appeared numerous times in the media to inform her peers and the public about the dangers of Fetal Alcohol Syndrome.

Her studies continue. With colleagues, Dr. Streissguth recently began a five-year study of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and neuropsychological function in persons with Fetal Alcohol Syndrome in an effort to find improved treatment methods.

**Portland State University**

Portland State University requests authorization to award an honorary doctorate of humane letters to **Neal Keny-Guyer**, CEO of Mercy Corps, at its spring commencement 2005. President Bernstine is pleased to announce that Mr. Keny-Guyer has also accepted an invitation to be PSU's commencement speaker.

Portland State University is deeply honored to recognize the outstanding contributions made by Mr. Keny-Guyer. Today, under his guidance, Mercy Corps works in more than 30 countries, including the United States, helping communities overcome hunger, poverty, and conflict.

In 1994, Mr. Keny-Guyer joined Mercy Corps as chief executive officer and Mercy Corps has emerged as a leading international relief and development agency with over 2,000 staff and an annual operating budget in excess of $140 million. He has forged new organizational directions – most notably, globalizing operations through mergers and strategic alliances; placing peace making, human rights, and civil society at the heart of Mercy Corps' humanitarian mission; and building an organizational reputation for innovative and entrepreneurial practices.
Mr. Keny-Guyer’s career began in America’s inner cities in 1976. As special projects coordinator for Cities-In-Schools, he worked with at-risk youth to stem high school dropout rates and gang activity among minority young people in Washington, D.C. and Atlanta, Georgia. In 1980, Mr. Keny-Guyer moved to Thailand to aid Cambodian refugees. As field coordinator for CARE/UNICEF, he organized an emergency relief program along the Thai-Cambodian border, including cross-border distribution of food and agricultural supplies.

Over the course of the next nine years, Mr. Keny-Guyer worked with Save the Children, designing and implementing high-impact relief and development programs in some of the world’s most politically sensitive regions. In Lebanon, living in war-torn Beirut, he developed the country’s largest locally managed relief and rehabilitation program (including an acclaimed credit project with a 90 percent repayment rate) and promoted peaceful governmental organization in an isolated, war-torn border area. In Jordan, the West Bank, Gaza, Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Sudan, he implemented innovative and cost-effective programs that directly impacted over two million people. As director of the agency’s Middle East, Europe, and North Africa programs, Mr. Keny-Guyer managed a $44 million budget and supervised 900 staff in ten countries.

In 1990, Mr. Keny-Guyer focused his efforts stateside, founding Keny-Guyer Associates in Menlo Park, California to offer strategic planning and organizational development consulting to businesses, foundations, and non-profit agencies. His subsequent work with Mercy Corps has resulted in the agency quadrupling in size and scope while maintaining a 91 percent efficiency rating. The agency reaches more than five million people each year with emergency relief, long-term social and economic development, and civil society programs.

Mr. Keny-Guyer serves on the boards of local and national organizations, including InterAction, an alliance of humanitarian and development organizations, and on the Board of Advisors for the Yale School of Management. He earned his BA in public policy and religion from Duke University and a Master’s of Public and Private Management from the Yale School of Management.

Neal Keny-Guyer’s commitment of energy, vision, and entrepreneurial enterprise to serving the world’s poorest and least represented people has truly made a difference in the global community. Our graduating class, their friends, and families will greatly benefit from his experience and the University will proudly welcome him to the Viking family.

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the Board authorize Oregon State University to award honorary doctorates to Dr. David Satcher and Dr. Ann Streissguth, and Portland State University to award an honorary doctorate to Mr. Neal Keny-Guyer at their 2005 Spring Commencement ceremonies.

**(Board action required.)**
PSU, Ph.D. in Applied Psychology

The Ph.D. will require 52 credit hours beyond the Master’s degree (56 credit hours), for a minimum total of 108 credit hours. The program has been designed explicitly to train research professionals who will have the tools and expertise to contribute to the definition and solution of significant social problems. The program will offer concentrations in Industrial/Organizational, Applied Social/Community, and Applied Developmental Psychology. The Industrial/Organizational concentration applies psychological principles to organizational and workplace issues. The Applied Social/Community concentration highlights the manner in which applied issues are shaped by social relationships, social groups, socialization practices, culture, and community. The Applied Developmental concentration brings a life-span perspective to the study of developmental processes in their social and historical contexts.

Demand for the specific specialties and for the applied focus of the degree has been documented by professional societies, by Department of Labor forecasts, and in the increasing applications for graduate study in these fields. Meeting that demand, and in particular meeting it through the applied nature of the program (as well as the associated research programs), is consistent with the mission of Portland State University, as well as the strategic direction of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. In keeping with the community orientation of Portland State University, the program emphasizes community collaboration in the preparation of Ph.D. recipients. This collaboration is accomplished through community-based learning classes, practica, applied research initiatives, and internships. Department faculty and community professionals jointly supervise these experiences to ensure quality and program relevance.

While some of the graduates from the program will undoubtedly enter higher education careers, most will probably enter diverse occupations related to the applied nature of the program specialties. For example, some will address issues of employee selection, retention, and motivation as industrial/organizational psychologists. Others will enter the growing fields of program evaluation, particularly in areas related to mental health and other community services. Still others will find positions with local, state, and national institutions and organizations that serve children, youth, the elderly, and their families.

In five years time, Portland State University expects to have 15 to 20 graduates per year from this program.

All appropriate University committees and the OUS Provosts’ Council have positively reviewed the proposed program. It was also reviewed by an external review team, which confirmed the program’s quality and viability.

Recommendation to the Board:
The OUS Provosts’ Council recommends that the Board authorize Portland State University to establish a Ph.D. in Applied Psychology, effective immediately.

(Board action required.)
WOU, Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art

The Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) in Art is a rigorous program of study intended to provide art majors with an option to obtain a greater level of proficiency in specific studio concentration areas. Students will acquire expanded technical expertise and conceptual proficiency through research and study, along with components in service learning and/or international study.

The BFA in Art program is a fifth year of work in which the student proposes and completes a thesis project, resulting in an exhibit or other presentation appropriate to the area of study. B.A./B.S. in Art majors take studio courses in two discipline areas. These students (having completed university undergraduate degree requirements for a B.A. or B.S.), upon admission to the BFA in Art program (through portfolio and grade point average evaluation, interviews, and recommendations), will focus in a single chosen discipline. The BFA program consists of 218-222 credit hours (depending upon whether the student was completing a B.A. or B.S. in Art degree prior to being accepted into the BFA program). The service learning and international study components of the proposed BFA degree prepare students for entry into the marketplace more thoroughly than do the B.A./B.S. degrees.

Many students have transferred from Western Oregon University to pursue the BFA in Art at other private and public colleges in Oregon. These are excellent students who have valued their experience here, expressed gratitude for the strong foundation gained here, and would have stayed if a BFA were available.

To be competitive in the majority of the projected career in art related jobs, students should have a bachelor’s degree plus work experience; the proposed BFA degree will offer both, as well as the necessary preparation for acceptance into graduate programs in art and design.

The art department will admit five to ten students each year into the program for a total of 20 to 40 students within four years.

All appropriate University committees and the OUS Provosts’ Council have positively reviewed the proposed program.

*Recommendation to the Board*:
The OUS Provosts’ Council recommends that the Board authorize Western Oregon University to establish a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Art, effective immediately.
Proposed Adoption of Temporary OAR 580-021-0029: Career Development Leave

**Background:**
The Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) rules include a provision that allows an employee to extend a period of unpaid leave from six months to up to one calendar year without a break in service when leave is granted under an employer’s career development policy.

This rule establishes career development leave as a policy of the Oregon University System. OUS institutions approve leave under guidelines developed for their employee populations. Paid sabbatical leave is not affected by this rule.

**580-021-0029**
**Career Development Leave**

(1) Career development leave is available to unclassified, faculty, and classified employees of Oregon University System institutions as leave without pay, subject to the approval of the employing institution.

Stat Auth. ORS 351.070; ORS 238A.025.

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends the adoption of the temporary rule as drafted, effective upon filing.
Voyager Tuition Assistance (Volunteer Guard and Reserve)

Background:

Since September 11, 2001, 4,870 members of the Oregon National Guard and Reserves have been deployed to Afghanistan or Iraq. These men and women have made significant sacrifices for our nation's security. Many of these soldiers will return to Oregon wanting to build a future for themselves and their families. The completion of a college education is a very effective way to meet that goal.

Financial Aid Directors and members of the OUS Student Affairs Council have designed the Voyager Tuition Assistance (Volunteer Guard and Reserve) that will, when combined with the veteran’s federal tuition benefits earned by the members of the Guard and Reserves, allow these soldiers to attend an OUS campus in pursuit of their first undergraduate degree without having to pay for tuition or mandatory fees.

It is proposed that legislative approval be pursued to have this new and unique fee remission program not counted against any fee remission limitation imposed by the legislature.

Eligibility for the proposed program includes the following:

1. Oregon resident for tuition purposes as defined in ORS 580-010-0029 through 580-010-0045.
2. Active duty service as a member of the Guard or Reserves in a combat zone since September 11, 2001.
3. Fulfillment of the admission requirements of OUS campus where they plan to enroll.
4. Enrollment for initial bachelor’s degree only.
5. Completion of the Free Application for Federal Student Assistance (FAFSA) annually.
6. Receipt of the award is dependent upon the soldier’s receipt of the Military Tuition support (up to $4,500 for full-time student).

Award Amounts and Duration:

1. Fee remission amount will be the difference between the campus tuition and mandatory fee level and the Military Tuition Support.
2. Remission will be effective fall term 2005. No credits or refunds will be issued to eligible students for enrollment prior to fall 2005.
3. Students must continue to make satisfactory academic progress as defined by the campus to continue to receive fee remission.
4. The award period shall be:
   a. For undergraduate majors designed to be completed in four years the lesser of:
      i. Four years (12 academic quarters) from the point of initial support

ii. 15 credits beyond the required minimum number of credits required for the degree.

b. For undergraduate majors designed to be completed in more than four years the lesser of:
   i. Five years (15 academic quarters) from the point of initial support or
   ii. 15 credits beyond the required minimum number of credits required for the degree.

5. There will be no extending of the award period for part-time enrollment.

6. Other forms of financial aid including federal grants and loans and state-supported financial aid shall be applied after the fee remission to support other educational expenses such as books and living expenses.

7. There will be no refunds of the fee remission if a student withdraws from classes.

**Program Review and Continuation:**
This program will be formally reviewed no later than June 2010 to determine its effectiveness in supporting college enrollment and completion and to evaluate its fiscal impact. A decision to continue or end the program will be made by the Board based upon this review.

**Estimated Fiscal Impact:**
It is not possible to accurately determine the number of potential students that will participate in this program. As of Fall 2004, there were 306 members of the Guard or Reserves enrolled in undergraduate degree programs on OUS campuses. An unknown number of these students did not serve in a battle zone since September 11, 2001. However, the total number of enrolled members is a useful starting point.

The enrollment of these students will result in a payment of tuition to OUS institutions of $4,500 per student as a result of the military tuition benefits that are earned by these soldiers.

The number of current members of the Guard or Reserves stationed in battle zones who may plan to pursue a bachelor’s degree at an OUS campus is also undeterminable. The best estimate is to double the current 306 enrolled students. The table on the following page is the expected cost and tuition revenue distribution of the new remission by campus based upon 2004-05 tuition and fees.
### Maximum Estimated Fee Remission Amounts 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004-05 Data</th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>OUS Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated number of eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05 tuition and fees</td>
<td>5,508</td>
<td>4,974</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>4,761</td>
<td>4,697</td>
<td>5,670</td>
<td>4,332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Guard/Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Benefit</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per student fee remission amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(tuition/fees minus veterans tuition benefit)</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fee Remission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$32,256</td>
<td>$24,648</td>
<td>$91,728</td>
<td>$44,892</td>
<td>$13,396</td>
<td>$109,980</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$316,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Recommendation to the Board:**

Staff recommends that the fee remission program for Oregon Guard and reservists serving on activity duty in a combat zone since September 11, 2001, be approved and that it be included in the Academic Year Fee Book 2005-06. Staff further recommends that legislative approval be sought to exempt this fee remission from counting towards any legislative limitation upon the fee remission program.

*(Board action required.)*
Articulated Transfer Linked Audit System (ATLAS)

**Background:**
The Excellence in Delivery and Productivity (EDP) Working Group identified in its original work plan the need to develop a statewide web-based course articulation system that would enable students and academic advisors to determine if and how college courses taken at one college could be used to meet degree requirements at another college or university. Such a system would better support students who now enroll in multiple colleges or universities in the process of completing their college degrees.

A group of faculty and staff from Mt. Hood Community College, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon developed an initial proposal to use a currently available software package called the Course Articulation System (CAS) to meet the student advising need. A presentation of the CAS software was made at the January 2005 meeting of the EDP Working Group. The Working Group endorsed the product and created a more formal group to further develop the pricing and implementation strategies.

The system is now called ATLAS (Articulated Transfer Linked Audit System). Students will be able to create and store personalized records of courses taken from community colleges and OUS campuses on a central server. This record of courses can then be matched with the degree requirements of participating community colleges and universities. Arizona, Minnesota, and Ohio have implemented statewide systems with very positive results. Portland State University has already implemented this system.

**Benefits:**
- Accurate advising
- More efficient course selection and degree completion
- Better match between courses completed and possible degree options at multiple colleges or universities
- More seamless transfer between colleges and universities

**System Requirements for OUS:**
- An automated degree audit system at the degree awarding campus. Currently six of the seven OUS campuses have such systems in place
- Software package to connect CAS to the degree audit programs at three OUS campuses
- Purchase of the CAS software and server. Current price estimate is approximately $125,000. An annual maintenance fee of approximately $15,000
- Staff time to load current articulation tables into CAS and to articulate additional courses (pricing being determined. Note PSU would not have additional cost since its CAS program is already operational)
- Technical staff support
System requirements for community colleges:
Students interested in a bachelor’s degree from an OUS campus could use the system without community college action. However, to make ATLAS a true collaboration between community colleges and OUS campuses, their involvement is critical. Community colleges would not need to create new data systems since the CAS software connects to many existing degree audit systems. The key for full community college participation that would allow students to look into course transfer between community colleges as well as transfer of credits from an OUS campus to a community college degree audit systems at all 17 community colleges. A survey of the status of degree audit systems in the community colleges is being undertaken.

For full participation:
- Degree audit systems
- Software package to connect CAS to the degree audit programs at some (to be determined) colleges
- Purchase of the CAS software and server (current price estimate $175,000)
- Staff time to load current articulation tables into CAS and to articulate additional courses (pricing being determined)
- Technical staff support

Next steps:
- Complete data collection on current degree audit systems in community colleges
- Actively engage key campus stakeholders
- Complete pricing estimates
- Develop funding package
Fiscal Year 2006 Federal Appropriations Priorities

In a continuing effort to respond to requests from the staff of the seven-member Oregon congressional delegation, the institutions comprising the Oregon University System have submitted their federal appropriations priorities for fiscal year 2006. The campus lists enable Congressional delegation members to address a clear set of stated campus appropriation objectives.

With the release of President Bush’s Fiscal Year 2006 budget and as House and Senate Committees begin deliberations on the Higher Education Amendments, the timely submission of campus requests prepare congressional staff to deal effectively with specific appropriation requests.

As in the past, 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 federal priorities. Selection, preparation, and dissemination of federal appropriation projects have remained at the president's discretion.

SUMMARY OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATION PRIORITY SUBMISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

EASTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY:

(1) Oregon Center for Rural Development and Policy Studies

Eastern Oregon has historically been a natural resource-based economy, relying on forest and agricultural related industries for its economic well-being. A series of policy changes and regulatory mandates in recent years have seriously affected these industries as many mills have had to close and many more workers have lost their livelihood in related industries. The purpose of the proposed Center for Rural Development and Policy Studies is to alleviate this problem by: assisting businesses with new opportunities; reducing the dependence of the region on a single economic base; retraining the affected work force and preparing them for other professions; studying the affects of poverty, hunger, and joblessness in rural economies; and enable the region to avoid future economic crises by enhancing the educational opportunities available to the students of the region.

(2) Rural High School Outreach

Rural eastern Oregon holds 42 percent of the state’s landmass, but only 5 percent of the state’s population. In comparison with the rest of Oregon, the eastern Oregon region is younger, is less educated, is poor, and is shrinking. In comparison with the rest of Oregon, eastern Oregon’s economy has limited diversity and manufacturing capacity and its higher education population is severely underserved and is declining in numbers. The reasons include access, cost, intimidation, and insufficient incentives. A
comprehensive, collaborative, and long-term solution to address these higher education and, therefore, economic problems of the region is necessary. EOU is proposing an extensive high school outreach program that starts early (ninth grade), involves parents, and promotes college education, not specific institutions. Also included in this program are college courses on high school campuses, joint summer institutes, and increased financial aid.

