1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL
Chair Roger Bassett called the meeting of the System Strategic Planning Committee of the State Board of Higher Education to order at 1:12 p.m.

On roll call, the following Committee members answered present:
  Kerry Barnett
  Leslie Lehmann (arrived 1:31 p.m.)
  Erin Watari (arrived 1:25 p.m.)
  Phyllis Wustenberg
  Roger Bassett

Absent: none.

Other Board members present: Geri Richmond (arrived 1:25 p.m.) and Jim Lussier.

Chancellor’s Office staff present: Chancellor Richard Jarvis, Tom Anderes, Shirley Clark, Grattan Kerans, Virginia Thompson, Diane Vines, Yvette Webber-Davis, and Susan Weeks.

Others: Ron Bolstad (SOU), Philip Conn (WOU), Martha Anne Dow (OIT), Dixie Lund (EOU), John Moseley (UO), Sabah Randhawa (OSU), and Mary Kay Tetrault (PSU).

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   • April 17, 2003, System Strategic Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

The Committee dispensed with the reading of the April 17, 2003, Committee meeting minutes. Director Wustenberg moved and Director Barnett seconded the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Barnett, Wustenberg, and Bassett. Those voting no: none.

3. ACTION ITEM
   a. Board Statement on Commitment to Quality

Chair Bassett introduced the “Board Statement on Commitment to Quality” by explaining that this was a continuation of the discussion of the last meeting when the Committee considered the usefulness of a Joint Boards Statement. This statement, to
be endorsed by the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education, connects quality to enrollment as a joint response to “what we’re calling the hydraulics among affordability, access, and quality. All of this is a context within which to consider and address the state funding contribution to the OUS and, if it becomes a joint statement, community college system enrollment support,” Director Bassett explained.

The “Why Quality Matters” document was discussed extensively at the last meeting of the Joint Boards Working Group (JBWG). In attendance at that meeting were Board of Education Chair Jill Kirk and Board member Judy Stiegler; Commissioner Cam Preus-Braly; Board of Higher Education Chair Jim Lussier, Board member Roger Bassett, and Chancellor Jarvis.

Continuing, Director Bassett indicated that the statement is “intended to be both descriptive and as precise as we can be. Descriptive in the sense that a Governor or a legislative leader would understand our reasons for establishing quality as the important condition here on how we look at the relationship between state support and dollars. It is a state dollar-to-enrollment relationship. Precise in the sense that a peg, which is probably as precise a wording as I’ve used for this, but that there be almost an index or a ratio established between the level of state support and the level of enrollment that exists in the year 2002-03 for the University System, and for the year 2001-02 for the community colleges, those being the years that we consider to be the point below which quality should not be allowed to drop.”

Vice Chancellor Anderes indicated that this level would be about 74 percent of the RAM funding model. In response to the question of the meaning of the term “funded enrollment,” Director Bassett indicated, “it referred to the level of enrollment that the state allocation can support. The legislature could say, ‘here’s some money; we want you to enroll 10,000 more students.’ This statement would have the Board take the position that ‘no, the level of enrollments that the dollar amount can support is the level that reflects the ratio in 2002-03.’”

Chancellor Jarvis attempted to answer the question of how precise the statement is in defining state funding for some enrollments and not others. “This would be the enrollment that would go through our funding model and would be the enrollment that we acknowledge the state has supported at the level of support that the Board has determined is (its) limit for acceptable funded enrollment.” He indicated that it would refer to those categories for which state General Fund is applicable, specifically resident undergraduate students.

There was considerable discussion around what percent of funding of the RAM is acceptable. The general consensus was that the System has already passed the “tipping point” in terms of sufficient resources to maintain quality within the System. “We’re beyond where we want to be from a quality perspective,” Director Lussier observed. General agreement was that we were already below the acceptable level of funding for Oregon resident students.
Ms. Melissa Unger, Legislative Director, Oregon Student Association (OSA), expressed the concern of the OSA that the Board was making a commitment to quality but not to access and affordability, and that there must be a better balance. Chair Bassett responded, “The balance among quality, access, and affordability is changed from all being equal towards sacrificing access for the sake of quality and affordability so that we are rebalancing them for the sake of a sustainable relationship among them. It does, no doubt, create a reduction or a potential for it in the enrollment opportunity, but our hope is to create an environment within which tuition doesn’t have to carry the same load that it has and, for now, our best response to your point on that is when that next tuition decision comes before the Board, we will have this as context. I just want to keep the idea of balance as a relationship among these three major policy areas in a way that we can somehow sustain the capacity at a level of quality that reflects the promise that you would get what you paid for.”

