REGULAR MEETING OF THE
OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

December 15, 1995

ROLL CALL

ACTION ITEM

Finance and Administration
President’s Residence, OIT

ADJOURNMENT TO WORK SESSION

Birth Announcement

WORK SESSION: Board’s Planning Process

ADJOURNMENT
ROLL CALL
The special meeting of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 9 a.m. by President Swanson.

On roll call, the following answered present:

Dr. Herb Aschkenasy  Ms. Gail McAllister
Mr. Bob Bailey  Mr. Rob Miller
Ms. Diane Christopher  Ms. Esther Puentes
Mr. Tom Imeson  Mr. Jim Willis

Mr. Les Swanson, Jr.

Mr. Mark Rhinard was out of state, and Ms. April Waddy was absent because, on December 1, her son, Isaiah Barhoum, was born.

PRESIDENT'S RESIDENCE, OIT

Staff Report to the Board
The owner of the house in Klamath Falls being leased as the residence for the president of Oregon Institute of Technology has informed us that she wishes to occupy the house and is ending the lease. Due to this situation, it is an appropriate time to purchase a president's residence near the Oregon Institute of Technology campus, since there are houses available that can meet the public access needs for such a residence.

Staff Recommendation to the Board
Staff recommended that the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration be instructed to take appropriate action to identify and purchase a president's residence in Klamath Falls.

Board Discussion and Action
Ms. Marilyn Foute reported that a three-person committee has been formed to explore various options. A formal report will be presented to the Board at the January meeting.
Mr. Willis moved and Ms. Christopher seconded the motion to approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Aschkenasy, Bailey, Christopher, Imeson, McAllister, Miller, Puentes, Willis, and Swanson. Those voting no: none.

The special meeting of the Board adjourned at 9:07 a.m.

Chancellor Cox announced to the Board the birth of Isaiah Saleem Barhoum to Board member April Waddy. Isaiah was born on December 1, 1995, to April and Erek.

The Work Session began at 9:10 a.m.

Chancellor Cox indicated that he wanted to take a few minutes to set the stage for the Board’s Work Session.

"I would like to set the scene for the process in which we’re engaged, what we hope the outcome will be, and the ambitious timeframe we’re on, and then talk about today’s tasks. I’d like you to think about a vision for higher education in Oregon that goes beyond where we are now into 2005-2010. It’s a daunting aspiration because it asks us to do things differently, asks us to let go of a lot of history in terms of our thinking, and asks us to engage in a very hectic and focused period of work that will so command our time that we will need to place the rest of the Board’s work in a maintenance mode so that we can focus on this. It will mean that the Academic Council and the Administrative Council will put some things aside on behalf of focusing maximum energies on what we’re trying to do here.

"Let me talk about the Oregon higher education system I envision. It would be an environment where education sectors work together in complementary ways far beyond anything we’ve ever done in the past -- K-12, the community colleges, independent colleges, and even out-of-state providers -- an Oregon where our relationship with the community colleges and K-12 truly produces a seamless system. I dream of the day when a student can take Biology 101 and it won’t matter where -- because the state’s biology faculty will have agreed what the learning outcomes of Biology 101 should be, at least for the freshman and sophomore years. This ought to be the case for the entire Freshman-Sophomore liberal arts and sciences phase of undergraduate education."
"I think we need to think about relationships with the independent colleges beyond where we have in the past and what our relationship is to organizations such as OGI. How do our science and engineering efforts relate?

"I envision an Oregon where we will make strategic targeted investments in higher education in support of identified key industries and gear up to produce educated personnel to make those enterprises function.

"We must change the way we think about statewide services. It involves all of us, not just OSU. It's an Oregon where graduate programs and our research efforts are far more coordinated than they have been before in the sense of meeting needs that we and Oregon have identified together. An Oregon where our institutions are far more differentiated than they are now in terms of missions. An Oregon where our role in regional and economic development is not an afterthought but fundamental...where all regions come to share in the prosperity -- a diversified, balanced economy. It has to be an Oregon where not all growth occurs in Portland. I think higher education has a role in economic and regional development in working with the State Department of Economic Development far beyond anything in which we're presently engaged. An Oregon that pays attention to the total economic base. We come from the land and spring from a natural resource economy and we cannot neglect that. But we must balance it against the Oregon economy that's coming, and we must be certain that our educational enterprise relates to both.