(3) Eastern Oregon Center for Regional Economic Studies

Eastern Oregon counties are currently without a comprehensive and centralized database on regional economic activities. Instituting such a Center would provide businesses in the region support in making sound business decisions and, more critically, attract external investments. (Eastern Oregon region is defined here to include the following ten counties: Baker, Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Malheur, Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, and Wheeler). To address this problem, Eastern Oregon University is proposing to establish the Eastern Oregon Center for Regional Economic Studies (EOCRES).

OREGON INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

(1) Center for Allied Health Professions Project

OIT is requesting federal funding to match with funding from private and state sources to underwrite the construction and equipping of an 80,000 square foot facility (Center for Health Professions). To address a long-term shortage of health care professionals in Oregon and around the nation, OIT has embarked on a five-year campaign to double its enrollment in these areas (from 700 to 1,400 students) and to expand its menu of offerings on the main campus, in off-site locations, and on-line. To facilitate this growth, expanded and updated facilities in the form of this facility are required.

(2) Expanding the Health Professions Workforce in Rural Areas

OIT seeks funding to strengthen and expand its partnerships with community colleges and the health care industry in rural areas to increase student access to both associate’s and bachelor’s degree programs in a variety of health care professions. The goal is to provide more and better qualified allied health employees in rural areas. This will be addressed by increasing enrollment capacity, upgrading facilities and equipment, and expanding outreach and collaborative capabilities. OIT will build on a long tradition of success in its allied health programs. The goal is to double the number of graduates by 2010 to help meet unprecedented industry demand for professionals in these fields.

(3) Certification of Performance of Renewable Energy Systems

The Oregon Renewable Energy Center (OREC) presently supports projects that test the performance of photovoltaic systems, geothermal energy systems, alternative energy transportation systems, wind power systems, bio-mass energy conversion systems and
other components for efficient energy utilization. OREC is a leader in the practical application of renewable energy systems to meet the energy needs of homes and businesses in the northwest. OREC is requesting funding for laboratory equipment to support the expansion of its component and systems testing laboratory. OREC will provide independent, objective evaluations of systems and components used in the growing renewable energy systems marketplace as a service to businesses, industry, and homeowners. Independent certification of system and component performance is vital for the long-term growth and development of the renewable energy system industry in Oregon and the nation.

(5) Laboratory for Applied Energy Research

The Oregon Renewable Energy Center (OREC) has programs in photovoltaic systems, geothermal energy, transportation, wind, bio-mass, and other renewable energy systems. OREC is requesting funding for equipment to support a public-private demonstration project that monitors the behavior of complex alternative energy systems in real-world settings. This equipment will be installed in multi-use facilities on the OIT campus and will serve as a laboratory to demonstrate the behavior and performance of components and systems during diurnal, weekly, and annual cycles. Student and faculty teams will conduct applied research in smart energy systems. The research will include the development of predictive models of elements and system performance. Models will be refined and improved as system behavior is analyzed and the results will be published to influence market decisions on equipment acquisition, installation, and operation.

(6) Geothermal Power Plant Construction

We are requesting financial assistance to install a small-scale geothermal power plant on the Oregon Institute of Technology campus. The plant, a binary or organic Rankine cycle type, would be in the 100 to 250 kW range. This plant would use the existing geothermal water that is presently supplied from wells for heating the campus. At 192°F and 750 gallons a minute, the plant would provide between $30,000 and $50,000 in electric energy savings annually. This would be the first geothermal power plant in Oregon and also the one that uses the lowest temperature geothermal fluid in the U.S.

(7) Continued Operation of the Geo-Heat Center

This request is for the continued operation of the Geo-Heat Center, the only one of its kind in the United States, providing services nationally and internationally in the development and use of geothermal energy. The Center provides free technical assistance to developers and operators of geothermal direct-use, geothermal heat pump and small-scale electric power projects, either through the Internet, by phone, and/or a site visit. We also have an extensive website: (http://geoheat.oit.edu) that has 1,860 files, 172 PDF articles, 12,000 well and hot spring database for 16 western states, and a U.S. direct-use database of 2,345 projects. We also publish a Quarterly Bulletin sent to 2,000 subscribers. We support the USDOE GeoPowering the West program that
assists interested geothermal groups in the western states to promote and develop geothermal energy resources

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

(1) Oregon Nanoscience and Microtechnologies Institute (ONAMI)

The Oregon Nanoscience and Microtechnologies Institute is collectively requesting a second year of federal appropriations. The request is growing to accommodate a new “Nanometrology Institute.” The three projects that will comprise the ONAMI package are:

ONAMI Miniature Tactical Energy Systems Development, $5,000,000 from the Army; ONAMI Safer Nanomaterials and Nanomanufacturing, $5,000,000 from the Air Force; and ONAMI Nanometrology Initiative, $5,000,000 from the Navy.

(2) Program for Water Cooperation

This project takes an integrative approach to water resources management, education, and research. The Program for Water Cooperation is conceived as a resource and information source that would facilitate dialogue on critical water issues through three integrated programs: A Certificate in Water Conflict and Resolution and Prevention; a Transboundary Freshwater Dispute Database; and the Universities Partnership for Transboundary Waters, which will act as a base for an international consortium of water expertise.

(3) Hatchery Research

This request is for research funds that will contribute to the effort that is underway jointly between OSU and ODF&W to turn the former Fall Creek Hatchery into a fish research laboratory. The Hatchery Research Center will be a cooperative experimental laboratory where partners in salmon restoration can develop an understanding of the mechanisms that create differences between hatchery and wild fish and devise the tools to manage the differences.

(4) Oregon Coastal Ocean Observing System

This proposal is to build an integrated coastal ocean observing system designed to improve the safety and efficiency of marine operations, mitigate the effects of natural hazards, improve predictions of climate change and its effects, reduce public health risks, protect and restore healthy coastal marine ecosystems, and enable the sustained use of marine resources through ecosystem-based management.
(5) Aging in Place

This project relies on interdisciplinary work among faculty in OSU’s Program on Gerontology. At present there are very little data to support informed decision-making by elders and their caregivers and to guide decision-makers in public policy and in the high-tech industry. The goal of this proposal is to understand needs, identify the impacts of the physical and social environment, and establish the range of individual differences that must be accommodated to enable the nation’s growing elder population and meet the challenges of aging.

(6) Education Double Degree

The School of Education recently implemented the Education Double Degree program to promote higher standards of competence for teachers and to lower barriers to full teacher certification. The goal of this proposal is to conduct research on the program, including analysis of student access, program participation, and post-graduation teaching effectiveness as well as to complete research studies comparing traditional models of teacher preparation and innovative models as the Education Double Degree.

Oregon State University Programs with Authorizations and/or Previous Funding:

(1) Sun Grant

The Sun Grant Initiative was established to enhance national energy security through the development, distribution, and implementation of bio-based energy technologies; to promote diversification in, and the environmental sustainability of, agricultural production in the United States through bio-based energy and product technologies; to promote economic diversification in rural areas of the United States through bio-based energy and product technologies; to enhance the efficiency of bioenergy and biomass research and development programs through improved coordination and collaboration between the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, and land-grant colleges and universities.

Members of the Sun Grant consortium are pressing for inclusion of a provision in the Senate version of the Transportation reauthorization bill that would provide $3 million per year to each of the member institutions. If the bill fails to pass, or should the provision fail to be included, the appropriations strategy is to seek $5 million per year for each institution either through the Department of Energy or through USDA. The program currently receives some federal funding through earmarks to South Dakota State University and the University of Tennessee. However, the consortium is seeking a stable, long-term federal funding source to support the authorization that passed in 2004.
(2) CPORT

Despite the economic significance of ports and the clear link between maritime and surface transportation systems (MTS), there are no nationally recognized centers focusing on security, risk reduction, and efficiency of the nation’s maritime transportation system. A Center for Port Operations, Risk, and Technology would support a mission of research and education in port security that would establish a national research roadmap for port and MTS security, direct collaborative University-industry-agency-national laboratory research, and develop interdisciplinary educational programs. CPORT has not yet received any federal funding but the program was authorized in 2004.

(3) Oregon Watersheds Research Cooperative

Oregon has led the nation in science-based forest policy and regulation of forest management activities to protect water and fish since the Oregon Forest Practices Act was passed in 1971. Forest landowners have embraced the application of scientific information to guide development of rules that govern timber harvest, reforestation, road building, streamside protection, and other forestry practices that affect water and fish. A cooperative program of research and outreach has been established through local efforts and funding to address these information needs. Federal funds are being sought to enhance this support to achieve the full scientific potential for this effort. This project received $500,000 in federal funding in FY 2005.

(4) Value-Added Seafood Product Development

Value-Added Seafood Product Development: A Community Seafood Initiative would continue to strengthen and formalize an existing network of institutions into a systematic approach designed to ensure application of research by industry and maximize local economic impact. Research will focus on new technologies such as high-pressure processing and value-added products for oysters, shellfish, and albacore tuna. Direct participation in the early stages of the project will bring research and science closer to the community and individual business level, thereby involving communities in rebuilding their economy and protecting their natural resources. The Value-Added Seafood Product Development Initiative received $1.5 million through NOAA in FY 2004.

PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

(1) Promoting Cultural Awareness and Honoring Diversity Through Contemporary Northwest Jazz: PSU’s Leroy Vinnegar Jazz Institute and Millar Library

Portland State University is seeking funding to enhance and increase the accessibility of its Millar Library Collections to support the newly established Leroy Vinnegar Jazz Institute (LVJI) in the School of Fine and Performing Arts. The Library would use this funding to support activities such as: 1) Acquire, catalogue, and transfer to digital media
an extensive local collection of over 4,000 historic live jazz recordings dating from World War II to the present; 2) Preserve and store donated collections of historically significant artifacts, including historic photographs, manuscripts, journals/periodicals, and letters from local historian Homer Clark concerning The Portland Jazz Book; 3) Purchase scores, recordings, books, and other library materials to support a diverse and multi-culturally-based arts education curriculum, including assisting in the creation of a high-level educational performance ensemble at PSU, and an adult jazz participation program -- and further enhancing the LVJI's jazz-based arts education programs; 4) Develop a searchable electronic archive of oral histories; 5) Digitize existing archival video and audio materials; 6) Purchase electronic resources for arts education-related curricular materials; 7) Document the rich history of jazz in Portland by collaborating with the Northwest Jazz Oral Histories Project; and 8) Establish a public outreach and dissemination effort supporting programs for schoolchildren.

(2) ONAMI – The Nanoscience and Microtechnologies Institute

Portland State University is a partner in ONAMI, which is collectively requesting a second year of federal appropriations. The request is growing to accommodate a new “Nanometrology Initiative.” The purpose of this new proposal is to initiate additional research in nanometrology and testing of nanodevices and circuits that enables the implementation of nanoscale materials into useful electronic applications such as high density memories on silicon integrated circuits. This will lead to new applications in computing, information processing, and biosensing.

The three projects that will comprise the ONAMI package are:

ONAMI Miniature Tactical Energy Systems Development, $5,000,000 from the Army; ONAMI Safer Nanomaterials and Nanomanufacturing, $5,000,000 from the Air Force; and; ONAMI Nanometrology Initiative, $5,000,000 from the Navy.

(3) PSU's Strategic Initiative on Aquatic Bioinvasions: A Catalyst for Critical Research and Development, Management, Outreach, and Education in the Pacific Northwest (A PSU Partnership Involving the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center)

PSU and the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (SERC) have recently joined forces to establish the Aquatic BioInvasion Research and Policy Institute. Based at PSU, the Institute combines the expertise of two complementary, world-class research programs on marine invasions (SERC) and freshwater invasions (PSU). The Institute’s mission is to advance multi-disciplinary understanding and real-world solutions for aquatic bioinvasions and is a focal point for interdisciplinary approaches, engaging researchers, industry, and resource managers from a consortium of participating institutions. This initiative implements a series of activities at the Institute, while expanding the consortium to include collaborative and coordinated efforts with other universities in the region including, 1) Research focused on biological invasions, including the biology and ecology of invasive species; 2) Public outreach to communicate about management plans and assist in the implementation of these plans;
3) Technology development and ballast water management, including use of biological sensors to detect new invasions or monitor treatment systems, and the application of remote sensing to predict spread and risk of invasions; and 4) Early detection and rapid response programs including development of a web-based toolkit of information on criteria and options for rapid response and implementation of demonstration projects. The funding will also support symposia and workshops, as well as provide support for student and professional development.

(4) PSU Small Business Initiative: Center for Law, Entrepreneurship, and Technology and the Portland Business Accelerator

Portland State University’s Small Business Initiative is a two-pronged approach to support small and emerging businesses: the Center for Law, Entrepreneurship, and Technology (CLET) and the creation of Portland’s Business Accelerator. CLET is a nationally unique collaboration between the School of Business at Portland State University and the Lewis & Clark Law School to provide technical assistance to developing businesses, while teaching future lawyers and business professionals how to work together. The CLET is a central element to PSU’s plan to encourage the growth of small businesses in the Central City – the Portland Business Accelerator. The Portland Business Accelerator, a program developed in partnership with the Portland Development Commission, supports small and emerging cutting-edge businesses and encourages the spin off of new companies through technology transfer and research already occurring on campus. The Portland Business Accelerator focuses on two market sectors, based on the strengths of our regional economy and local talent – information technology and biosciences. The accelerator provides small businesses in these sectors with facilities, mentoring, facilitation of technology transfer, and commercialization opportunities.

(5) Building a Sustainable Urban Campus: PSU’s Solar Photovoltaic Test Facility System, Materials, and Installation Project

Portland State University is seeking funding to continue its work as a leader in building a sustainable urban campus. This proposal will support the University’s work in this area by funding the Solar Photovoltaic Test Facility System, Materials, and Installation Project. This project would be the first large-scale solar test facility installation on a university campus to be used primarily as an educational and research tool. The installation would be of a ~25 kW solar array system on the roof of Cramer Hall, one of PSU’s main academic buildings.

(6) Multimodal ITS Research to Improve Transportation Safety, Efficiency, and Mobility in a Metropolitan Community – A request submitted by the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT)

The request by the JPACT (a metro region group comprised of elected and appointed members representing transportation agencies) seeks funds for an intelligent transportation research initiative that will support the transportation research needs of
the regional and state agencies. This research will be conducted by the team of interdisciplinary faculty affiliated with the PSU Center for Transportation Studies and be focused on a set of multimodal issues related to improving the safety and efficiency of the transportation system including urban transit, freight, non-motorized transportation management, and information systems. These research priorities reflect the unique nature of transportation planning and operations in Oregon and the state’s commitment to linkages between land use policy and transportation systems.

SOUTHERN OREGON UNIVERSITY

(1) Support for Equipment in the Planned Southern Oregon University–Rogue Community College Joint Educational Facility in Downtown Medford

Southern Oregon University and Rogue Community College jointly seek $3 million from federal sources for equipment as part of the $23.3M facility being planned for Downtown Medford. Governor Kulongoski’s Recommended Budget for 2005-07 included the Southern Oregon University and Rogue Community College Joint Facility in Medford. The executive budget includes SOU’s portion at $11.8 million ($5.4 million in general fund, $5.9 million Article XI-G bonds, and $500,000 private match) and RCC’s share with state allocation and local match to be determined.

(2) Southern Oregon Institute for Environmental Studies at Southern Oregon University

Southern Oregon University and partners seek federal funding to accomplish two objectives that together would build SOU’s capacity to support balanced research, education, and service through partnerships in support of wise uses of natural resources and long-term sustainability of its forests and other natural lands. They are:

- To provide the matching funds to an identified $3 million private donation currently pledged to establish a field station in southern Oregon via SOU in partnership with the Siskiyou Field Institute and Rogue Community College. It will serve as a long-term site for experimental work and experiential learning. Collaborative research projects involving the faculty, students, and partners, including those from other universities, can be fully explored and monitored at the intersection of economic development and environmental stewardship. Results would fuel sound exploration of policy issues, grounded in balanced and credible research and discussion across all “sides” of issues.

- To establish an Institute Website to link with the federally-funded digital database available now in SOU’s Hannon Library. It will provide information on current projects in the region such as the Biscuit fire recovery and the regional impact of the Healthy Forest Act. It would communicate and publish relevant scholarly research activities and resources, announce planned cross-disciplinary educational workshops, encourage networking in the region, and serve as a link between the University, government agencies, and businesses in the region for
rich and wide-ranging discussion, planning, and instruction grounded in sound research and scientific information.

