MINUTES

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of February 14th and March 7th Minutes
3. Legislative Update
4. Campus 40-40-20 Assumptions and Diversity Goals
5. No other items were put forward by the committee
6. Adjournment
Committee members present: Chair James Francesconi, Jill Eiland, Emily Plec, Brianna Coulombe and Jim Middleton. Director David Yaden was absent.

Chancellor’s staff present: Karen Marrongelle, Anna Teske, Bruce Schafer, Bridget Burns and Rod Johnson.

Campus representatives present: Steve Adkison (EOU), Brad Burda (OIT), Sona Andrews (PSU), and Steve Scheck (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. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 14TH AND MARCH 7TH MINUTES

ACTION: Directors Emily Plec made the motion to approve the minutes and Jim Francesconi seconded. Motion carried.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

3. LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Chair Francesconi called upon Bridget Burns, Chief of Staff, to update the committee on the progress of the 2013 Legislative Session. It was reported that all Oregon University System (OUS) policy bills have passed out of their respective Senate policy committees, and have moved onto the Ways and Means committee or House policy committees for further consideration. In addition, HB 3120 (structural reform concept) and SB 270 (institutional governing boards) are central to the conversation around governance reform. Stakeholders continue to sharpen amendments to both bills with the understanding that both pieces of legislation must work in concert with one another.

The committee also heard status updates on tuition equity (HB 2787), veterans tuition equity (HB 2158 and SB 820), Oregon Opportunity Grant for students in STEM fields (SB 702), and an overview of the OUS Ways and Means Education Subcommittee presentation. In addition, the committee discussed capital projects, the Governor’s recommended budget, tuition increases, and the impact of PERS and PEBB reform on state allocations.

NEXT STEPS: Staff will continue to track key legislation and provide an update to the Full Board in April.
4. **Campus 40-40-20 Assumptions and Diversity Goals**

Chair Francesconi opened the discussion by asking Karen Marrongelle, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Strategies, to provide context for the report on campus 40-40-20 assumptions and diversity goals. It was pointed out that while campuses have provided conservative diversity projections, staff will be working to establish standards to evaluate goals for effectiveness, as well as possible synergies with the committee’s work on 40-40-20.

Attention was drawn to the staff request for campuses work on 40-40-20. The request included details of current 40-40-20 plans, strategies considered for reaching 40-40-20, obstacles to success, and the type guidance needed from the Committee and full Board. In response, campuses put forward a variety of strategies and key assumptions that should be evaluated and rolled-up into the work being conducted by President Donegan and Interim Chancellor Rose.

Discussion centered on campus climate, college readiness and the student pipeline, and cost of instruction. It was pointed out that while many of the campuses have made the assumption that the state will increase appropriations to help k-12, community colleges and universities reach 40-40-20, educators will also need to consider how much more work they can do without additional appropriations. Concern was expressed about campus capacity to expand current academic programs without saturating the employment market in particular fields. One recommendation advanced by the provosts expands the idea of targeted recruitment to help connect students with critical degrees, and/or programs that have room for expansion. The matter was studied at length noting that the cost of increased enrollment depends primarily on where campuses experience growth, in addition to concerns over physical space.

The committee agreed that while additional investment is needed on campuses to meet 40-40-20, students and their families are unable to bear the continuously increasing costs of higher education. Discussion pointed to expanding connections between high schools, community colleges, and four year institutions as a strategy for managing costs.

**NEXT STEPS:** Staff will work with the Provosts to generate campus-specific responses to 40-40-20 that includes what they can do without additional funding, and what they would be able to accomplish with additional investments. The response should include enrollment projections and underlying costs, as well as unique campus strategies for reaching 40-40-20.

5. **Other Items**

6. **Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.