"I envision an Oregon where citizens point with pride to their university system and acknowledge the effect we have had upon moving the state's agenda forward to achieving a level of economic balance and the good life to which all of our citizens are entitled. Where businesses can look to us for baccalaureate-level students with the competencies employers need, are entitled to expect, and which they have had a hand in specifying. I've been asked by the board of a very influential organization in Oregon: "Are you still paying attention to the education of the next generation of leadership in this state? Are you paying attention to undergraduate education?" Our answer must be: "Yes, and it's at the center of what we're doing." We must envision an Oregon into the new century where the promise we made to young Oregonians when the university system was created is fulfilled: If you're willing to work hard, study diligently, and prepare, there will be a place for you in higher education. We promised them that opportunity and we must keep that pledge."
"I envision an Oregon that can be constructed on that great capacity in science and research that our university system provides, where the line between private and public sectors is more blurred and where joint ventures become easier. "Partnership" can't just be rhetoric; it must signify the reality of what we must do if the industries that will need to be here in the next century are to be created.

"How do we do all of this with declining resources? By doing fewer things better. Greater institutional mission differentiation must occur. Our process, as John Bernard has shared it, is in three parts. We're at the start. We're at the situational analysis stage — trying to understand clearly what we're doing and also listening carefully to what Oregonians say we need to be. We're at the discovery stage. Once we more clearly understand what Oregon will need from us, then we can move to the second stage (in about 90 days).

"In the second phase, we must stretch to envision the Oregon university system that we'll need to be. Then, in the third step, we will identify gaps between what we are presently doing now, how we're doing it, and what we will need to do to achieve that vision. Along the way, I anticipate that a lot of present thinking and a good deal of focus on narrower objectives will be put aside, as it must be if we are to achieve what best serves Oregon.

"Let me talk about what we're doing today. We need to review the planning process — definitions and charges — and to buy into that as the process. It may be imperfect, but it's well thought out and gets us started. Then we'll look at understanding what our working relationships with each other will be along the way — with the Governor's Office, the legislative branch, with our other education sector colleagues, with various associations, etc., and we will possibly create some other teams that don't now exist. For example, the presidents this morning talked about creating an "intersection team" of provosts to monitor the work of the task forces and identify where those agendas cross/collide.

"With our legislative colleagues, we have talked about adding liaison members who have an interest in higher education and who can be a link of understanding between our work and the task forces and their colleagues. You'll notice, in the planning notebook, that we've left the four task forces with room for additional members. We've made suggestions to the kinds of representation you may want. We will leave that for the task forces to decide, for balance, who to invite. We didn't want to lock you into what kinds of expertise you may need or what information and data you will need from us. We've asked Lisa Stevens and Dale Hess to go back through Board minutes.
and identify all of the studies we’ve done as a System and produce executive summaries of those so you won’t have to reinvent wheels. We’ve also asked the presidents to give to me, by Monday, their list of the top five or six recent higher education national studies.

“Finally, today, in the task force meetings, you will need to set calendars. Ninety days is ambitious and there is a lot of work. We won’t tell you how often to meet, but you will be able to use regular Board meetings. Also, just to reassure the four chairs, we have assigned a note taker/scribe to each team. The Economic and Community Development task force will be supported by Susan Johnese; the Undergraduate task force supported by Vicki Shives; Graduate Education and Research task force supported by Jim Arnold; and Lifelong Education supported by Diane Sawyer. Senior staff assistance will be provided by the vice chancellors and their associates.

“Finally, let me say again as emphatically as I can, this is not a short-term crash effort just aimed at the 1997-1999 biennium. That is an integral piece of our work, but we are also focused on the long-term tasks before us stretching well in to the new century.”

In closing, the Chancellor indicated that the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) would be submitting names to him for membership on each of the task forces. In addition, the Oregon Student Lobby (OSL) will do the same for student membership.

