CALL TO ORDER
A meeting of the State Board of Higher Education Executive Committee was called to order by Vice President Jim Lussier at 10:03 a.m.

ROLL CALL
On roll call, the following Executive Committee members answered present:

Mr. Jim Lussier
Mr. Don VanLuvanee (arrived at 10:13 a.m.)
Mr. Tom Imeson
Ms. Leslie Lehmann (arrived at 10:05 a.m.)
Ms. Phyllis Wustenberg

Absent: None.

Other Board members present: Roger Bassett, Kerry Barnett, Geri Richmond

Chancellor’s Office staff: Bob Bruce, Nancy Goldschmidt, Mike Green, Marilyn Lanier, Bob Simonton, Susan Weeks

Others: Phillip Creighton (EOU), Elaine Deutschman (IFS), Martha Anne Dow (OIT), Dave Frohnmayer (UO), Lesley Hallick (OHSU), Mark McCambridge (OSU), Paul Risser (OSU), Betty Youngblood (WOU), Elizabeth Zinser (SOU)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
The Board dispensed with the reading of the January 18, 2002, Executive Committee minutes. Ms. Wustenberg moved and Mr. Imeson seconded the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Lussier, VanLuvanee, Imeson, Lehmann and Wustenberg. Those voting no: none.

CLASSROOM BUILDING PURCHASE BY PSU
Bob Simonton, OUS director of capital construction, stated that PSU seeks Board approval to authorize the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration to complete the proposed purchase of two parcels of land with office facilities and associated parking, located at 621 SW Jackson Street and 1975 SW Sixth Avenue in Portland, Oregon, from
Mr. Beau Bradley, for a maximum of $625,000 plus closing costs for both parcels. Board approval is being sought to purchase the facilities using Article XI-F(1) bonds. He explained that the buildings are currently being leased by PSU.

Staff Recommendation to the Executive Committee:

Staff recommends that the Executive Committee approve on behalf of the Board, PSU’s request to purchase two properties, located at 612 SW Jackson Street and 1975 SW Sixth Street in Portland, Oregon, from Mr. Beau Bradley, for a maximum of $625,000 plus closing costs, assuming all conditions are met and that the final purchase details are agreed upon by all parties, subject to final approval by the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration.

Executive Committee Discussion and Action

Mr. Imeson moved and Ms. Wustenberg seconded the motion to approve on behalf of the Board the purchase of property by PSU as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Lussier, VanLuvanee, Imeson, Lehmann, and Wustenberg. Those voting no: none.

Vice Chancellor Anderes reminded the Board that Talbot, Korvola, and Warwick (TKW) provided initial findings regarding the OSU shortfall at the February 2002 Board meeting and is presenting the final recommendations and summary.

Brad Rafish, TKW partner, stated that TKW’s analysis indicated OSU’s shortfall was less than initially reported. The original estimation of $19.2 million was reduced by reconciling mathematical errors and overstatements of expenditures in the amount of $5.9 million. The shortfall was further reduced by identifying desired incremental versus mandated expenditures and the final shortfall determination was determined to be $6.78 million. The evaluation also reviewed assumptions made and documentation that supported OSU’s projected shortfall and considered the plan they put together to help provide solutions.

Mr. Rafish explained that the reasons and methods by which the projected shortfall was identified included mathematical errors made during the preparation of the preliminary budget; OSU commitments made without determining whether resources were available to fund
those commitments; a significant delay in the budget preparation process; and inadequate communication between individuals responsible for budget development. Based on those items, TKW attempted to identify recommendations that would ensure that projected shortfalls and these types of problems would not occur in the future. He explained that both OUS and OSU identified several specific solutions. OSU will use its existing accounting system to a greater extent to ensure that day to day financial information and the analysis of financial operations would take place. Other solutions include developing a network of university business managers to assist in periodic reviews; improving communication among university administration reporting units and stakeholders; analyzing each unit’s financial position; incorporating the use of enhanced economic modeling; preparing monthly financial statements for the Chancellor’s office; and preparing quarterly financial status reports for the president.

Mr. Rafish explained that additional recommendations by TKW included: instituting a comprehensive review by the OSU vice president of finance and administration focusing on assumptions and calculations made for the preliminary budget; including reserves as a resource in beginning fund balance of the initial annual budget to ensure an accurate understanding of the university’s financial position; monitoring resources; and ensuring that projected revenues and expenditures are updated in a timely manner.

