1. **Call To Order/Roll Call**

The meeting of the System Strategic Planning Committee of the State Board of Higher Education was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by Chair Bassett.

On roll call, the following Committee members answered present:

Roger Bassett  
Jim Lussier  
Kerry Barnett  
Erin Watari  
Leslie Lehmann  
Phyllis Wustenberg

Absent: None

**Other Board members present:**

Geri Richmond  
Tim Young

**Chancellor's Office staff present:** Chancellor Richard Jarvis, Tom Anderes, Shirley Clark, Nancy Goldschmidt, Grattan Kerans, Bob Kieran, Dave McDonald, Ben Rawlins, Diane Vines, and Susan Weeks

**Others:** Philip Conn (WOU), Phil Creighton (EOU), Martha Anne Dow (OIT), Tim White (OSU) and Elisabeth Zinser (SOU)

Meeting attendees also included other institutional representatives, members of the Chancellor’s Office staff, and interested observers.

2. **Approval Of Minutes**

- **October 18, 2002, System Strategic Planning Committee Meeting Minutes**

The Committee dispensed with the reading of the October 18, 2002, Committee meeting minutes. Director Lehmann moved and Director Wustenberg seconded the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Barnett, Bassett, Lehmann, Lussier, Watari, and Wustenberg. Those voting no: none.

**CONTINUATION OF WORK SESSION**

- **Discussion of 2002-2003 Enrollment Report**

Continuing the discussion of the Enrollment Report that was presented during the Work Session, Director Wustenberg asked if there were data on the number of Oregon high school graduates who went on to higher education or community colleges.

Mr. Kieran responded that every two years a study entitled, “Where Have Oregon's Graduates Gone” is conducted. In the last study, there were indications that about 70 percent of the students go on to higher education somewhere. About 23 out of 100 enrolled in OUS institutions; about 22 or 23 out of 100 went to community colleges, and
the rest went out-of-state or delayed a year or more before moving into higher education.

Director Lussier observed that after the passage of Measure 5 there was a flattening of enrollment and he wondered if there were a way to measure what the impact on enrollment would have been had that not occurred. He asked if there were a way of projecting what might happen if enrollment were capped today. Mr. Kieran indicated that it would be a straight line. “If we had projected to 100,000 in 2010 and we’re projecting a flat line, then the difference between 78,000 or 80,000 currently enrolled and the 100,000 we would project, would be a 20,000 student difference in that ten year period.” Mr. Lussier asked if that could be shown on the graph. “I think it will help us in terms of advocacy to be able to say, ‘Here is the number of students who fall out of this picture if that same thing occurred today as a result of actions we’re taking that happened after Measure 5.’”

President White observed that, “In the realm of public opinion and government opinion, we’re doing well. Student numbers are up, nominal money is up, student satisfaction is up. So what’s the problem?” He indicated that we need to be careful about the messages we are sending to the public.

3. **Report Item**
   a. **The Status of the 2000-01 Bachelor’s Degree Recipients: One Year Later**

*Background*

In the mid-1990s, both Oregon legislators and leaders in the business community began asking questions about how well prepared today’s college graduates are for the demands of the contemporary workplace and knowledge-based economy. These questions corresponded with a shift in concern about workplace readiness, heretofore largely confined to elementary and secondary schooling. This consideration reflected the growing importance of a college education and highly educated workforce to support Oregon’s plan for economic diversification.

To fill gaps in campus information about whether graduates found employment and were prepared for the workplace, the Chancellor’s Office of the Oregon University System initiated the first systematic study of recent graduates in 1996 (for graduates in 1994-95). OUS asked questions about what graduates were doing, the employment sector and location of their jobs, whether what they are doing relates to their degrees, and if their academic studies provided ample opportunities to gain practical experience. The focus of this report is the satisfaction of the 2000-01 bachelor’s graduates within a year after crossing the stage to receive their bachelor’s degrees.

These data suggest both the System’s capacity to provide quality undergraduate programs as well as the student’s perception about the academic and professional benefits of a higher education experience. In addition to providing baseline measures of graduate satisfaction, these data, in conjunction with campus-specific surveys, help to focus campus improvement efforts.
Findings for 2000-01 Bachelor’s Graduates

OUS awarded 9,590 bachelor’s degrees in academic year 2000-01. Using the lists of graduates provided by the campuses, the University of Oregon’s Oregon Survey Research Laboratory (OSRL) randomly selected bachelor’s degree recipients to serve as the representative sample of that larger population. OSRL conducted a total of 1,004 telephone interviews with recent bachelor’s graduates.

