Minutes

Chair Francesconi called the meeting to order at: 2:35 p.m.

Committee members present included: Chair Jim Francesconi, Hannah Fisher, Dalton Miller-Jones, Rosemary Powers, and Preston Pulliams (arriving at 3:35 p.m.).

Others present included Chancellor’s Office staff Chancellor George Pernsteiner, Vice Chancellor Susan Weeks, Larry Galizio, Joe Holliday, Alicia Ortega, Di Saunders, Charles Triplett, and Bob Turner; Provosts Brad Burda (OIT), Jim Bean (UO), Jim Klein (SOU), Michael Jaeger (EOU), Kent Neely (WOU), and Bob Vieira (OHSU); Bill Feyerherm (Research Council); Eric Meslow and Steve Pawlowski (ETIC); Eileen Drake (PCC), Renjen Su (PSU Engineering), Norm Eder (MFG 21), and Charles Martinez (UO).

1) Approval of minutes of April 8, 2010 meeting

Chair Francesconi called for a motion to approve the April 2010 minutes; Powers/Miller-Jones, minutes approved.

2) Academic program approval

a) Eastern Oregon University: B.A./B.S. in Public Administration

Chair Francesconi called upon Provost Jaeger to present the item. Director Miller-Jones asked for information pertaining to faculty resources and moving toward a master’s program. Jaeger noted that while the long-term aspiration of the public administration program is to also offer the MPA degree, doing so would depend on having adequate faculty and financial resources not currently available. Director Powers made the motion to approve, Miller-Jones seconded; motion passed.

b) Southern Oregon University: B.A./B.S. in Outdoor Adventure Leadership

Provost Jim Klein presented the item. Director Powers made the motion to approve, Fisher seconded; motion passed.
3) ETIC proposal for 2011-2013

Chair Francesconi called upon Eric Meslow, ETIC vice chair, who also introduced Steve Pawlowski, ETIC chair. Meslow provided background on the establishment of the Engineering and Technology Industry Council, highlighting the objectives as growing Oregon’s innovation capacity to ensure prosperity, delivering more work-ready graduates to Oregon industry, increasing research and linking results to Oregon industry needs, and helping to integrate the K-12-community college-university “pipeline.” One goal established at the inception of the Council was to double the number of engineering graduates. However, although graduation rates are increasing, engineering and computer science degrees have not doubled in the past decade, due to the software industry downturn and the lead time needed to obtain a return on the investment in degree programs. Private funding has outpaced public funding.

Included in ETIC’s 10-year strategic plan are, in priority order: (1) Sustainable Engineering (environmental sensing & systems, energy generation, energy conservation & efficiency, intelligent energy management, green materials, and water resources), (2) Neuro Engineering, and (3) Cyber Security. He noted that sustainable engineering matches Oregon’s economic development strategy and one of the Board of Higher Education’s top priorities, leveraging existing expertise and providing the opportunity to grow this expertise. It supports collaboration among Oregon universities and between universities and industry; aligns with existing and emerging industry strengths in Oregon; provides opportunity to attract the best faculty and the best students; aligns with federal funding priorities and opportunities; and leverages strengths unique to Oregon.

In 2009, a separate advocacy group, called the ETIC Coalition, was formed and includes representatives of several industry associations, as well as major Oregon employers. This group meets regularly to coordinate advocacy in Salem, scheduling “ETIC Days” at the Capitol, business leader visits and lobbying. Many members of the ETIC board serve on other boards and extend the advocacy at those venues.

Director Miller-Jones noted that to expand the pipeline of K-12 students entering engineering would require improving the skill sets of entering students, and that may require greater resources than many schools, especially those in rural districts, can provide. Miller-Jones also cautioned that it’s important to pay attention to the first year in college for students and not to assume that it’s OK for students to wash out. Pawlowski responded that we need to communicate to K-12 students that if they don’t understand the fundamentals, such as algebra, they won’t be able to get through the calculus courses needed for engineering. Miller-Jones advised that schools and universities need to encourage early hands-on experiences for students.