(3) Health and Aging

Southern Oregon University seeks federal funding to develop research models and to design and implement a pilot program to help families, communities, businesses, and organizations recognize the needs and challenges of serving our aging population in Oregon. The project recognizes that the demographics and economy of the Rogue Valley are being transformed by the in-migration of retirees along with the predictable aging of the Baby Boom generation. Healthcare is now the largest employer in the Valley and the region is home to both medical experts on aging and premier assisted living enterprises.

This project will study and develop models for healthy aging and end-of-life care that encompass community strategies and best healthcare business practices. Our initiative will involve a broad representation of public and private partners and develop practical tools that Oregon urban and rural communities can use and adapt to assist in empowering seniors and preparing for further expansion of the aging population.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON

(1) Brain, Biology, and Machine Initiative (BBMI)

BBMI is a research project that unites the University of Oregon’s internationally recognized strengths in biology, computational sciences, and cognitive neuroscience. First funded by Congress in FY00 with a $3 million investment in a functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging machine, a total of $14.3 million has been earmarked for BBMI since it was first funded. The project is a significant lever for competitive grants and private funding and can lay claim to the generation of several new research centers and spin-off companies. In FY06, the University seeks funds to further develop the initiative, for example, by moving basic scientific research further toward clinical applications, and by connecting the basic understanding of the brain to improved educational practices.

(2) Oregon Nanoscience and Microtechnologies Institute (ONAMI)

(a) ONAMI Miniature Tactical Energy Systems ($5 million) (Army); (b) ONAMI Safer Nanomaterials and Nanomanufacturing ($5 million) (Air Force); (c) ONAMI Nanoelectronics and Nanometrology Initiative ($5 million) (Navy)

ONAMI Miniature Tactical Energy Systems and ONAMI Safer Nanomaterials and Nanomanufacturing both were earmarked at $2.5 million each in FY05 from the Department of Defense Army and Air Force research programs, respectively. ONAMI is a collaboration involving Oregon State University, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon, their industry partners, and other entities such as the U.S. Department of Energy’s Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.
(3) Museum of Natural and Cultural History Curation Facility

The University of Oregon is the officially designated state repository for archaeological items found on state lands, but its repository is nearing capacity. The University seeks an authorization for funding to expand or replace the current facility. Both the House and Senate versions of the Water Resources Development Act included a provision authorizing $2.5 million for the facility, but final action was not taken on the bill before the 108th Congress adjourned.

WESTERN OREGON UNIVERSITY

(1) Leonard W. Rice Auditorium and Smith Performance Hall Rehabilitation and Renovation

Western Oregon University is requesting federal funds for renovation, rehabilitation, and program development for the Leonard W. Rice Auditorium and Smith Performance Hall. The objective is to make the facilities more accessible to our students and the citizens of the region by expanding the performance art venues; making critical technological upgrades to acoustics, lighting and sound reinforcement; and developing outreach art education activities for area K-12 students and their families.

Western Oregon University serves as the center for arts performance and education in Oregon’s mid-Willamette Valley. The Rice Auditorium and Smith Hall performing arts programs draw audiences from throughout Western Oregon and, in particular, the adjoining Polk County communities of Monmouth and Independence. For years, WOU has presented a diverse range of high quality performances by established and emerging artists that expand and enrich the community’s cultural experiences; provide educational programs that engage children, teens, and adults in the artistic process; cultivate appreciation of the performing arts; and make the performing arts an integral part of school and community life. As our region grows, and the demand for arts programming becomes more intense, critical investments must be made to meet the community need.

(2) Center for Student Success in College at Western Oregon University

The Center for Student Success in College is a joint venture between Western Oregon University, Oregon’s community colleges, and the Oregon University System. The Center will provide a statewide resource for campuses to identify and draw upon best practices that support successful student learning and program completion.

Federal funds have been requested for the technology enhancement and completion of a comprehensive community college and university student retention database and to provide technical assistance, training, research, resource development, and policy development and interpretation to education professionals statewide. Additionally, federal funds will allow the coordination of resource consultants and trainers from
universities and community colleges and the organization of a statewide conference on student retention and completion that informs and instructs on best practices nationwide. The database, conference, and local “drive-in workshops” on specific retention issues will result in a statewide, collaborative approach to retention that focuses upon student success and builds upon the expertise already present throughout the state’s colleges and universities. This retention effort will support revised and new practices that better serve a more mobile student population that also enrolls in more than one institution at a time.
NOTES

Materials:
Workgroup Meeting Agenda – October 15, 2004
Excellence in Delivery and Productivity Work Plan – Draft

2:15 p.m. - Gretchen Schuette Call to Order

New Workgroup Member Introductions:
Bill Christopher: Rock Creek Campus, President
Joe Johnson: Clackamas CC, President
Adriana Mendoza: EOU, student member, Board of Higher Education
Karen Phillips: Oregon Small Schools Initiative member, Board of Higher Education.
Tony Van Vliet: Clatsop CC, Chief Academic Officer (retired)

Introductions:
Connie Green: CCWD
Dave McDonald: OUS, Director of Enrollment Svcs
Jonathan Jacobs: OUS, Admin Assistant
Karen Sprague: UO, Molecular Biologist
Maureen Sevigny: OIT, Professor of Management
Debbie Murdock: PSU, Government Relations
Bob Turner: WOU, President Elect at IFS
Lorraine Davis: UO, VP of Academic Affairs

LOGISTICS:
SCHUETTE: Wants to invite the right people to the workgroup meetings. Invitations should go to OUS Presidents, community colleges presidents, Head of CIA, Head of CSSA,
MCDONALD: Confirmed it would be done

Key Accomplishments of the Work Group, SCHUETTE:
• Skeletal work plan is complete
• Plan represents K-16 collaborative statewide student centered platform of improved post-secondary education with statewide impact
• Traction has been gained in collaborative cross-sector work

Today’s Goals, SCHUETTE:
• Current status of all topics.
• Current status of and improvement to processes for each topic
• Clarify how we are projecting costs for near future (current legislative discussion) as well as later phases.
• Focus on integration of initiatives that together will form a strong platform.

**Future Meetings:**
Next Workgroup Meeting: 11/10/2004, 1-3pm at Chemeketa community colleges

**TOPIC 1: STUDENT DATA TRANSFER PROCESS**
How do you better track and inform students.

**Discussion led by CONNIE GREEN:**
The group working on this item met the first week of October. Included representatives from OUS and OSU (Bob Kiernan, Kurt Peterson, Christine Tell, Liza Mentz, and David McDonald, representatives from the Department of Education (Doug Kosti), as well as Connie Green and Marilyn Kolodziejczyk. The next meeting on this topic will be after the pilot, expected in late November or early December.

• **A small pilot** will be executed before legislative session begins. This pilot will demonstrate how to get data back and forth using the unique student identifier. The pilot will not be complete by the Nov 10th meeting.

• **A Data Warehouse** is needed. We need a consistent way to track students and give high schools the feedback they need. The current paper system includes questions: Do high schools use it? Does it get to the right instructor? Is it present when they need it? The data warehouse will allow schools web-based access to this data whenever it is needed.

• **The Post-Secondary Data Warehouse** is expected to be the most difficult. The current OUS database is Oracle based. The current community colleges database is FoxPro based. Unknown: How difficult is it to add the community colleges database to the OUS database? Is Oracle the best way to go?

• **An articulation table** can be created. Students should be able to access and compare what they have taken at different campuses (1 class from OIT, 2 from UO, 3 from WOU) and create a postsecondary database with data at one point FOR students. The warehouse will allow students to see what they have taken and how it articulates to ALL universities.

**Costs:**
**SCHUETTE:** Projected costs for this element including web-based articulation are $2.3 million dollars

**GREEN:** These projected costs are the best estimate for developing and posting the warehouses. The postsecondary warehouse will be the hardest. The first student-oriented test of these warehouses will be the statewide web-based articulation table. There are cost concerns: Is there enough money to do articulation and add community colleges database. We think there is.
Pilot Comments:
DAVIS: The pilot is to make sure the pieces are identified that will make it work prior to buying into a plan that might not meet current needs.

Data Warehouse Comments:
MCDONALD: This is not a “data system.” This is connecting data systems into a linked way of sharing student data. There is the potential for Phase 3, 4, 5, as we see the functionality of the project. The pilot is an important first step.

Articulation System Comments:
SPRAGUE: Question: How does web-based system work?
MCDONALD: Answer: The hope is to take articulation which are currently one campus to one campus across 17 community colleges and 7 OUS campuses. This warehouse will allow students to see what they have taken and how it articulates to ALL universities and colleges.
SCHUETTE: Allows us to see where articulation problems are and how we can strengthen a particular set of colleges or universities.
SEVIGNY: Question: Are we looking at articulation course to course from institution to institution, or major to major? A challenge as an advisor is that a class will apply to one major but not another.
MCDONALD: Answer: In best of all worlds it would do both, but course to course will be first. Major is trickier, but may be a later phase.
SCHUETTE: The articulation of the majors would be the most powerful for students long term for them to continue on the path to a major.
SCHUETTE: There are not enough advisors and counselors at the HS and community colleges to advise every student. Can we have something more accessible to students and families that allow them to see the lay of the land even if they cannot change it.

General Topic Comments:
SEVIGNY: Recent meeting of Oregon business program chairs discussed a statewide degree audit system. Jeannie Cove (UO) and Valerie Wood (Mt. Hood) proposed a statewide degree audit system that takes composite of courses from everywhere and allows the student to see how their history fits into programs being offered at each school. This audit system will be coordinated with the workgroup.
SCHUETTE: State board will take the lead on identifying collaborative work necessary to get done.
SCHUETTE: (in response to cost concerns) The data transfer process is foundational to what we want to do. There is legislative support.
MCDONALD: K12 has a policy option package requesting connectivity to this process. K12, community colleges, and OUS each have policy packages, but the Governor’s staff will use them as one package, one project with three parts.
KIRK: We need an understanding of how increased efficiency will reduce cost. To do that we need to know first what the current cost is. Another approach: Will the new system pay back investment?
GREEN: The cost savings will come from reduced high school processing time, reduced registrar processing time. These will be efficiency savings, and are hard to measure.

TOPIC 2: GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER MODULE

Timeline provided by John Miller:
- Early October - Review by community colleges and OUS early October (complete)
- Early October – IFS visiting all OUS campuses for discussions (on schedule)
- October 18 – JBAC conference call on status led by Peter Gilkey
- November 15 – Deadline for all JBAC faculty input and data gathering
- November 18 or 19 (tentative) – JBAC Summit.
- December 10 – Articulation Conference / JBAC Review
- Winter Quarter – Faculty adoption per institutional practices

Key Description of Program
- **DAVIS**: Currently in existence is the AAOT, which allows for an easily articulated core from 2-yr campuses to 4-yr campuses.
- **SPRAGUE**: This module will set up an array of general education courses guaranteed to count toward general education wherever the student goes in Oregon.
- **SPRAGUE**: The module is smaller than full GE requirements. Other requirements must be articulated per major. This is because all schools have individual characteristics, and additional general education coursework at the receiving school will display that school’s character.

Costs, SCHUETTE: Estimate of cost is $400,000 for communications, advising materials, and associated costs.

Timeline Comments:
- MILLER: Summit will be held after JBAC input deadline, on Nov 19. Invitees: MBF, JBAC, IFS, Provosts, and CIA. Goal will be to look at all information and see what are the major difficulties and common ground on the proposal.
- TURNER: General Education transfer module has been taking up 98% of discussion in IFS meetings because it is more concrete and hits the faculty in curriculum.
- MILLER: Per Peter: Not likely all OUS campuses could adopt JBAC proposal until Jan meeting.
- GREEN: We need a provisional board approval before campuses so that we are ready for January legislative piece.
- SUCHANEK: Legislation is being drafted.
- MCDONALD: We can develop a conceptual draft for legislative session showing what is in place and what will happen.
- SEVIGNY: November Summit will provide vital information for conceptual draft.
General Topic Comments:
SCHUETTE: The hope is to address barriers that lessen circumstances where student transfers and has to retake courses, to develop a statewide agreed common core to go with the student or easily transfer with the student.
SPRAGUE: The module does not address the problem of courses improperly selected that do not apply to the major.
SEVIGNY: Students who do not know what to do and have no advising will flounder. The module will assist a counselor in advising when transferring.
CHRISTOPHER: Question: Does the existence of a transfer module with set units imply to student that Gen Ed classes outside the module taken at community colleges won't apply to university? Why would we do that?
SPRAGUE: Answer: Technically you can take general education courses at a community colleges that apply to community colleges but not OUS when transfer. You must check articulation to know all the courses that will transfer and take all your general education at the community colleges level, but PSU general education requirements differ slightly from OIT requirements.
SCHUETTE: community colleges Concern: to what extent do the healthy curriculum differences between universities play out as a barrier? Which differences could and should be addressed?
MILLER: Data shows only about 30% of community colleges students transfer with complete AAOT.
CHRISTOPHER: What is the lifespan of this as campuses change their courses that make this invalid? What notification to students must be given? Needs to be a set of time restraints.
POTTER: We need to go past the agreement to the way we work together. Need to be consultative between campuses as changes occur.
SCHUETTE: Adapting to course changes needs further addressing in phase 2. A legacy review process.

Module’s Relation to Majors:
CHRISTOPHER: Several majors have major coursework in the first two years, with gen ed taken over all four years. We need to work closer programatically between campuses. Develop common core agreements in business, sciences, premed, pre-dental, chem., math, biology. The general education transfer module is limiting.
GREEN: Communication is critical. The intent is not to say, 'when you finish this general ed core you can leave.' The hope is to say that you can take these to any institutions and they will transfer, but you can and need to continue to take other courses throughout all 4 years (in community colleges or OUS) that will apply to the school/major you would like to take.
TURNER: We should think of coursework as fitting in one of four boxes: major, minor, general ed, and electives. Gen Ed is covered by transfer module. The major and minor have their own structure and coursework.

Communication Comments:
JOHNSON: We need to provide a report to the outside world that shows the number of students this applies to. This would be helpful for legislature.
SCHUETTE: Agreed. There is much legislative interest in this topic. How can we characterize what we have accomplished and what we have yet to accomplish in a way that is easy to understand and support.

SAUNDERS: Will the general public understand the name “General Education Transfer Module”? Do we want to move to an acronym that public will understand?


SCHUETTE: Lets think about it and bring back ideas.

Competency Comments:

SCHUETTE: Work on stronger general ed common core that relates to student competency. Look at where we are and create something in timely fashion that helps students early on while we continue longer work on student competencies, which is critical.

SPRAGUE: We need a simple way to measure student competencies. How do you measure whether students have learned how to think? Look at other states (North Carolina and Michigan).

TURNER: Idea for cost effective way to determine competencies: Have a course (e.g. biology) which would act as gatekeeper course with elements built in to determine if student had necessary skills in statistics, writing skills, etc to proceed. If the student does not have the skills regardless of where he came from he must go back and take those classes.

SPRAGUE: Pilot programs in other states believe they can measure competencies by building them into courses in this way.

TOPIC 3: ARTICULATION OF MAJORS AND DUAL ENROLLMENT

Articulation of Majors Key Points:

- GREEN: The goal is to make sure there are articulation agreements for popular programs. For example, there are lots of students transferring into education from Chemeketa to WOU, but there is no articulation agreement. We need to find patterns and make sure articulation agreements follow these patterns.
- MCDONALD: Community Colleges are giving us their current articulation agreements. OUS has the number of students transferring to campus by major. We will overlay this information to see where gaps are, and where needs remain to be met.

Dual Enrollment Key Points:

- GREEN: EOU and OSU have produced a draft template on dual enrollment. We need to look at how to implement it. This will be discussed at the November meeting of the Provosts/CIA.

TIMELINE:

- February 2004 – Matrix of all Community College Articulation Agreements completed
- October 18 – Updates to Agreements due from Community Colleges
Costs, SCHUETTE: Estimated costs and time. We believe costs to be between $400-600,000 for materials and training.