Ms. Wustenberg asked why the beginning fund balance wasn’t already included. Vice Chancellor Anderes explained that, historically, more discretion was allowed in the use of the fund balances within each department as opposed to at a university-wide level.

Mark McCambridge, OSU vice president for finance and administration, explained that TKW encourages colleges to bill the fund balances if they are identified as directly tied to future initiatives or goals. OSU reviews all fund balances in the institution when determining budget, but those fund balances held in non-central institutional funds have not been included. He explained that Mr. Rafish’s suggestion would require that OSU include those funds sweeping the fund balances. Mr. McCambridge felt that if OSU were to take all of the fund balances from the specific units and allocate them as discretionary dollars to be distributed by the institution, it would take away the incentive on the part of specific units to save money.
Ms. Wustenberg felt that it is just as important to account for the dollars as to indicate how they are used. She felt that public dollars shouldn’t be hidden in the accountability process. If funds have been earmarked as a savings for a specific purpose, that’s fine, but the public should know the funds are there. Mr. McCambridge assured the Board that OSU clearly reports its total fund balance.

Ms. Wustenberg asked for clarification then that the recommendation is to include the beginning fund balance, including reserves, to be designated a resource. Mr. Rafish explained that, during the course of its analysis of the projected shortfall, TKW identified $850,000 which was not included as part of the fund balance and potential reserves, therefore, the shortfall was adjusted accordingly. He expressed the importance of ascertaining a true picture of total resources available for the university and that those dollars be included in the initial identification.

Mr. Lussier asked how the errors occurred, whether corrective actions are being implemented to ensure against future problems, and what is the plan to address the $6 million projected shortfall.

Mr. Rafish said that, based on what was identified as the cause of the problem and the subsequent solution plan, OSU has adequately addressed the initial shortage such as to balance the budget and address the $6 million shortfall. He felt that, from a management perspective, the recommendations appear to be adequate.

Dr. Richmond expressed concern that the new budget allow for scholarships to be payed. Mr. McCambridge assured the Board that the scholarships will be honored.

Staff Recommendation to the Executive Committee:

Staff recommends that the Executive Committee approve, on behalf of the Board, the TKW Performance Audit of the OSU budget process and redesign plan. Board approval assumes implementation of all TKW recommendations and OSU solutions. OSU will review, within one year, the implementation of recommendations and report the status to the Board.
Executive Committee Discussion and Action

Ms. Lehmann moved and Mr. VanLuvanee seconded the motion to approve, on behalf of the Board, the TKW Performance Audit of the OSU budget process and redesign plan as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Lussier, VanLuvanee, Imeson, Lehmann, and Wustenberg. Those voting no: none.

UO President Frohnmayer stated that the UO tuition proposal is the result of a problem created through the success it has had in recruiting record numbers of students at a time when 17 percent of UO classrooms have gone offline for a renovation project. He noted that, when Gilbert Hall comes back online in two years, it will be the world’s most modern business education and liberal arts undergraduate education facility. He explained that this proposal has been carefully examined, and the basis of it is to allow a tuition discount to be used for off-hours classes in such a way that the university can serve a greater number of students throughout the balance of a whole class day in a way that better utilizes the classroom facilities. This is one of the ways in which UO is attempting, through innovative use of a pricing mechanism, to deal with issues of capacity and hopes that this will serve as a pilot project, if approved by this Board, that will allow other institutions to investigate variations in tuition fees.

Dr. Moseley explained that this proposal is designed to spread classes and students more evenly throughout the day, allowing UO to accommodate the increase in enrollment, and will spread tuition more equitably among students. He explained that the current plateau model actually represents a subsidy by students who take fewer credit hours to students who take more. The new proposal doesn’t completely eliminate the subsidy, which, in proportion to the total cost of education, has grown directly as tuition has grown. He said that this proposal would provide some lower cost alternatives, thus enhancing access, particularly to those students for whom cost is the major barrier to obtaining a higher education. In addition, he explained that the proposal would provide more choices for students in terms of cost, time of day, and total number of courses.

