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MEETING NOTES

Board Committee members present: Paul Kelly, Matt Donegan, Rosemary Powers, Kirk Schueler, and David Yaden. Other Board Members included: Dalton Miller-Jones.


Others: Paul Siebert, Bill McGee, Tim Black (UO), Courtney White (UO), Joel Alexander (IFS), Emily McLain (OSA), and Bill Graves (Oregonian).

Chair Kelly called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. and asked that the roll be called and then provided welcoming remarks. He then called upon Chancellor Pernsteiner to introduce the material. Director Yaden asked whether or not the Committee would be ratifying any of the issues; Chancellor Pernsteiner advised that each agenda item builds upon the previous. Therefore, agreement on the principles and five issues would be necessary in order to continue the discussion.

1. Review of Guiding Principles

Postponed.

2. Policy and Values Statements

The policy and value statements were first drafted during the 2009 Board Retreat and the item as presented at present is submitted for either approval, amendment, or a determination that more work is needed. Chancellor Pernsteiner then called the Committee’s attention to the value statements:

1) Subject to available capacity and consistent with standards of academic quality:
   a) All Oregonians who are qualified to be admitted to an Oregon public university will be able to attend and earn a degree...
Director Miller-Jones said that stating that student access should be defined in more detail. Chair Kelly noted that a decision was made during the budget planning, the Board made a decision that if the state revenue was not sufficient to support the statement. Chancellor Pernsteiner put forward that, if the System was not able to fully fund student access, then the make-up of the student body, no matter what size, would be made up of all groups of students (ethnic, geographic, low-income, etc.). Director Yaden agreed and added that the Board agreed that if quality was potentially affected by access, then enrollment must be limited in order to ensure quality. We must emphasize that the core value is the quality of the education and student success (emphasizing the attainment of a quality education; i.e., student retention through graduation). Director Schueler pointed out the sentence “equal for all groups,” and that “success” may be a separate thought from “access.” Director Miller-Jones questioned the emphasis on student success over seeking representational equity and diversity. Chancellor Pernsteiner explained that it’s not emphasizing success over equity, but that it should be two issues (student success and access being separate issues).

Director Schueler said that the preamble does not adequate address the issue of limited funding. Chair Kelly agreed and added that it should state “high academic quality.” Director Yaden opined that using the word “subject to available capacity” implies that there would be different standards put in effect with limited funding. The intent was to say that, if we have unlimited resources, we’d do all, but if we have limited resources, we’d still do all but limit enrollment across all demographic areas. “The Board is committed to establish and maintaining academic quality to the extent that funding allows.”

“Student success shall include (among other measures), the attainment of degrees...” Input received from business community has emphasized the quality of the attained education: demonstrated student learning, employment of graduates, and the acceptance of graduates into graduate programs. One of the outcomes from the January Tri-Board forum was that a liberally-educated workforce that is employable and promotable (differentiating between knowledge-gained and courses taken toward a degree). Director Powers noted that the “demonstrated student learning” will be an issue to the faculty. Director Donegan added maintaining a balance between technical knowledge and life-skills knowledge. Ms. McLain agreed with Director Powers that equity and equality are different and “equity” should be included in the paragraph.

b) “All Oregonians who are qualified to transfer to an Oregon public university...”

Pernsteiner advised that paragraph B builds upon paragraph A and then adds the Joint Boards’ policy on transferability between OUS institutions and/or community colleges. This policy, however, is affected by state goals established by the legislature and/or the Joint Boards of Education. Director Miller-Jones noted that the policy itself may be accepted by the universities but the verbiage “without loss of credit or progress toward degree” may not be accepted at the department-level. Assistant Vice Chancellor opined that referencing the AAOT and General Education may support the statement. Chancellor Pernsteiner agreed but asked if the Board was not a statewide governing Board and each university had an independent governing board,
would we want these value statements be enforced on the university boards even though they did not participate in the development of the value statements. Director Miller-Jones suggested “with a minimum loss of credits” rather than “without loss;” Pernsteiner stated that that statement poses political issues. Chair Kelly proposed that if the universities are granted authority to have independent governing boards, there should be a statewide Board that would have the authority to disseminate funds and maintain the statewide System values.

Chancellor Pernsteiner stated that three additions be made: sufficiency of funding, maintaining collaboration efforts and current policies, and referencing Joint Boards’ policies. It was suggested that paragraph C be blended into B.

d) “The composition of faculty and staff…” deals with the workforce; i.e., a diverse faculty in order to ensure the success of a diverse student body.