General Topic Comments:
JOHNSON: Articulation is easily described to Legislators. We can say we have “x” agreements in place, expanding to “y”, we have “x” dual enrollments, moving toward “y” number. We can provide a report of the number of students benefiting from this agreement.
GREEN: Articulation is helping students more than dual-enrollment.
SCHUETTE: There is not a lot of need to do a dual-enrollment agreement if there is no articulation agreement.
SCHUETTE: We need to approach dual enrollment together and globally. We were beefing dual-enrollment agreements at PSU, then OSU, one campus at a time, which takes too many resources. We need to add language about sorting out how we work together on it on continuing basis.
MURDOCK: In recent years, students at PSU seem very happy with transfer process. We need to look at where the program already works.
CHRISTOPHER: Question: Are we talking about program articulation agreements or course articulation agreements? Will my three courses taken at Chemeketa in Biology transfer to Western as the same three classes working towards my major?
GREEN: Answer: We are doing the program by major first. Currently if you are going to SOU you must take one set of courses, and for WOU another set of courses. Each school has their own data and system. The information is not at one place. We are starting with the majors (step 1) and working from there.
SCHUETTE: As we work on the majors, some of the course problems disappear.
MCDONALD: Course by course comparison will be part of Student Data Transfer Process phase 2.

TOPIC 4: ONLINE DELIVERY AND CAPACITY COURSES

Timeline by Connie:
October 18 – CIA numbers due on Community College articulation, gaps, and capacity.
October 21 – John Moseley to have information on OUS bottleneck courses.
Provosts/CIA Meeting – Talk about how information should be presented in November.
November 4 – Present information

Online Delivery & Capacity Key Points
- SCHUETTE: We need more courses to ensure more Oregonians get education. The goal with online courses is to identify where students are hung up and can’t make progress because they can’t take the course. Make sure we are using well what we have from a student-centered perspective. What is the next capacity that would make the biggest difference for students? Look for gaps. Make recommendations. Ask for resources when necessary for greater capacity.
• SCHUETTE: Next steps: does the process make sense? Are we going to get some traction? We put early deadlines for proposal on purpose. We want to identify and add capacity, and we need to know what it will take. We need a proposal that might reach some resources.

Costs, SCHUETTE: Initial cost estimates $1.6 to $1.7 million dollars (for both online and capacity). What would this go for, who would be involved. We need this to be concrete for legislature.

Capacity Courses Comments:
MURDOCK: Question: Are we looking at alternative times of delivery for bottleneck courses? 3AM, etc.
GREEN: Answer: Solutions to bottleneck courses will be discussed in next meeting.
MURDOCK: Students are willing to be mobile. A student at UO takes one class at PSU since there is an opening.
MCDONALD: In a past meeting, Liz Goulard and John Minahan were talking about capacity. In one instance WOU had faculty capacity, Chemeketa had technology capacity. It would be a great way to use resources that are not fully maxed out in ways to address areas that we have need in.
CHRISTOPHER: There are several models for sharing facilities and faculty to make it easier.
SCHUETTE: Need to make bottleneck courses visible to neighboring campuses.
JOHNSON: In Washington, there was huge increase in capacity, but they found they jammed at upper division level. We need to take a global view to make sure this doesn’t occur if we increase capacity.

Online Courses Comments:
SCHUETTE: Southwestern community colleges received a grant for distance learning. We need to clarify best next steps to fund. Looking to John Miller and Liz Goulard – and should look for Grant opportunities for distance education.
MURDOCK: Question: Common Courses: Can a person take online courses at one campus that count at another?
GREEN: Answer: If PSU can make common courses work for surrounding community colleges, it would be a great pilot for the state. Need to track it and confirm it works.
DAVIS: As we move forward with online courses we need more support services.
SCHUETTE: If we do things in a collaborative fashion the ensuing support would make more capacity possible.

TOPIC 5: ACCELERATION FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Key Points:
1. MCDONALD: What does it mean to be college ready? When we figure it out, we need to articulate it to the high schools, students, and parents.
   • GREEN: Next Step: Create draft of college-ready and test it with larger group. We have the philosophy with it but need the right words for it.
2. **MCDONALD:** Align proficiencies in the system. Through PASS, OUS has a strong alignment with K12. Community colleges not as systematic as OUS. OUS needs to take the next step to align with community colleges.
   - **GREEN:** Next Step: Dave work with State Board of Education policy director. Progress will take a couple of years.

3. **MCDONALD:** Recommendations for pilots for high school acceleration to college. Current piecemeal offerings (one school has AP, another has IB, another has Dual-Enrollment, some have nothing) are offered to too few students, and not enough areas. We need to do it systemically, possibly using Washington’s “Running Start” as a model.
   - **GREEN:** Next Step Review recommendations for pilots – Need to get group together and figure out what Oregon pilot will look like.

**Costs, SCHUETTE:** $135-$500,000 for nature of mapping, launching pilot, sharing information.

**Pilot Comments:**

**POTTER:** Currently preparing for Provost action. Met with Steve Bouyoski at Jackson Education Service District to discuss regional perspective. Has inventoried OUS resources to HS, noticing that OUS often work without the knowledge each other is there. Wants to take perspective from HS point of view. Need to talk with school leaders to assess readiness for systemic implementation. Reason he is talking to school leaders is so he can ask the right questions when he meets with Connie.

**CHRISTOPHER:** Opportunities such as AP classes, Dual Enrollment, etc need to coexist because they reach different kinds of students. Well-adjusted students who enjoy HS don’t join Running Start. Those who do not like HS and would normally drop out enjoy AP classes and opportunity to take college type courses.

**CHRISTOPHER:** We need to dispel the notion that if Running Start is implemented other programs will disappear.

**GREEN:** We are not trying to take away anything; we are trying to add something systemic to the mix. The money is there. It is not about new money, it is about taking money you have and using it for this. There is no policy stopping this from happening. It is an operations issue. There needs to be a will to change the program locally.

**JOHNSON:** Suggestion: Single out three pilot areas (one urban, one rural) to get arms around this. Do not launch statewide. Pilot districts report back, show costs, show performance.

**SCHUETTE:** The pilot should demonstrate potential for statewide impacts, ability to create access statewide even if not fully adopted at first.

**SAUNDERS:** Grants are possible for this type of effort.

**SCHUETTE:** There were several community colleges wanting to participate in pilot once we get it in place.

**JOHNSON:** Greatest challenge will be concern that programs are elitist. Working with college-ready is easiest, but what about the dropouts?
General Topic Comments:
SCHUETTE: A small group at the acceleration summit signed invitation to join with larger group on this topic to think about current barriers to more systemic statewide approach to college coursework for HS students. Includes Elaine Yandle-Roth CCWD, Linda Jessell from Gretchen Barlow, David Douglas sup. Barbara Rommel, Hermiston superintendent Jerry Wilson (Advisor to state board of ed), Wallawa superintendent, OEA rep, Chuck Bennit COSA, Cheryl Falk CIA.

Current Acceleration Comments:
PHILLIPS: Currently large high schools are being divided into smaller schools. As schools go smaller, the current models and AP opportunities are challenging. Need statewide system.

Washington Running Start Comments:
JOHNSON: Washington Superintendent has a model in place using both Running Start and AP. The two programs complement one another, with a tremendous # of students participating.
TURNER: Question: How did WA program dollars work?
JOHNSON: Answer: Dollars flow with students. 7% retained for HS, 93% to college. WA superintendent felt it is purpose of HS to move person on to higher education. 7% is plenty of money to provide necessary advising.
MCDONALD: Bellevue Washington’s superintendent is very progressive. Believes every student should be taking AP type class. He has HIGH expectations, and students are meeting them!
CHRISTOPHER: Hundreds of students in WA that were home schooled came back into formal education system to enroll in college through Running Start. Districts lost no dollars because students were not enrolled there in first place. Siphoned off students were helpful by taking pressure off areas of high enrollment.

Legislature Comments:
JOHNSON: Legislature repeatedly asks, ‘will we institute a student bill of rights?’
CHRISTOPHER: Student Bill of Rights. Has come up in two past iterations. Unlike WA Running Start program that takes college ready, the last iteration said remedial students would get access to classes for college credit. We need to set the standards so it is very clear who this program is geared for. Need a focus, or legislature will decide what focus ought to be.

TOPIC 6: RETENTION

Identified Best Practices for Retention (JEMSPECTAR):
Following is per meeting with CSSA at Linn-Benton community colleges
- Advising – good advising connects a student to the institution
- Learning Communities – Communities needed at all campuses
- **Early Warning Systems** – Track students with difficulties to catch students before they drop out
- **Supplemental Instruction** – Offer tutoring or additional instruction in selected areas of common difficulty (math, sciences, writing)
- **Campus Climate/Environment** – institutions need to embrace retention as an institutional goal.
- **Academic Intervention/Career Guidance** – Show students the connection between 1st year of college and future career.
- **Peer Mentorship** – Students learn very well from peers.
- **Rigorous Curriculum at HS Level** – HS Students are not sufficiently prepared. Need to focus on difficult areas and prepare students at HS level. It would be proactive to fix the program at this level before it becomes a college problem.
- **Capital Construction** - Student centers, library, etc. Students can interact and feel connected to their communities if they have comfortable places to hang out with their peers.

**Costs (SCHUETTE):** $500-$550,000 range for retention efforts. This is for initial stages. We need to clarify what we can do with our current resources, identify key next steps and costs, demonstrate our collaborative ability across three sectors, and get greater support from legislature. Only then, having shown impact, could we ask for the big bucks.

**General Topic Comments:**
- **SCHUETTE:** We need to focus efforts on first generation, low-income, minority students and transfer students. Yvette Webber-Davis provided paper of recommendations for MBF. Think about how strategies relate to all students.
- **CHRISTOPHER:** Faculty need to view retention as part of their responsibility and not just a job for student services. Retention should be explicit, accountable, and rewardable activity for faculty.
- **PHILLIPS:** It is about relationships, rigor, aligning the system so we have high standards for student and staff.
- **SCHUETTE:** There may be different strategies for older students who are working while in school.
- **SEVIGNY:** Financial situation impacts retention also. Students drop out because they can’t afford to return.
- **TURNER:** It is difficult to be a successful student if you are working 40-hours a week at an outside job.

**High School Requirement Comments:**
- **CHRISTOPHER:** Is it time to modify HS Grad requirements? HS students can stop taking math as a sophomore and still graduate. This affects their ability to move on to college.
- **MCDONALD:** Had a conversation with ODE. Now may be the best and only time to make significant changes to HS graduation requirements.
- **GREEN:** K-14 board has ability, will, passion. Initiative to ensure college-life ready. They are ready to move on this topic.
**Pilot Comments:**

**SPECTER:** A pilot could have dramatic effect.

**SCHUETTE:** We need to define what we mean by a pilot and what funds will be required. Pilot needs to ultimately have a statewide impact.

**Funding Comments:**

**GREEN:** Funding for some efforts come from federal dollars, not general fund. If money disappears, access for students would disappear.

**UNKNOWN SPEAKER:** Some of these initiatives might be right for statewide FIPSE application, or possibly a Title III application.

**SCHUETTE:** Collaborative support can be provided if needed for grant writing support.
NOTES

11/10/04, 1:00 p.m. – Gretchen Schuette called the meeting to order.

Materials:
1. Workgroup Meeting Agenda – 11/10/2004
2. CrossTalk article “An Interview: Mark Warner”
3. Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate, summary of information from campus visits (green)
4. Inter-Institutional Faculty Senate, information from Mt Hood Community College campus visit (blue)
6. Retention Analytical Model for LDC Students, Draft v6.0
7. Patterns Relating to Student Success Among Institutional Effectiveness Indicators
8. Retention Grid – Best Practices
9. Retention Best Practices Glossary of Terms
10. General Education Transfer Module, Presidents’ Council Resolution and CIA Resolution
11. JBAC General Education Transfer Module possible revision – 11/5/2004

Introductions:

Sam Connel: OHSU, Vice Provost Allied Health
Morgan Cowling: Oregon Student Association
Lorraine Davis: UO, VP Academic Affairs &OUS, Provost’s Council Chair
Cheryl Falk: Chemeketa CC & CIA Chair
Peter Gilkey: UO, President IFS
Connie Green: CCWD
Jonathan Jacobs: OUS, Admin Assistant
Dave McDonald: OUS, Director of Enrollment Svcs
George Pernsteiner: Acting OUS Chancellor
David Phillips: Clatsop CC, Retired
Earl Potter: SOU, Provost
Linda Reisser: Portland CC, Cascade campus

BJ Repp: PSU Salem Center, Asst Director & CSSA
Terry Rhodes: PSU, VP Academic Affairs
Gretchen Schuette: Chemeketa CC, President & OUS Board Member
Jem Specter: WOU, Provost
Julie Suchanek: OCCA, Gov Relations
Bob Turner: WOU, President-elect IFS
Diane Watson: Linn-Benton, Dean of Student Svcs & CSSA
Elaine Yandle-Roth: CCWD
MEETING COMMENTS:
MCDONALD: Crosstalk Handout interviews Mark Warner, Governor of Virginia. A lot of what Warner talks about parallels the discussions we have here. It is a reference point to show that we are not charting these waters alone. We just happen to have a boat that has a smaller engine and a few more leaks in it.

MCDONALD: Minutes from the last meeting are online at http://www.ous.edu/workinggroups/EDP/group_EDP_meet.htm

Future Meetings:
Next workgroup meeting will be in January. Exact date and time to be determined.

TOPIC 1: CAPACITY COURSES / ONLINE DELIVERY

Progress:
MCDONALD: A lot of work has been done mapping what is currently available and seeing where gaps may be.
MCDONALD: We are working to gauge better distance education offerings at community colleges and OUS, which is a way in which we can address capacity needs.
MCDONALD: At the 11/4/04 Meeting, John Moseley and Liz Goulard discussed and distributed material on where bottleneck courses are. Provided data shows that community college course bottlenecks parallel OUS bottlenecks. Generally these are in Writing, Intro Math, Intro Sciences, and sometimes courses within majors. Community colleges show similar patterns in capacity issues.
GREEN: We have a list of courses. We have some tentative numbers of sections where if you have small investment it can get people through bottleneck areas. This would not take care of all needs.

Current Work GREEN:
• Liz Goulard and John Moseley will determine guidelines to prioritize the capacity courses
• Capacity course investment: What makes sense to invest online vs. what makes sense to invest in the classroom?
• Is there a key program in distance delivery that should be explored?
• Waiting for John Moseley, John Miller, and Liz Goulard’s guidance and direction before continue.

General Topic Comments:
DAVIS: The groups working on Online Delivery and Capacity Courses will coordinate and assist with each other’s programs.
SCHUETTE: We are pretty much on target with schedule on this topic. Investigation of grant opportunities is being considered. Working to clarify with legislators and the Governor’s Office that while we can do a lot in this arena, resources will be needed for next steps.
PERNSTEINER: **Question:** Bottleneck course definitions, are they only gross numbers or do we have specific time of day or finer information defining where bottlenecks are?

GREEN: **Answer:** Largely they are not analyzed at that level.

SCHUETTE: **Answer:** Not for now, but at some point it might be a desired level of detail, because time of day does make a difference on access to bottleneck courses.

**TOPIC 2: ACCELERATED HIGH SCHOOL COURSES**

POTTER: There are three working committees:
- Aligning high school exit requirements with post-secondary entrance requirements
- Pilot for high school acceleration to college (using the Fast Start model)
- Defining college/life ready.

**General Comments:**

POTTER: High School (HS) Acceleration Conversation started that OUS ought to be doing more to get college courses down into high school. Shape of conversation has changed a lot. Want to make sure we are heading in the right direction.

SCHUETTE: Does HS Acceleration need to be part of the EDP work? Do we need to take on or wait for this piece?

GREEN: Accelerating HS is something State Board of Ed is working on. Between AP, Dual Credit, and IB, we have a high level of postsecondary access in our high schools. Conversations have resulted in new practices to put in place, including a task force that looks at a pilot that is more programmatic than course-by-course. While trying to honor all three partners, most of the things have been about community colleges and OUS. The ODE has a vested role in HS Acceleration, and want to keep it in their own system. A student bill of rights has come at them in three different sessions, so they have a high visibility of what they do not want. They have several large lobbying groups (Oregon School Board Association, COSA) that have major concerns that EDP’s plan for HS Acceleration looks like a student bill of rights.

DAVIS: Concern: What piece of HS Acceleration belongs to the EDP Working Group as a Board of Higher Education working group?

SCHUETTE: Of the three items in HS Acceleration, the defining college-life ready we would hope that Dept of Education would include community colleges and OUS perspective. Aligning Proficiencies in systems is important, but needs to have a life of its own, not necessarily directed from EDP Workgroup. Pilots for Systematic Approach, we want to be early at the table to get together with K-12 ahead of the political curve.

POTTER: Have never meant with Salam Noor, and need to meet with him to understand more. Need to get to know each other and understand each other's perspective so that they can be good partners.
GREEN: Understand the need for the meeting with Salam will be set up. Had not set this up yet because Salam had said there was no reason to get together until committees had something requiring a meeting.

