Minutes

Committee members present: Kerry Barnett, Roger Bassett, Leslie Lehmann, Jim Lussier, Geri Richmond (via telephone), Erin Watari, Bill Williams, Phyllis Wustenberg, Tim Young and Don VanLuvanee.

Chancellor’s Office staff present: Tom Anderes, Bob Bruce, Shirley Clark, Chancellor Cox, Bob Dryden, David McDonald, Bob Simonton, Diane Vines, Susan Weeks

Others: Dan Bernstine (PSU), Ron Bolstad (SOU), Phil Creighton (EOU), Elaine Deutschman (IFS), Martha Anne Dow (OIT), Dave Frohnmayer (UO), Lesley Hallick (OHSU), John Minahan (WOU), Paul Risser (OSU)

Meeting attendees also included other institutional representatives, other members of the Chancellor’s Office staff, and interested observers.

Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 8:47 a.m. by Co-chair Lehmann, and roll call was conducted by Board Secretary Diane Vines.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Bassett moved and Mr. Lussier seconded the motion to approve the April 19, 2002, Joint Committees meeting minutes as submitted. The motion unanimously passed.

Strategic Planning Discussion

Ms. Lehmann explained that, due to the significance of the strategic planning process, it is important that Board members and presidents be fully engaged and informed. She provided a brief report on the progress of the two work sessions, explaining that the results have been synthesized and recommendations made on important issues that need to be addressed in order to clarify System priorities and design, and to determine governance issues. Ms. Lehmann introduced John Svicarovich, a consultant who will assist in preparing a draft strategic plan based on the responses and suggestions received from the work sessions and this discussion. The draft will not be a recommendation, but will be a guide for addressing important decisions at the Board renewal in July. She asked everyone to consult their calendars for July 18 and to inform
the Board’s office of any conflicts for that date. Ms. Lehmann stated that Presidents Frohnmayer and Risser will be making presentations and encouraged all presidents to contribute their ideas. She expressed the importance of input from the presidents, recognizing that some of best creative input resides at the campus level. She said their suggestions would be incorporated into the written documents that will help frame the renewal discussion in July, which will be facilitated by David Longanecker.

UO President Dave Frohnmayer presented a letter dated June 20, 2002, addressed to the System Strategic Planning Committee and signed by the institution presidents. He explained that UO recently concluded its Strategic Directions plan, a process of planning for the next five years. The plan will become a template not only for UO’s growth, but also for a capital campaign of some substantial magnitude in the near future. In the course of the planning effort, it became apparent that the other institutions were engaged in similar efforts on their campuses. He stated that the letter amalgamates the ideas previously submitted to the Board by individual campuses, and represents the collective views of presidents constituting a point of departure for some central decisions that urgently need to be made by the System.

He noted that there was a major revision of the funding model of the System in 1999, which enabled the institutions, at least for a brief period of time, to thrive. He stated that there have been great surges in enrollment and questioned the ability for institutions to meet the growing needs at the very time when financing is so precarious. He said the situation is not sustainable and significant change is needed in order for institutions to be successful, and to provide the kind of quality education that Oregonians expect. He noted that, at the July meeting, the Board will be making a decision about tuition levels and how they will be reflected among the various institutions. He noted that some decisions facing the Board will need to be made no later than September in order to get significant momentum from legislative allies for the kinds of changes that may need legislative approval.

Referring to the letter, President Frohnmayer stated that institutions need greater flexibility to allow them to increase and utilize non-state revenues for purposes of their operations. They also need to be granted authority, whether by the Board’s delegation or by legislative approval, to allow them to operate more efficiently, and, as validated by the passage of Measure 10, they need the ability to operate more entrepreneurially in the market economy. He stated there are several issues that concern all campuses and the System. One is a need to manage enrollment by making a commitment to educate all qualified resident undergraduates, at least up to the level that is funded by the State of Oregon. He said that would require that institutions be allowed, within broad guidelines, to manage their enrollment in ways that they think is most effective. Institutions need the authority to set their own tuition and fees. He expressed concern with the ambiguity of the term “access”. He stated that access is not just tuition levels, it deals with the full financial ability of the student to attend an institution. He said institutions need the assurance that they have the flexibility to increase and to use non-state revenues, which
would give them greater flexibility. He said each institution should have the capacity to have its own board of trustees to meet its specific needs, pointing out that each institution would have different perspectives about what that board might do, the powers that it might have, and the extent to which it would be freed of the controls of the Board of Higher Education or subject to its guidelines. He felt that, in most respects, these are legal questions, but in some respects they are political questions. He pointed out that the Board not only has the authority to set tuition, but also has the authority to sub-delegate the authority of setting tuition and fees to campuses should it wish to do so.