Dr. Moseley cautioned that this proposal is presented as an example and not a specific request. For the final tuition proposal, UO will approach the Board in June, but the request before the Board today is for approval to move forward on the concept of developing such a
proposal. He explained that, in the *University of Oregon Example of Possible Tuition Structure for 2002-2003*, the numbers are based on a 3 percent net increase after enrollment incentives and time of day discounts. He clarified that the proposed 3 percent is the number that has been previously discussed with respect to the currently approved budget and that it is a revenue-neutral proposal. He illustrated how the plan would work based on the proposed incentives, which includes discounts for increased credits and off-peak times of day. He noted that the average carrying load for UO students is 13.5 credit hours and said that this new proposal would encourage students to carry a heavier load and complete their degrees in a more timely fashion. He noted that there are opportunities for students to take a full load of courses and actually pay less tuition than they would this year under the current model.

Dr. Moseley noted that there are still some issues that need fine tuning and pointed out that not every course, such as science labs and some other exceptions, can be discounted. He asked that the Board approve the concept of this proposal as a three-year pilot plan, which will be fine-tuned annually, and periodically reported to the Board. He was optimistic that, within a two or three year period, UO will be able to optimize the situation. He noted that this is not necessarily the best solution for all other institutions although there may be variations on this solution that will work well. Other institutions would have to look at their market, capacity, and enrollment pressure to determine what kind of a model works best for them. He requested Board approval to move forward in developing the proposal to be brought back to the Board in June for final approval.

Mr. Imeson stated that this is the kind of approach that is consistent with what the Board is requesting in development of the new budget model, which is giving additional latitude to institutions. Chancellor Cox expressed enthusiasm for this kind of experimentation. He felt that, if the System can increase the utilization of its facilities by as little as 5 percent, it would make a tremendous difference.

President Frohnmayer cautioned that studying this for a year won’t be beneficial because UO will first need to test the market. He recognized that there is a degree of risk, but if the Board wishes to encourage innovation, this is something UO would encourage the Board to endorse. However, he noted that many of the brochures, manuals and explanations for next year need to go to press immediately and he requested a reasonable assurance from the
Board and from its Executive Committee that UO will have the
authority to move forward when it presents the final proposal in June.

Mr. Lussier asked about the potential impact of the proposal and
whether UO had a sense of its acceptability. Dr. Moseley explained
that there have been numerous discussions with faculty and students.
He noted that it is uncertain whether it will have a positive or negative
impact but he felt confident that any negative impact would be
minimal. He felt that the proposal would have a positive impact by
increasing carrying load by the second year of implementation as
students begin to understand the concept. In addition, the new
proposal may decrease the number of students dropping courses. He
pointed out that it is only in the first week of each term that students
may drop courses and be partially reimbursed for tuition. He pointed
out that there is a real cost to the university for students signing up for
more courses than they really intend to take and he hopes this
proposal will encourage students to apply more discipline into making
those decisions.

Ms. Lehmann commended the entrepreneurial and creative idea,
noting that most of the Board’s tuition discussion to date has centered
around the dilemma of students opposing any increases as costs of
providing services continue to rise. Historically, tuition increases have
been a simplistic discussion and she hoped this would mark the
beginning of creative thought about tuition, how the subject of tuition
is approached, and how people perceive benefits in relation to tuition.

Dr. Moseley noted that there are many students for whom cost is an
issue and this proposal attempts to accommodate those students. He
noted, however, there are also many students for whom availability of
courses and quality are primary issues and would therefore be willing
to pay a little more for those courses. He noted that the inability to
make even modest increases in tuition at a time of significant
legislative budget cuts is certain to impact students. He opined that
this proposal may address at least some of those issues by keeping
available courses that would otherwise be facing cuts.

Ms. Wustenberg noted that, if it’s done correctly to the advantage of
the student, it is more complicated than it appears, pointing out that
classes should be scheduled in a manner that would assist the largest
number of students toward completing their degrees. Dr. Moseley
stated that one of the objectives is to offer 25 percent of UO credit
hours under one of the discounted times. He explained that UO is
concentrating on those courses that meet general education requirements and meet the requirements of larger majors and upper-division electives. Dr. Moseley stated that the success of the pilot would be measured by carrying load, retention, average progress toward degrees, classroom utilization, and whether students are taking advantage of the new options.

Staff Recommendation to the Executive Committee:

Staff recommends the Executive Committee approve, on behalf of the Board, the University of Oregon’s request for permission to develop a proposal to shift to a per-credit-hour tuition plan with enrollment incentives and time-of-day discounts, narrowing the current plateau to 14-16 credit hours with all other credits to be charged on a per-credit-hour basis and, at the University’s discretion, to allow some undergraduate courses to offered at a lower rate when unused classrooms are available.