Vice Chancellor Tim Griffin asked the work group to consider three things:

- What you want to accomplish today
- Concerns
- Questions that need to be answered

The results of the group discussion is summarized on Attachment A.

Mr. Willis indicated that he had the following questions: What do we want to accomplish? Is it a new mix of programs at the institutions or a broader look at the future of education? Chancellor Cox asked the question, “Are we going to get this opportunity again?”

Mr. Miller remarked that he was uncomfortable with the process. “Is the process the product? Sometimes the process becomes the product and I am totally against that. A failure of task force work is that there is no enforcement mechanism, no accountability. I worry about those things.”
Dave Gilbert added that we may need to be prepared to send some very clear messages to others that they need to do things differently, too.

Mr. Griffin re-introduced John Bernard of World Class Management, Inc., who has continued to donate his time assisting the Board and OSSHE in the planning effort. Mr. Bernard emphasized that this is not just planning. We are looking at creating new levels of working together and creating trust. "We must be creative and move to different levels of thinking than we have done before. There is no chance for success if you are not all aligned. When you’re making system changes, when it’s complex, there are a lot of people trying to pull it apart. The less aligned you are, the less likelihood there is that you are going to be successful."

One of the first steps to being aligned is to have agreement on ground rules for functioning during the period of planning. "When you set ground rules to which you all agree, you actually sign your name to them. It is the way we have to work together to get this job done and that is not the same way in which we have operated in the past. The responsibility to get this done is yours. The degree to which you fall apart and become misaligned is the degree to which you tear away the fabric and chances of success. When you disagree, you argue it out. Seek first to understand and then to be understood," continued Mr. Bernard.

At the conclusion of the Work Session, the Board members, presidents, IFS, and OSL representatives signed a list of ground rules. A copy of those rules is found in Attachment B.

The group discussed the charters that had been proposed for each of the task forces. Dave Frohnmayer observed that "system" was used frequently in the charter statements and that it should not be interpreted to mean "OSSHE," but rather should mean "system of education." There was agreement that he was correct and the interpretation should be one that crosses education boundaries.

Mr. Bernard added that the matrix for work by the task forces needed to include "clients." Following on that comment, Mr. Griffin indicated a need for caution in "over-surveying constituents. There is the possibility that each group will think it needs to survey the same clients, and we must guard against that."

Mr. Charles Rosenthal, a member of the public attending the Work Session, asked a series of questions. "As a lay person, it is not clear how you define
terms like undergraduate education, economic development, and graduate education. Any process like this is a continuing process that adapts to environmental changes. In business you make a five-year plan and re-evaluate it every year. You are assuming reduced resources. As a citizen, I consider education very vital. If it is necessary to have more resources, you need to say so. Why is labor not considered a contributor to the process? You have businesses, but why not professional societies?"

Mr. Miller challenged some of the planning assumptions. “Where I have seen task forces fail is that they spend too much time and gather too much information in phase one. Secondly, they fail because people don’t accurately assess what is really doable. Finally, they fail because no one is strong enough to put up targets and goals on which you might fail.”

Mr. Imeson asked, “How do you agree on a process that will get us to our goal? We talk about what the Governor wants and doesn’t want. He wanted to see education approached in a seamless way. I don’t see us bringing in other people. Turf battles won’t be the product the Governor wants. We need to ask other players whether they think our design is appropriate and incorporate responses as much as possible into the work of the task forces. Also, I agree that there is urgency. But I’d like to have a better idea of what we are trying to deliver in June. If we’re trying to look at whether Oregon’s educational delivery system matches the needs of the next century, that is a pretty fundamental and large undertaking and we need to make sure we are doing everything possible to link others up with this.”

President Ramaley questioned a comment made about the overall goal. “You [Mr. Bernard] have said twice that our goal is to change the System. This is, in my opinion, not our goal. I believe our goal is first to be certain that we are utilizing resources currently in the System as effectively as possible to service the needs of the state. Second, we need to align ourselves as closely as possible to service needs of the state. Then we need to figure out what needs and gaps exist and connect to them. Those are all ways to be sure that we are using resources to the best possible advantage of the state and that they are tied to others’ efforts to do the same thing. Change of the System is not the goal; that may be the means to achieve the goals.”

