1. **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/WELCOME**

President Henry Lorenzen called the meeting of the State Board of Higher Education to order at 10:56 a.m.

**The following Board members were present:** Henry Lorenzen, Don Blair, Gerry Blakney (arrived at 11:02 a.m.), Adriana Mendoza, Tim Nesbitt, John Von Schlegell, Gretchen Schuette, Howard Sohn, and Tony Van Vliet. Directors Geri Richmond and Kirby Dyess were absent due to business conflicts.

**OUS staff present included:** George Pernsteiner, Ryan J. Hagemann, Jay Kenton, Benjamin Rawlins, Yvette Webber-Davis, and Susan Weeks.

**Others present included:** Presidents Dan Bernstine, Martha Anne Dow, Khosrow Fatemi, Dave Frohmayer, John Minahan, and Elisabeth Zinser. Provosts Lesley Hallick and Sabah Randhawa and Bridget Burns were also present.

Meeting attendees also included OUS staff, faculty, institution representatives, the press, and interested observers.

2. **CONSENT ITEM**

   a. **OIT, B.S. in Applied Mathematics**

   **BOARD DOCKET:**

   The proposed Bachelor of Science in Applied Mathematics will prepare students to address the application of mathematics to engineering, technology, and the sciences. The degree includes 182 quarter-credits of coursework, a solid foundation in applied mathematics, and a one-year elective sequence in science, engineering, or technology.

   The proposed program will meet the growing need of Oregon and the region for employees trained in the application of mathematics to science, engineering, computing, and technology. Applied mathematicians work in a wide range of corporations including manufacturers of aerospace, computer and transportation equipment and systems, computer service firms, and communication services providers. Applied mathematics is heavily employed in engineering design, biological research, and the modeling of various physical and biological systems.
The program will provide a natural pipeline for students to continue their education within Oregon to graduate programs at the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University.

It is anticipated that Oregon Institute of Technology will have 60-80 upper division students per year in this program within five years and will have 15-20 graduates per year.

All appropriate University committees and the OUS Provosts’ Council have positively reviewed the proposed program.

Recommendation to the Board:
The OUS Provosts’ Council recommended that the Board authorize Oregon Institute of Technology to establish an instructional program leading to a B.S. in Applied Mathematics, effective Fall 2006.

BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:

President Lorenzen called for a motion to approve the consent agenda. Director Mendoza made the motion to approve the consent agenda and Director Sohn seconded the motion. All in favor: Blair, Blakney, Mendoza, Nesbitt, Schuette, Sohn, von Schlegell, Van Vliet, and Lorenzen. Opposed: none. Motion passed.

3. REPORT ITEM

a. 2005-06 Annual Diversity Report: Fostering a Future of Inclusion: A Conversation with the Board

BOARD DOCKET:

The Oregon University System (OUS) continues to work diligently to find creative, resourceful, and effective ways to fulfill its mission of public higher education. As the Oregon State Board of Higher Education engages in a long-range planning process, there are opportunities to incorporate considerations of Oregon’s increasingly varied population into the discussions and actions. In recent years, the Board has heard status reports on the progress within OUS toward more diverse representation in all segments of the System and, beyond the issues of representation, efforts to enhance the inclusion and engagement of all populations.

Increasingly, broad concepts of diversity in the populations that we serve – including race/ethnicity, national origin, multiracial identity, gender, socioeconomic status, geographic diversity (i.e., rural, urban, suburban, and locations beyond Oregon), language, disability, and age, among others – continue to emerge. In support of the Board’s developing strategic framework, the purpose of this document is to stimulate discussion concerning inclusive aspects associated with Oregon’s integrated educational system.
Background
Pursuant to the language of desired “Outcomes and Goals,” included in the Board’s March 1, 2006, draft long-range plan document:

"OUS will endeavor to provide affordable access to high-quality postsecondary education for all qualified Oregonians, and encourage Oregonians from every income level, region, race, gender and ethnic background to seek such opportunities. In the evolving global environment, the pool of qualified Oregonians OUS will serve includes recent high school and community college graduates, a more ethnically diverse student population, and older Oregonians seeking postsecondary educational opportunities for economic or other reasons..."

The Board continues to develop guiding principles within the long-range plan that encompass multiple elements. For the purpose of this preliminary conversation relating to inclusive aspects within the long-range planning process, this discussion will center around the guiding principles associated with an interconnected PK-20 educational system. Key factors in advancing the state’s student-centered agenda include early and adequate academic preparation to facilitate postsecondary achievement and success. In recognition of the growing and broadly defined diversity within the PK-14 pipeline, enhanced attention is given to outreach, encouragement, readiness, and ease of accessibility for a college education. Also, initiatives that seek to better integrate seamless secondary, community college, and OUS opportunities through multiple activities must include sustained and comprehensive attention to reach all populations.

Converging Considerations

- **Oregon Education Pipeline Demographics**
  The most recent data available indicate the following.