Mr. Bassett recognized that the needs, and even the future identity, of each campus could become more unique from one another than they have been. He said that the better the Board understands that identity, the less likely they are to get in the way of it as they do the enabling work. President Frohmayer hoped that the Board will consider the differential needs of each campus when making a decision about tuition at the July meeting. Mr. VanLuvanee commented that the Board will approve the tuition, but that it is the responsibility of the presidents to recommend tuition based on their institutions’ specific needs.

Ms. Wustenberg felt the Board’s responsibility is more to assure that the specific needs of the students are met and not necessarily to grow bigger and more diverse in each institution. Chancellor Cox advised that the Board be prepared to talk to the governor-elect shortly after the election. He stated that legislation should be prepared to be presented and discussed with the governor-elect and advised against waiting until January, as it would then be too late.

Board Secretary Vines reminded everyone that the purpose of the meeting was a presentation so that they will be prepared for the discussion in July, not to open the discussion in all the issues today. Mr. Young stated that he would like to address at the July renewal the issues of cooperation and accountability, keeping in mind the relative risks. He also expressed the need to address efficiency and the need to preserve some kind of state-wide perspective in the legislature and in our policies.

OSU President Paul Risser suggested that the current planning process is old fashioned and policy driven. He argued that in the world today it ought to be focusing on a more entrepreneurial, energetic way of proceeding and urged the planning process be changed. He stated that in Oregon there is a market consisting of students; the state of Oregon; and OUS, and said that the model OSU needs to use for strategic planning is to manage its interest against the interest of OUS and the market. He noted that state government has certain interests in terms of access, diversity, efficiency, productivity, economic development, student retention, reasonable choice and graduation success but pointed out that the university also has interests and must develop strategic planning to address those interests. He felt that the current model restricts campuses thereby losing resources and the ability to be responsive. He suggested that each institution should have its own board responding to those same interests. He said the institutions need to
approve their own internal budgets and their own academic programs. Each institution
should set its tuition and fees, identify its own performance standards, manage legal
purchasing and contracting processes, manage its own research and intellectual
property, and manage construction of capital projects.

He asked that the Board investigate what statute changes would need to occur, how
many legislative actions, and how many changes in administrative rules are needed in
order to achieve this goal. He felt the System should be able to codify the distinctive
missions of each of the universities; negotiate the E&G (Education and General) capital
budget; audit universities; supply requested information of policy analyses; evaluate the
performance of each university; and advocate for higher education. He stated that such
a process would allow for more flexibility as well as accountability while providing for
more institutional responsiveness to better meet the needs of the state and the market.

Mr. Bassett felt it would be helpful to reconcile the state government interests to those of
the System. He felt the need for the Board to find a balance between enabling and
protecting. Mr. Williams felt it is also important to determine how the legislature interacts
with various boards, agencies, and commissions, particularly in an era when the
legislature is of one party and the governor of another party. Responding to a question
from Ms. Wustenberg, Dr. Clark confirmed that a governing board would be required to
approve programs. It could not be done by institutional administration, she said.

Chancellor Cox urged the Board to include orphan issues, those issues that don’t have
sufficient clout in the legislature and in which individual institutions aren’t particularly
interested, in their renewal discussion.

EOU President Phil Creighton stated that Pennsylvania and Ohio demonstrate this type
of approach to governance and it’s worked well in their Systems. He noted that there are
demands that the smaller institutions place upon the System that are much different from
what the larger institutions place on it. Mr. Young reminded Dr. Creighton of a diagram
explaining the flexibility of that model that Dr. Creighton had presented at the last meeting
and asked if he would have that available for the renewal.

Ms. Lehmann asked Vice Chancellor Shirley Clark to respond to specific questions raised
by President Risser in regard to the potential of changing to a semester system.

Dr. Clark agreed that some planning and decisions are imminent with respect to
enrollment management as the System faces the challenge of increasing enrollment and
decreasing state funding of the model.

