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Minutes

Committee members present: Chair James Francesconi, and Director Jill Eiland. Director Preston Pulliams was absent due to prior commitment. Other Board members present: Directors Brianna Coulombe, and Emily Plec.


Campus representatives: Steve Adkison and Dan Mielke (EOU); Grant Kirby (IFS); David Robinson, Leslie Garcia, and Norwood Knight-Richardson (OHSU); Brad Burda and Ron McCutcheon (OIT); Sabah Randhawa, Larry Flick, and Angelo Gomez (OSU); Roy Koch, Randy Hitz, and Jilma Meneses (PSU); Jim Klein (SOU); Lorraine Davis, and Robin Holmes (UO); and Kent Neely and Malissa Larson (WOU).

ACTION ITEMS

1. Call to Order

Chair Francesconi called the meeting of the Academic Strategies Committee to order at 3:08 p.m.

2. ASC Recommendations for Board Approval

   - OSU, Digital Communication Arts
   - OSU, Women’s Studies
   - SOU, PSM in Applied Mathematics

   Action: Chair Francesconi opened discussion on the new programs proposed, however, because there was not a quorum the program approvals will go to the full Board.

Note: Directors Coulombe and Plec have not formally been appointed to the Academic Strategies Committee, and a quorum is not present for action items.

3. Approval of November 2011 Minutes

   Action: Approval has been carried over to the February 2012 agenda.
DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. ASC Work Plan Update
Chair Francesconi called upon Vice Chancellor Sona Andrews to update members on the progress of annual Committee priorities and provide context for new Board members. Priorities include: educator preparation, diversity, mission alignment/campus compact/achievement compact, and faculty satisfaction, career flexibility, and recruitment and retention. It was agreed that the Committee would also like to focus on economic development.

5. Mission Alignment/ Achievement Compact
Chair Francesconi called upon Dr. Andrews to report on mission alignment and achievement compacts. She indicated that the mission alignment document was developed around the Boards four goals, noting that Systemwide- and institution-specific metrics have been developed to ensure institutions are aligning with mission statements and meeting performance objectives. Each campus compact will include the developed Systemwide metrics, in addition to selected institution-specific metrics. In addition, the achievement compact has been organized in a way that reflects OEIB criteria; however, numbers and capacity have yet to be determined.

Discussion focused on the lessons learned by campuses, which included increased prioritization and organization, introspection, and institutional capacity.

NEXT STEPS: Mission Alignment scheduled to go before the Board for approval in January.

6. Education Deans- Case Statement Presentation
Chair Francesconi directed Dr. Andrews to lead the discussion on the work of the OUS Colleges of Education. Sona Andrews noted that the Education Deans have been working on a case statement title “Oregon Alliance for Teacher Preparation and Partnerships.” The case statement articulates the direction for the Colleges of Education, which is achievable with the proper allocation of resources. Dr. Randy Hitz spoke on behalf of the Education Deans, offering several points of consideration to the Committee:

- Oregon will not realize 40-40-20 without quality education, which extends to quality programs for teachers and school leaders.
- Quality investments in professional development.
- Need for stronger, more intense student teaching experience.
- Oregon is not unique. We should learn from others models for partnership.
- A transformation of the system is needed to create a seamless infrastructure.

Dr. Dan Mielke proceeded by posing several questions for the Committee centering on how the goals of the Education Deans connect to 40-40-20, and STEM. It was agreed that focusing on the “20” or PK-12 will impact students at the pre-college level and by concentrating on teacher education as a critical degree, increase the quality of teaching, as well as cultivate leadership skills. Attention was drawn to the need to focus on student access, as well as diversity, noting
that strategies for addressing these issues will contribute to achieving 40-40-20. In addition, the Committee noted that the Education Deans should highlight for the State Board of Higher Education those areas where they have performed well, and outline those areas where additional support is needed in terms of deliverables and funding. It was agreed that a coordinated effort is needed between K-12 and higher education in order to meet state goals.

**NEXT STEPS:** Deans of Education will provide an update to ASC at the February meeting, and consider future steps.

7. **Diversity Presentation**
Chair Francesconi facilitated the Diversity Presentation by providing a brief history of work previously done in this area, noting that diversity has not been a previously organized group, that ASC has taken a position on diversity that requires campuses to develop a diversity action plan, and that the board expects regular feedback from campuses on diversity.

Angelo Gomez, Chief Diversity Officer at Oregon State University, led the campus presentations by prioritizing the questions in which the Committee members are interested.

**OUTCOMES:** Attention was drawn to institutional design, and enhancing the culture of institutions to the end that they support three core themes: equity, inclusion and diversity. Through introspective analysis campuses may reflect on access, success, institutional climate, curriculum, scholarship and mission, and incorporate into strategic thinking.

**CHALLENGES:** Concern was expressed that campuses possess an embedded institutional opposition to diversity efforts, citing the need to invest in peer groups, and exercise greater outreach in diversity education. Another challenge to diversity efforts is the lack of internal consensus surrounding change, available resources, and prioritization.

**ACCOUNTABILITY:** It was agreed that university presidents must be held accountable for the success of diversity efforts. In doing so, a model has been established, linking the practices of executive leadership to the campus as a whole. It was noted that diversity initiatives should be linked to performance evaluations, which in turn are connected to salary.

In addition, each campus reported on their institutional diversity efforts, highlighting areas of advancement as well as challenges and barriers to achievement. It was agreed that while financial resources are helpful in achieving diversity goals, that alone will not lead to achievement. Rather, financial resources should be coupled with other support systems to achieve successful diversity efforts.

Following the discussion, it was suggested that the Board and campuses need to view models that are working elsewhere, so as to frame a successful result as something that is achievable, as opposed to viewing diversity efforts as obstacles and barriers.

**NEXT STEPS:** Committee will reflect the report from Chief Diversity Officers, and provide them with feedback.
OTHER ITEMS
8. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.