SCHUETTE: It would be helpful to learn state-level efforts to this point so higher education understands the context and what we are facing.

Aligning Proficiencies in the System:
GREEN: Currently waiting for stuff back from assessment. Once information is back, we can roll something out, but definitely on State Board of Education’s agenda. They are handling it and eager to tackle it with us.
MCDONALD: ACT has done preliminary work on content alignment. I Have asked ACT to look at assessment tools and how they might be used instead of or in supplement to current state assessments of 10th grade, as well as extending it into CC placement practices. ACT should have proposal this week showing initial costs to offer assessment to every student in Oregon. Colorado and Illinois have successfully implemented this using ACT as 11th grade assessment in lieu of 10th grade assessments with very good results.

Pilot for Acceleration to College:
GREEN: Pilot group trying to get a meeting time, which has been difficult.
GREEN: Hard to find a time to get four or five key folks together (COSA, OSB, EDP). Just need to find a time we can all meet.
SCHUETTE: Question: Is work getting prepared for the meeting that is difficult to schedule? We need to think through from community colleges and OUS perspective what is important to know and be able to answer at the meeting.
POTTER: Answer: We have been working with ESD without a community college presence. Meeting was to understand relationships in OUS sector so that we are ready with questions and language for the pilot meeting.
GREEN: Answer: Will get group “on the left hand side” together, to prepare for the meeting that is difficult to schedule. Because of Salam Noor, Connie needs to set up the meeting. It is a delicate situation. State Board of Ed does not want the State Board of Higher Ed telling them what to do. State Board of Ed wants to own this.

Define College/Life Ready:
GREEN: Salam Noor working on college/life ready definition.
SCHUETTE: Question: Defining College-Ready: What are we expecting as a product and how long will it take?
GREEN: Answer: ODE has a group working on definitions. It is important for ODE Standards 22 to identify what is college-life-ready. We will get a definition from that group.
SCHUETTE: There is an interest in the EDP group was to participate in the conversation from community college and OUS perspective on what makes college-ready.
GREEN: They are looking at college/life ready standards we currently have and standards in other state to put something together. They will bring it back to summit group to give them the pieces. Connie will check with Salam on the timing, and will volunteer someone from EDP group to help with them.

PHILLIPS: Does dual-credit apply here and are the administrative rules still in place? Administrative rules provide definition in terms of High School students that are eligible to take college classes. Most institutions have a process to verify readiness for academic work. Seems like this needs to be part of the definition.

GREEN: What came out of summit: Were we clear on what was being college-ready? Was it college ready or life ready? What do you need when you leave high school to be ready for the next step? There are different definitions by standards throughout different states how these are defined. Also our own standards in: Standards 22, Dual Credit Standards, and PASS Standards. Salam Noor and a small group are trying to determine the best practices and different definitions of what that would mean. This would not apply to every single area, but provide a broad umbrella for College-Life ready. They are not trying to ignore anything else, but just trying to get a definition. If we are clear about a definition, we can determine how it aligns in the next steps.

TOPIC 3: RETENTION

PROGRESS:

WATSON: Analytic model has been developed.

REISSER: Identified effectiveness indicators with each of the 17 community colleges, and see what patterns and commonalities exist. Began to see data being collected and student groups involved.

WATSON: Had meetings with institutional research experts to see how we can design a system of retention across all community colleges that uses data already collected or that could easily be collected. Includes definition of retention and a way to measure it. Baseline data is very important. They begin by looking at lower division collegiate students and propose a way to measure retention. Version 6 has been discussed and approved by CSSA with OUS representation. Institutional Researchers are tweaking the model, at some point they want to look at other groups including professional technical students

GREEN: Professional Technical Deans and Directors at community colleges and high schools have been talking about a retention study for professional technical students. We will combine their retention study with our retention study, and make sure it uses a similar format and work with them so that their study will tie into ours.

BEST PRACTICES:

WATSON: CSSA and all community colleges campuses have had a discussion about best practices for retention. (see Meeting Materials 8 & 9). Best Practices are categorized by curriculum initiatives. We brainstormed different retention techniques under each category. CSSA is collecting information showing what each CC currently practices for retention. Jem Spectar is doing the same for OUS.
SPECTAR: Right now, marking an “X” doesn’t tell us how invasive and how successful a particular intervention is in each campus. Suggest a scale of 1-4 (some success, moderate success, etc) as well as an additional paragraph describing the success of the measure. Other colleges could utilize this info.

WATSON: Agrees with Jem and will follow up with CSSA to implement these suggestions to prevent the data from being too general.

SPECTAR: Resources: If there is something that is very successful and that leads to retention, and there is supporting assessment and longitudinal data, it would be useful to be able to provide resources to strengthen the practice.

SPECTAR: We are observing that retention cannot be successful by doing only one or two retention practices. There are so many reasons why students stay in an environment, including feel of place, facilities, friendliness of staff, initiatives, and money being spent. If you try to separate too many practices, you will not affect the overall problem. Need to think of retention as an Ethos of success that can’t be solved by doing one thing. Institutions that were able to move 5 or 10 points on retention were able to do a broad variety of changes (example: reenergizing curriculum, more academic support for struggling students, and better residential life)

DAVIS: Suggestion: Have each institution identify the four top retention practices. This way a campus can pick out the four top things they would suggest as a best practice to others, and explain why.

ROSE: There may not be new resources, so we may need to reallocate existing resources to better practices. Need evidence of what practices work best for what types of students, and what resources those practices take.

SCHUETTE: The goal is to measure our success, to know what strategies contribute to our success, and provide training for each other related to best practices, and over time build stronger institutional strategies to support student success.

WATSON: Once the grid is complete and measured, we can provide feedback to institutions. Then campuses can see what other campuses are doing. This could lead to statewide resource for retention information. A central office can provide information or be called for help, possibly a website.

HISTORICAL RETENTION DATA:

PERNSTEINER: Question: Do we have data for all 25 institutions, and if so, do we know which ones have had the most positive change in the last few years? That way we can see what successful campuses have been doing to increase their retention.

GREEN: Answer: Retention data has been kept and maintained by each community college. There was not a definition of what retention was. We have the definitions, so we are building the baseline.

WATSON: At Linn-Benton Community College, we have retention data for the last six years, a dramatic change was a college-wide initiative. Retention went from 30 percent to 50 percent in five to six years. Lots of different things caused the change.
PERNSTEINER: This is what we would want to know. Also want to know what it took for that positive change.

MCDONALD: We do have retention data by community colleges examining after community college students move to OUS, but while they are in community college each campus has their own system of measurement.

MEASURING RETENTION:

GREEN: Part of establishing uniform retention measurement is getting all community colleges to agree to retention definition. Once they agree what retention is, it is easy to measure. We now have a definition.

REISSER: Very few institutions had data determining what practices were effective. The question: What would stimulate the most amount of impact with the least amount of resources? Linn-Benton has a great model and can show some data that it had an impact.

PHILLIPS: Concern: Many community college students do not have an intent to transfer or get a degree. We need to know who intends to come just to take a handful of courses and that is it.

REISSER: Response: The model targets students who indicate their goal is a 2-year or 4-year degree.

WATSON: It is still extremely difficult to track. Students change to professional technical, or drop out for two years and come back. It is a limitation of the analytic model.

WATSON: Concern: The current analytic model does not measure when a student transfers. They are already enrolled at the OUS institution. Oregon State University does not show many transfer students because there are many dual enrolled.

MCDONALD: Response: Starting Fall 2005, we have changed the coding so that students in the dual enrollment program have an admission code so we can track them. We can’t go backwards, but we can determine that volume from this point on.

RETENTION FOCUS:

SCHUETTE: This group is to look at not only the short-term success for students but the long view and how to make OUS successful for more students, and what it would cost to do that.

SCHUETTE: This group does focus on minority, transfer, older, and working students. We do not isolate those from support systems for all students.

DAVIS: The focus of this working group has to be community college students that come to OUS institution, since this working group is for the Board of Higher Education.

PERNSTEINER: Disagree: If we are going to measure how successful we are in moving students through their degree, it matters to me what their retention is through the first two years. Until we know where we have the retention leakage, we do not know where to focus our attention.
FALK: It we aren’t doing our job at the community college level retaining and helping to clarify values and goals of GED and ESL students, many of those students will never reach OUS. We need to help those students succeed to reach the next level.

GENERAL TOPIC COMMENTS:
DAVIS: Question: OUS Perspective has 32 performance indicators. Some relate and some don’t. What is the outcome of this data gathering?
GREEN: Answer: Several retention goals are similar to what OUS and OCURS currently do. We are adding to and making sure we have a complete package with our 4-year institutions. It doesn’t go to the 36 measures that OUS has, but there is a lot of similarity and alignment.
MCDONALD: It is logical to expect legislators to ask, “What does this really say overall to postsecondary education and how well are our students doing as they move between institutions?” Logically we should be able to have an overall gauge of how well they are doing.
WATSON: The current indicators would be a starting point, and we could add more.
SCHUETTE: Question: Our commitment is to have a student-centered point of view. Are we moving towards a way to see if there is a way to measure from the student point of view if they are successfully beginning, continuing, and transferring on, and we are providing the paths and support?
WATSON: Answer: Difficulty with community college students is they go, stop, go, stop. We measure as much as we can get a handle on.

TOPIC 4: STUDENT DATA TRANSFER PROCESS

PROGRESS:
GREEN: Pilot in progress, trying to get student identifier to move and connect without data behind it. Will revisit in December with Curt Pederson to check on success of pilot. Also waiting on legislation for the pieces.

TOPIC 5: GENERAL EDUCATION and ARTICULATION OF MAJORS

TIMELINE:
11/18 JBAC Meeting
11/19 General Education Summit Meeting
12/2 Provosts' Council Discussion

KEY PROGRESS/DETAILS GILKEY:
• 11/9/04 Held meeting at Mt Hood Community College, included Central Oregon Community College by telephone. Mt Hood input very different than input at OUS campuses. Tremendous participation and support at Mt Hood. Engaging discussions.
• Due to time and energy constraints, it is not possible to hold discussions at all community colleges.
• Provosts' Council will help facilitate the efforts of faculty to reach closure. It will be taken to the appropriate committees on campus and brought to a vote.
• Module cannot be amendable, or we will have seven different modules at each campus plus 17 at community college campuses.
• Advising is key. This will not work without advising.
• Module does not replace articulation agreements or dual-enrollment programs.
• Hope to reach closure on the issue at 11/19 summit. Failure is not the desired option because other people will take over and create a product that we might not want.

**FURTHER REVISIONS TO MODULE:**

ROSE: Student Transfer Committee (committee of JBAC), made editorial suggestions in terms of language of proposal from standpoint of implementation. Elaine Yandle-Roth will distribute current suggestions.

DAVIS: Provosts are working on preamble to proposal to set the stage of what we are trying to accomplish. Draft will go to Provosts' Council, then JBAC, then Summit. It is to put it in juxtaposition with AAOT to explain academic basis for reason to do this.

SCHUETTE: If possible, have draft of Provosts' Preamble available for community colleges president meeting next week. Cheryl Falk will be discussing topic. Wants all groups to see it before it gets to the state boards.

**COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONCERNS:**

DAVIS: Had a discussion with CIA/Provosts for any tweaks to current Transfer Module. Conceptually they all understand the need for it, but are hesitant to endorse it until faculty input is received. This is important first step to show we are working towards something.

FALK: CIA discussed outcomes of Gen Ed Transfer Module. There is not total agreement. They had ten different versions. CIA has passed a resolution saying they endorse the concept of the General Ed Transfer Module and the role of JBAC to finalize the model. It is general so that it remains effective as the module changes, but contains specific characteristics. Some colleges did not feel comfortable supporting the concept because it had not been discussed thoroughly at their campus.

FALK: Community colleges feel that higher education has discussed this topic in more depth. There is a strong belief that community colleges are at the mercy of higher education.

WATSON: Transfer committee agreed outcomes need to be phased in, and their needs to be an audit system where a student can program in their coursework, and it will tell them what the pathway is through the core curriculum to transfer.

SCHUETTE: All these things are connected (Articulation to majors, web-based articulation model). Handout sheet has Presidents’ Council info as well as CIA Resolution. The next step will be to work with community college presidents. Key difference between resolutions is that presidents call out 55 credits. Also presidents’ second bullet is “expedited student pathway to baccalaureate degree
by developing competency-based…” An agreement on the transfer module is expected as it is clarified.

SOPHOMORE STANDING:
POTTER: Sophomore standing may be a problem. For example the new nursing curriculum at community colleges integrates nursing education into all four years. This nursing tract does not match the Transfer Module.
GREEN: Sophomore standing is a dilemma. The current text appears to be a reasonable path to get to a transfer module. There is no harm to this. The value of it is that it is not unwrappable. Sophomore standing is a way to say, “You didn’t throw away a year, or your credit hours.” It does not get you to the next step in your majors. In a perfect world all students would have a major and all majors articulated, but in reality students move around.
ROSE: Most students will never do it in their first year. Students in particular major will take classes that are not part of the Transfer Module to get into their major.

GENERAL COMMENTS:
WATSON: Wordsmithing: Recommend a new name of “Oregon Transfer Module” it is cleaner than “General Education Transfer Module.” One science class should be a “Lab Science” class. These recommendations make the module stronger, and will be boiled down to something that will be fairly useful for students in the 11/18 meeting.

FUTURE MEETINGS:
DAVIS: The Goal of the 11/18 JBAC meeting is to have a draft of the “final” product. This will then be discussed at the 11/19 summit.
MCDONALD: Vision for 11/19 summit meeting: Time talking about how we got to where we are to honor IFS, JBAC, and Provosts. Then discuss and endorse the JBAC proposal, recognizing that our group does not have the authority to approve or disapprove, but the endorsement is critical. This will lead to action by the boards, and faculty process.

TOPIC 6: ARTICULATION OF MAJORS and DUAL ENROLLMENT

PROGRESS GREEN:
• We have the list of where articulation agreements exist at all campuses.
• We have areas with highest student enrollment.

ARTICULATION CURRENT WORK:
GREEN: We need to know from every campus what agreements they have on the drawing board and what they think they will have on the drawing board. Once obtained, we can present it as what we are working on as system of higher education.

DUAL ENROLLMENT CURRENT WORK:
GREEN: Potential template did not get approval. We need to determine whom we will
go through to get the dual-enrollment template approved.

DAVIS: Template would have to be approved by CIA then Provosts’ Council.

SCHUETTE: That is true for OUS, but for community colleges it would be CIA plus others.

SCHUETTE: EDP can work on it as a group so when it goes to the two sectors it has
some problems ironed out.
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11/10/04, 1:00pm – Gretchen Schuette called the meeting to order.

Materials:
1. Cover letter to Gretchen Schuette with Oregon Transfer Module (OTM) context
2. Oregon Transfer Module: includes memos from CIA and Provost council.

Introductions:
Joanna Blount Southwestern Oregon CC, Assoc Dean
Galyn Carlile Rogue CC
Sam Connel OHSU, Vice Provost Allied Health
Berta Dargen Umpqua CC, VP Instruction
Lorraine Davis UO, VP of Academic Affairs & OUS, Provost’s council chair
Gary Dukes WOU, Vice Pres Student Affairs
Cheryl Falk Chemeketa CC & CIA Chair
James Fritz Southwestern Oregon CC, Art Instructor
Lori Gates Tillamook Bay CC, Dean of Instruction
Peter Gilkey UO, President IFS
Liz Goulard Chemeketa CC, Vice President
Adam Hall Clackamas CC, Curriculum Committee
Jonathan Jacobs OUS, Admin Assistant
John Miller EOU, Provost
Terry Rhodes PSU, VP Academic Affairs
Gary Ruppert Linn-Benton CC, Dean of Arts & Comm
Maureen Sevigny OIT, Professor of Management IFS Chair, General Ed Transfer Module
Gretchen Schuette Chemeketa CC, President & OUS Board Member
Jem Spectar WOU, Provost
Karen Sprague UO, Molecular Biologist & Vice Provost Undergrad Studies
Paul Steinley SOU, Associate Provost
Ellen Sunnes Oregon Coast CC, Director Student Svcs
Joanne Truesdell Chemeketa CC, Executive Dean
Bob Turner WOU, President-elect IFS
Ed Watson Linn-Benton CC, VP Academic Affairs
Elaine Yandle-Roth CCWD

Context of Meeting:
SCHUETTE: First heard about the General Education Transfer Core in February 2004. There was an urgency to address our current situation with something that would help in the shorter term as we looked at long-term goals. The focus must be on student learning.
MILLER: Review and full reading of context letter and new and improved OTM resulting from 11/18 JBAC meeting.
Points of emphasis in review of context letter to Gretchen Schuette:
• Paragraph 1, Emphasize that the module is the first step.
• **Rationale for the OTM**, The key is to build on the AA/OT, AS/OT-BUS, or Baccalaureate programs.