Executive Committee Discussion and Action

Mr. VanLuvanee moved and Mr. Imeson seconded the motion to approve, on behalf of the Board, the UO tuition pilot proposal request as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Lussier, VanLuvanee, Imeson, Lehmann, and Wustenberg. Those voting no: none.

Mr. Simonton explained that OSU has recently completed a $9 million athletics building and proposes naming the facility the Merritt Truax Indoor Practice Facility, noting that the administrative rules require Board approval to name any building or structure after a living person. He explained that Mr. Truax is a 1934 graduate of OSU and he and his family have been long time supporters of OSU. Vice Chancellor Anderes explained that this is one of many gifts received from Mr. Truax, noting his continued generosity to OSU. Mr. Simonton added that the building was funded solely through donations.

Staff Recommendation to the Executive Committee:

Staff recommends that the Executive Committee approve, on behalf of the Board, that a new indoor practice facility be named the "Merritt Truax Indoor Practice Facility" in honor of Merritt Truax, a strong supporter of the University.
Executive Committee—Minutes

March 15, 2002

Executive Committee Discussion and Action

Mr. Imeson moved and Mr. VanLuvanee seconded the motion to approve, on behalf of the Board, the naming of a new indoor practice facility at OSU as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Lussier, VanLuvanee, Imeson, Lehmann, and Wustenberg. Those voting no: none.

Chancellor Cox, referring to the recent special session, stated that OUS is currently facing an 8.5 percent reduction in General Fund. He noted there are impacts from the Federal Economic Stimulus Act, which Congress passed and the President signed, that have serious consequences for the state because of tax code connections and a variety of technical issues. He said it could mean additional cuts of $148 million and it is likely there will be a third special session in June.

He explained that in the most recent set of reductions and re-balances the Governor identified $80.7 million in reductions across all agencies, which went beyond the reductions the legislature had previously made. These are serious reductions that fall most heavily upon OSU because of the targeted nature of the cuts.

Vice Chancellor Anderes discussed the proposed cuts, specifically in relation to the targeted cuts affecting OSU, noting that the targeted cuts are disproportionate to OSU. He explained that the Governor’s office has requested the System identify specific areas of reduction within certain programs. Chancellor Cox noted that, with respect to the statewide programs, reductions of state General Fund support may also effectuate the loss of matching federal dollars.

Mr. Kerans stated that the Governor and the legislative leadership are engaged in a struggle over budget processes and the philosophy of budget development and support. He said the Governor believes that if the budget is going to be developed it should have continuing revenues associated with the expenditures, and not be funded from a series of one-time non-recurring funds. The impacts of his action, by taking and publishing an administrative rule under the Allotment Control Act and excising particular program functions through this budget, impacts not just the OUS budget but other General Fund supported budgets as well. He explained that significant cuts are being applied throughout the state and the Governor and Budget Management Division expect that the rule would impact the next fiscal year.
Mr. Kerans explained that the Governor remains pessimistic regarding the continuing revenue forecasts and will again seek permanent revenues or permanent cuts in order to bring the budget into balance. The Governor is including in his administrative rule a provision that stipulates, if the suits, which are expected to be filed immediately to overturn the administrative rule, are successful, then the cuts will take place in an across-the-board process, which the allotment control law does permit.

Chancellor Cox noted that the universities still need to take action, citing notification requirements for personnel which are legally binding contracts and will produce tremendous hardship for many, regardless of the outcome of the special session.

Chancellor Cox continued that the institutions and the System have been anticipating the need to bring spending under a different ceiling and have been holding positions vacant and deferring expenditures to a significant level across all seven institutions and in the Chancellor's office. Potential cuts in June would tax the System beyond its ability to manage without layoffs and contract terminations. The institutions and the System will face non-renewal of contracts and, in some cases, will have to break contracts. He noted that the 3 percent tuition increase has already been factored into the numbers and there has been no signal from the legislature, or the executive branch, that an additional tuition increase to offset some of the cuts will be considered.

Mr. Kerans explained that, if the legislature is successful in its lawsuit against the Governor, then the Governor's administrative rule will call for an eight tenths of one percent reduction in all General Fund budgets across-the-board. If the lawsuit is not successful, negotiations between the executive and legislative branches will ensue.