Recent OUS bachelor’s graduates are satisfied and “loyal customers.”

▪ The mean quality rating was 4.0 on a 5-point scale (1 as “poor” and 5 as “excellent”);
▪ If they had to begin all over again, 77 percent would choose the same OUS university; and
▪ 84 percent would choose an OUS university to further objectives in the future.

Nearly all graduates are engaged productively in this downturn economy.

▪ Most graduates are employed in either full- (68 percent) or part-time (15 percent) jobs;
▪ One in ten say they are furthering their education as their primary commitment, but twice as many respondents are taking some classes and working; and
▪ Only 4 percent say they are “looking for work,” suggesting their jobless rate was lower than the jobless rate for the state of Oregon in summer 2002, the time of the survey.

OUS bachelor’s graduates contribute to Oregon’s economy.

▪ 80 percent of the graduates employed took jobs in Oregon; and
▪ The average annual salary for full-time employment ranged between $30,000 and $45,000.

Bachelor’s graduates say OUS experience added skills and competencies to their portfolios.

▪ Nearly all say their OUS experience contributed to the improvement of their critical thinking, oral communication, and writing skills;
▪ 64 percent participated in an internship, with slightly more than half indicating that the experience led to paid employment; and
▪ Of those employed full- or part-time, 15 percent draw upon second language skills to communicate with customers, clients, students, or employees in their workplaces.

OUS graduates exercised choice in pathways to a bachelor’s degree — some held on to the traditional means.
Most begin and complete a degree at different institutions, on average in 4.9 years;
- 57 percent enter as transfer students — two-thirds of those entering from community colleges;
- Only four in ten enter as freshmen and complete at the same institution;
- 36 percent are first in their immediate families to earn a bachelor’s degree, with most beginning at a community college.

Students are bundling available fund sources to pay for college.

- Nearly two-thirds borrowed money by taking out federal loans (65 percent);
- Slightly less than half (48 percent) received support from their families;
- 61 percent received aid in the form of a grant or scholarship; and
- The median loan amount was $17,000 for those borrowing from government and/or private sources.

Performance Summary (1996 compared to 2002)
Learner needs are driving the OUS concept of productivity. Performance of the System and OUS institutions is tracked for (1) recent graduate satisfaction or rating with the overall quality of the education they received, (2) proportion of students completing an internship, and (3) proportion of recent graduates who are successful — all who are productively engaged in a job, furthering their education, or other activity. The proportion that indicate they are “looking for work” reflect the challenges stemming from the nexus of individual characteristics, learning experience, and economic conditions.

Compared to previous findings for 1994-95 graduates one year later (1996), these recent bachelor’s graduates in 2000-01 one year later (2002) suggest that the System’s institutions are doing a better job at meeting their needs:

- Recent graduates give slightly higher ratings of the overall quality of OUS education they received (improving from a mean of 3.7 in 1996 to 4.0 in 2002 on a 5-point scale where 5.0 is “excellent”);
- More graduates completed internships (climbing from 49.8 percent in 1996 to 64.0 percent in 2002, a 29 percent increase); and
- More graduates found work after receiving their baccalaureates (increasing from 74 percent in 1996 to 83 percent in 2002).

The information about the preferences of recent graduates for OUS institutions to future career and personal objectives suggest opportunities for campuses to expand linkages with alumni.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:
Dr. Nancy Goldschmidt presented highlights of what was termed a very positive report on graduates one year after graduation from System institutions. She pointed out that quality and satisfaction with graduates’ university experience were examined.
Chair Bassett indicated that he wanted to structure the SSP work plan so that it would include, in addition to the agreements reached about work scope, references to reports received and/or reports planned to be completed. Director Lussier also noted that the reports in and of themselves are extremely valuable, but that the ultimate question is how do we extract the measures that could be used as a monitor of the System. “A lot of businesses today have what are called dashboards, which amount to taking 15-20 measures that are absolutely critical in a range of areas. It would mean we would select one or two measures from a report like this one, not 10-12, and say these are the things we are going to key in on,” Director Lussier explained. It was agreed that this idea should be further explored.

COMMITTEE ACTION:
No action required.