  A. Profile of Oregon’s Public School K-12 Population:

  The Hispanic/Latino population is growing dramatically, with anticipated projections that public school K-12 Hispanic/Latino students will increase to 27% (164,000) in 2020. During 2003-04, approximately 11% (60,000) of public school students spoke at least one of 138 different languages other than English; about 13% (71,000) were special education students; and, as one measure of socioeconomic status, approximately 40% qualified for free or reduced lunches. High school dropout rates continue to be of concern, with a total of 7,923 dropouts reported during 2003-04. Disproportionate rates by race/ethnicity exist, with dropout rates of 9.8% Hispanic/Latino, 8.3% Black/African American, 5.8% American Indian/Alaska Native, 3.4% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3.8% Caucasian. Males represent nearly 56% of dropouts. (Oregon Department of Education)
Total Oregon public school K-12 students in fall 2004 -- 552,322
24% students of color
4.8% Asian/Pacific Islander (26,634)
3.2% Black/African American (17,410)
13.9% Hispanic/Latino (76,747)
2.2% American Indian (12,253)
3.4% Multiethnic (4,064)
2.7% Unknown (7,705)
72.5% Caucasian (400,167)

48.5% female
51.5% male

(Source: Oregon Department of Education)

B. Profile of Oregon's Community College Population:
Total students in fall 2004: 82,860
14.5% students of color
4.4% Asian/Pacific Islander (3,676)
2.2% Black/African American (1,800)
6.0% Hispanic/Latino (4,960)
1.9% American Indian/Alaska Native (1,536)
1.0% Nonresident Alien (790)
8.9% Unknown (7,404)
75.7% Caucasian (62,694)

56.7% female
43.2% male

(Source: IPEDS)

Detailed data by race/ethnicity and gender within OUS populations are included as an appendix to this document.

- **Selected Factors Affecting Movement Through the PK-20 Pipeline**

Complex and multi-faceted considerations affect the ways in which people view higher education and the possibilities of educational access and opportunity. Although individual goals, motivations, and aspirations are difficult to measure, experience and research indicate several common themes – many of which are interconnected – relating to post-secondary access and opportunity. Often, a combination of multiple factors might construct difficult challenges, or even barriers, to progress. These include but are not limited to the following concerns *(grouped below into categories to promote discussion; however, overlapping concerns exist).*
Social factors
- First generation college student status
- Recent immigrant/refugee status
- English language learners
- Rural isolation
- Experiential isolation

Academic factors
- Foundational preparation prior to and through high school, including literacy skills
- Rigor of high school courses
- Lack of understanding about educational processes
- Negative educational experiences
- High achievers seeking additional challenges

Challenges within the male population
Boys are more likely to—
- Experience special education placements
- Receive behavioral citations, including suspension/expulsion
- Choose post-high school options other than college

Personal factors
- Self-esteem
- Social skills, including interactions with adult “authority” figures
- Confidence in academic abilities
- Balancing school, work, and family responsibilities
- Balancing cultural/family values and mores with personal aspirations

Motivational factors
- Role models
- Interactions with those who encourage and advise
- Sustained efforts by external entities
- Knowledge of higher education opportunities

Post-secondary “savvy”
- Early exploration relating to talents, skills, interests
- Understanding the connection between career goals and educational preparation
- Understanding prerequisites and other requirements
- Knowledge of how to “navigate” the system, including transitions between educational sectors (i.e., high school to post-secondary; 2-year to 4-year)

Economic factors
- Low income status
Key discussion points: Given these factors, how does OUS 1) expand and apply effectively the concept of “seamlessness” to all populations, 2) give appropriately focused dimension to the collaborations with Oregon’s other education sectors toward common goals, and 3) encourage student success within increasingly complex educational environments?

- **Strengthening the Educator/Student Pipeline Infrastructure**

In addition to the System’s focus on educational alignment, dual enrollment, articulation agreements, and other initiatives designed to ease the ways in which students move through and within Oregon public education, OUS works both internally and collaboratively with other state partners to address educator preparation issues.

Core concepts:
1. Preparing educators to address effectively the state’s multidimensional PK-12 educational needs
2. Actively participating in an integrated and “reciprocal” educational environment with statewide partners (i.e., moving students through the PK-20 system, through educator preparation programs, and back into PK-12 schools as educators)
3. Contributing to educational environments that seek to promote for all students at all levels the sense that they can develop the skills and have the encouragement to be successful (i.e., “you can do it”)

Selected examples:
- Educator preparation initiatives within OUS Colleges/Schools of Education, and in cooperation with other education entities
  * Outreach to enhance, among other factors, the racial/ethnic, gender, and socioeconomic diversity of candidates
  * Preparation of candidates to work effectively in increasingly diverse environments
  * Consistent with the state’s high-need areas for teachers, enhanced focus on ESL, math/science, and special education

- Statewide Education Pathways for Teachers Project
  * Creation of advising materials to assist students and advisors in navigating the various paths toward becoming a teacher
  * Early connection and encouragement with high school and community college populations
* Curricular initiatives (led by the Joint Boards Articulation Commission)

- Campus-specific initiatives, including articulation agreements with community colleges that focus on teacher preparation, local district/school connections, etc.