Francesconi asked Pawlowski what the $12 million state investment return for Oregon would be in the areas of job creation, discovery, and research? Pawlowski highlighted the focus of Intel on bringing in the best professors, setting up collaborative agreements, and then bringing students in – he noted a 95% retention rate of those students. Intel is particularly interested in
the cyber security area; bringing in the best faculty in that area will attract the best students, creating a high quality workforce pool once those students graduate. Meslow noted that these are long term solutions and that we can’t expect to see results tomorrow. Unlike Intel, which can recruit out of state graduates while waiting for the production of Oregon grads, smaller companies must rely more heavily on what Oregon universities can produce.

4) Metals and Manufacturing Collaboratory

Chair Francesconi called upon Eileen Drake (PCC Structurals), Renjen Su (PSU Engineering), and Norm Eder (MFG 21) to present the Metals and Manufacturing Collaboratory proposal. Chair Francesconi called for a motion to accept the proposal. Director Pulliams made the motion, Director Powers seconded; motion passed.

5) School of Public Health

Chair Francesconi noted that this item will be referred to the presidents and provosts of OSU, PSU, and OHSU for further development, followed by discussion and recommendation from the Provosts’ Council. The Chancellor suggested that this item be kept as a placeholder for the budget discussion in July.

6) Academic Strategies Committee 2011-2013 recommendations to full Board

Chair Francesconi expressed his thanks to Vice Chancellor Weeks, provosts, and Chancellor’s Office staff, as well as Committee members, for their excellent work in the proposed policy option packages. He explained that the packages fall into five categories: 1) creating a college-going culture for underrepresented students, 2) improving student outcomes, 3) preparing for a diverse world, 4) serving Oregon with regionalized approaches, and 5) strengthening critical areas of Oregon’s economy. Chancellor Pernsteiner advised that the campus presidents and provosts are examining the policy option packages to determine where campuses may be able to apply some of their budget reserves toward the board priorities. Pernsteiner noted that there are no quick fixes, but that “we are not in the quick fix business.” He indicated that it will be important to target priorities for campus investment where the payoff will be greatest, and to identify things that are necessary to do regardless of other investment.

Director Miller-Jones expressed his support of the proposed packages and Powers also affirmed her support; they both noted that there are items that appear to be left out (e.g., ONWARD). Vice Chancellor Weeks advised that items for which funding was not being sought, such as ONWARD, were noted in the narrative portion of the docket but not in Appendix A or in the summary table.

Category 1: Creating a College-Going Culture for Underrepresented Students. Chancellor Pernsteiner noted that two campuses so far have each committed some of their reserve funds to support the bilingual college access information proposal. Chair Francesconi asked if those campuses expect their commitments to be expended on their campuses; Pernsteiner replied
that they know that the funds will be pooled. For the mini-grants for outreach and retention, the Chancellor’s Office would be willing to match the campuses’ commitments rather than seeking new funds for that portion from the state ($250,000 Chancellor’s Office match, for a total of $500,000 including campus commitments). Directors Fisher, Miller-Jones, and Pulliams expressed their support of the three proposals under “creating a college-going culture for underrepresented students;” while Director Powers supported the proposals, she noted that they directly support the goals established by the legislature.

**Category 2: Improving student outcomes.** The $3.4 million proposed in 2.A is state funding that will be applied to retention programs (advising, student support) associated with need-based aid programs. Pernsteiner clarified that, by state law, General Funds cannot be applied directly to aid; fee remissions must be generated through tuition revenues. This proposal would apply state funds to just the retention-related programs. Increased peer mentoring and advising ($3.55 million) and teacher data exchange ($50,000) are also proposed as part of the “improving student outcomes” package. All Committee members supported these proposals. Pernsteiner asked if the first two items could be combined; Directors’ Miller-Jones and Powers disagreed, emphasizing that it is important to keep the proposals separate since, if funding is available for only one of the proposals, we don’t want to risk losing both if they were bundled together.