4. Discussion Items
   a. Oregon Council for Knowledge & Economic Development Recommendation

   Summary
   The Oregon Council for Knowledge and Economic Development (OCKED) has recommended changes to the Oregon Revised Statutes to direct the missions and functions of the Oregon University System and State Board of Higher Education to promote the creation, dissemination, and commercialization of ideas to benefit the economy. Staff recommends the Board support this recommendation.

   Background
   The Oregon Council for Knowledge and Economic Development (OCKED) was established by the 2001 legislature under Senate Bill 273. The mission of the Council is to promote knowledge-based economic development in the State of Oregon.

   At the October 18, 2002, meeting of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education, the Board received the background and draft recommendations of the Council. These recommendations were subsequently presented as part of the Oregon Business Plan Summit on December 9, 2002.

   Included in these recommendations are proposed changes to the Oregon Statutes to direct the missions and functions of the Oregon University System, the State Board of Higher Education, the Oregon Health & Science University and the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department to promote the creation, dissemination, and commercialization of ideas to benefit the economy. The proposed OUS changes are attached.

   At the December 20, 2002, Board meeting, the Board President asked the System Strategic Planning Committee to consider the proposed changes to the OUS mission and functions and make a recommendation to the full Board.
Recommended Changes

351.001 Legislative findings. The Legislative Assembly finds that:

(1) For its political well-being, Oregon needs wise and effective leadership and an informed citizenry.

(2) For its economic well-being, Oregon needs able and imaginative men and women for the direction and operation of all its institutions, for the production of goods and services and for the management of its fiscal affairs. Oregon also needs alert and informed consumers.

(3) For its cultural advancement, Oregon needs creative talent as well as appreciative and discriminating readers, viewers and listeners. Oregon also needs people who understand the diverse patterns of behavior, communication and belief that make up the common cultures of the various communities in which we all must function.

(4) For its survival, Oregon needs citizens who understand the interdependence of human beings and our shared dependence on the resources provided by our natural environment.

(5) Oregon needs people who, in the roles of parents and teachers and in other capacities, are able to transmit the state's and the nation's ideals and heritage to future generations.

(6) For their personal well-being, individual Oregonians need to cultivate an advanced literacy essential to leading productive and rewarding lives. This includes the capacity to think logically and critically; to internalize and exemplify humane values; to write, speak and figure clearly and accurately; to understand, in some depth, a variety of psychological, historical, cultural, aesthetic and scientific concepts and theories; and to master a range of occupational, professional, avocational, social and personal skills. [1993 c.240 §1]

351.003 Additional findings. In addition to making the findings under ORS 351.001, the Legislative Assembly finds that:

(1) Oregonians need access to post-secondary education opportunities throughout life in a variety of forms.

(2) To meet the societal and individual needs described under ORS 351.001, Oregonians have created and sustained, from territorial days to the present, many and diverse institutions of higher education, both independent and state-assisted.

(3) These institutions have developed the intellectual capacity of Oregonians and have prepared thousands of them for productive and fulfilling careers.
(4) These institutions provide educational access to all segments of Oregon’s diverse population, including many students for whom higher education creates the first opportunity for their entry into the mainstream of society.

(5) These institutions provide basic and applied research, both basic and applied, that and actively promote the commercialization of research into generates new knowledge and applies it to the development of new products and processes essential for Oregon’s economic growth.

(6) These institutions provide public service activities that engage the professional expertise of their faculties to solve social problems.

(7) These institutions share with our communities many cultural activities and services of immense importance to the quality of life enjoyed by Oregonians.

(8) These institutions are expanding the times, places and formats of course offerings.

(9) Oregonians’ diverse educational needs will be best met in an environment in which public and independent schools are recognized as critical for meeting those needs. [1993 c.240 §2; 2001 c.964 §1]

351.005 Higher education an important public purpose. Giving due consideration to the historical and continuing interest of the people of the State of Oregon in encouraging deserving and qualified citizens to realize their aspirations for higher education, the Legislative Assembly declares that higher education for residents of Oregon who desire it and are qualified to benefit from it is critical to the welfare and security of this state and this nation and consequently is an important public purpose. [1993 c.240 §3]

351.007 Intent to promote and enhance higher education. The Legislative Assembly declares its intent to promote and enhance higher education in a manner that:

(1) Enables citizens of all ages, backgrounds and levels of income to participate in the search for knowledge and individual development.