- **Connecting with Oregon’s Communities**

  Core concepts:
  1. *Reaching multiple populations within Oregon to promote post-secondary awareness*
  2. *Motivating and encouraging those in the K-14 sector (and others) toward university-level pursuits, particularly if they experience challenges to higher education access and opportunity*
  3. *Providing opportunities for engagement surrounding post-secondary possibilities and pursuits (i.e., “we want you to do it”)*

  Selected examples:
  - OUS *Lift Every Voice* newsletter
  - Campus-specific initiatives, including local, regional, and statewide connections

- **Enhancing Campus Environments**

  Core concepts:
  1. *Promoting retention through a variety of student-related opportunities*
  2. *Encouraging campus-wide commitments to awareness, receptivity, and responsiveness*
  3. *Encouraging a sense of fellowship (i.e., “we seek to create environments that assist your success”)*

  Selected examples:
  - Campus climate initiatives
  - Retention initiatives

- **Infusion of Inclusive Concepts throughout OUS and within Campus Portfolio Frameworks**

  Attention to inclusive post-secondary educational issues has long been a part of certain highly successful student-focused programs, such as TRIO, GEAR UP, etc. However, given the magnitude of challenges and barriers to post-secondary education facing many Oregonians, reliance on a few programs to motivate students and increase access and opportunity is an inadequate approach. It is not so much that the state needs brand new approaches to the issues; rather, proactive and creative approaches must be **infused throughout** OUS and PK-20 efforts, particularly within an era of limited fiscal resources. In addition to state-level and
System initiatives, mission-related and flexible approaches that connect with specific campus foci will assist in maximizing OUS efforts toward enhanced student success.
# OUS System Total Enrollment by Racial/Ethnic Group

Ten Year Trend (1995-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American / Black</th>
<th>American Indian / Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian / Pacific American</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Reporting More Than One Race/Unspecified Race*</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>OUS Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>1,548 1.9%</td>
<td>1,097 1.4%</td>
<td>5,273 6.5%</td>
<td>3,115 3.9%</td>
<td>58,834 72.7%</td>
<td>7,254 9.0%</td>
<td>3,767 4.7%</td>
<td>80,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>1,132 1.6%</td>
<td>868 1.2%</td>
<td>4,559 6.6%</td>
<td>2,259 3.2%</td>
<td>51,126 73.6%</td>
<td>5,633 8.1%</td>
<td>3,931 5.7%</td>
<td>69,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>950 1.5%</td>
<td>885 1.4%</td>
<td>3,792 6.2%</td>
<td>1,831 3.0%</td>
<td>45,592 74.0%</td>
<td>4,417 7.2%</td>
<td>4,147 6.7%</td>
<td>61,614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes extended enrollment students and credit at all levels.
* The current federal category is "unknown;" reported here as "Reporting More Than One Race/Unspecified Race"

**Source:** OUS Institutional Research Services, fall fourth-week enrollment reports
### OUS System Enrollment of First Time Freshmen by Racial/Ethnic Group

**Ten Year Trend (1995-2005)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American / Black</th>
<th>American Indian / Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian / Pacific American</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Reporting More Than One Race/Unspecified Race*</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>OUS Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2005</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 1995</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The current federal category is “unknown;” reported here as “Reporting More Than One Race/Unspecified Race”

**Source:** OUS Institutional Research Services, fall fourth-week enrollment reports

Students who transfer with 12 credits or more are excluded unless they graduated from high school in spring of the college entrance year.
## OUS Degrees Awarded\(^1\) by All Levels and Racial/Ethnic Group

### Ten Year Trend (1995-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year/Range</th>
<th>African American / Black</th>
<th>American Indian / Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian / Pacific American</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Reporting More Than One Race/Unspecified Race*</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>OUS Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Only degrees are reported. Postbaccalaureate and teacher education certificates are excluded.

* The current federal category is "unknown;“ reported here as "Reporting More Than One Race/Unspecified Race”

**Source:** OUS Institutional Research Degrees Awarded by Award Level, Discipline, Ethnicity, and Gender
### OUS System Total Enrollment\(^1\) by Gender
#### Ten Year Trend (1995-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>OUS Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>37,680</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>43,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>32,238</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>37,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>30,085</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>31,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes extended enrollment students and credit at all levels.

Source: OUS Institutional Research Services, fall fourth-week enrollment reports

### OUS Degrees Awarded\(^1\) by Gender
#### Ten Year Trend (1995-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>OUS Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>7,483</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>9,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>7,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>6,110</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>6,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Only degrees are reported. Postbaccalaureate and teacher education certificates are excluded.

Source: OUS Institutional Research Degrees Awarded by Award Level, Discipline, Ethnicity, and Gender
### OUS Full Time Ranked Instructional Faculty by Racial/Ethnic Group
#### Ten Year Trend (1995-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American / Black</th>
<th>American Indian / Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian / Pacific American</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Reporting More Than One Race/ Unspecified Race*</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>OUS Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2005</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The current federal category is “unknown;” reported here as "Reporting More Than One Race/Unspecified Race"

**Source:** OUS Institutional Research Services, end-of-October payrolls
### OUS Full Time Ranked Instructional Faculty by Gender

Ten Year Trend (1995-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male N</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female N</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>OUS Totals N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>2,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>2,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>2,366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** OUS Institutional Research Services, end-of-October payrolls
# OUS Faculty and Staff by Racial/Ethnic Group