She stated that the Board has been provided with a handout that addresses the
questions about governance authority for potential academic calendar changes and
processes. She stated that the calendar conversion authority is within the purview of the
Board rather than campuses and briefly discussed recent history pertaining to proposed
changes. She said the most important proposal documented is the decision in the mid-
and late 1980's to convert the entire System to the semester calendar. She explained that the first decision by the Board was to permit the change, only to later reverse of that decision after the planning and work had been done, as the result of external forces and pressures upon the Board and the campuses.

If the Board is willing to consider a calendar change, Mr Bassett strongly urged it find a way to decide first and then enable the semester conversion planning process to proceed. He stated that the previous proposal was an awful experience for folks who made a strong commitment to the process only to find it ultimately set aside. He felt it was possible to make a watershed decision with regard to an issue like this and then enable the conversion planning process to follow through. Ms. Lehmann suggested it could go through the Joint Education Boards involving the community colleges to discuss issues like this and get some understanding and collaboration ahead of any public effort. Mr. Barnett asked what objections to semester system led to the reversal of the decision. Chancellor Cox opined that the greatest issues was the lack of consultation.

Mr. Bassett advised that they not surface this in the middle of a legislative session. He recalled that the previous proposal drew concern from the agricultural industry because September would become part of the academic calendar, which is a month that matters to that industry. There was also the issue of transferability from the community colleges who felt they weren't consulted enough. But he stated that the decision ultimately came down to a question of whether the proposal was for the betterment of the educational process or to save money. There were issues that became convenient catch phases for political debate and obscured remarkable work that had been done to answer most of those questions. Because of this past experience, he strongly cautioned against taking on something this important in the midst of the legislative session.

Action Item

Biennial Budget Priorities, 2003-2005

Dr. Anderes reviewed the Board goals: access to qualified Oregonians; quality educational programs at all campuses; cost effective operations; and employable graduates. He explained that the goals came about as the new model was being developed in 1997-98 and have since been the basis for budget requests. He pointed out that, for this biennium, the Board approved preservation of the current service level; quality educational programs; expanded access for all qualified resident undergraduates; and contribution to the current needs of the state and its communities and economic development. He stated that the priority is for funding at the median of System peers. He explained that when funding doesn’t meet the median, smaller universities become more vulnerable. He pointed out that this year the System absorbed, through tuition dollars, increased health care costs.

Dr. Anderes felt that managing enrollment to address market demands within budgetary limitations would be a common theme which addresses the issue of university choice.
He stated that institutions would like to have the ability to look at their own markets, their own tuition, and their own enrollment strategies and to create more individualized approaches. He said that organizational issues include the issues of flexibility and autonomy, seeking greater autonomy from the state, eliminating the limitations for expenditure of non-state funds and assuming full authority in information technology, contracting and purchasing. He noted that some limited authority approvals and freedoms have already been granted individual campuses. He addressed the issue of corporate status and institutional concerns as it relates to OHSU and its model of a more individualized state-free environment. He expressed the need to define the necessary mechanisms to provide the Board with the support they need and the kinds of support that varying types of institutions need as they go through the strategic planning process. He noted that enrollment demand is likely to grow beyond funding capacity, and the state funding support per FTE will likely decline.

Dr. Anderes explained that the universities have determined a growth and enrollment strategy and how that relates to state funding. He explained that tuition, growth and state funding affect each institution differently. He noted that increasing demand and decreasing resources have an impact on quality. In addressing the proposed priorities, he explained that the intent is to connect access and quality, not to separate them, and suggested that the first priority is to meet existing demand. He noted that the institutions are already serving thousands of students beyond what the state has provided funding for, and felt it is important that the state resources support that growth. Looking at the future demand for 2003-2005, he said it is estimated that there will be 7-8 percent more students entering OUS institutions, further increasing the need for state funding support. He noted that performance funding is a major component of the Board’s model but that funding was eliminated this biennium due to budgetary constraints. He felt it would be important to resume that support in this budget. He referred to the Board’s commitment to engineering and stated that the ETIC committee is working on a proposal that will be presented at the July Board meeting. He briefly discussed the Board’s commitment to meeting state needs and economic development. He also addressed the mission-specific requirements.