Ms. Wustenberg questioned the wisdom of trying to attract more students given the current crisis. Chancellor Cox noted that the demand for higher education is at a national high. Both UO and OSU expect record enrollments in fall 2002. He related how, in the wake of significant budget cuts, the University of Wisconsin recently froze enrollment applications, only to have the legislature respond by cutting $14 million more from the budget to impress its position that higher education accept all academically qualified Wisconsin high school graduates. He cautioned that OUS not make that same
mistake. He stated that Oregon’s legislature has not historically supported enrollment caps and in two of the last five sessions has instructed the universities to accept all academically qualified Oregon residents. Dr. Richmond pointed out that current graduate student applications have also significantly increased.

President Risser noted the System has been working toward entering the high tech sector in terms of engineering, providing upper-division graduate programs in Central Oregon and addressing the natural resources and community strengths around the State, yet these are the programs that are facing significant cuts, and have sparked the current political struggle.

Mr. Bassett suggested that the current dilemma underscores the fundamental quality-of-life struggle that is much larger than the current economic crisis. He argued that the universities aren’t in this bind because of the economy, but because of the combination of the economy and 10 years of cut-and-cap taxes in the state. He felt that the economy might recover but the negative effects of cut-and-cap policies will endure. He observed what appears to be a struggle over whether, as taxpayers, Oregonians will chose to invest in the future. He argued that if Oregonians can’t find a way to break the downward spiral of cut-and-cap, the System can expect a series of annual 10 percent cuts over the next two or three biennia. He said it is imperative that the Board find some way to publically vocalize the importance of the future of higher education.

Mr. Lussier encouraged the Board to prepare a statement with reference to the devastating and detrimental impact these reductions will have on the System and the services it provides Oregonians. Chancellor Cox suggested a subcommittee of the Board draft a statement to present at the April meeting.

Mr. Imeson noted that there is little support for the Governor’s additional reductions. He expressed the need to proceed with caution given the current political environment. Chancellor Cox pointed out that the Governor stands firm behind his objective to protect undergraduate education. Ms. Lehmann said that even minor victories won’t resolve the long-term issues and suggested the Board approach the public with the reality of how much access and quality can be provided given available resources.
Mr. Lussier stated his concern that at some point in time the Board will need to say to the general public that these impacts, and not internal politics, jeopardizes the stewardship for the System. He stated that, although the System has, in the past, improved efficiencies with fewer revenues, it has reached a point where it can no longer do so.

Mr. Bassett suggested the Board develop a script that members can take with them to other meetings so the message could be a single, unified message from the Board. Mr. Imeson felt that the greater difficulty facing the Board is the longer term disinvestment in the future of higher education. He agreed with Mr. Bassett that it would have greater impact to spread the message in other forums rather than simply as a formal position of the Board. He stated that there has not historically been sufficient state support, therefore the Board needs to address the fundamental issue of a long-term, sustainable budget. Ms. Wustenberg noted that the problem of shrinking state support exists in all levels of education, not just in higher education, and that the trend has been to dis-invest in Oregon’s youth.

Mr. VanLuvanee acknowledged that the issue is highly political. He expressed frustration that the Board seems to be receiving conflicting message to discontinue doing the same things but to not do anything different. He said he would be willing to draft a letter stating the Board’s position. Chancellor Cox offered to have staff create talking points for the Board. Citing the WOU presidential search, Mr. VanLuvanee noted that, if the issue of financial support isn’t resolved, the System will continue to lose good leadership. Mr. Imeson noted that the problem isn’t just the state appropriations for higher education, but shrinking state funds overall.

Ms. Wustenberg opined that a tax initiative dedicated to higher education would protect the System from being politically vulnerable. Chancellor Cox suggested the Board explore the viability of charter universities.

Chancellor Cox stated that the Board faces a serious challenge regarding presidential compensation, particularly with two searches in progress. He stated that great presidents are needed in good times and are critical in tough times. He pointed out that there are extraordinarily gifted people leading OUS institutions, yet over the last decade, their compensation packages have slipped, and there were years when the presidents and Chancellor voluntarily rejected
increases. The System is now searching for a president for WOU and for a Chancellor at a time when the compensation packages are outside of the market for attracting good leadership. He expressed the need to find other ways, perhaps from a combination of General Fund adjustments and foundation funds, to allay the competitive disadvantage. He recognized that the System can’t expect to be at the high end, but noted that the need to be more competitive is pressing.