## Five Year History (2001-02 to 2005-06)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Africa American / Black</th>
<th>American Indian / Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian / Pacific American</th>
<th>Hispanic / Latino</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Reporting More Than One Race/Unspecified Race*</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>OUS Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>194 1.5%</td>
<td>143 1.1%</td>
<td>515 4.0%</td>
<td>360 2.8%</td>
<td>10,664 82.0%</td>
<td>635 4.9%</td>
<td>495 3.8%</td>
<td>13,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>189 1.5%</td>
<td>134 1.1%</td>
<td>484 3.9%</td>
<td>329 2.6%</td>
<td>10,352 82.6%</td>
<td>620 4.9%</td>
<td>423 3.4%</td>
<td>12,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>189 1.5%</td>
<td>129 1.1%</td>
<td>449 3.7%</td>
<td>299 2.4%</td>
<td>10,163 83.0%</td>
<td>647 5.3%</td>
<td>372 3.0%</td>
<td>12,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>184 1.5%</td>
<td>129 1.0%</td>
<td>434 3.5%</td>
<td>285 2.3%</td>
<td>10,319 83.1%</td>
<td>683 5.5%</td>
<td>379 3.1%</td>
<td>12,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>163 1.3%</td>
<td>131 1.1%</td>
<td>438 3.6%</td>
<td>295 2.4%</td>
<td>10,309 83.7%</td>
<td>658 5.3%</td>
<td>325 2.6%</td>
<td>12,319</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The current federal category is "unknown;" reported here as "Reporting More Than One Race/Unspecified Race*

Faculty/Staff totals do not include graduate assistants, research assistants, and medical interns

**Source:** OUS Institutional Research Services, end-of-October payrolls
### OUS Faculty and Staff by Gender
Five Year History (2001-02 to 2005-06)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>OUS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>5,977</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>7,029</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>13,006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>6,774</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>12,531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>5,669</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>12,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>6,622</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>12,413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>5,740</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>12,319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty/Staff totals do not include graduate assistants, research assistants, and medical interns

**Source:** OUS Institutional Research Services, end-of-October payrolls
BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Yvette Webber-Davis began the conversation by introducing herself and providing pertinent credential background information.

Dr. Webber-Davis described the discussion framework as including selected factors affecting student movement through the Pre-Kindergarten through 20 pipeline as social, academic, challenges within the male population, personal, motivational, postsecondary “savvy” (the knowledge it takes to move into and through postsecondary education), and economic factors. She also identified key discussion points on how the System expands and applies effectively the concept of “seamlessness” to all populations, gives appropriately focused dimension to the collaborations with Oregon’s other education sectors toward common goals, and encourages student success within increasingly complex educational environments. Next, Dr. Webber-Davis outlined the key policy areas as strengthening the educator/student pipeline infrastructure, connecting with Oregon’s communities, enhancing campus environments, and the infusion of inclusive concepts throughout the OUS and within campus portfolio frameworks.

When Director Schuette asked for further clarification pertaining to the campus portfolio framework, Dr. Webber-Davis explained that it corresponds with the long-range planning work on the uniqueness of campus missions—the uniqueness of locale and outreach and what that might mean in terms of campus presidencies for actually working within their specific environments.

Webber-Davis described the varied population of students that are in the educational pipeline as students with opportunities to travel abroad, exposure to cultural factors such as museums, zoos, and stage plays; students who are from a variety of cultural backgrounds, including immigrants, refugees, long-time residents, and new arrivals; many racial and ethnic backgrounds. She shared with the Board that there are nearly 140 different languages spoken in Oregon’s PK-12 schools, with many as first languages by many students. There are also many students who have never been beyond a two-mile radius of their homes.

These social factors also contribute to the academic diversity of the student population. Many students have good foundational skills prior to entering into a postsecondary education. There are those, however, that have undiagnosed learning disabilities that result in their inability to move through the educational pipeline. There is also the other end of the spectrum with high achievers from all populations within Oregon and elsewhere who are seeking new challenges and who are ready, able, and wanting to expand their horizons.

In terms of the challenges within the male population, historically, males were the predominant recipients of education in America. “Now,” Dr. Webber-Davis pointed out, “we find ourselves nationally at a point where males are representing about 44 percent of all U.S. college students—less than half of the student population throughout the
country are male." Within the OUS, that population is just under 47 percent in the current academic year. She emphasized that this is an issue to which the Board and System need to give close attention.

Webber-Davis continued, observing the other personal factors affecting the ability of students to move through the educational pipeline include the ability to interact with adult authority figures; students who are the primary breadwinner or those who are the primary caretakers of minor children or even their aging parents. Postsecondary savvy issues include the exploration, or knowing what it takes to succeed in obtaining goals where talent or interest lay—in other words, understanding the connection between career goals and the education needed to obtain those goals. For many students from low-income or first-generation college backgrounds, this is not perceived as information readily available to them.

Director Schuette noted that, although the male population may be decreasing, it is still vital that girls and women are encouraged to seek and achieve a postsecondary education. Dr. Webber-Davis agreed and stated that there continues to be a shortage of women in the sciences and engineering fields.