**Category 3: Preparing for a diverse world.** This package consists of two parts: (1) recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and professional staff ($400,000) and (2) establishment of a Latino Student Success Advisory Council ($30,000). Chair Francesconi encouraged the Latino Student Success Resource Team (LSSRT) to continue to meet. However, he opined that formally organizing the LSSRT as a council with funding would establish an unneeded precedent of funding advisory councils. Director Fisher disagreed and advised that, without the funding, the council would not be able to work on the cultural competency issue. Dr. Martinez advised that this view had been discussed within LSSRT but that the highly focused and culturally-specific work of the LSSRT could not have been completed without the group structure, and that experience led them to recommend formally establishing the ongoing Council. The Committee supported both items, including the advisory council. Dr. Martinez added that the advisory council has been developed with elements intended to also serve as a model for other communities of color.

Chair Francesconi handed out a draft Board resolution on the federal “DREAM Act” (Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors) and noted that this will be discussed at the May 14 Board meeting. Dr. Martinez advised that this strong voice by the Board is to be commended.

**Category 4: Serving Oregon with regionalized approaches.** Director Powers noted that the “hub and spoke” model described in section 4.A is essential to reaching the remote rural areas of the state. Larry Galizio noted that the proposal recognizes the need for a physical presence versus only an online delivery as students need advising and other student support that can only be provided on campus. Powers noted that for EOU, which is already undertaking a hub and spoke
approach, adding another pilot would not offer much value. She suggested that a pilot focusing on economic development would be better for Eastern Oregon, rather than one focused on more outreach or educational delivery. Francesconi commented that 4.A needs more work to focus it or perhaps reduce the number of sites. Director Pulliams suggested leaving all 3 sites on the table for now; Directors Fisher, Miller-Jones, and Powers recommended reducing the number of sites to two.

Regarding section 4.B., Di Saunders advised that Central Oregon Community College and OSU-Cascades have committed monies toward supporting the academically and administratively aligned “University College” for Central Oregon, ensuring a more streamlined process for the students. Section 4.C addresses a future new instructional facility for OSU-Cascades; that proposal would need to be addressed through the regular capital construction request process.

The Committee supported all three proposals, recommending further development and refinement of 4.A and referral of 4.C to the capital construction request process.

**Category 5: Strengthening critical areas of Oregon’s economy.** Director Powers stated that she supports the proposals and noted that it demonstrates that the System and private companies are willing to invest monies into the strategies, and the legislature needs to respond in kind. Powers indicated that she was particularly interested in the proposal regarding doctoral education, noting that OUS has been behind other states and that makes us uncompetitive. Dr. Feyerherm advised that the Research Council created item C (Core facilities for proteomics and high performance computing) as a challenge for the campuses to compete for research dollars. Chancellor Pernsteiner stated that this is a capacity-building issue and that the infrastructure is necessary although not supported in prior biennia by OregonInC. But, while this may be key to long-term strategies and research that will lead to an innovation economy in Oregon, the timing may not be right. Chair Francesconi recommended eliminating this item. Director Powers supported the doctoral education item; Director Miller-Jones added his support and noted that doctoral education is critical to the growth of the economy. Directors Powers and Miller-Jones recommended combining the doctoral education proposal (5.D) with the Sustainability Research Initiative (5.A). Chair Francesconi agreed but recommended leaving Health/Life Sciences as a stand-alone.

**Category 6: Consolidation of OIT’s Portland Area Programs into a single location in Wilsonville.** Chair Francesconi advised that the task of the Committee was to take a position regarding the endorsement of this capital request and its advancement to the next steps in the capital request process. Provost Burda expressed a concern that, as presented in the package, the item might be viewed as not falling under the five categories and, therefore, as having lower priority. Pernsteiner noted that, although capital items are not required to go through the Committee, this proposal was presented to the Academic Strategies Committee for endorsement. However, for biennial budget request purposes, this item will be included in the capital budget and not the operating budget. All Committee members expressed support for the proposal and recommended that it be advanced to the capital request process.
Pernsteiner noted that he would come to the Board in July with a funding recommendation that would indicate what portions would come from OUS institution reserves, what portions would be requested from the state, and what amounts might be sought through private match.

Adjournment
Chair Francesconi adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m.