(2) Stresses undergraduate teaching as a high priority.

(3) Provides for selected graduate and professional programs that address state, national and global needs.

(4) Encourages high quality research and scholarship, both basic and applied, by its faculty and students.
(5) Fosters diversity of educational opportunity.

(6) Promotes service to the public.

(7) Makes effective and efficient use of human, physical and financial resources.

(8) Encourages cooperation with other educational institutions. [1993 c.240 §4]

351.009 Mission of higher education. The Legislative Assembly declares that the mission of all higher education in Oregon is to:

(1) Enable students to extend prior educational experiences in order to reach their full potential as participating and contributing citizens by helping them develop scientific, professional and technological expertise, together with heightened intellectual, cultural and humane sensitivities and a sense of purpose.

(2) Create, collect, evaluate, store and pass on the body of knowledge necessary to educate future generations.

(3) Provide appropriate instructional, research and public service programs to enrich the cultural life of Oregon and to support and maintain a healthy state economy. [1993 c.240 §5]

(4) Recognize and support the concept that universities give rise to the next generation of ideas and serve as an engine for economic development.

Sec. 1. Board duties regarding measurements, admission standards, degree models, access to services, educational opportunities and credit transfer. The State Board of Higher Education shall:

(1) Continue development of accountability and performance measures with indicators in broad goal areas, including but not limited to:
(a) Enhancing existing quality;
(b) Expanding access;
(c) Maintaining reasonable cost-effectiveness; and
(d) Ensuring employability.

(2) Continue development of a proficiency-based admission standards system that aligns with school reform requirements for kindergarten through grade 12 under ORS chapter 329 in order to improve student performance and better articulate expectations of student learning among the educational sectors.

(3) Continue experimentation with and implementation of various accelerated baccalaureate degree models at state institutions of higher education in applicable programs. The models may include but need not be limited to early
entry and post-secondary options and models that are jointly developed with the State Board of Education.

(4) Continue development of strategies to provide the broadest possible access to educational services for both on-campus and off-campus learners by using technology as well as traditional options.

(5) Continue to work with businesses, industries and agencies to offer increased opportunities for students to participate in internships, practica and service learning experiences. The board shall continue to explore faculty internship opportunities with businesses, industries and agencies.

(6) Continue to work with the State Board of Education to develop policies and procedures that ensure maximum transfer of academic credits between community colleges and state institutions of higher education. [1997 c.653 §1]

(7) Foster both basic research and applied research. Work closely with businesses and economic development entities to expand the commercialization of ideas into companies and jobs for the State of Oregon.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:
Chancellor Jarvis explained that OCKED was requesting the Board’s endorsement of their recommendation to have the mission of OUS changed in the Oregon Revised Statutes. He pointed out that Oregon Health & Science University and the community colleges were in the process of considering similar changes.

Director Young asked for a rationale for striking part of point 351.009 (3), “and to support and maintain a healthy state economy.” Chancellor Jarvis indicated it was to capture the idea more succinctly. Director Watari questioned if the changes were, in fact, moving the Board in a direction of overstepping its role in attempting to oversee what institutions do. Chancellor Jarvis indicated that the proposal would be encouraging the campuses to facilitate and support the ideas, but that the language is entirely permissive.

Director Richmond expressed the view that it was extremely important to have the changes because historically the tenure and promotion system, certainly for faculty in the sciences and, to some extent engineering, have not put a heavy weight on commercialization of research. She added, “Faculty have wanted to do this, but sometimes it is held against them because it is not an article in a peer reviewed published journal. This all validates their exercise and actually supports it.”

President White suggested that the wording in Sec. 1, “…expand the commercialization of ideas into companies and jobs for the State of Oregon,” read “…jobs that benefit the State of Oregon,” so that later there is no misunderstanding about whether it is a company that might be in Washington but that benefits Oregon.
Vice Chancellor Vines acknowledged that this was a valid suggestion and felt assured that the Council would be willing to make the change.

**COMMITTEE ACTION:**
Director Wustenberg moved and Director Lussier seconded a motion to recommend approval by the full Board of the staff recommendation.


**b. System Strategic Directions – Work Plan and Committee Assignment**

Chair Bassett set the context for the Committee work on the proposed set of planning activities. He indicated that the discussion would include reference to the “Measuring Up” report to determine if there is a good connection between the work of the Committee and the general importance of the performance measures used in creating the report. The materials that would be used for the discussion were explained, as well.