Director Bassett observed that the point Ms. Unger was making is that the work is not done until all three (quality, affordability, and accessibility) are anchored. “I would still argue it is a necessary place to start. Unless we signal a larger context that places similar emphasis on other elements, access and affordability being the two we’re talking about mostly here, then both the message and the true sense of balance, the sustainable relationship among the three, has still escaped us. It’s not enough just to say this is a starting point when we haven’t recognized those other two. Let us try to work on both the context in which the message is presented and then, beginning with the next agenda of this Committee, bring access and affordability back up on an urgent basis,” Chair Bassett said.

COMMITTEE ACTION:
Director Wustenberg moved that the System Strategic Planning Committee approve the Joint Boards of Education Statement on Commitment to Quality and present it to the full Board for final approval. Director Lehman seconded the motion. Those voting in favor of the motion: Directors Barnett, Lehmann, Watari, Wustenberg, and Bassett. Those voting no: none.

Director Lussier called the Board’s attention to a national movement called the “balanced scorecard” that is specifically directed at healthcare. He indicated that perhaps the Board had done itself some disservice with reference to using just the financial model. “I think better government might be instituted if we had a balanced approach to where all the legislators who need to make these kinds of decisions had the capability to say, ‘here are the three or four or five measures of the important factors and as we affect one, like financing, which is the easiest one to dwell on, we can see the impacts on other measures because more informed decisions will be made. We might take a look at what a balanced scorecard would look like, what would be measured, (and) how would we develop those measures to keep ourselves, as well as other policy makers, honest about the fluidity between those things.”
4. **CONSENT ITEM**  
a. Authorization to Award an Honorary Degree, SOU

**DOCKET ITEM:**  
*Summary*

Board of Higher Education policy permits institutions, with the concurrence of their faculty, to award honorary degrees. Each institution proposing the award of honorary degrees has received the Chancellor’s approval of criteria and procedures for selection that ensure the award honors distinguished achievement and outstanding contributions to the institution, state, or society.

**Southern Oregon University**

Southern Oregon University requested authorization to award an honorary doctorate to Ben Tyran at its June 2003 Commencement ceremony.

Ben Tyran’s highly distinguished business career spans over 50 years. His educational preparation began at Ryder College where he earned a Bachelor’s in Business Education in 1944. He taught high school for a year before signing on with the Arabian American Oil Company to work in Saudi Arabia, New York, and San Francisco as an accountant, economic analyst, and marketing account executive. He returned to school, completing a Master’s in Business Administration at New York University in 1950, and soon thereafter pursued doctoral program coursework at American University.

After serving as a shipping industry analyst with the Labor Management Maritime Committee in Washington, D.C., Tyran moved to San Francisco where he served as general sales manager for the American Independent Oil Company. He moved on to found the International Petroleum Supply Company, serving as president and chief executive officer. In 1962, Tyran joined Natomas, Inc., where he served as director and vice president in charge of developing oil activities. As his career continued to evolve, Tyran was increasingly sought out to assume positions of oil industry leadership. For example, he founded the Isle of Man Petroleum Ltd., served as managing director of the West Indies Oil Company, and director of the Independent Indonesian American Petroleum Company. Finally, culminating a long career of executive entrepreneurship, Tyran became president and director of Natomas Canada, and director of Independent Petroleum Supply (Eastern, Tokyo, and Riyadh). For the decade that followed his retirement until the mid-1980s, Tyran actively consulted with Natomas and other companies and agencies on all aspects of the international oil industry.

Tyran’s retirement has been characterized by dedicated service to Oregon, where he has long resided. At the state level, Tyran served as president of the Council for Economic Development in Oregon and accompanied more than one Governors’ trade missions to the Middle East and Japan. Locally, for many years he led the Economic Development Commission of Ashland, and later joined the board of Rogue Valley Manor.
Southern Oregon University has enjoyed a long-time relationship with Tyran. He was a member and then president of the foundation board from 1979-1983. Two endowments given to the School of Business for lectureships and scholarships attest to his personal generosity. Tyran’s legacy also includes his visionary advocacy for Southern Oregon University’s full development as a distinctive university.

**Staff Recommendation to the System Strategic Planning Committee**

Staff recommended the Board authorize Southern Oregon University to award an honorary doctorate to Ben Tyran at its June 2003 Commencement ceremony.

**COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTION:**

Vice President Ron Bolstad provided additional background information on Ben Tyran and indicated this was an important decision for Southern Oregon University.

