Committee members present: Kerry Barnett, Roger Bassett, Jim Lussier, Erin Watari (arrived 8:25 a.m.), Phyllis Wustenberg and Leslie Lehmann.

Chancellor’s Office staff: Chancellor-designate Richard Jarvis, Shirley Clark

Others: Phil Creighton (EOU), Martha Anne Dow (OIT), Dave Frohnmayer (UO), Lesley Hallick (OHSU), Paul Risser (OSU)

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 8:03 a.m. by Chair Leslie Lehmann, and roll call was conducted by Board Secretary Vines.

Approval of April 19, 2002, Meeting Minutes

Mr. Lussier moved and Mr. Bassett seconded the motion to approve the April 19, 2002, Committee meeting minutes as submitted. The motion unanimously passed.

Discussion Item

Strategic Planning Update

Ms. Lehmann said that summaries of the two work sessions involving the Board, Vice Chancellors and Presidents are available. She explained that the summaries contain information which synthesizes the individual responses to template questions; identifies the areas of agreement; lists the issues for clarification on System priorities; and address the issue of the relative roles of the System and the campuses. She stated that John Svicarovich, a consultant, is working on a draft plan for the Board renewal in July, which will incorporate the work done in the sessions and will frame the policies issue before the Board. The draft will provide the history of the strategic planning process; identify plan sections; include suggestions from the presidents; and frame key policy decisions for discussion. Ms. Lehmann stressed that this is a draft only and isn’t intended to represent recommendations or conclusions but is being developed as a working piece only. She explained that David Longanecker, who facilitated the two prior work sessions, will facilitate the renewal.
John Svicarovich stated that he hoped to bring to the renewal a set of ideas that will help to define some of the strategic issues that the Board and System are currently facing. He stated that, as they progress, they will begin to address policy choices and recommendations for policy decisions. Ms. Lehmann expressed the importance of full Board and presidential engagement in this process.

Mr. Bassett stressed the importance of recognizing that the question of access and governance affects not only the Board, but university campuses as well. He felt that the role of the Board in this process is to identify the fundamental policy and to enable decisions. He felt the decisions should allow for change at a broad level. He recognized that there are some immediate needs on the part of the universities and their presidents and that significant momentum at the campus level is driven by enlightened leadership. However, he acknowledged the time constraints of facing the legislative session, which creates a sense of urgency that isn’t necessarily in the best interest of solid enabling decisions. He urged presidents and campus communities to keep the Board informed about campus strategies and plans that are under way so that the Board can manage the time-lines in such a way that doesn’t slow the momentum necessary at the campus level. He stated that the strategic planning process also serves to inform the public that the System is collectively considering some new directions. By making the message general and widely understood, it would take some of the pressure out of the planning process. He felt that the enabling work will continue beyond the legislative session, but must begin now so that it can be reconciled through appropriate momentum at the campus level.

Mr. Lussier expressed the importance of moving beyond the planning stage and into the implementation phase. He reiterated the importance of the presidents’ role in the process. He felt the Board needs to concentrate its time and effort to create a context so that the issues can be addressed without delaying progress. He suggested developing a schedule of the policies and decisions, which sets target dates for completion.

Although some of the decisions are pressing, Ms. Lehmann pointed out that the Board may have to come back later and look Systemwide at issues such as affordability and access, and possibly make adjustments after the fact. Mr. Lussier noted the challenge of balancing the commendable things that campuses would like to do with the needs of the System while supporting the campus efforts, allowing that the greater void is at the System level rather than at the campus level. He felt that it is the Board’s responsibility to design a System that supports all those things, and there are issues that need to be enumerated. He pointed out that the Board doesn’t spend a lot of time actually writing policy, which would define what the Board means by access and other issues. He expressed the importance of including presidents in the process.

Ms. Wustenberg expressed the need to also define quality. She has been increasingly concerned that the Board has made access the highest priority, inviting all qualified students to enroll, but that is no guarantee that they’re going to get a quality education. She felt that, with increasingly more students enrolling without state support, it becomes
more difficult to maintain quality. She stated that there has to be a balance and felt that it is far more important to guarantee a quality education than to enroll every student.

Dr. Vines noted that all of the template responses have been completed, with the contribution of all Board members and presidents. She pointed out the importance of the result of the template responses as they clearly identify where there is agreement and disagreement, and where major policy work still needs to be done. She felt that a fair amount of that work can be achieved at the July renewal, which will be entirely dedicated to the strategic planning process.

Mr. Bassett said there is some line between what the Board does and what is naturally and best left to others. He felt that additional sessions may be needed in order to find a mutually comfortable distinction between those issues best determined by the Board and those that are better decided elsewhere, particularly at the campus level.

Mr. Lussier stated that he has some goals that he would like to present during the renewal, which will be sent in draft form to Board members prior to then. Ms. Lehmann encouraged Mr. Lussier to provide a draft for Mr. Svicarovich.

Dr. Vines said she would be sure that Mr. Svicarovich and Mr. Longanecker work together to develop a decision-making schedule.

Mr. Bassett also encouraged Chancellor-designate Jarvis to participate in the process.

Adjournment

Mr. Bassett moved to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 8:29 a.m.