In working through the major topics of the System Strategic Directions document presented at the Board Work Session, Director Bassett pointed out that each of the sections suggested steps in an actual work plan. “For example, on the topic of ‘Adopting a Vision for OUS,’” Mr. Bassett indicated, “I would suggest that it is completed. We can return to an item at any time and we can use decisions made earlier as a basis for enriching our discussion. The same is true on the item, ‘OUS Goals and Anticipated Services’ – it is complete.”

Moving through the System Strategic Directions, Director Bassett reminded the Committee that the topic of refining “Mission Statements of Each University and Aligning them with OUS Vision and Goals,” could be labeled a work in progress.” He indicated that this would be an item the Chancellor and presidents would be asked to address and suggested that it would be helpful to have an idea of when this might come up on the agenda of the presidents’ council. In regard to institution missions, Director Lussier reminded the Committee that each of the presidents has expressed some specific goals out of their own strategic plans. He expressed the hope that the individual mission statements would capture the differences, more than the commonalities, of the universities.

Under Item E, ‘Strengthen the Role of OUS Regarding Economic Development,’ it was generally agreed that this is greater than just OCKED and the Board and System involvement in it. Director Bassett suggested that this item was not completed and should have further attention.

‘Identify Unmet Higher Education Needs of the State,’ was highlighted as a place where the report made earlier in the Work Session on enrollment projections and ‘The Status of the 2000-2001 Bachelor’s Degree Recipients: One Year Later,’ should take into
account “the notion of a pipeline of some kind that represents aspirations of Oregonians from the earliest exposure to school until some agreed upon point."

Continuing through the planning document, Director Bassett pointed out that the item regarding partnerships is appropriately addressed by the Joint Boards Working Group. He urged regular attendance and participation by Board of Higher Education members in the work of the Joint Boards since the work of that group and SSP actually overlap in a number of ways. There was discussion around the topic 3(c) that focused on “other Oregon state and local government agencies.” Directors Bassett and Wustenberg indicated a lack of clarity on the topic and a question of partnerships during a time of very limited resources. President Creighton offered the example of capstone experiences at EOU that required internships and co-op experiences with other agencies. He indicated confidence that each of the campuses could provide excellent examples of a range of partnerships that exist with other local government and service agencies.

On the topic of governance structures, Chair Bassett indicated that he had put a hold on the topic, separating the question of governance, as it is likely to develop from the work of the Joint Boards.

Director Lehmann proposed that one way to prioritize the work plan from a time perspective would be to consider those items that would enable the Board and the System to make the higher education case in as strong a manner as possible. “I think the issue of somehow quantifying our relationship to economic recovery is extremely important if we are going to be able to help people understand how we do what we do. How do we explain to folks that disinvestments now are going to hurt us economically?” she questioned.

Director Bassett concurred and expressed the need to capture the urgency that is present around the System and include those items in precise and analytical ways. Going back to the extract of the “Measuring Up Report”, Mr. Bassett underscored that “this work is too visible and too important for us not to have it also reflected in our work. There is really only one category here that I think is not already covered in one way or another and that is the category called ‘preparation.’ That is, the notion of how well and in what ways students are prepared before they arrive at the post-secondary education phase of their lives. This is an item of great interest and will be an item of attention for the Joint Boards Working Group.

“I suggest that the ‘Measuring Up Report’ be embraced by us as a relevant, national work that we consider, not just the document itself, but how it is constructed, and that we use the measures as a guide to things we might do. I make a big point of this document even though it has drawn its share of controversy on several levels. One of these is that it was not constructed in a way that is exactly comparable or relevant. In other words, there are criticisms of the actual measures and whether they are relevant. Mostly it was and still is seen as a judgment of the institutional performance.”
Director Lussier observed that the report actually measures the environment in which an institution exists and it might be interesting to contrast the performance of the institutions with the environment in which they reside. Director Lehmann expanded the discussion by indicating that the Board could use the measures to show two things. “We could use the statistics on participation of high school freshmen entering college and affordability, and compare that to those states that are doing so much better than we are.”

Director Lussier asked Vice Chancellor Clark to comment on whether or not some achievement tests have been downplayed and if some of the state’s internal initiatives were based on the K-12 system making substantial progress in many areas.