• **Refinement of the Module**, Since September 2004 all discussions on all campuses have resulted in input which has been incorporated in the current module. The 2010 review is important because we would have 5 years to collect information between now and then.

**NEXT STEPS (SHORT TERM)**

**TURNER:** Expect that at December IFS meeting the OTM will be approved. Expect next steps will be to get the OTM approved from each campus senate.

**GILKEY:** Process at UO: Undergraduate Council will be looking at OTM on 11/24. Assuming that is successful will be getting notice of motion in UO senate 12/1 with action hopefully to occur 1/12/05. It is hopeful that with Bob Turner’s lead this action will occur on all other institutions as well.

**SCHUETTE:** Need continuous assessment as well as more comprehensive review periodically

**SPECTAR:** For approval in December, what document would be approved by the faculty? Would it be just the OTM, or would the letter to Gretchen be a preamble?

**GILKEY:** That depends on the individual campus. As far as legislation for UO, we would ask that the faculty approve the OTM as a curricular matter. It is not clear to me how to phrase a motion to handle the cover letter to Schuette. I believe that it is the OTM I will be presenting to the undergraduate council. This will need a context. With proposed legislation there is 1) the legislation, and then 2) supporting documents for the legislative history. The letter to Schuette would be part of these documents to contextualize it. The actual vote needs to be on the OTM.

**TURNER:** Would be taken to WOU senate in the same way. The OTM alone would be the curricular change, and the other documents would be provided as context.

**SCHUETTE:** I would ask in the spirit of support that Cheryl Falk and Lorraine Davis would know what the OTM is about and would work with faculty leadership and presidents to make sure we get to the next steps at every institution. This way at the state boards we can reflect what has occurred at an institutional level.

**NEXT STEPS (LONG TERM)**

**DARGON:** Cheryl Falk on 11/4 meeting appointed a seven-person committee that will discuss next steps. Co-chaired by Ed Watson and Berta Dargen.

**WATSON:** General education is important in the success of dual enrollment and articulation. From general education articulation we can align major articulation. This is just a piece of the bigger issue.

**RECENT CHANGES:**

**SPRAGUE:** Transfer Committee consists of people much closer to the implementation of policy. They find the flaws in ideas JBAC and others come up with. JBAC submitted the OTM proposal to the Student Transfer committee to give the proposal a serious look at. Transfer Committee offered important refinements such as the specifications of grades that must be received in module courses, the designation between science and social science, etc. The original version was
defined by credits. It has been refined in terms of courses. This movement will avoid the hang-ups associated with credits.

MILLER: Defining as courses is a step towards outcomes.

SPRAGUE: There was an addition that biology must include a lab because this was a requirement of the AA/OT. They didn’t want a student to take a course because it applied to the OTM just to find it does not apply to the AA/OT.

MILLER: The name has been changed to the Oregon Transfer Module.

SEVIGNY: One correction on proposal, listing as Arts & Sciences should be Arts & Letters.

**Qualified Endorsement by CC Presidents SCHUETTE:**
- Community college presidents see this as a short first step. Presidents want to move beyond this.
- Presidents support the portability of earned competencies, and creating a system in which Oregonians can obtain their Baccalaureate degree in the same time frame regardless of taking lower division coursework at a community college or university. The presidents also added a comment supportive of dual-enrollment agreements.
- Presidents support expediting the students pathway to a Baccalaureate degree by developing competency based fully transferable core of lower division general education creating a framework for a unified agreement among community colleges and between community colleges and OUS that utilizes the 55 credits of general education already agreed upon.
- Presidents affirm a longer further path for this work and in that context the presidents support the OTM as a step toward.
- There was a lot of discussion about continued work on articulation toward majors and at least some sentiment to continue in the direction of additional AS/OT types of degrees.
- In cooperation with OUS, presidents want to create a web-delivered statewide degree audit system facilitating a seamless transfer of academic achievements between community colleges and from community colleges to OUS.
- Presidents reaffirmed a number of things that had been on the plate in August along with raising questions. Summary: Presidents want continued work to outcomes based and systems that work, a truly transferable core of lower division general education that values the work done at community colleges level, and does not encourage too early transfer when students could stay longer at community colleges and have value of lower cost experience that still counts.
- Presidents appreciate the CIA endorsement using the words “approve the concept.”
- Presidents are supportive of continued work of JBAC.
- We can’t have the universities move the finish line. If people come in with the transfer module, we can’t have the goals be pushed further out by adding other requirements.
- Concern that the OTM could be unwrapped by the universities and it wouldn’t come as a single package.
• Do not want the AA/OT diminished for those it does help and would like it to be revisited by the CIA. Cheryl did a brilliant job of working with the presidents and presidents hope that communication can continue.

Approval of OTM Concept by Provosts Council DAVIS:
• Provosts understand the need for consistency as well as collaborative ways in which students can move between the institutions.
• Communication is a core piece. Advising can only be as good as the communication between the departments and the advisors. In addition, EDP work on data system will assist in facilitating good advising.
• The Provosts’ Council approves the concept of the OTM with those caveats.
• Sabah Randhawa (OSU) and Jem Spectar (WOU) wrote a document related to outcomes of General Education in the context of what they want accomplished.
• The curriculum in our institution is developed and approved by the faculty, so provosts are looking to IFS to help facilitate necessary faculty approval. Provosts approve the concept.

CONCERNS
TURNER: Concern: There are many problems involved in students trying to transfer between institutions. Many of those problems can be solved with timely and effective advising. Believe that the OTM by itself cannot be a solution to the problem. It must be followed by effective advising.

WATSON: Concern: Feels that we have a completed document that isn’t quite ready for full implementation because it has certain limitations. Does feel that document will facilitate communication around those limitations, and has brought to light aspects of AA/OT that have not been contemplated in the past. It is a great building block with which to move ahead.

CARLILE: Concern: If we only facilitate transfer we have missed the point. We must transfer credible curriculum. When we can get K-12, community colleges, and OUS faculty together and agree on course content it will make the transfer module work. Needs to be “more appropriately as fast as it needs to take.”

SEVIGNY: Response: More appropriately as fast as it can be was not a fast process. Courses are not equal between the universities. Some courses have accreditation and some do not. Even so they came up with a proposal with recommended and/or required courses with needed flexibility. Believe it is a good process. It does take time to align the campuses.

SCHUETTE: Alignment of courses and the time involved is something we might want to get resources for in as fast as a time frame that we can.

WATSON: Concern: The other area we have heard this dialogue: What are the outcomes of studio courses compared to lecture/lab courses? There is some debate of the value of one compared to the other.

RUPPERT: Concern: AA/OT is a 90 credit clump. The module is a 45-credit clump. What happens to the students who only have 41 or 42 credits?

GOULARD: Response: All courses should be transferable courses. The student would need to take four more credits to get the endorsement from the campus.
GILKEY: **Concern:** Exceptional case. If a student has 40 credits and transfers, many community colleges have residency requirements requiring a certain amount of time needed at the community colleges. It is an implementation problem.

GOULARD: **Response:** Need to discuss with student services folks during next meeting in March.

WATSON: **Important Point:** In OTM, a three credit course (counted as a single course) will transfer to a community colleges that has the same course with four credits.

GOULARD: **Response:** That is why the module was changed to course based rather than credit based.

HALL: **Concern:** Preventing moving the finish line. I understand that when students transfer they will get sophomore status, but what prevents the receiving institution from moving the finish line.

GILKEY: **Response:** At the UO, the reason we are taking the OTM to the undergraduate council and then the senate is because all curricular changes require signing off of the faculty. Moving the finish line requires this major public action. It is not a small action.

SCHUETTE: **Concern:** The concern is that an individual student will be told by the receiving institution that more general education work is required. The question is, is it clear that this could happen?

GILKEY: **Response:** In the second sentence of the OTM it is stated that upon transfer the receiving institution may specify additional coursework that is required for a major or an institutions specific general education requirements.

SPRAGUE: Additional coursework might be required, but repeat courses should not happen.

DAVIS: **Concern:** People change their requirements based on what they think needs to be done. Ten years from now, our general education requirements could have changed substantially.

GILKEY: **Response:** The UO will not change the general education requirements for all students because of the OTM.

SEVIGNY: **Concern:** Concern that the OTM may change between now and the time it goes to the boards.

GILKEY: **Response:** The OTM is unamenable. We will take specific language to our faculties. If somebody changes the text, the process must start all over again. We cannot tinker with the language.

SCHUETTE: For the OSBHE to approve the OTM there may be a motion that says something like, “We support the OTM and encourage further next steps.”

SCHUETTE: There might be a value at the state level to make a motion that individual institutions cannot modify the module.

GOULARD: There is a concern that institutions might do similar to what happened to the AA/OT, where they agreed to the module, but require additional courses or sequences.

**SUGGESTIONS**

WATSON: **Suggestion:** We could break this down into smaller modules so that for example the portability of arts & letters is easier. As we further examine a lot of the ideas we can come up with something better.
SPECTAR: **Suggestion:** Can the Gretchen cover letter be formulated as a context letter directed to the school senates that will be voting on the OTM. Comfort level would increase if this module were attached to a common set of outcomes. That is in the future. Will still endorse the OTM and will help move it through with faculty. Much of the confusion that students have as they try to transfer is because there is no consensus on outcomes.

GILKEY: **Response:** Opposed to that because it makes drafting the legislation infinitely complicated. At UO campus all material will be included as part of context.

SEVIGNY: As we are looking at 2005 deadline for implementation, we cannot tag on another idea.

GILKEY: We are moving at blinding speed, and if we consider outcomes we will move at blinding speed and nothing will happen.

SCHUETTE: **Alternate Suggestion:** Would it be helpful if we asked the chair of JBAC to send the letter to Gretchen copied to Provosts, CIA members, Presidents, and IFS members?

MILLER: **Response:** Will work with Lorraine on that. The support of the EDP workgroup will be added to it. It will be sent to all constituencies to let them know where we are.

TURNER: At the December IFS meeting, all IFS senators will get the message agreed on here and are strongly urged and requested to include Gretchen cover as context. These documents will go forward.

SPRAGUE: **Suggestion:** One suggested change on the coursework. Under “Guidelines” line 2 should be changed to remove the word credit and change it to “institution issuing the Oregon Transfer Module.”

GILKEY: **Response:** Respectfully disagree. That changes the meaning. If student takes course at institution X and moves it to Y, it still counts as counted at institution Y. The word credit does not mean credit hours.

SPRAGUE: **Alternate Suggestion:** It is still not made clear. Possibly change to “institution issuing credit for the course.”

GILKEY: **Response:** I am resistant to writing on the fly. It tends to have unintended consequences. We will leave it as currently written.

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

TURNER: It needs to be made clear what the faculty see as a goal of the curriculum. We are not setting curriculum because we want students to take this or that class from our campus. Our goal: We need to produce graduates that are going to satisfy graduate schools and professional schools and employers. A lot of the curricular conversation needs to keep an eye on what the curriculum is going to supply for our student.

SCHUETTE: We are on the same page, we probably do well to overstate what we are doing and restate our commitment to what we are doing, counting as it goes. We need to continue to put out there the intentions that we share. It is a concern on what moves and does not get sustained when we do not work together.

SCHUETTE: We need to stay together and keep the student in the middle of the table, and maybe we will have a legacy.
AA/OT COMMENTS

FALK: Pleased at process. We have come a long way. CIA has been asked to revisit the effectiveness and other issues surrounding the AA/OT. Only 30 percent of transfers to OUS are using the AA/OT. Jim Arnold wrote a paper regarding the effectiveness of the AA/OT. The OTM gives more energy and impetus for moving forward along those lines.

FRITZ: Southwestern Oregon community colleges faculty is discussing revising AA/OT back to state guidelines. There are concerns that the guidelines may change at the state level. Is it a good idea to revise the guidelines at this time?

WATSON: At the end of the term Linn-Benton will have a 2-day workshop, and will take the arts and letters distribution area in the AA/OT and will put outcomes and criteria on those. It is a micro activity on what could be done statewide. I would encourage Southwestern Oregon Community College faculty to get together and look at the AA/OT and have a dialogue around outcomes.

CARLILE: A single community colleges cannot fix the AA/OT. With the OUS system we can create fixes, otherwise we will have 17 different fixes.

GOULARD: If a faculty group would like to examine the AA/OT, go for it. Southwestern still has sequences, which has been the hardest area for community colleges. It is not an easy change to make.

WATSON: Among community colleges we have changed the AA/OT target. Some community colleges have wellness component, sequence component, cultural diversity component… We have changed the bar amongst ourselves.

OTHER EDP WORK

SCHUETTE: EDP has had a number of fronts, OTM has been lifted up, but there are connections with all other pieces that strengthen the overall platform.

MILLER: All OUS schools received data on 11/4 detailing where transfers came from so Articulation can be started. Things will quickly go into place, which will result in more, better, faster transfers.

SCHUETTE: Articulation meeting on 12/10 will take us further. Will collaboratively look at bottlenecks and access problems for students to take next steps.

SEVIGNY: It does help with articulation if we can develop advising guides to suggest courses for students. From an advisor’s point of view it helps tremendously.

SCHUETTE: This is where EDP and JBAC can help set priorities for the state as we look at student intent. We need to know what pathways to focus on next. Work on outcomes also takes time and is a target of resources.

STEINLEY: Articulation, major issues. 1) Institutions need to support communication between faculties, 2) Within institutions need communication because of dynamic environment.

APPROVAL OF OREGON TRANSFER MODULE

SCHUETTE: Is there a consensus on the proposal

GILKEY: I can speak for members of IFS that there is a consensus. I think we should move ahead

FALK: I can speak for the CIA and agree.

SEVIGNY: With faculty support, the provosts agree.
SCHUETTE: Now confirming that all people have a comfort level with having said their peace and feel supportive of this summit in effect endorsing moving forward with the Oregon Transfer Module.

ALL PRESENT: All Ayes. No Nays.
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- Appreciate the JBAC Student Transfer Committee involvement.
- Elaine Yandle-Roth has done well in Jim Arnold’s absence.
- Craig Collins has been the leader of our group and has been outstanding.

GILKEY: Signify thanks by giving a t-shirt to John Miller, Cheryl Falk, and Karen Sprague for their work on the transfer module. IFS ran town hall meetings at the seven OUS campuses, as well as Mt Hood Community College. IFS reached out wide for input on the transfer module, and all input was very useful.

SEVIGNY: Thanks to Peter Gilkey for his efforts to come to all campuses.

Comments on Process to Date:

MILLER: Unparalleled Collaboration.

SPRAGUE: Never heard so much spirited discussion about General Education.

STEINLEY: Impressed by Peter Gilkey’s presentations and faculty interaction.

DAVIS: Impressed by openness of process and information being shared.

CONNEL: Interested in seeing how EDP will impact the nursing consortium.

DUKES: Impressed with speed of process.
GILKEY: Enjoyed being on all eight OUS campuses and four community colleges campuses.
SEVIGNY: Impressed with collaboration.
YANDLE-ROTH: Impressed with openness and how together we are on issues.
WATSON: Collaboration not just between sectors but more communication between community colleges.
FALK: Impressed by seriousness of conversations, intercommunication between OUS and community colleges, ability to easily communicate between sectors, focus on student-success.
DARGEN: This is the first of many steps.
CARLILE: What is next? What we have done is great, but we must build on these first steps.
RUPPERT: Even on own campus there is more serious discussion about general education than ever before.
TRUESDELL: Has watched the movement from casual discussion to actual movement on issues.
BLOUNT: Discussions on general education are fast and furious. It will be interesting to see what the next steps are on both community colleges and OUS level.
SPECTAR: The process has brought out the potential for greater collaboration between all sectors.
Excellence in Delivery and Productivity Working Group
January 21, 2005
Chemekeata Community College

NOTES

Chair: Gretchen Schuette, President Chemeketa Community College,
Recorder: Jonathan Jacobs, Admin Asst, OUS Chancellor’s Office

01/21/05, 1:00pm – Gretchen Schuette Call to Order.