Director Powers opined that the paragraph could be read as setting quotas and noted that Eastern is generally made up of a Caucasian students, reflecting the ethnic make-up of the region even though Eastern honors the value of diversity. Pernsteiner said he could add “will reflect, at a minimum,” but that the value, as stated, supports the state goal of diversity and may be imposing unrealistic or aspirational goals on the campuses. Ms. McLain noted that, with the possibility of students may be forced to attend a particular university due to the desired degree being offered only at that university. Mr. Hagemann suggested that appropriate verbiage may be obtained from the Board’s diversity policy and the College Board’s material. Add “as nearly as possible” be added to the “students” portion of the sentence.

Value statement #2 pertains to research, faculty, and the state’s economic development and job creation. Oregon is not able to target a specific research area at specific universities. Given that, should we build on the strengths and abilities of the current faculty and not invest in bringing in targeted faculty. Director Yaden agreed but, with the limited funding, asked, shouldn’t specific research be targeted or generically build research on all campuses. Pernsteiner stated that directing or targeting funding to specific state goals for research is a policy shift for the System. Director Donegan queried if this value statement emphasizes research or economic developing; he encouraged using stronger language, “apply funding for faculty to focus research to enable the state’s ability to continue economic development strategies.” He added moving the reference to building on the strengths of its faculty to the latter part of the sentence; Director Powers disagreed with moving the faculty statement, noting that places the emphasis on economic development research rather than broader research programs. Director Donegan agreed with Powers’ statement and reconciled by suggesting changing “encourage and conduct” to “enable and enhance” (more active and proactive verbiage). Ms. McLain suggested leaving “encourage and conduct” and replace “aligns” with enable and enhance the State’s economic…” Donegan noted that emphasizing building research around the “static” area of faculty strengths and then on economic development is opposite of a business practices; Schueler noted that the make-up of faculty is fluid given the attrition and movement of faculty—changing the strengths of faculty at the universities. Director Powers noted that she interpreted this as all faculty supporting the
research efforts within the university and state. Chancellor Pernsteiner suggested “Oregon’s public universities will encourage and conduct research that builds and improves on the strengths of its faculty and will enable and enhance the state’s economic development...” Director Yaden opined that two things must be said in the overall statements: 1) the connection to economic development and 2) collaboration among the universities to attain higher intellectual and economic levels for the state. Director Schueler suggested changing “relates to” to “contributes to” or “results in” the creation and sustenance of Oregon companies.

Chair Kelly noted that the statement does not identify the universities that will conduct research and that it is an issue that will be discussed at a later date.

3) “Oregon’s public universities will provide an educated adult population...” Chancellor Pernsteiner stated that this, in particular, addresses healthcare/technology programs (and the workforce needs as they involve) and not adult education, in general. Director Powers suggested moving “state’s workforce needs” to the beginning of the sentence.

4) “In achieving its goals...” Director Powers suggested replacing “high schools” to “K-12” in order to be more broadly inclusive.

Director Schueler requested an analysis of how the IFS and presidents’ guidelines/resolution matches up to the proposed value statements and guiding principles.

3. Issues Discussion
   a. Tuition Guidelines

In the matter of increasing the tuition rates charged by campuses, it was noted that, in Oregon, the rate of inflation has grown and the household income has declined in the past nine years. Should the per-student funding change with the declining state funding?

If each university had an independent board, would the statewide Board want to impose tuition guidelines on those boards; does the Board even want to establish tuition guidelines at all or treat the universities in the same tuition governing manner as the community colleges? The overarching question would be, can the System reach its goals and support its value statements if each university can set its own tuition rate and thereby rapidly increase tuition levels.

Director Yaden noted that Willamette University has stated that their high-tuition/high-aid philosophy has allowed them to educate more lower income students than public university; Chancellor Pernsteiner stated that the national trend has been that, for public universities, those that adopted a policy of high-tuition/high-aid, has created more of a high-tuition/medium-aid or even high-tuition/low-aid because of reducing state funding support, i.e., financial aid becomes a casualty of reduced state funding.

Ms. McLain advised that this issue, coupled with the possibility of independent university boards, is of great concern to the students. Vice Chancellor Kenton, February 2006 Board
meeting materials contains a PowerPoint presentation by Jerry Kissler on a high-tuition/high-aid study.

b. Financial Aid
Postponed.

c. Demography and Location
The Chancellor provided an introduction to the issue. Director Yaden wondered if the term “demography” is being used for “placement within the state” (e.g., rural); Director Powers noted that this is to acknowledge that rural students need additional support for success. She added she would reword it in order to avoid the supposition that the shortfall of funding at the rural universities is due to expensive programs rather than reduced state funding. Chair Kelly cautioned against crafting this policy in a manner that may put it at odds to the policy and value statements/goals.

d. Education collaboration
Postponed.

e. Research collaboration
Postponed.

4. Performance Framework
Postponed.

5. Next Meeting / Adjournment
Chair Kelly asked the Committee to check their calendars for the proposed Fourth Thursday of the Month, 9a-noon, meetings (in particular, March and May) and let the Board’s Office know of conflicts. The meeting was adjourned at 12:06 p.m.