Dr. Clark responded that the study that will be presented to the Joint Boards will be examining the high school performance data of students and comparing it to their performance in their first year in college. This, she continued, will have the benefit of looking more closely at the interrelationship of performance at two levels. “I think it’s a very important area for us to discuss further in terms of how we got a grade of ‘C’ as a state in relation to the very serious reform agenda that Oregon has had for a decade. We could certainly look at this in greater detail as it relates to preparation for college and provide more information than what will be in the report.”

Director Young suggested that it was a priority to demonstrate in at least the budget acquisition strategy, that we own access and quality. “It might be useful if we could compile information from the State Scholarship Commission and what could be projected to be raised, and could compile the information and say these are the additional students that will be able to receive a grant at some level.”

Continuing, Director Young shared an idea of creating an OUS citizen advocacy program for higher education and the various partners who could be involved in it. He observed that there are a lot of campus organizations that already do advocacy for their particular institutions and wondered about including them in advocacy for the broader System.

Director Bassett called on Ms. Weeks to present how the SSP Committee might work on a topic such as affordability. “Affordability, for example, addresses a range of topics like a student’s ability to pay. We could get a sense of the continuum between our highest aspiration and what we would do with the last public dollar on the table. This would give the Board a sense of the high stakes that are involved in making a decision in this arena and the importance of it being a very fundamental and focused decision.”

Ms. Weeks indicated that the process of discussion might be to focus on a way to define a particular variable, such as affordability, and look at all of its dimensions. By way of illustration, most of the categories under affordability were drawn from “Measuring Up.” “Family ability to pay is one of those variables. Availability of need-based financial aid, low student debt, manageable tuition rates, and total costs are some additional variables used in the Report. Each of these has, or will have, attached to it some piece
of data that resembles a ‘dashboard’ indicator. Flowing from that is the connection to other strategic planning variables. These are some examples of how the topics might interrelate," Ms. Weeks concluded.

Director Wustenberg suggested another way of looking at progression from the highest aspiration to the last dollar commitment. “It could be to focus on trying to achieve 100 percent of the RAM and going from that as the highest aspiration to the lowest aspiration which is to tax students. If we had our preference, we would have the full state support. Somewhere in between is what we will realistically achieve.”

Director Lussier added that as the policy statements are discussed, they need to be interconnected with other things the Board is doing and connected to the RAM. “It is important that as we finish this work we end up with a System that is in concert with each other item throughout.”

Director Lehmann asked if it were possible to have a way of showing the economic prosperity or economic trends of the other states in the sample of “Measuring Up.” “I am hoping that we can make the case that states that are making the investments in education are doing better economically.”

Director Bassett focused the conversation on materials displaying budget models and quality that had been prepared for the Joint Boards Working Group and indicated they had been useful in that group’s dialogue. “The Quality Education Model from K-12 is the most obvious connection between policy and resource allocation among the three sectors (K-12, community colleges, and higher education). There was a request to see information on these dimensions for the three and have them displayed side-by-side.”

Another overview document prepared by Dr. Clark was reviewed. It was prepared in response to a Joint Board request to examine several questions: How is quality measured? Where are there examples? Have studies of quality been completed and if so, where are they? Director Bassett indicated that the real question is, “What standards of measurement are used in a time of declining resources? The Board does not need to get involved in the detail of performance measures of campuses to enter into a discussion of quality.”

In response to a suggestion by Director Young that advocacy should be included in the planning scheme, Chair Bassett indicated that it is a topic to be picked up later. “We need to be mindful that our work here is that of adopting policy. We had a discussion earlier about advocacy. We can wrestle later with whether advocacy is a policy topic or is a way in which we deliver the results of policy work. I believe there is a distinction to be made here.”

President Creighton suggested that the topic of economic development be added to the work agenda that could also include the focus of economic recovery.
In closing the discussion, Director Bassett said that at the next meeting there would be a work plan that would be a refined version of the System Strategic Directions with an emphasis on the topics to be covered by the SSP Committee. In addition, a more focused discussion would be planned on the topics of affordability and quality.

Director Watari expressed an interest in some information and/or training in diversity since, “We will be forced to make some decisions, especially in light of the Supreme Court decision with the University of Michigan. We need to be informed on this type of information.” Director Bassett acknowledged that this was a topic that he had neglected to add to the list of focus areas for the Committee.

5. Adjournment

The Committee adjourned at 8:15 p.m.