Materials:
1. Agenda
2. Minutes from 11/10 EDP Meeting
3. Minutes from 11/19 OTM meeting
4. CAS Powerpoint Presentation
5. Summary Report on Accelerated Learning from 9/15/05 conference

Introductions:
Cindy Baccar: PSU, Associate Director Admissions
Herb Cherek: UO, Registrar
Patsy Chester Linn-Benton CC, Director Ed Partnerships
Bill Christopher: PCC Rock Creek Campus, President
Jeanne Coe: UO, Assist Director Undergrad Progs
Sam Connel: OHSU, Vice Provost Allied Health
Lorraine Davis: OUS, Provost’s Council Chair
Gary Dukes: WOU, Vice Pres Student Affairs
Mark Endsley: OUS, PASS Coordinator K-16 Assessment
Jim Eustrom: Chemeketa CC, SDLR
Cheryl Falk: Chemeketa CC & CIA Chair
Liz Goulard: Chemeketa CC, Vice President
Connie Green: CCWD, Deputy Director
Jonathan Jacobs: OUS, Admin Assistant
Joe Johnson: Clackamas CC, President
Jill Kirk: Oregon Business Council, Vice Pres
Cheryl Markwell: Rogue CC, Associate Dean
David McDonald: OUS, Director of Enrollment Svcs
Robert Mercer: PSU, Assistant Dean Liberal Arts
Wendy Mitchell: UO, Assistant Dean Undergrad Programs
Ralph Orr: Tillamook Bay CC, President
George Pernstein: Acting OUS Chancellor
David Phillips: Clatsop CC, Chief Academic Officer (retired)
Karen Phillips: Oregon Small Schools Initiative, Director
Earl Potter: SOU, Provost
Sahab Randhawa: PSU, VP Academic Affairs
Linda Reisser: Portland CC, Cascade campus & CSSA
Terry Rhodes: PSU, VP Academic Affairs
James Sager: Governor’s Office, Education Advisor
Jim Schoelkopf: ODE
Maureen Sevigny: OIT, Professor of Management & IFS Chair for General Ed Transfer Module
Gretchen Schuette: Chemeketa CC, President & OUS Board Member
Jem Spectar: WOU, Provost
Karen Sprague: UO, Molecular Biologist & Vice Provost Undergrad Studies
Paul Steinley: SOU, Associate Provost
Bob Turner: WOU, President IFS
Tony Van Vliet: OUS Board Member
Valerie Ward: Mt Hood CC, Dean of Admission
Ed Watson: Linn-Benton CC, VP Academic Affairs
Elaine Yandle-Roth: CCWD
Common Acronyms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAOT</td>
<td>Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDP</td>
<td>Excellence in Delivery and Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Course Applicability System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCWD</td>
<td>Community College and Workforce Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIA</td>
<td>Council of Instructional Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARS</td>
<td>Degree Audit Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFS</td>
<td>Interinstitutional Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBAC</td>
<td>Joint Boards Articulation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>Kindergarten through 12th grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLDA</td>
<td>Oregon Linked Degree Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBE</td>
<td>Oregon State Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBHE</td>
<td>Oregon State Board of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Oregon Transfer Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUS</td>
<td>Oregon University System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEETING UPDATE: IMPORTANT EVENTS

State Board Update SCHUETTE:
Update from the State Board of Higher Education's Retreat to figure out strategic direction for the Board.

- Board does not want higher education to be "a bottleneck of opportunity."
- The Board recognizes we are in a world that relentlessly punishes individuals in regions and states that are undereducated. Education was not fully designed to serve the roles that we see education needs to serve right now. We need to better educate more people.
- The Board is making policies that don’t just decide who gets a leg up, but decides the life chances of people. The work to have more opportunities with people in education is critically important.
- The Boards discussed defining success not in institutional terms but in student terms. This does not make institutions less important.
- We should be relentlessly outcomes focused.

TOPIC 1: OREGON TRANSFER MODULE

Progress:

DAVIS: The OTM has been introduced and passed at the faculty senates at OIT, SOU, OSU, UO, and PSU. It will be considered at the 1/25/05 faculty senate at WOU, and considered at EOU on 2/1 or 2/2/05. It has gone well because many of the issues and concerns were addressed at the town hall meetings facilitated by the IFS. I anticipate passage by each faculty senates before the Board Meeting.

FALK: At Community Colleges we have a different situation because we have a different structure. Oral passage has not happened at all campuses. Several CCs are waiting to see exactly what the OTM language is and what will happen at the boards.

Next Steps:

YANDLE-ROTH: It is expected that both the CC and OUS Systems will adopt the OTM. The student transfer committee, a subcommittee of JBAC, will be meeting in February to start talking about implementation issues. We are finding there is still some confusion on the technical aspects of the module. We want to create a brochure for advisors and give advice to the campuses so there is uniform
reaction and interpretation. We are beginning discussions with engineering faculty across institutions about potential outcomes, common outcomes, expectations, and better cross-system dialog. The same is beginning in Education. We met with OACTE (deans and heads of education programs for privates as well as CC and OUS). There is interest in talking about defining the difference between lower division education courses and technical education courses. We hope we will end up with agreements and better idea of common outcomes.

WATSON: As a result of the 12/10/04 Transfer/Articulation conference, numerous questions came up about the implementation of the module. The subcommittee of JBAC will be working the next month or two trying to answer implementation questions. There will be ongoing questions.

MCDONALD: Many CCs are waiting for formal board action before moving on the OTM. The next Joint Board meeting will occur 2/3/05 at Chemeketa’s Eola Center. There will be formal action by the Joint Boards on the OTM. We expect no problems getting formal approval of the final OTM language because both boards have endorsed the OTM concept independent of each other.

General Comments:

SCHUETTE: We need to focus on student outcomes. It is the OSBHE focus to work together across all sectors on a student outcomes approach on moving between institutions and sectors.

SCHUETTE: JBAC was invited to the CC presidents’ meeting to have lunch and discuss shared interests. The partnership with JBAC was made clear to the CC presidents. The CC presidents have a great appreciation for JBAC as well as the joint boards. They appreciate the key role that those two groups can play in creating a legacy for this work and that it will continue, be institutionalized, and have a life after EDP is gone.

SCHUETTE: In their 1/21/05 meeting, OSBE (K-12 and CC) discussed several topics, most directly an overview of the OTM with docket item that explained where we are and OSBE’s role and JBAC’s role with the OTM. There is interest from the board level and presidents as well.

CHRISTOPHER: You hear so often the students saying, “Courses I took at CC did not transfer, or did not transfer how I thought they would.” If you have lots of advising but no clear communication on how courses can be used there is still a barrier. The OTM will hopefully dissolve some of these barriers.

Articulation and Advising Guides:

DAVIS: At the CIA/Provost summit we received the top majors that transferred to each institution, and we are working to get articulation as clean as it can be. Provosts are updating articulation conversations with CC counterparts to confirm articulation agreements as well as ensure seamless transfer.

POTTER: My sense is the articulation agreement is a situation where a CC 2-year program directly matches an OUS four-year program. The “advising guide” or “template” is where the CC doesn’t have a signed program but have a plan to assist their students in moving toward a four year major.
GREEN: We have two different things. We have a database with articulation agreements. We also have some of the advising guides and templates. We purposely went after articulation agreements because that helps the student go one to one. Guides give us 99 percent, but it is a guide, not a signed agreement. We can put both on the JBAC site. But the advisors can look at the really good articulation agreement between a CC and a University and can implement it between themselves and that University rather than reinvent the wheel.

CHRISTOPHER: We have a ton of templates (not signed agreements) from CC advisors working with OUS folks. We have the makings of formal documents with the templates we already have. We should begin gathering those templates. It seems we should be able to come up with signed formal agreement for several of those degrees in a relatively short amount of time. Much of the work is already done.

YANDLE-ROTH: It becomes more difficult when you have multiple OUS institutions each with business and engineering degrees with a different focus, and creating something that fits those as well as community colleges.

Sharing of Articulation and Advising Guides:
GREEN: As we have these conversations between campuses about articulation, would it be possible to get from provosts not only articulation agreements that are in place but what is being worked on so the movement can be seen?

SCHUETTE: To have this articulation information accessible on a real time basis is critical.

BALDWIN: If the various colleges share their program articulation it will reduce the amount of work that needs doing. We can piggyback off each other.

VISITOR: Sometimes there are not written signed articulation documents but there is an agreed upon advising document or template which is used and might be helpful to share.

GREEN: We already have a database with articulation agreements. OUS will send what we have on record for each campus, and request you send us back the written things that go behind it, as well as items we do not yet know.

YANDLE-ROTH: JBAC has a file system that is probably the best spot for it. We have a forum of people on campuses who care about articulation and transfers.

SCHUETTE: Pat Baldwin, Dave McDonald, Connie Green, Elaine Yandle-Roth, and whomever you need to enlist will make sense of what is there and to make sure people in the field have access to it.

MERCER: I would like to point out there is a difference between articulation agreements and advising guides. We have an extensive collection of advising guides. Every year they are updated.

GREEN: Next expectations in this arena: Advising guides and templates as up to date as possible. Articulation agreements posted on the JBAC site. Work with Baldwin’s committee on which Articulation Agreements should be replicated at other CCs. We will make sure we are clear on what we ask for.

RHODES: This is all good movement to have the information and share it. It has to be maintained on a regular basis for it to be of any value. We need to do expectation management. You are still advising students and they don’t always do or hear
what you say. Students will always be saying, “My credits don’t transfer” as long as we have any requirements.

TURNER: There are a lot of documents. It makes more sense to send to JBAC the URLs from each institution to simplify updates. There will constantly be problems. The most effective way to proceed is where there are disciplines with large numbers of students that go back and forth and make sure those large pipelines are the ones being worked on in respect to articulation agreements. That seems to be a vital next step.

AAOT Comments:

WATSON: There was a formal recommendation from the CC Presidents’ Council that part of JBAC’s workplan will be looking at the AAOT in its entirety. The OTM might be a good transitional model while we look at the AAOT and the issues with it. The next year will not only be about implementing the OTM but looking at the AAOT and outcome based solutions.

FALK: The Presidents’ Council made it clear to the CIA that they need to continue looking at the AAOT. Our next step is to figure out where we are going.

WATSON: We do have a subcommittee of the CIA that will be working on the Transfer Module and the AAOT and the various issues.

CHRISTOPHER: Question: Regarding the transfer degree option in disciplines where lower division classes are prescribed. Will you be looking at this piece when examining the AAOT? If a student doesn’t get certain classes in the first two years they are not eligible to enter junior year.

SEVIGNY: Answer: What you described is the intention of Associate of Science Oregon Transfer degree. We have one of those in business, and we definitely need to have the same discussions as we have changes to AAOT and ASOT.

CONCERNS

POTTER: Concern: There are still many independent conversations and different places to go to get materials on the OTM. Would there be any way to link the minutes and other materials on JBAC in one central place. We need to be able to get all the information on a real time basis.

MCDONALD: Response: It will be done

KIRK: Concern: How many of the articulation barriers that students experience will be solved by the OTM?

YANDLE-ROTH: Response: The biggest recommendation we received in this process is that there is no substitute for academic advising. The OTM is primarily an advising tool to tell students that if they are going to be focused they should take solid general education, and if they know what they want to do they need major requirements as well. Some type of electronic degree auditing system is the most important next step. This is especially important for students who do not get advising at all. PSU has started in this area, but it should be extended statewide.

DAVIS: Response: We will be seeing a presentation on degree audit, a system called OLDA, which is used at PSU.

CHEREK: Concern: There is one issue that has not been talked about. For those of us that are practitioners, we need something that reports the curricular changes so
we don’t have to compare last year’s and this year’s schedule to see what has changed. We have something in place that allows institutions to post curricular changes annually. So far three schools have done it. Help in moving progress of this would be appreciated.

MCDONALD: **Response:** Would it help to have something more formal, a recommendation to have people do it?

CHEREK: **Response:** We need to start with an awareness because not everybody knows how important it is and how to make it happen.

SCHUETTE: **Response:** It is a good idea to have it come from EDP or JBAC or Provosts or CIA or whatever would be the right way to do it.

PHILLIPS: **Concern:** We have not talked about part-time students. They rarely seek nor obtain formal academic advising. They tend to attend several institutions. Many of them will at some point choose to obtain a Baccalaureate degree. At the articulation agreement I heard that the work that has taken place so far is not the solution, but it is a springboard for more discussion that will hopefully lead to an outcome based fully transferrable gen ed curriculum. If that can be accomplished, some of these issues will be easier to address.

**TOPIC 2: STUDENT DATA TRANSFER PROCESS**

**Current Status ENDsLEY:**
- The emphasis on the prototype has been K16 transfer back and forth and transition from high school primarily to OUS and CC.
- OSU’s IT folks and Lisa Mentz in PASS have been working with ODE and have a partnership with Beaverton and Multnomah school districts in Multnomah ESD. We are also working with OSU and Linn-Benton.
- Our current goal is to have a completed data transfer from K-12 to post-secondary and back to K-12.
- We have sent a mockup of a K-12 transcript and identified all data elements that should be sent.
- We have a finalized version of data elements set up, and we are figuring out how to move the information back and forth.
- The programming for the input side is basically done.
- Weekly progress updates are available, but only larger updates have been sent to board members.
- The following website you can visit for continual updates: [http://pass.ous.edu/?id=CSAP](http://pass.ous.edu/?id=CSAP)

**Future Steps ENDsLEY:**
- We need to test the programming so that each data type will get through.
- After that we will talk about how to scale up to all institutions and talk about how to transfer it into CCs that do not use Banner.
- We are currently working with K-12 on the extraction of data. That will take to the end of February.
- At the end of February, we will be running the prototype and debugging.
• In March, we should have a final projection on what is involved and what additional work needs to be done.

**Expected Status by March** ENDSLEY:
• We will have proof of concept for where information lives in both systems.
• Coding will be available.
• We will know the entire process from start to finish about how extraction works from K-12 to OUS and CC.
• We will have document showing the responsibilities of each sector.
• We will know what programming work will need to be done to upscale it across the system

**QUESTIONS:**
MCDONALD: **Question:** In March will you have for us an accurate flowchart of how the data went from point A to point B and possibly point C and D, as well as a calendar for that work?

ENDSLEY: **Answer:** Yes, with more detail than the initial conceptual flowchart with more specifics around exactly how it operates.

CHRISTOPHER: **Question:** At some point will an advisor will be able to look at a report about a student and see where they have been and what they have done at K-12, multiple CCs and several Universities?

ENDSLEY: **Answer:** That is the ultimate goal. The initial phase is the transfer of K-12 into postsecondary. The other important piece is that it also simplifies the transfer information from K-12 to K-12 site. This means immense cost saving to K-12 sector.

MCDONALD: **Answer:** This system is truly multidirectional, cross-sector, up and/or down between all sectors.

RHODES: **Question:** Are you addressing privacy issues pertinent to all of this?

ENDSLEY: **Answer:** That is built into the prototype. There are issues because there is a change in privacy requirements for K-12 students under 18, and the rules change when you transfer them across.

RHODES: **Question:** For returning students, How far back will the data in this system go?

ENDSLEY: **Answer:** We do not know the degree to which student information on the K-12 side will have the capacity to go back in time and pull information. Some extensively used systems like ESIS have been archiving data for some time. Districts with this system can go back quite far. Other districts will have nothing except the start point forward. We will probably still be processing paper transcripts for some time for older students as well as students in small schools that don’t have electronic information that they are tracking. Once it is entered electronically at any point, it can be transferred in all directions.

JOHNSON: **Concern:** The legislature isn’t quite as knowledgeable as the Governor’s Office. We have to make sure that certain key legislatures are working with the Governor’s Office to understand the work in the pipeline.
**Cross-Sector Communication:**

**DAVIS:** The provosts have a concern with the communication about what is going on with data transfer. The provosts have a subcommittee that was supposed to be involved with communication, and I'm not certain that has happened. We thought we would be more involved before it went too far down the line.

**GREEN:** We met in October for those who could make it. We agreed we would not meet again until there is a prototype to look at. Lisa Mentz is calling the group back together for 1/31/04 to discuss the prototype. The concern was that we wanted enough at the table to have a product before we met and blessed what could be.

**MILLER:** There has been good communication between Lisa, Mark Endsley, Bob Costi, and Doug Patterson because the IT part and moving forward is important. We want the IT base to make the data transfer happen.

**GREEN:** The CC piece has been left out and purposely so. The system had to work between OUS and K-12. With the CC we need to figure out whether we use OCCURS, and a lot of other things. I'm looking at CC presidents that I promised would be involved. We are waiting on that piece.

**ENDSLEY:** Kurt was involved early on in terms of data element pieces from CC perspective. We are trying to make sure we have CC involvement in Prototype. There have been meetings with CC folks, but not systemically.

**Project Responsibility:**

**ENDSLEY:** There is concern on K-12 side that suddenly what was viewed as cross-sector project that was initially sponsored by the joint boards has suddenly become such a priority of higher education and the EDP workgroup. The question may come up where is the most appropriate line of communication. Who has responsibility for making the decisions, Joint Boards or EDP Workgroup? How many people do they report to? How many times do we have to answer the same questions?