Dr. Anderes outlined the draft budget, explaining that, to meet the first priority of access and quality, the cost is $159 million. He noted that OUS is currently funded at 75 percent of the median level of its peers. To fund the unanticipated current growth, the cost would be an additional $35-$45 million. To fund projected new growth, the additional cost would be $45-$55 million. He reiterated that the budget for performance funding was $2 million. Engineering, depending on Board’s priority, could be upwards of $40 million. He stated that cost for economic development initiatives would depend on the Board’s approach to addressing the issue and mission-specific requirements would vary. He stated that staff will have a proposal that reflects the total cost of funding growth and quality at the July Board meeting. He noted that the current total request could reach approximately $400 million. Staff will recommend less in recognition of state funding reality. He explained that the General Fund plus the tuition provide the operating budget. Tuition supports instruction and instructional support programs. The proposal will have a
combination of General Fund and tuition to address the priorities. He recommended that the Board approve the proposed biennial priorities for 2003-2005.

Dr. Anderes explained that this is a System-wide budget request that goes forward without sub requests for the individual universities. There is flexibility within the document that can evolve up to the legislative session. Mr. Young suggested the Board prioritize the need to support greater state investment and financial aid opportunities as well.

Mr. Lussier observed that last year the Board prioritized biotechnology and Cascades-Campus and asked where they fit into these priorities. Dr. Anderes explained that the Cascades-Campus is continuation funding that would fall under Operational Commitments. Biotechnology will fit either as a specific initiative or as a biotechnology program expansion. Dr. Vines noted that OHSU and OUS came forward with the bioscience initiative because there was a lot of activity, some of it jointly with OHSU and some of it separate on the campuses. She noted that this is an important item for the state in terms of economic development. Ms. Watari asked where deferred maintenance falls into the priorities. Dr. Anderes noted that this item deals only with the operating budget and that there will be a presentation that deals with the capital budget and the ongoing deferred maintenance issues.

Mr. Bassett commented that economic development is too narrow and the notion of statewide needs is more fundamental than just another item on the budget. He recognized that this presentation is an outline to allow for a broader discussion than just engineering and economic development. He suggested the proposal in July include information regarding what priorities are possible at projected funding rates. He also suggested staff track what is happening with state revenues, what is likely to happen with them and how those trends in state funding relate to OUS current service level aspirations. Ms. Wustenberg expressed concern that the Board not stray from what its core mission is, which is to provide an excellent liberal arts and science education. Mr. Williams felt that, under tight budget circumstances, expense management should be a goal. He felt that the current proposal needs to be a stronger and more acceptable document before making a decision.

President Dow expressed the importance of recognizing that there needs to be an internal adjustment in the model itself that would address the needs of the smaller universities and clarified that OIT is not always included in a regional definition.

Mr. VanLuvanee moved and Ms. Wustenberg seconded the motion to accept the Biennial Budget Priorities, 2003-2005, as submitted.

Responding to a question by Mr. Bassett, Dr. Anderes explained that if there is a desire to change a priority as they through this, or if there are additional initiatives to add, they can do so in July and continue to build the budget from those assumptions. Mr. Bassett asked that the materials be provided well in advance of the meeting.
Mr. Williams said he wouldn’t vote for this item, arguing that it is incomplete. Mr. VanLuvanee felt that Board approval is needed to move forward, with the understanding that there is more work to be done. Dr. Anderes stated that the purpose of voting is to get a position that allows staff to move forward based upon discussion. Mr. VanLuvanee suggested that they approve the issues in general, but with more specifics to follow. Dr. Anderes pointed out that the Board will be approving a System-wide budget and within that, institutions will utilize the dollars that are allocated as part of that process. Chancellor Cox pointed out that the goals are statutory. Mr. Williams reiterated his concerns regarding expense management. Chancellor Cox pointed out that OUS is required to submit a 10, 20, and 30 percent reduction to the state.

Chancellor Cox stated that the Board doesn’t have to vote today. Mr. VanLuvanee disagreed, stating that the Board has a responsibility to direct staff in moving in the right direction. He reiterated that the motion isn’t to approve it unchanged, but is intended to give staff a sense of direction. Mr. Lussier agreed and reiterated that expense management ought be more explicit, but argued that, implicitly staff have been managing expenses since the universities have been under an austere funding cycle for a long period of time. Ms. Wustenberg felt it was important to reduce expenses before raising tuition. UO Provost John Moseley, with regard to managing expenses, pointed out that UO received a significant cut and has managed that cut with further expense reductions in a way that is going to allow UO to serve, at a reasonable level, the great influx of students. He stated that, as UO goes into the next biennium, further expense reductions are going to necessarily come from program reductions, course reductions and reductions in the number of students served.