President Minahan thanked Dr. Webber-Davis for her work in the area of teacher education. Western Oregon University has extended its teacher education curriculum with the community colleges so that there are common strategies for finding minority students and emphasizing early choices about teacher education in ways that used to be introduced during the last term of the sophomore year. Western Oregon University has also obtained a teacher education pathways grant to develop a more unified curriculum that between the community colleges and the private schools collaboratively.

President Zinser brought up two other areas of sensitivity that should be included: sexual identity and religious identity. She noted that these are two areas that have become increasingly "out front" in terms of campus dynamics and should be explicitly laid out within the long-range planning effort.

Building on the comments of President Minahan, Webber-Davis introduced core concepts that contribute to strengthening the educator/student pipeline infrastructure: preparing educators to address effectively the state’s multidimensional PK-12 educational needs; actively participating in an integrated and "reciprocal" educational environment with statewide partners; and contributing to educational environments that seek to promote for all students at all levels the sense that they can develop the needed skills and have the encouragement to be successful (in other words, "you can do it"). She pointed out that the Excellence in Delivery and Productivity Working Group has been discussing potential policy packages that directly affect and address these particular issues. The Working Group is attempting to shore up the preparation of educators to work effectively with the increasing diversity in Oregon, including bilingual and English as a second language needs, and math and science needs.
Provost Randhawa reminded the Board of the partnership between Oregon State University and Linn-Benton Community College and informed that over the past two years, the number of students in degree partnership programs has increased by 45 percent and the number of students of color has increased by almost 50 percent. Between 2003-04 and 2004-05, students entering the degree partnership programs and graduating increased by 40 percent. Also, OSU has initiated an education dual degree—a second bachelor's degree for an additional 45 hours. The primary focus of these education degrees is in engineering and the sciences. Webber-Davis noted that the dual degree approach includes students from a variety of degree backgrounds. She added, “You look at that from the perspective of being an educator and say what capacity they would have to encourage and motivate in a classroom and bring a different cast to the content that they are teaching.” President Minahan added that people do not go into teacher education for the money, but to nurture student learning. Western Oregon University has instituted a performance-based curriculum that attempts to identify the variables that are involved in successful teaching and student learning.

President Bernstine said that Portland State is attempting to change the semantics of diversity in that rather than the label of “underrepresented,” PSU is viewing these students as “under-invited,” meaning that the burden is on the campus to seek out these groups “rather than the burden being on the groups to find their way to the campus.”

Dr. Webber-Davis guided the conversation into the topic of connecting with Oregon’s communities. She works throughout the state to promote an awareness of the availability of postsecondary education to the populace of Oregon. One way of reaching these prospective students is with the “Lift Every Voice” newsletter. Each issue uses different people who are active in their communities and can motivate and encourage those in the K-14 sector toward university-level pursuits.

President Frohnmayer advised that the Ford Foundation is extraordinarily interested in the issue of diversity, or the “under-invited” sector, and how to reach the larger community, the larger peer group, and the larger family structure. To develop a “strategy guided by motivation, guided by some knowledge in a nondiscriminatory way of the different appeals, different barriers, and different reasons why under-invitations are under-accepted.” In answer to a comment by President Zinser, President Frohnmayer advised that the Ford Foundation is very much interested in partnering with the universities to identify and encourage populations within their communities to pursue a postsecondary education.

Provost Hallick noted that OHSU has experienced success in what she termed “longitudinal programs.” These programs reach into the elementary and middle schools, by way of the teachers, to encourage students in the areas of math and science—those areas vital to the pipeline into healthcare professions. Provost Randhawa commented that OSU, as a land-grant university, has an active structure in place through its extension service programs. OSU has over 500 faculty and staff, most of them located off-campus, with one of the biggest programs being the family/community development and the 4H program. The University, however, is looking at the extension service and
how it can be effectively used to reach the “under-invited” populace. Ms. Bridget Burns mentioned the ASPIRE (Access to Student assistance Programs In Reach of Everyone) programs that send volunteers and coordinators into schools to encourage students to start thinking about being involved and going to college. She wondered if the ASPIRE programs have a specific focus on underrepresented communities. Webber-Davis replied that the ASPIRE programs are often in very diverse schools and encourage adult participation as role models and mentors to those students.

Director Von Schlegell queried Dr. Webber-Davis concerning the number of counselors in the K-12 sector and if those numbers are declining. Webber-Davis acknowledged that the number of college counselors at the secondary level has, indeed, declined and high schools are relying on volunteers in increasing numbers to fill the role of guidance counselors. With an average case load of several hundred students in many high schools, there is less and less chance of one-on-one guidance. Von Schlegell asked if trend information could be provided to the Board in the future and Webber-Davis agreed.

Chancellor Pernsteiner thanked Dr. Webber-Davis for her presentation. He concluded the discussion by pointing out that even though there is greater diversity in the student body and faculty, the Board must look to the next twenty years at what demographic shifts might occur, what challenges the Board and System will be facing as campuses strive to educate the Oregon population as it currently is and as it will be in the future.

4. Reports

a. Chancellor's Report

Chancellor Pernsteiner introduced Neil Bryant for the legislative update. Mr. Bryant advised the legislature has announced the convening of a special session on April 20th. At this meeting, they will be discussing the $140 million budget deficit. He advised this deficit will not impact the “kicker” but will be filled with fund balance monies. A $130 million state salary package will be reviewed; this package was scheduled to go before the Emergency Board for release in June. K-12 will be receiving an additional $42 million in lottery funds, with approximately $3.5 million going to Portland schools; the remaining $38.5 to be distributed according to formula throughout the state.