Mr. Imeson asked for clarification that the Board has to approve any compensation, regardless of where the funds originate. Chancellor Cox explained that, with respect to base compensation and the expenses incident to the position, those numbers come to the Board on an annual basis for approval. He explained that the Chancellor is required to obtain approval of the Board president and share recommendations with the Executive Committee in the case of foundation support for presidential compensation.

Mr. Imeson felt that the Board should address the issue of total compensation rather than just salary; should determine the target salary and what portion could be paid through General Funds; and should identify how much should be funded through other sources. Chancellor Cox proposed a plan that would address the compensation target over several biennia and asked that the Board direct the Chancellor and the campuses to determine the means by which those objectives could be met. He said he would have the proposal ready for the April Board meeting and advised that compensation proposals be based on performance and achievement. He expects the process could be completed in sufficient time to allow the Search Committees the necessary tools for negotiation with candidates in the ongoing searches.

Susan Weeks, OUS chief information officer, noted that the technology plan which Board members have received is only a draft. She said the final version for presentation to the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management and Technology will be ready in April and she encouraged the Board to comment on the plan.

Ms. Weeks explained that the plan was originally developed in response to the biennial budget authorization. The plan needed to reflect a perspective that was Systemwide and addressed issues of IT purchasing and asset management. OUS included the larger array of management and planning issues from both a System and campus
perspective, in the process fostering productive professional relationships with the Oregon Department of Administrative Services (DAS), other education sectors, and the private sector.

Ms. Weeks said that topics in the plan include: technology and the university enterprise; technology partnerships; the direction OUS is headed; organization and management structures within the System and at the campuses; costs and resources in technology; and different frameworks for accountability. Underlying the plan is the recognition that technology is ubiquitous as a part of classroom teaching, both in traditional campus programs as well as distance education, through the use of web technologies, libraries, and connecting the research community through internet use.

She noted that the System plays a strong leadership role in a number of partnerships, one of the most significant being the Wide Area Network, which includes the Oregon Public Education Network, and the DAS networks. Technical staff provide the management and, in the Chancellor’s office, provide the administrative support and management of the Owen system.

Ms. Weeks noted that new construction projects Systemwide are being designed with technology in mind. In telecommunications, she explained, staff is researching developments in voice-over internet protocol. She noted that security is becoming an increasingly important issue at the state level and that higher education is further along than most other state agencies in developing policies, plans and firewalls to address security concerns and some individual campuses also have their own IT security plans. Ms. Weeks stated that the Oregon Public Higher Education Information System is being coordinated through the Office of Institutional Research in the Chancellor’s office and will become the foundation for the Board information system. It will provide the collection of data on students, courses, degrees, faculty, budgets, and human resource information and will be accessible via web technologies the public as well as individuals within higher education.

Ms. Weeks noted that technology costs on campuses are the function of many factors. She pointed out that even those institutions not offering a traditionally technical curriculum may also have high technology costs resulting from the infusion of curriculums with technology.
She explained that there is a centralized structure with respect to the four regional universities and the Chancellor’s office. There are decentralized structures with much greater autonomy, she added, at the campus level, and an even greater diffusion of technology across departments within the campuses. She explained that the large universities also have further decentralized structures as determined by the scope of research programs and graduate programs that have specialized technology needs.

Ms. Weeks stated that IT audits are performed annually, both internally and externally, through the internal audit division and through external Secretary of State contract audits. She explained that, in the course of preparing the IT plan, OUS has developed a framework for displaying and presenting IT expenditures to the legislature, and the legislative fiscal office agrees with the OUS approach, which should be helpful in preparing future presentations to the legislature. She stated that OUS has developed a common reporting system and database called IT Metrics, which is included in the plan.

She added that some immediate goals include coordinating security and disaster recovery planning, developing asset management, and connecting IT reporting to the fiscal accountability framework. OUS is also developing ways to streamline IT expenditure reporting and to further refine IT Metrics.

Responding to Mr. Bassett’s concerns regarding past problematic relationships with other state agencies, Ms. Weeks assured the Board that the current plan has been well received and OUS is working collaboratively and effectively with other agencies.

Dr. Anderes noted that a tremendous amount of work went into this plan. Mr. Lussier commended Ms. Weeks and her staff for the excellent work in putting this plan together.

ADJOURNMENT The Executive Committee meeting adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

Diane Vines
Secretary of the Board

Don VanLuvanee
President of the Board