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REGULAR MEETING OF THE STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
OREGON HEALTH & SCIENCE UNIVERSITY
APRIL 4, 2008

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/WELCOME

President Dyess called the meeting of the State Board of Higher Education to order at 10:52 a.m. Board members present included President Kirby Dyess and Directors Don Blair, Hannah Fisher, Jim Francesconi, Paul Kelly, Brian Fox, Rosemary Powers, Dalton Miller-Jones, John von Schlegell, and Tony Van Vliet. Director Preston Pulliams was absent due to business conflicts.

Presidents present included Mary Cullinan (SOU), Dave Frohnmayer (UO), Dixie Lund (EOU), John Minahan (WOU), Ed Ray (OSU), Michael Reardon (PSU), and David Woodall (OIT). Provost Lesley Hallick (OHSU) was also present.

Others present included: Chancellor George Pernsteiner, Michael Green, Ryan Hagemann, Jay Kenton, Bob Simonton, Marcia Stuart, and Susan Weeks.

2. REPORTS

   a. Chancellor’s Report

    Chancellor Pernsteiner thanked staff at OHSU for hosting the Board meetings, acknowledging that it is a large undertaking. In introducing Paul Siebert, the new Legislative Fiscal Analyst assigned to OUS, Chancellor Pernsteiner thanked Steve Bender for his ten years of service in the position.

    It was reported that Portland State University was in the process of hosting presidential candidates on the campus. Dr. Wim Wiewel was on campus the past two days; Dr. Kathie Olsen and Dr. Jon Whitmore are scheduled for the next week. The Chancellor indicated that a time was being arranged for the Board to interview the candidates.

    The day prior to the Board meeting, A Sustainability Summit was help in which a number of people participated. This meeting demonstrated the diversity of opinions on the subject and the complete infusion of aspects of sustainability as an ethic within OUS.

    Chancellor Pernsteiner introduced Nancy Goldschmidt, Vice Provost, OHSU, to report on a developing relationship with Ireland and a conference that OUS will be hosing in the fall and Neil Bryant to provide a legislative update.
Ms. Goldschmidt reminded the board that an Oregon delegation attended a colloquium in Galway, Ireland for the purpose of bringing together higher education officials to study and talk about a global knowledge economy. At that time, Oregon was invited to host the fourth annual meeting of the group, American Higher Education Research Organization (A-HERO). Representatives from five countries will be attending the conference where the format is based on dialogue with an eye to expanding thinking and sharing of best practices in higher education. Director Francesconi suggested that this event would provide a good opportunity to publicly highlight how OUS is “making focused investments that make us internationally competitive.” Chair Dyess echoed the idea and suggested that it was an excellent opportunity for OUS to gain new insights on how higher education works in other countries. President Manahan suggested that adding some cultural anthropologists and scholars who “see change from the standpoint of social structures. One of the things that’s striking about Ireland is the homogeneity of that society.”

Mr. Bryant provided the Board with a recap of the supplemental Legislative session that was held in February. At that time the revenue forecast dipped a net $143-$144 million from the December forecast. The salary for state employees, which was $125 million was not disbursed and continues to be held. OUS’ portion of that total is about $28.5 million, which Mr. Bryant reminded the Board, is significant to all of the campuses. The Department of Administrative Services (DAS) requested a report from OUS on the impacts to the System if only 50 percent or zero of this was received. Vice Chancellor Kenton has been reviewing these projections. Continuing, Mr. Bryant indicated that the E-Board has the authority release some, all, or none of the money in the salary fund. It is important for OUS to get the message out about the severe consequences if the monies are not received.

Director Van Viet asked how much of the salary monies were in pre-negotiated contracts that OUS would be required to honor. Mr. Bryant responded that in some cases the raises might be paid and in others, agencies would have to cut the number of employees necessary to pay the negotiated raises. Chancellor Perneiteiner added that each of the campuses is reviewing what the impact might be of receiving half or none of the salary monies. “I think it’s premature to speculate about what the campuses will be reporting back to us. Suffice it to say, though, that almost all of the labor negotiations have been concluded, contracts have been signed, and we are obligated to meet those requirements,” he added.

President Ray indicated that, “with the best of intentions on all sides, at some point we might have to simply say to ourselves, ‘this is not working, it’s got to change.’ And maybe that’s the impetus for people.”

On a different topic, Mr. Bryant remarked that Director Sohn had resigned from the Board and the opening would need to be filled. He observed that a one or two page “job description” for being a Board member would be helpful in recruiting new board members. In addition, he said that the Governor had asked for recommendations from the board for new members. Chair Dyess asked Director Kelly to be the key contact person to whom Board members or presidents could submit names of potential Board members.
Director Fisher asked Mr. Bryant what impact the current economic projections would have on current work of the Board. He responded that the discussion was continuing and involved pre-K through higher education representatives. “There is going to be some research done with focus groups and some polling for information to see what Oregonians are willing to support. Oregonians are very progressive, but they don’t like taxes,” he observed. There was Board discussion about whether the focus of the planning was on infrastructure (capital construction) or operational support for the educational enterprise. “How does (capital construction) help us educate students?” Director Blair asked. President Ray observed that there is a real need in Oregon to build the capacity to attract and educate more students. Continuing the discussion, Director Blair asked how we can adequately educate our students at a quality level that makes them competitive globally, attract and retain the best faculty, and all the things we have to do today. “So it is great to plan where you want to be in ten or 15 years, but you’ve got to survive for the next five. We’ve got to figure out how to use what we have and continue to work for more funding wherever we can find it. One of the things we’re going to have to figure out is how we get maximum productivity out of the dollars we have.” he concluded.