Director Barnett moved and Director Bassett seconded the motion to approve the request from Southern Oregon University to award Ben Tyran an honorary doctorate. Those voting in favor of the motion: Directors Barnett, Lehmann, Watari, Wustenberg, and Bassett. Those voting no: None.

5. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

   a. **Mission Differentiation: Initial Discussion**

Director Bassett opened the discussion on mission differentiation by indicating that it comes up in different ways. In the Joint Boards Working Group (JBWG) discussions, it arises as the community colleges wrestle with lack of funding and what kinds of programs could be reduced or eliminated. These usually relate to the vocational and workforce preparation missions. “So, there is a low level worry so far that could become more intense as the budget continues to decline that otherwise really good decisions are going to alter the intended and stated mission of one system or the other and particularly of the relationship between the two of them,” Director Bassett explained.

Attention was focused on four of the seven questions that had been provided:

- What elements of System and institution missions are most important to protect?
- Are there particular strengths in OUS missions and particular weaknesses? Are we missing opportunities, because of “mission gaps,” to serve Oregon’s future needs?
- Is there a danger of “mission collapse” due to Oregon’s budget crisis?
- How do OUS missions relate and articulate with the mission(s) of Oregon’s community colleges?

It was pointed out that there has never been a policy discussion on these issues at the Joint Boards level. Director Wustenberg asked where the Department of Education stood in terms of the Education Reform Act. Chair Bassett observed that higher education has asked for quite a long while when or if it was going to be stabilized so that we could count on the results and build it into higher education plans as well. One of the major failings is that the Act was made law but with little or no funding. “The
funding stayed pretty much the same and the expectations went way up,” Chair Bassett continued. “But that is not what we mean by preparation here. What we’re talking about is how to better link the importance of excellence and of student achievement at the K-12 level to the transition to both community college and higher education. We want to hold the State Board of Education accountable for the preparation of students as they reach us, even if there’s never been an Education Reform Act.”

It was pointed out that, by collaborating across education sectors, by doing things together on purpose, we can even better enable student achievement as students move along the line to college. Vice Chancellor Clark pointed out that there is no evidence at the national level that the standards discussion is diminishing at all. “The ‘No Child Left Behind’ legislation makes it very clear that schools are to be held to high levels of performance. So, there is strong commitment to standards and preparing students for college but, of course, there is also much debate about how that is to be done and who pays.”

Director Lehmann made the point that another area of cooperation was the important role of preparing teachers, since they represent the preparation pipeline.

Returning to the discussion of mission differentiation, Director Lehmann and Chair Bassett indicated that part of the discussion has to revolve around what the state thinks that higher education can and should provide. In times of reduced resources, it may be more a matter of the growing gap between the aspirations we have for the total postsecondary enterprise and the collective effort of the community colleges and OUS institutions to try to address it. Chair Bassett said, “In my experience, it tends to pull back around lower division transfer on both sides. It is for all kinds of good reasons. We might need some help from those who’ve worked with mission differentiation in the past to try to figure out how to adjust to that.”

Kerry Barnett, identifying himself as one of the newer Board members, indicated that for him a starting point would be to hear from the institutions how they define their missions. “As a Board, I think we have to have our antennae up for statements that essentially say that we are going to try to be all things to all people. It’s relatively easy to identify what you’re going to be really good at. The hard questions are the things that aren’t on that list that you’re good at and what you propose that we do with them.”

Director Lussier indicated, “The Board is responsible to the Governor and to the state, and here is the justification for our System; here are the great contributions that each one of our seven institutions makes. That’s what needs to be designed and we need to be relatively comfortable that, in the differentiation, we have the lion’s share, to the best of our ability, of the needs for higher education for the state covered.

“It isn’t just about mission statements, it’s about how we differentiate and rationalize the resources and their allocation for the rest of the state. We have to have a rationalized approach that says ‘here’s why we have seven institutions, here are the unique
contributions, and they are different.’ It’s about the System’s design; it’s about how we rationally allocate resources.”

