1. Call to meeting

DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. Mission Alignment/Metrics

3. Work Plan for Equity-Diversity Initiatives

4. Teacher Education Update

OTHER ITEMS

5. Adjournment
Minutes

Committee members present included: Jill Eiland (phone), Hannah Fisher, Jim Francesconi, and Rosemary Powers (phone).

Chancellor’s Office staff present included: Sona Andrews, Endi Hartigan, Joe Holliday, Di Saunders (phone), and Bob Turner.

Others present included: Steve Adkison (EOU), Brad Burda (OIT), Grant Kirby (OIT), James Klein (SOU), Roy Koch (PSU), Dave McDonald (WOU), Sabah Randhawa (OSU), and Robert Vieira (OHSU).

1. CALL TO MEETING
Chair Francesconi called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. MISSION ALIGNMENT/METRICS
Chair Francesconi asked Vice Chancellor Andrews to begin the discussion on the Provosts’ document on Mission Alignment. Both in response to Senate Bill 442 and the goals of the Board, the System institutions have defined their missions, student access, academic program array, and research. These efforts are conveyed in the matrices in the docket with accompanying metrics. The matrices and metrics are designed to be used as tools at the campus-level for decision-making related to program development and strategic planning.

Vice Chancellor Andrews explained the purpose of this project was to be sure that the System is providing access, research, and innovation to meet the four primary goals of the Board. In the matrices, the numbers reflect the intensity with which each program is doing each item, not quality. These will help the Board to determine the universities are making progress in the primary goals. There are three tables and Systemwide metrics for each: Student Access Mission Intensity, Academic Program Mission Intensity, and Innovation/Research Mission Intensity. The document also lists institution-specific measures below the tables, and the mission statements for each university. The document represents a snapshot in time and will evolve with annual updates provided to the Board. It can be used as a planning tool, not an assessment tool, since

1 Meeting materials may be obtained at:
http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/state_board/meeting/dockets/ddoc110331-ASC_0.pdf
these are not measures of quality. It will help planning new programs and determine mission alignment and core themes for regional accreditation and the Provosts’ Council can use it in the program approval process.

Provost Koch, who currently chairs the Provosts’ Council, said this is a consensus document and determining the intensity numbers proved to be a useful analysis and promote helpful discussions at the campus level. Provost Burda added that the process was also integral to facilitating planning discussions that will help with accreditation. Provost Randhawa noted that this document, the mission statement, and the aspirational goals define an institution and will be useful to gauge; however, he cautioned that, with regard to duplication, it’s important to note that there are some areas of study that all universities need to cover in order to be 4-year universities and some reflect specific local needs around institutions. Several provosts commented the importance to understanding document as descriptive not evaluative.

Chair Francesconi noted that he would like this to go to the full Board for discussion. He said this document will be important in the development of the OUS compact with the state that would stem from Senate Bill 242 and with the OUS compact with the campuses. Vice Chancellor Andrews added that this document can be part of the OUS compact with the campuses.

Director Powers asked what qualitative measures will be put in or considered. Provost Randawha said that what was agreed upon was a broad set of metrics; each institution has the freedom to select a subset of campus measures. Although this document is completed, it will evolve and institutional metrics will change over time. Since this is a mission-based document, there will be some consistency in it over time while performance measures may vary more.

Chair Francesconi asked how programmatic areas or geographic gaps that appear in this document would be addressed, noting for example that general education is a ‘1’ for every institution but math is not, and that the coastal region does not have a high intensity focus for any OUS institution. It was noted that this is a bridge document between the Board and the campuses and should facilitate planning discussion of this kind. Provosts clarified that the numbers don’t necessarily mean that the coast isn’t adequately served, but that it may be necessary to look at the demographics closer to see if this requires focus, such as more distance education or community college partnerships. It was also clarified that math is generally a subset of general education.

Director Francesconi asked the provosts to consider what happens next with this document to facilitate its usefulness, and that they prepare an approach to the discussion with the Board as a whole. The Committee members present supported the document and commended the provosts and Vice Chancellor Andrews for their work. Director Fisher and Director Eiland had to leave the meeting early due to other commitments so in the absence of a quorum, no formal action was taken on the report.

3. **Work Plan for Equity-Diversity Initiatives**

Director Francesconi asked Vice Chancellor Andrews to report on the OUS plan for Equity/Diversity Initiatives. Andrews said that the diversity plan has been discussed in detail by the provosts and that each campus has or is in the process of developing a diversity plan, which
she will analyze once complete. She reviewed each item/activity in the docket item, noting that it is a list of actions for current initiatives but is not a comprehensive plan for the System.

The document details plans for the development of measures of equity/accountability; the organization of a diversity summit for leadership; the development of best practices related to faculty diversity; the engagement of staff, campuses, and the Board with external groups; and the addition of equity/diversity as a frequent item on the agendas of the Board and leadership councils. It also includes the development of a resources list of key individuals and an inventory of campus initiatives at each institution, review of practices related to equity and diversity in business areas such as capital projects, continued prioritization of System-level initiatives, inclusion of equity/diversity as a criteria for presidential and Chancellor evaluations, and improvement of the Board’s diversity and ethic on equity and diversity. Dr. Andrews reported that the AACU has a Diversity Scorecard tool that may be useful in the development of measures. She also added the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Success Initiatives Joe Holliday is working with enrollment managers across OUS and community colleges on a middle school outreach consortium to bring college outreach to underserved middle school students in the state. Dr. Holliday reported that four pilot project events are planned for this spring and will be delivered in both Spanish and English.