There was agreement that each task force should begin with a review of the relevance of the 2010 vision coupled with the opening remarks made by Chancellor Cox. These steps could provide some uniformity of purpose and direction. In addition, Dr. Aschkenasy added, “We have an opportunity. It would be very useful to come up with a game plan in time to be included in
the Governor’s June budget for one reason only: This is a popular Governor and he has made noises about running again. If that’s true, and he buys into our plan, we have six years to execute it -- six years to make transitions that may very likely be difficult. Time is an asset if we use it wisely. It is a good idea to have a program supported by the executive branch.”

Mr. Imeson emphasized a point he had made earlier. “The Governor said, in a letter we received at our meeting in Klamath Falls, that he would create a process and have people involved -- K-12, the Children and Families Commission, the Economic Development Commission, and higher education. We need to be clear about those things we are looking at and what the check points are. I see this going beyond the biennial budget -- it is a five- to six-year plan, revised each year. It doesn’t help the Governor to have higher education plan and the community colleges have something quite different that he tries to adjudicate. He has told us to talk to other people, too, and don’t make this inside baseball; make it connect with the state. We have to make the System relevant. Then you have something with which to work that is a longer-term investment strategy.

“I met with President Ramaley and we talked about the business community and linkages to higher education. She said that the business community doesn’t always know what it wants. CEOs don’t know what they want. But it is more than asking questions and getting answers. It is having a dialogue. This needs to occur so that dialogues are done and done right.”

It was observed that if the Governor doesn’t buy into the process the Board is using, we risk being bypassed by him. Then time and energy is wasted by all who have been part of the process.

Before adjourning to the task force meetings, Mr. Swanson added two areas of concern. “First, how much we make what we do come into contact with other interest groups in the state? And secondly, how do we keep in synch with the governor’s planning process and what he does about the other segments of education starting in 1996?

“As the Chancellor mentioned, at every monthly meeting of the Board, we will have to set aside some time for the planning process. We are going to have to be flexible and work hard to identify some of the groups in the community. That is not just groups back at the campuses, but some business and industry groups, K-12 groups. We have to be sensitive to communicating with others and the Governor and not do good planning in which no one wants to be a part.”
The work group adjourned at 11:50 a.m. and reconvened at 1:45 p.m.

Mr. Barnard suggested that by January 10, 1996, each of the task forces would finalize their charters and circulate them to everyone else.

Agreements were reached on the ground rules and there was further discussion of previous concerns.
What You Want to Accomplish Today

- Clarity on what we want to achieve in this process
- Develop a plan/mechanism for sharing between task forces
- A method where an idea developed/challenged is developed to implementation
- IFS be part of task forces work to help accomplish that work
- A clear understanding of the ground rules for the first 90 days
- Task forces need to clearly state assumptions

Concerns

- Scope of task forces is too broad -- what can we accomplish?
- Do we have enough time?
- Credibility of process -- make sure there is no predetermined answer!
- Look carefully at what we do well!
- That we won’t go in depth enough to deal with critical issues for education and we’ll be here again!
- That we’ll do nothing and what would that create?
- Don’t miss the Governor’s opportunity
- That the process might become the product
- Can we implement?
- We won’t send messages about what others need to do differently
- That we address the different work environment effectively
- That we change just to say we did
Strategic Planning Process -- Ground Rules

- No tenure on task force (into phases II and III)
- Seek consensus on key decisions
- No turf
- No destructive press
- Everyone is equal
- No hidden agendas
- No passive voice (identify what you own)
- No long stories (dominating)
- Humor is ok, not at other’s expense
- Seek 100% attendance; own catching up
- Speak your peace; own the problem
- Use meetings wisely
ADJOURNMENT  The special meeting of the Board adjourned at 2 p.m.

Virginia L. Thompson
Secretary of the Board

Les Swanson, Jr.
President of the Board