It was pointed out that, as funding forces choices, some things are lost and others gained. Mission review and adjustment is part of the Board’s role in the context of larger public policy issues.

b. **Preparation for College: Initial Discussion**
No discussion occurred on this item.
### Revised SSP Work Plan Through October 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Status &amp; Next Steps</th>
<th>Related Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adopt a vision</strong> for OUS.</td>
<td>December 2002</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop a statement of the OUS goals and anticipated services to the citizens of Oregon.</strong></td>
<td>December 2002</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refine mission statements</strong> for each university and align with OUS vision and goals, identifying distinctions between and strengthening collaborative relationships among the institutions.</td>
<td>To be determined.</td>
<td>Initial discussion in SSP in May 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop policies</strong> that include measurable outcomes and outline the respective OUS and University responsibilities for:</td>
<td><strong>Quality</strong></td>
<td>January – February 2003</td>
<td>Introduction in January; full discussion in February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong></td>
<td>January – April 2003</td>
<td>Introduction in January, discussion in February and April.</td>
<td>Board resolution in support of increased funding for the Oregon Opportunity Grant adopted in October 2002. Report to Budget &amp; Finance Committee on fee remissions in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Timelines</td>
<td>Status &amp; Next Steps</td>
<td>Related Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access/Enrollment Demand</td>
<td>February – April 2003</td>
<td>Introduction in February, full discussion in April. Report to SSP Committee on admissions policy in February; new admissions policies adopted.</td>
<td>February and on tuition in April. Board approval of tuition policies for 2003-2005 in May. Joint Boards Working Group discussions of affordability in January and March. Changing Directions Roundtable discussions February and June. Report to Board Work Session on OUS enrollment in January. OUS updated enrollment projections completed in June. Changing Directions Roundtable discussions February and June. Ongoing work on Oregon GEAR UP Network; status reports presented to Joint Boards (January) and to Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee on Education (April). Staff to develop study of promotion and tenure of faculty of color and an update of salary equity study for faculty of color. Studies to be completed for either the September or October discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Admission policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Unmet higher educational needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April – October 2003</td>
<td>Initial discussion with Annual Report on Diversity presented in April. Focused discussion with presidents on specific campus initiatives in September. Broader discussion, including students, in October.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased diversity of students and faculty</td>
<td>May – July 2003</td>
<td>Initial discussion in May to frame questions for more focused discussions in July.</td>
<td>Discussions initiated in Joint Boards Working Group in April, to be continued in May.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation for college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Timelines</td>
<td>Status &amp; Next Steps</td>
<td>Related Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mission differentiation</td>
<td>May 2003 - ?</td>
<td>Initial discussion in May to frame questions for more focused discussions in July and beyond.</td>
<td>Discussions initiated in Joint Boards Working Group in April, to be continued in May.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengthen the role of OUS and individual institutions working with the business community in support of Oregon’s **economic development**.

Presentation made to Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee on the contributions of instruction (through degree production) and research (with the example of the first Signature Research Center) to Oregon’s economic vitality.

Develop policies to facilitate and direct the System and the Universities to increase the effectiveness of their **partnerships** with other education sectors.

 Ø Oregon K-12 education, to support seamless transitions through K-16.

 Ø Oregon community colleges, to optimize access through dual enrollment, articulation, and transfer.

Ongoing Completing joint statements on the commitment to quality for postsecondary education, reflected in *Choices and Challenges in Public Postsecondary Education in Oregon*.

The OUS report, *Partnerships*..., describes many K-16 initiatives in areas of enrollment, articulation, and transfer; distance education programming; technology support; and library services. Examples of some of these initiatives were presented to the Joint Ways and Means Subcommittee in April.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Timelines</th>
<th>Status &amp; Next Steps</th>
<th>Related Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Joint Boards Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic planning framework for K-16 under development. Focused discussions on quality, access, and affordability conducted January through March; initial discussions on preparation and mission differentiation in April and May.</td>
<td>Proposal under consideration to alternate Joint Boards Working Group meetings with meetings of staff from K-12, community colleges, and OUS, to facilitate regular communication and joint project development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint Boards Articulation Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community college partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td>To be determined later.</td>
<td>On hold.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explore effectiveness of current **governance** structures as needs arise. Assess possible scope of local university advisory boards in light of progress on Flexibility (Efficiency) Initiatives presented to the 2003 Legislature, and determine whether formal Board policy statement is necessary.
Committee Discussion

Chair Bassett, in highlighting areas of the SSP work plan, remarked that the work of the Committee has focused primarily on the larger strategic policies of quality, affordability, and access. One area, strengthening of the role of OUS and individual institutions in working with the business community in support of Oregon’s economic development, has not yet come up on the SSP agenda. It was noted that, while much has occurred in this area, it has not been at the Committee level.

Committee members thanked Chair Bassett for his considerable time and effort as the Committee chair and as one of the Board’s representatives to the Joint Boards Working Group.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**
   The meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.