Vice Chancellor Andrews further explained several of the action items in the plan. To improve faculty diversity, she explained that the System would develop resources on best practices for campuses, such as workshops on recruiting and retaining diverse faculty. On engagement with external groups, Andrews reported that on June 3, 2011, the Coalition of Color will speak to the OSBHE regarding a study they performed that showed major disparities in higher education. Director Powers commented that it will be important to engage Native American communities as well. Equity and diversity are now frequently on leadership agendas such as the Provosts’ Council and ASC. To ensure Board diversity, Director Powers also commented that the ASC should look at ways to encourage diverse membership, although membership is not the Board’s decision. Chair Francesconi suggested that diversity be added to the Governance Committee in regard to recommendations to the Governor. It was further suggested that the Finance and Administration Committee review diversity in capital projects and contracting.

Provost Steven Adkison noted that, from a campus perspective, the plan is important for EOU because the campus is small and needs to serve broad rural communities. They look forward to having more expertise and resources from which to draw.

Director Francesconi and Director Powers were supportive of the document and Francesconi noted that it would be good to prioritize a few of the items on this list as a committee. Director Powers added that most of the campus diversity plans will have issues on courses and curriculum on diverse issues and those issues could be more explicit here. She also added that in program approval she always asks the campus representatives what is being done to recruit or serve underserved communities in each program area to encourage sensitivity about diversity and access. Director Powers said she doesn’t want the Board to take an over-controlling stance but she would like to look into how tenure promotion and other rewards to faculty can reward faculty commitment to diversity. She also suggested follow-up with the
Oregon College Access Network, review of the past work and priorities set by the Participation and Completion Committee, and engagement with the Oregon tribes.

Director Francesconi and Director Powers thanked Vice Chancellor Andrews and commended her for developing a promising action plan in this area. In response to Director Francesconi’s question on what priorities should be from the document, Director Powers said there should be review of the past work and priorities set by the Participation and Completion Committee, a consideration of the Diversity Scorecard, progress on faculty diversity, and prioritization of bridge-building with the Native American community. Vice Chancellor Andrews said she would come back with a revised plan based on the discussion and with a progress column added. Director Francesconi asked that the ASC have a deeper discussion on the item in April, followed by a discussion with the full Board.

4. **Teacher Education Update**

Chair Francesconi called upon Dr. Andrews to present the item noting that this is not a report requiring approval but a brief update on developments related to teacher education so that a larger discussion can occur later. Vice Chancellor Andrews asked Assistant Vice Chancellor Bob Turner to present status of current initiatives and developments.

Dr. Turner explained contextual issues regarding the complexity of policy discussions with regard to teacher preparation. He noted that the private programs in the state tend to follow the strategic direction of the OUS teacher education programs so setting initiatives at the OUS level can have a state impact. OUS is working with the Oregon Coalition for Quality Teaching and Learning, which launched in 2009 and have worked on several initiatives that are outlined in the House Bill 3619 report. Two of these have gone forward into bills on adoption of statewide standards for teacher preparation programs based on InTASC standards, an a second on an “ETIC-like” fund for teacher prep partnerships with school districts that would require new funding. They have also discussed how to incorporate student learning assessments into the teacher evaluations.

The coalition very much wants OUS’ involvement and wants someone from OUS to be on their executive committee, and Turner said that it is in our universities’ interest to be kept abreast on teacher education developments. The next initiative for the coalition is the new NCATE Alliance for Clinical Teacher Preparation. Vice Chancellor Andrews added that OUS was the lead in signing up for this initiative and should be a strong presence if not on the main group that moves this forward. The document submitted by OUS, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission, and Oregon Department of Education is included in the docket materials.

Through the NCATE Alliance, participating states higher education officials and K-12 leaders will work to create local partnerships that provide clinically based training to develop teachers. They will start pilot programs which may demonstrate how the state could scale up the work of teacher prep providers and classroom practitioner partnerships more broadly. Alliance participants will be influence state and local policies, funding incentives, and new approaches to teacher preparation programs.

Turner suggested potential roles the Committee to consider, to propose and define goals for OUS teacher preparation programs, or to request that programs develop outcomes and
timelines for these goals. Teacher prep programs could report their progress regularly to the Provosts’ Council to hear recommendations. Director Powers committed that the clinical practice sounds like a good idea but, in a rural area, sometimes the capacity of school districts to mentor teachers may become overwhelmed since there are not many schools. Vice Chancellor Andrews responded that this initiative has discussed this caution and they want to ensure that the burden of clinical practice doesn’t fall on teachers but is a shared responsibility. Powers also suggested the System can also review to see that university programs are preparing future teachers to teach for diversity.

Chair Francesconi and Board members discussed with Vice Chancellor Andrews and Bob Turner what the best role would be for the Committee going forward since the work plan is not yet clear. Dr. Andrews responded that the Committee has established teacher education as an important priority, so staff will continue reporting back and will request endorsement for initiatives as they develop further.

OTHER ITEMS

5. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business proposed, Chair Francesconi adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.