Mr. VanLuvanee amended the motion to be more explicit about how expenses will be reduced and how additional sources of revenue will be attained. Ms. Wustenberg seconded the amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

Discussion Items

Financial Aid/Tuition Overview

Dr. Anderes stated that the overview is intended to make the Board aware of the factors that begin to influence the way students make decisions regarding tuition. The factors include state support, financial aid, student financial capacity and a willingness to assume debt.

In July staff will be coming back to the Board and looking at determining, as part of the budget process, what the total tuition would be that is necessary to support the budget request and that would be linked to a particular percentage increase, not by institution, but across the system. He noted that institutions receive a state appropriation but it doesn’t provide all the funding needed and thus, institutions have to look to the students for tuition and fees.
Susan Weeks, OUS chief information officer, provided background on factors contributing to price sensitivity and college choice. She focused on the cost characteristics including current tuition, peer institution tuition and financial aid. She said that the research on student price sensitivity shows us that the groups most sensitive to increases in tuition are lower income students, first generation college students, ethnic minorities, female students and entering freshmen. Data also shows that the differential enrollment responses from these various groups may create an economically stratified higher education system where middle and upper income students are shifting to the comprehensive four year public institutions, the richest students move into the more prestigious private universities and colleges, and the lower income students make up the bulk of the two year colleges. Finally, in terms of price elasticity, recent analysis shows that for every $100 increase in tuition, there is likely to be 0.5 - 1 percent drop in enrollment. The national analyses are drawn from data from the 1970's through the early 1990's covering 2 year and 4 year colleges and sometimes both combined.

Mr Barnett asked if it was just an increase in tuition or if any increase of $100 such as transportation costs, housing costs, and energy costs resulted in a decline. Ms. Weeks explained that the analyses focused on tuition but also looked at the combination of tuition and financial aid and whether there are balancing factors. She highlighted the research on financial aid, stating that the groups most sensitive are low-income students, some ethnic minority students, particularly African-Americans, and high achieving students who may be less sensitive to tuition increases but are more sensitive to financial aid. Financial aid, especially grants, has a positive effect on access and choice. The studies report enrollment increases of 4-8 percent for each $1000 increase in grant aid. One study found that, to offset a 10 percent tuition increase per capita, grant spending would have to increase by 16 percent. The influence of financial aid is complicated by the avenues through which students learn about financial aid opportunities.

Dave McDonald, OUS director of enrollment and student services, explained that financial aid includes basically two types; either a merit component or a need component. The government is the primary source for need-based aid. Institutions and private donors are the primary sources for merit-based aid. Need-based aid has traditionally served as an access tool, lowering the overall cost of education for students. Merit-based aid has served as a recruitment and retention tool, targeted to specific populations of students and also targeted to meet the institutional objectives. The basic way in which need-based aid is awarded is through a simple formula of cost of education versus the expected family contribution, which includes the income and savings available to the student and their family. The majority of need-based aid that is awarded is in the form of loans and primarily benefits low income students. Merit-based aids are primarily scholarships and grants which don’t require repayment by the student or the family. He stated that research has indicated that over half of the students in the graduating high school class of 1999 said that scholarship was a key factor in their ultimate college choice. Merit-based aid is typically defined by GPA and test scores and serves as an enrollment management tool.
Mr. McDonald stated that tuition is only one part of the actual cost students factor into making a decision about which school to attend. Tuition is less than 1/3 of the overall budget for the average student at an OUS campus. Room and board makes up the largest piece of the budget. Overall, the cost to attend college is over $12,000 on an OUS campus. Tuition and fees are $3,600 on average. He stated that as late as 1992-93, the amount of federal money that was available was comparable for both grants and loans, however, loans have become the dominant form of aid available with the majority in the form of unsubsidized loans, for which the student is responsible for paying back the interest accruing while they are currently a student. He noted that grant aid has increased somewhat in this period of time. He pointed out that when PELL grants were originally created they were envisioned to cover the full cost of student education. They currently cover less than 50 percent on average. He referred to the Oregon Student Assistance Commission, a state agency, and its largest award program, the Oregon Opportunity Grant. He discussed financial aid provided in Minnesota, Washington and California noting that the major difference is in funding. He explained that structurally the way they award state-based financial aid is comparable to Oregon, but Oregon has no merit-based state aid and other states’ need-based programs are far more substantial. He stated that Washington’s goal is to fund 100 percent of the cost of tuition for over 50,000 students who are eligible while in Oregon, 16,000 students receive awards which cover only about 11 percent of the cost of tuition.