Bryant touched briefly on the ballot measures, providing information concerning the process of getting measures on the November ballots and touching on measures that might have potential impact on the System. One of note is sponsored by the Oregon Education Association and is called the “Oregon Corporate Accountability Act.” This act would require corporations to turn over their income tax returns, or portions of it, so that they become a public record. Another of note, the TABOR Amendment (Taxpayer Bill of Rights) is a spending limit very similar to what Colorado passed six years ago. This mandates that the increase in state spending can be no greater than the percentage of increase of state population plus inflation for the two calendar years immediately preceding the start of the biennium. The exceptions to the total spending are monies for
the rainy day fund, federal funds that are received, money relating to the kicker that are spent, money to fund tax and other refunds, donations, proceeds from the sale of bonds, and the proceeds from the sale of real estate property. Inflation is defined as the Portland Consumer Price Index and population growth would be estimated by the federal government. Bryant explained that spending can exceed the limit if two-thirds of the House and Senate agree that there is an emergency and declare it. Following that, it would be referred to the people for a vote at a general election. Bryant noted that Oregonians do not seem to be supporting this measure. Director Nesbitt added that he believes that under the TABOR measure, all tuition revenues are subject to the spending cap. The Board and campuses would not be able to increase tuition rates to maintain levels of service even if they wanted to. Bryant corrected that the campuses could collect the monies but not spend them. Nesbitt added that the voters in Colorado voted to suspend the TABOR measure last year because of the adverse impact it had, particularly on higher education. Director Nesbitt requested that the Chancellor provide information at the June meeting concerning the fiscal impact of the “federal reconnect" and the TABOR measures on higher education.

b. Presidents’ Reports

President Lorenzen called on the presidents to give their reports.

President Khosrow Fatemi thanked Provost Hallick for the excellent programs OHSU provides on the EOU campus. He stated that although the OHSU/EOU nursing program has been in the region for some time, in response to the rising nursing shortage, the program is being expanded to attempt to meet the demand. Another recent expansion in OHSU/EOU collaboration is in the area of research.

President Martha Anne Dow advised that Oregon Institute of Technology recently received a grant for pre-college opportunities through ETIC’s (the Engineering and Technology Industry Council) “Project Lead the Way.” Oregon Tech will soon be leading the way in encouraging school children throughout the state to better prepare for careers in engineering thanks to a new partnership with a national organization and a $30,000 grant from the Intel Foundation. The grant will help establish OIT as the National Affiliate Center in Oregon for Project Lead the Way, a non-profit organization that seeks to introduce middle- and high-school students to "the scope, rigor, and discipline of engineering and engineering technology prior to entering college." President Dow noted that the grant will fund opportunities for Oregon teachers to attend intensive summer workshops in engineering education and provide equipment that high school faculty will be able to use throughout the year. A couple of activities of note: OIT’s self-study work is progressing well and OIT is scheduled for an accreditation review in spring 2007.

Provost Randhawa reported that Dr. James D. White, from Oregon State’s department of chemistry, was recently rewarded the 2006 Outstanding Scientist award by the Oregon Academy of Science for his work in organic synthesis. Dr. White shares this
honor with Dr. David C. Johnson of the University of Oregon’s department of chemistry and material science.

Provost Randhawa informed that a multidisciplinary team from science and engineering fields has created the first completely transparent integrated circuit having the potential to be used in televisions, windshields of automobiles, and many other applications. OSU is currently collaborating with Hewlett-Packard in the manufacturing and commercialization of the product. Contrary to what has been in the news media, Dr. Randhawa advised that OSU is not eliminating its cheerleading program. Rather, the intent is to either do away or modify the more dangerous routines used in the program. This is similar to the actions of other Pac-10 schools resulting from a recent incident where a Southern Illinois cheerleader was seriously injured in a fall.

Provost Lesley Hallick thanked the Board for visiting the Oregon Health & Science University. During the visit, the Board had an opportunity to visit recent building additions to the campus and receive a status report on the construction of the tram. The University is currently building the Center for Health and Healing—a wellness center containing multidisciplinary programs, including a gymnasium offering swimming and fitness classes. The former building, which now houses the campus gymnasium on Marquam Hill, will be converted to a conference center and student union.

Provost Hallick announced that the environmental aspects of the research building and the riverfront CHH buildings will be receiving silver and platinum LEED status, respectively. They will be the first of their kind in those categories to receive these awards in the country or Northwest. The University also received an environmental award from the American Hospital Association for their recycling efforts (as a side note, OHSU recycled 1,014 tons of material in 2005). Finally, she made the announcement of the appointment of Dr. Carol A. Ledbetter as associate dean of the OHSU School of Nursing, La Grande campus, effective April 1, 2006. Dr. Ledbetter previously served as the senior vice president and chief operating officer of Surgical Anesthesia Services LLC, and Surgical Synergies, Inc., and as a professor of nursing at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. Prior appointments include the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences Graduate School of Nursing, and the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston.