**SCHUETTE:** You probably have to answer the questions as many times as they are asked. There is high level of interest in this. The governor and all parties at the EDP table are interested. The question regarding whom to report to should be less confusing because members of joint boards, CIA, and provosts attend the EDP workgroup. The folks who are named in the left hand column of the workplan are the critical folks to be in communication with.

**ENDSLEY:** In one way or another we keep those people involved. Especially K-12 concern that this is becoming primarily a higher ed project, and that affects how people understand it.

**SCHUETTE:** It is not at all primarily a higher education project. Both boards are involved.

**ENDSLEY:** It is political. We need to make sure that it is clear to folks that it is still a collaborative project.

**GREEN:** It is clear. Vickie Flemming, James Sager, and others know whom it belongs to. The bottom line is that the group Gretchen is talking about on the workplan is the steering committee, and they will be brought together on 1/31/05 by Lisa
Mentz. Those people are the interfaces for K-12, CC, and OUS. If the steering committee is kept informed they will worry about the boards. It would be embarrassing if it was thought that we don’t know the line of communication. We do know what is going to happen and you can come to us if there is any question.

MCDONALD: Bottom line it is blessed by everybody involved. There is not a group that does not want this to happen.

**TOPIC 3: LINKED DEGREE AUDIT SYSTEM**

**OLDA (Oregon Linked Degree Audit) Team:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herb Cherek, UO</th>
<th>Wendy Mitchell, UO</th>
<th>Cindy Baccar, PSU</th>
<th>Valerie Ward, Mt Hood CC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Coe, UO</td>
<td>Karen Sprague, UO</td>
<td>Robert Mercer, PSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic Overview:**

WARD: The degree audit team is representative of collaborate work being done between CC and all educational institutions in the state. In May 2004, the Oregon Business department chairs and university deans, public and private, had a meeting at the UO. At that meeting, Geri Richmond, OSBHE, gave a challenge to come up with ideas that could be used to increase and enhance transfer across the state among institutions.

WARD: We used the partnership we had established among department chairs and university deans. We have a foundation of success because it is the same collaboration that developed the ASOT in Business. We desire to move things forward.

**Powerpoint Presentation:**

CHEREK: The linked degree audit system will offer a powerful advising tool for planning academic programs that lead sufficiently to degrees. This promotes collaboration that needs to happen to get the articulation agreements working. It facilitates seamless transfer from CC to university. It provides the student with the opportunity to find the best match between completed coursework and degree promotions. Allows the students to look at “what if” possibilities to see what is required in other programs. Eliminates costly advising errors that we all experience.

WARD: In our meetings with the institutions and CCs, we have addressed the items of greatest concern. What we are proposing leaves no institution behind. That is fundamental to the work we have done. It creates uniformity of information dissemination. Bill Christopher pointed out earlier that we need a system to keep information current, and OLDA can do that. It provides immediate information and feedback to students. It reduces redundancy of system-wide transfer and advising processes at statewide system level. Dave Phillips talked about the reams of paper available with advising guides. This should eliminate those system wide processes because the information is available instantly and at the system level.
CHEREK: **How it works:** There are two components required, and two phases to the process. The first phase will involve the OUS institutions, and the second will be the CCs. I will be primarily speaking about the first phase. What we have currently within the OUS system are two types of degree audit system. The first is DARS (Degree Audit Reporting System), standalone from the student information system. We also have CAPP (Curriculum Advising and Program Planning). What we need is an Internet system that will link the various 4-year schools together. What we will do is create a silo at each campus. The silo will contain transfer-articulation with each CC, which will show what course transfers to what equivalency at the other institution, and then the existing degree audit for all programs at that 4-year school. Right now when a campus receives a transcript it is manually articulated. This will do it automatically.

**What it will do:** Track coursework completed by individual students. Show which degree requirements have been met and which need to be completed. The resulting degree audit shows the kind of information we currently provide for our domestic students.

**What it adds:** It is an online resource for students and advisors to obtain information on transferring to other institutions. It can replace the paper articulation agreements that are on file. They will already be entered in the system. It will promote the collaboration between the units and departments and faculty so they will know exactly what course transfers as an equivalency for a given program. It also provides an immediate comparison of a student's completed or contemplated work at linked schools.

WARD: What we have found at Mt Hood Community College working closely with PSU is that they both have DARS and have implemented the linked degree audit system (CAS). We point students to use that system. If we find errors or opportunities to increase articulation or course equivalency opportunities, it generates motivation on our side immediately. When a student believes a program should be articulated but isn’t, they ask questions which results in updates to the equivalencies.

CHEREK: There is a package called CAS, which is supported by DARS. It is available and functioning in three statewide systems (Ohio, Arizona, Minnesota).

WARD: Nationwide there are 18 institutions currently connected to the CAS system. Portland State is one of those institutions.

CHEREK: To get started we need degree audit systems on university campuses. They do not need to be alike. They do not need to be in place at CC level. They do not require a transferable student record system. This is a standalone system. The cost: The license fee for a degree audit system (not linked) at a campus of 16,000 is $31,320.

WARD: Mt Hood CC is implementing DARS right now. Cost of $31,320 comes directly from the vendor.

CHEREK: Cost to implement a linked degree audit system: For all OUS campuses here would be a one-time fee of $85,857 plus annual maintenance of $15,454. When we implement phase 2 and the CCs, there is a one-time cost of $165,184 and annual maintenance cost of $29,733. The cost to implement a linked system (CAS) at a university would be approximately $160,000 for server, interface, and
project coordination. This is on top of the statewide costs. Project Coordination is for working closely with CCs and advisors to coordinate how the system works. Interface management will be needed, but is only provided for Banner, Peoplesoft, and Janzabar student systems.

WARD: We have spoken to students at institutions with stories about the costs of student self-advised transfer errors. This is because of a lack of dynamic information between institutions and programs.

Demonstration:

BACCAR: This demonstration will show you how to use the CAS system. When CAS was implemented at PSU we went to all community colleges to train advisors and have a full rollout. At PSU we started by using DARS, which meant building all of our degree plans and articulation agreements. After that work was done, CAS was the easy part. CAS is placed over the top of the internal DARS degree audit program, and it gives the public access to all the information.

- At PSU, the entrance site for the system is www.cas.pdx.edu. You can go in as a non-member or a member. This demonstration will show a member account with transcript information.
- The course equivalency guide shows how courses are accepted at PSU. The webpage asks you to select the school to which the courses will transfer. It shows you all states on the CAS network. Ohio has many institutions online. Oregon only has PSU currently. Once in PSU, can go into Chemeketa Community College, and see how courses transfer to PSU. (example: Chemeketa Bio 101, 102, & 103 transfer to PSU as 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, & 106) For courses that don’t have an equivalent match, it is still given lower division credit.
- A new function is to look up a course rather than an institution. You can enter in an exact course at PSU (example: PSY 321), and it will show all campuses that offer an equivalent course.
- A student can build a transcript and save it to their account. Currently, the student has to enter the transcript themselves. In the future, the student will be able to download their course history.
- The planning guide contains all of PSU’s degree programs. This will give the student a live audit of how their history will transfer to any major at PSU. It is unofficial, but it gives the student the information they need. It shows what degree requirements you have met in all aspects. It shows which subgroups you have completed, knows when to double count a course, knows when not to count equivalent courses from different campuses toward the same requirement.
- As well as regular degree audit, you can run a cross-reference audit. It will tell you what courses that are still required for your degree have equivalents at other institutions.
- What you saw in the presentation was all done by Portland State. The CCs benefit from this without any work. CAS takes advantage of the work that already goes on with the internal degree audit system.
**General Comments:**

**ORR:** I had the opportunity to be part of the steering committee on the Arizona CAS implementation. It grew out of the Arizona General Education core curriculum that is very similar to where Oregon is headed with the OTM. We got a statewide license and brought it in to all institutions in the state. We had two goals: to transfer seamlessly from CCs to Universities, and also to transfer seamlessly between CCs. We added changes to the interface seen here including live links on course names that take you instantly to the registration site to easily add courses to the student's matrix. We also enhanced the reports so they looked a lot less technical than the current PSU interface. Each semester became more student-friendly. I give the CAS system 100 percent endorsement. In Arizona the CCs were concerned about how to pay for it. Arizona received significant discounts by negotiating as a state serving as a pilot. The CCs that implemented DARS began to see savings in degree checking and advising costs that helped justify the cost.

**MERCER:** While we think it is a good idea for all institutions to use the same degree audit system (DARS), there may be resistance from some state institutions that use different internal degree auditing systems. (For example, Oregon State uses a Banner-related system). The wonderful thing about CAS is that it can be implemented statewide without everyone having a DARS system.

**VAN VLIET:** Concern: It has to be dynamic. Whenever somebody changes a course the system needs to reflect that change or it won’t have any value.

**CHRISTOPHER:** Response: We are talking about templates. They are already updated every year. Some place a lot of that work is already being done.

**ORR:** Response: Yes, the templates are just in a different format. With the new system it will be the same staff doing the same thing but they will be doing it electronically.

**MCDONALD:** The OLDA team is very symbolic about the work that has been in the workgroup. They are cross-sector and are getting things done.

**Support for the CAS System:**

**SEVIGNY:** As an academic advisor, helping a student figure out what they want to do requires sitting down a long time with a pencil and paper figuring out options. This system will save so much of my time as an advisor.

**CHRISTOPHER:** We know our advisors are doing this. Someone else pointed out that in our admissions dept, folks who certify transcripts for graduation are also doing it, because they have to do it again, and probably by hand.

**BACCAR:** The advantage for PSU to go to this system is that rather than having seven people evaluate a course from another campus (for example, Science 101 from the UO), every time a transcript comes through, it centralizes the work.

**ORR:** Students use the CAS system to shop for degrees, calculating how many classes are needed to be different majors.
TURNER: This system also addresses the student who decides not to follow the advisor’s advice because they can see what happens if they decide they don’t want to take biology or chemistry to save time.

MERCER: The most likely misinformation with student transfer is around major transfers, often because the student hasn’t decided on a major. This system will let you know. We like the idea that any student can figure out any possibility they like. It’s sometimes the most at risk student, who might be part time, makes less connection with advising, and drops in and out of various CCs. This student can still create a transcript and always know where they stand.

Costs:

CHRISTOPHER: It has been my experience that any projects like this it makes more sense to look for funding on a Systemwide level rather than individual institution costs.

ORR: In Arizona we received a state appropriation that covered all institution costs. It eliminated the need for articulation agreements. All institutions were required to keep their information up to date. Arizona State hosted the hardware part of it.

SAGER: Please include staffing costs in ultimate costs. We don’t want to go to the legislature and governor asking for $300,000 only to find out it costs $1.3 million.

ORR: There is also a small annual cost.

CHRISTOPHER: There is concern about the staff time it takes for people to do this. We have to understand that a lot of this is already being done. It shouldn’t be an additional cost. It should be a move of staff.

ORR: Your staff is already doing grad checking. We found there was a whole lot of staff time saved in grad checking to be applied to this project. They are automating that step.

Next Steps:

TURNER: This will be shown to IFS at their meeting in February to introduce the university faculty to the system.

SCHUETTE: If we can have a concerted effort and have the provosts and deans buy into this it seems like it will save a lot of people a lot of time.

DAVIS: There’s not much more work that needs to be done in terms of what it needs to take. It’s a matter of getting it there.

SCHUETTE: With Ralph Orr, Joe Johnson, and Bill Christopher we might want to bring it to presidents and CIA and make sure there is an understanding and buy-in there.

SCHUETTE: Ralph Orr, it might be helpful if you are willing to represent CC folks and work with the team. Connie Green was suggesting Joan Truesdale from CCWD also to make sure they bring in the variety of CC concerns. We need to know the process steps as well as ultimate costs to move forward.

SCHUETTE: Lorraine, do you want a specific provost involved?

DAVIS: I would probably say Sabah. Karen Sprague continues to be involved.

DAVIS: Somebody from OSU with the CAPP system should be involved.
TOPIC 4: DUAL ENROLLMENT FRAMEWORK

Overview, RHODES:
The presidents of PSU as well as our largest CC partners, PCC, Mt Hood, and Chemeketa have formed a higher ed consortium. Fall term is our target date to roll out a common web location that students can go to with a common admissions form for all institutions in the consortium.

- There will be access to all schedules of classes and they will be able to register for courses online at any college.
- The financial aid package is still hanging out there, because we may need a statewide waiver to combine some of the packages into a financial aid package for students.
- We would have advising links for students to get answers at any campus involved. Student services are included as well.
- We eventually want to tie in offering upper division PSU courses at the CC campuses so students can complete various courses without commuting. We are going to pilot those on programs with the most transfers so that students can see and plan for the courses at the CC level. Not all degree programs or courses would necessarily be offered at the CC.
- We are talking about potential pool buying possibilities. There is joint purchasing power in Statewide CAS, joint student IDs, and other services.
- Potentially shared positions so there are people at all locations to talk about options regardless of which campus the student is on.
- We are looking at IT possibilities to bring all of this together in one portal. We do not want to require any software or hardware. We want to use what is in place to bring it together.

SCHUETTE: We are hoping the work of this consortium can be expanded statewide and ultimately used by others.

RHODES: There is usefulness for the students because students are already crossing institution lines. We are trying to find ways to facilitate that, and hopefully find some models that will work elsewhere in the state. We are hoping to standardize it so it works everywhere without needing four systems.

CHRISTOPHER: We are not talking about all students. We are not trying to impose this on students in programs where it doesn’t apply.

SCHUETTE: We will bring this back in a future meeting and at a time when there is progress to show so people can weigh in on how it might have greater applicability.

TOPIC 5: ACCELERATED HIGH SCHOOL COURSES

GREEN: The Legislative House Education Committee are very excited about acceleration and how CCs will connect with everybody. They asked us to bring our partners in to talk about acceleration at their 1/31 meeting. We are going to use a draft of a progress report created for a 1/21 State Board meeting. It contains AP, International Baccalaureate, Dual Credit, and Tech Prep. It also
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illustrates different kinds of examples on how we do things differently, including
the PACE program at Scio HS, what’s happening at Lane county with the
Regional Education Center, Clackamas Middle College, etc. It has a variety
of information describing how we have taken elements and regrouped them to
create acceleration. That will be the basis of the report to the legislature so they
can see how we’re doing acceleration for HS students and acceleration for CC
students between CC and OUS.

GREEN: Distributed for this meeting was the summary for the 9/15/04 summit. It gives
you the back piece of it. We had a meeting with Earl Potter, Cheryl Falk, Salam
Noor, and myself to talk about where to go next with some acceleration pieces.
POTTER: One of the main issues in increasing opportunities for HS students and
access to dual credit courses is the availability of teachers at high schools. The
shortages have resulted in a workgroup across the systems to address this issue
and the OAR that sets up the framework for qualification of teachers in particular.
GREEN: We have CC folks that have volunteered to be in that working group, and
Lorraine and I have taken some CC concerns and are trying to track down those
concerns so that we are not only talking about the future but remedying gaps of
understanding.

TOPIC 6: STUDENT RETENTION

MCDONALD: As many of you know the CC’s and OUS have been asked to complete a
matrix of retention best practices. Five of the seven OUS campuses and 11 of 17
CCs have done so. We will be proceeding to complete this. We are also looking
at how CC’s analytical model can apply to OUS. We are looking at linking
existing retention performance standards and seeing if there is a connection
between that and the analytical model. There are many other activities being
worked on by the group. We will discuss further at the next meeting.

TOPIC 7: CAPACITY COURSES/ONLINE DELIVERY

GOULARD: There isn’t a resource provided in the state budget to move forward. John
Miller, John Moseley, and myself agreed to come back and review for the next
session. We will track what are those capacity courses and bottleneck courses
and what we should invest in for online delivery. We should potentially bring it
back and the end of spring. This appears to be something we should come back
to and be focused on for next legislative session. We have the information and
the Governor has asked for it, but we know it did not pass in the Governor's
budget.
SCHUETTE: We still want to set up an ongoing process for sustained cross-sector
efforts so we continue to track the issue.
GOULARD: That’s what we are working on.
VISITOR: John Moseley reported there might be some value in having a best practice
group.
TOPIC 8: COORDINATION OF AGENDA WITH JOINT BOARDS OF EDUCATION

SCHUETTE: Mark Endsley brought up the issue of coordination of agendas. We can do some further conversation offline. We have the elements to make sure there is good coordination, but we might come back with greater clarity about looping into the same agenda.