He stated that the average graduate debt for OUS students is over $16,000 and that debt increases annually. Slightly over half of OUS graduates receive loans. Students of all income levels are borrowing more. However, the lowest income students are the most vulnerable and are taking out the greatest number of loans. He noted that different demographic groups are affected differently by loans. He explained that unmet need is the difference between the amount of projected need compared to the available resources and there is a total of unmet need across the System of over $120 million. He noted that financial support is increasingly complex and, compared to other states, Oregon is a high tuition, low aid state.

Ms. Weeks stated that over the past few years they have looked at the relationship between instruction fee increases and freshman participation rates, which is the ratio of first-time Oregon freshmen divided by the previous June’s Oregon high school graduating class. They use this ratio as a measure for many things, including enrollment forecasting. She noted that there are other factors besides tuition that will affect student choice in attending college. She said major findings indicate that when tuition increases are large, freshman participation decreases. It appears that the threshold is a tuition increase of 6-8 percent that would result in a 4 percent or more decline in freshman participation. She explained that annual percentage increases in the instruction fee are set by the Board, and the increases in the incidental fee are initiated by student fee committees on each campus and approved by each president and by the Board.

She noted that there has been an increase in the percentage of students choosing college and the new enrollment projections show an increase in undergraduate
enrollment of 25 percent over what it was in fall 2001 by the year 2010, and by 2015 and increase of 36 percent, for a total increase of about 22,000 students in the System by 2015.

Dr. Anderes stated that there are a set of guidelines on tuition setting that each of the institutions could review as they begin to look at their enrollments, goals, and missions. He stated that staff acknowledged the Board goals, and is striving to be as simple, concise and understandable for students and families. He stated that in many regards the existing tuition and fee structure is pretty complex and the goal is to simplify the structures. Staff is looking at policies that may differ based on campus missions and Board priorities.

**Capital Construction Budget Request, 2003-2009**

Bob Simonton, OUS director of capital construction, presented the 2003-2009 capital construction request. He stated that OUS facilities have a current replacement value of over $3 billion. He discussed the four types of facility projects: education and general; auxiliaries; Systemwide projects; and student building fee projects. He explained that each project relates to a goal of either quality facilities, enrollment growth, or program needs. He noted that many of the sub systems within the buildings are failing due to age. He stated that, before program projects can be part of the request, they are reviewed by the campuses and the Chancellor’s office.

Mr. Simonton reviewed each campus’ priority projects. He said the OIT priority is to replace a water distribution system due to a new EPA standard that was adopted for arsenic content in the water and, since the wells that supply the OIT campus couldn’t meet that standard, they have until the year 2006 to comply. The project involves tying into Klamath Falls Municipal Water System, which can meet the EPA standard. He discussed two theater projects with different goals. He said the SOU project addresses the current situation where the existing facility must accommodate three times as many students as the 20 year old facility can accommodate. The UO project is for a new black box experimental theater space, which is now considered essential to theater education. He said there is a backlog of $500 million of capital renewal projects, which is why OUS is seeking a general obligation bond authority.

Mr. Simonton stated that the request, which will be before the Board in July, is for over $1 billion for 2003-2005 and then another $1 billion projected over the next two biennia. He stated that if the campuses can provide half of the project costs in donations, the state is more inclined to provide a match in the form of G bonds. Mr. Young asked whether this was supposed to go to the ballot. Mr Simonton explained that the deferred maintenance request, which was before the Board a few months ago, is a separate request in addition to this. OUS has submitted the legislative concept to DAS on behalf of the Board with a follow-up presentation. He stated that the plan, which was well received, will go before the Governor in November, who will hopefully recommend the concept to the legislature in January 2003. He anticipates a bill passing that would refer a ballot measure to the
voters for the November 2003 general election. He stated that they are also developing a
website that will be a quick resource for anyone who wants to better understand the
problem that each campus is facing and how they plan to correct the situation.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.