President Dan Bernstine announced that Dr. Scott Burns (PSU professor of geology and president of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate) has been appointed chair of one of the National Academy of Science’s committees on engineering, geology, and geotechnical engineering. Portland State is celebrating its 60th anniversary in 2006 and will be hosting a series of four 60-year retrospective lectures, with the first lecture delivered by former Chancellor Bill Lemman, who attended the Vanport campus.

President Bernstine advised that Portland State, and Chemeketa, Portland, Mt. Hood, and Clackamas community colleges signed an agreement to form the Portland Area Higher Education Consortium, “…signifying a mutual pledge of five of Oregon’s largest
education institutions to provide greater access to courses and degrees for students without having to negotiate multiple systems, and a more coordinated delivery of educational programs in the region. Students will be able to move freely among all five schools, taking advantage of where and when courses are offered at each school and what they need to complete their educational goals.” Bernstine speculated that this could impact over 100,000 students.

President Zinser announced that Professor Lawson Inada has become the Oregon Poet Laureate, with the investiture ceremony to be held on April 19. President Zinser advised that the new rector of the University of Guanajuato and Southern Oregon University have added a new dimension to that collaboration focused around water resource management and utilization. This is a unique opportunity for the joint faculty to work together on this serious issue. Secondly, Southern sent a 36-member choir with a handful of faculty to Guanajuato to provide a series of concerts around the state. While there, music education students and faculty in the group provided some education around music in the local grade- and high-schools. Finally, President Zinser announced that Shay Washington, a SOU basketball athlete, received the NAIA Division II player of the year award, of whom the campus is very proud, both as a student in the classroom and a player on the basketball court.

President Dave Frohnmayer advised that the University of Oregon just concluded the very successful visit of the 2006 Visiting Presidential Lecturer, Dr. Lee Hong-Koo. Dr. Hong-Koo was prime minister of South Korea between 1994 and 1995. Dr. Lee, a former member of the Korean National Assembly and former chairman of the New Korea Party, also has served as South Korea’s ambassador to the United States (1998-2000) and the United Kingdom (1991-1993). President Frohnmayer advised Dr. Hong-Koo is “also a very distinguished political scientist and has made very great contributions to the campus and certainly elevated our overall profile with our friends from South Korea.”

President Frohnmayer announced that Professor G.Z. “Charlie” Brown was recently elected to the U.S. architectural college of fellows. Dr. Brown is a “very distinguished architect and has worked very closely in the advancing field of not only ‘green architecture’ but of energy-efficient architecture.” The University of Oregon’s “Campaign Oregon” is now the largest campaign for any purpose, public or private, in the history of the state. The campaign recently attained two-thirds of its set goal of $600 million.

President John Minahan was delighted to inform the Board that Western has reached a tentative agreement with its faculty on a salary package and other provisions. President Minahan thanked the faculty and students for “the civil discourse that took place over a period of 11 months during very difficult and intense negotiations.” He also thanked Vice President Mark Weiss and Provost Jem Specter who began the negotiations for the campus, and Rick Hampton (OUS labor and employee relations director), Chancellor Pernsteiner, Vice Chancellor Kenton, General Counsel Ben Rawlins, and Di Saunders for their work in this process. President Minahan advised that the salary provisions are
within budget. He pledged that WOU will maintain a balanced budget and will continue to be very careful with funding.

c. Provosts’ Council

Dr. David Woodall provided the report from the Provosts’ Council. He stated that at the last meeting of the Provosts' Council, it reviewed three items: academic program issues, policy-related issues, and operational issues. In the area of academic programs, he noted that the Board will be receiving a number of program proposals in the near future, as well as requesting approval for degree name changes. The Council further refined its efforts relating to the retention policy package and expects to complete this effort in May. With respect to responses to Senate Bill 342 (statewide articulation and transfer system), the Council is continuing their deliberations on advanced placement credit proposal, gathering faculty input, and providing responses to the Joint Board Articulations Commission. Dr. Woodall noted that the Council feels it is important that a faculty committee broadly represents the universities and community colleges on the issue of AP credit in order to form a consensus. He advised that there is about 60 to 70 percent agreement on the process so far.

d. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) President

Dr. Scott Burns presented the report from the IFS, advising the IFS has been working to help the OUS implement Senate Bill 342. The faculty reaction has been very positive and the Senate is seeing, on most campuses, the faculty and administration working together and “enjoying it.” He complimented Karen Sprague (vice provost for undergraduate studies at the University of Oregon) for guiding the collaboration among OUS institutions, community colleges, and private institutions on the issue of general education outcomes. They were able to complete a first draft proposal. The IFS will begin working on the AP aspect of SB 342 and will be assisting the Provosts’ Council in their endeavor. Dr. Burns is confident that State Senator Kurt Schrader will be pleased with the outcomes from SB 342.

e. Oregon Student Association (OSA) Chair

Ms. Erin Devaney spoke to the Board on behalf of the OSA. She noted that a recent report was co-released by the Oregon State Public Interest Research Group and OSA entitled “Paying Back, Not Giving Back: Student Debts Negative Impact on Public Service Career Opportunities.” She advised that this report looked at “unmanageable undergraduate debt burden and the impact that debt burden is having on career choices in social service professions, specifically social workers and teachers.” (This report may be viewed at http://www.pirg.org/highered/payingback.pdf.) She noted that although this report focused on teaching, “it’s important to remember that there are other social professions, including nonprofit work, social service delivery, mental health workers, and homeless shelter workers, that Oregon needs and you have to continue to work to ensure that all students, especially students from low- and middle-income backgrounds can afford to make career decisions based on choices not just salary. It is critical that
postsecondary education be funded at a level that the whole cost of educating a student is not placed on the backs of the students.”

Ms. Devaney advised that OSA is in the process of setting its legislative agenda for the next session. The board has selected four top issues: tuition, funding for colleges and universities; need-based aid; childcare for student parents; and Access to Student assistance Programs In Research for Everyone (more commonly known as the ASPIRE program). At their April meeting, the OSA board will determine the policy options and solidify its legislative agenda for the next session. After choosing the agenda, it will begin to build coalitions with advocacy groups, state agencies, the Governor’s office, and legislators in order to bring about a successful legislative session for Oregon students.

In response to her report, Director Nesbitt complimented the Association for the “Paying Back, Not Giving Back” report and the timeliness of the report. He noted that the Access and Affordability Working Group is working to answer the question of what is a reasonable expectation of student borrowing in the affordability model.

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS

a. Standing Committee

President Lorenzen called on Director Don Blair to provide a report from the Finance and Administration Committee. Chair Blair reported the Committee covered the quarterly investment report and advised there are currently $273 million in endowment funds under management. The return for the second quarter was 2.1 percent and that compared against a benchmark of 1.8 percent. Year-to-date, the funds are up 6.1 percent, against a policy benchmark of 5.3 percent. He stated that Mike Mueller, of the State Treasury, advised the Committee that the treasury is recommending OUS take a “slightly different approach to how the funds are invested.” This includes changes in how much money is invested in international funds and private equity funds; however, Chair Blair opined that essentially the proposal is that this profile of investments would be a more efficient portfolio, enabling an improvement in returns without “really changing the risk profile.” Since the Board had moved responsibility for managing these funds to the state treasury department, the Committee took no action other than accepting the investment report.

The Committee also reviewed the quarterly management report of operating funds. He noted that although the OUS is to receive an additional $10 million from the Emergency Board for salaries, with additional personnel costs of $28 million related to recently settled faculty and staff agreements and higher energy costs, in many cases institutions are to make programmatic and personnel cuts and reductions in spending in order balance their budgets. It is anticipated that Eastern Oregon University may fall below the Board’s mandated 5-15 percent fund balance range. The Committee requested President Fatemi to provide a financial plan to the Committee at the May meeting. With regard to the OUS Resource Allocation Model, for the current RAM structure will be
used to develop the 2006-07 operating budget; however, the Committee felt the budget model will need revamping to meet future System allocation modeling needs.

b. Working Groups

President Lorenzen recognized Director Schuette for an update on the Excellence in Delivery and Productivity (EDP) Working Group. Director Schuette noted that the last three meetings of the EDP centered around reviewing possible policy option packages. She said that Director Van Vliet has urged the Working Group to structure these policies with a multi-biennial approach in order to make a difference over time.

Director Nesbitt announced that the Access and Affordability Working Group has been celebrating the success of an increase in the Oregon Opportunity Grant since the last legislative session; however, it left the session with questions from legislators about how much more will be enough and when will the goal of affordability be achieved. The working group contracted with a consultant to help establish a framework to do exactly that and has reviewed the consultant's report. This report provides a framework and formulas for “the earned opportunity model. The first component of the framework is student effort, which begins with working and earning and some amount of borrowing…the second component is family effort…and third federal (Pell Grant) and state grants.” From initial estimates, the cost would be $200 million per biennium for “everyone to work your way through college even if you have no assets.”

c. Other Board Committees

No reports were given.

6. Public Input

President Lorenzen acknowledged Mr. John Cougill who, after apologizing for his conduct at the previous Board meeting and providing information regarding his academic situation, requested the Board’s assistance by way of authorizing Special Assistant Attorney General Wendy Robinson to serve as mediator in this matter. President Lorenzen assured Mr. Cougill that he would discuss this matter with Ms. Robinson and respond back to Mr. Cougill.

7. Board Comments

No comments were provided.
8. **DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO BOARD’S EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

“Pursuant to Article II, Section 5 of the Bylaws of the Board of Higher Education, the Board delegates to the Executive Committee authority to take final action as here designated or deemed by the committee to be necessary, subsequent to the adjournment of this meeting and prior to the Board’s next meeting. The Executive Committee shall act for the Board in minor matters and in any matter where a timely response is required prior to the next Board meeting.”

President Lorenzen called for a motion to approve the delegation of the Board's authority to the Executive Committee as included in the Board materials. Director Van Vliet moved approval of the delegation and Director von Schlegell seconded the motion. All in favor: Blair, Blakney, Mendoza, Nesbitt, Schuette, Sohn, von Schlegell, Van Vliet, and Lorenzen. Opposed: none. Motion passed.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

President Lorenzen adjourned the meeting at 1:22 p.m.

Henry C. Lorenzen  
President of the Board
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Secretary of the Board