The Board engaged in conversation about alternative strategies for meeting educational, structural, and capital needs in times of financial uncertainty, and there was general agreement that the Board and OUS staff and presidents must proactively proceed on every front and not wait to see how the funding situation develops. Director Blair underscored that OUS needs to move more quickly in making some of the structural changes that must be made to live within the resource constraints placed by the dependence on the state for funding.

Director Francesconi suggested that first, there needs to be a ten-year strategy with the public about how OUS is going to get both the investments required and the spending flexibility required. “The people in this room are not the right people by themselves to structuring the conversation. They need to be part of it, but we’ve got to get some people who know what they’re doing to connect it so we don’t keep having the same conversation. That’s the second point. Thirdly, we do need more resources in the System and I’d rather be fighting about how we’re going to get more resources because then you’re educating the public even if you lose the first campaign. Fourthly, the public is not going to give money to us to decide how to spend it. They’re going to have to be targeted investments in key areas,” he concluded.

b. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) President

See http://www.uoregon.edu/~ifs/dir08/LeeAyers-Apr08-board.html

Dr. Ayers asked the Board’s indulgence while she added a few comments to her prepared report. “We need to declare war on education. The war on terrorism is funded; the war on drugs has been funded; how about a war on education?” IFS is focusing on the roles and responsibilities of the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Task Force in the areas of access, affordability, quality, and accountability. Director Francesconi requested that IFS consider the issue of sustainability and how to integrate it throughout the curriculum.
c. **Oregon Student Association (OSA) Chair**

Emily McLain reported that the OSA Board of Directors has chosen the following priority issues for the 2009 Legislative Session: increasing need-based aid, expansion of student parent child care, and tuition and funding with specific emphasis on regional and community college funding. The Oregon Students of Color coalition, an affiliate board to OSA, has chosen tuition equity and increasing students of color research, particularly as it applies to recruitment and retention of students of color. Ms. McLain added that OSA feels strongly that the regional schools should remain independent entities and that OUS should help facilitate increased enrollment and aid by finding innovative sources of funding.

3. **CONSENT ITEM**

a. **OSU, Graduate Certificate in Water Conflict Management and Transformation**

**DOCKET ITEM:**

1. *Describe the purpose and relationship of the proposed program to the institution’s mission and strategic plan.*

   This certificate program contributes to the goals of the Oregon State University’s (OSU) strategic plan and integrates OSU’s mission of teaching, research, and outreach in four of its five multidisciplinary thematic areas: (1) advancing the arts and sciences as the foundation for scientific discovery, social and cultural enhancement, and progress in the applied professions by delivering strong research and curricular activities that are strengthened by interdisciplinary connections with professional programs; (2) increasing the understanding of the origin, dynamics, and sustainability of the Earth and its resources by linking social, ecological, economic, and political systems as they apply to water resources; (3) optimizing enterprise, innovation, and economic development by helping to develop a network of professionals capable of the success of emerging and growing organizations across natural resource and technology sectors; and (4) helping in managing natural resources that contribute to Oregon’s quality of life and growing and sustaining natural resources-based industries by providing tools and skills to prevent or resolve conflict over water and move towards collaborative and less confrontational approaches that build community – an essential component to the existence of natural resources important to the state’s economy.

2. *What evidence of need does the institution have for the program?*

   OSU has been tasked with the training component for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) – a lead water cooperation facility. UNESCO, through its recent five-year program Potential Conflict to Cooperation Potential, identified key needs to alleviate the conflict potential over shared waters and found the lack of training in conflict management among stakeholders and water managers to be of
paramount importance. Of the universities involved, OSU has the strongest core faculty and experience in these issues and is thus poised to take the lead in this international initiative.

Even without a formal program, OSU faculty have already led training efforts in water conflict management throughout the U.S. and the world, including for the US Bureau of Reclamation, the US Army Corps of Engineers, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the US Agency for International Development, the Water Ministry of Mexico, UNESCO, and the World Bank. OSU faculty have been asked by the World Bank to design a course in international water conflict management based on their bi-annual course for water ministers, to meet what they see as a growing demand for the field at the professional and graduate student levels throughout the world.

More locally, over 90 local watershed councils formed over the past decade as a result of the water/watershed governance vision of Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds. These water councils create a place for local stakeholders and agencies to come together to assess and holistically address salmon and watershed restoration.

The scientific community at OSU is constantly bombarded by requests for technical input and engineering assistance. Many of OSU’s best graduates are now leading the technical staffing of these councils. Having students facile with the combination of technical skills, as well as organizational and community skills, will serve communities and the state well.

3. Are there similar programs in the state? If so, how does the proposed program supplement, complement, or collaborate with those programs?

OSU will be unique in offering the only Water Conflict Management and Transformation graduate certificate program in the Pacific Northwest.

4. What new resources will be needed initially and on a recurring basis to implement the program? How will the institution provide these resources? What efficiencies or revenue enhancements are achieved with this program, including consolidation or elimination of programs over time, if any?

The College of Science is committed to establishing the graduate certificate program in Water Conflict Management and Transformation by providing recurring funds over the next two years for a .25 FTE program coordinator ($16,103) and .50 FTE flat rate contractor ($9,000), and supplies ($6,000). The “contractor” would be an adjunct faculty or visiting scholar invited to teach at OSU. OSU has a large faculty in water resources and is able to offer this certificate program with no additional faculty hires. Classes will be taught as part of the instructors’ normal load.

OSU’s Extended Campus (E-campus) will return tuition revenue for enrollments in the online courses in accordance with the established E-campus revenue-share model. Beyond money generated through the development of E-courses, both private and Federal agenda funds are being sought to help sustain the program. College funding will be renewable
depending on the program’s progress and anticipated program funds generated through E-campus course offerings.

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 State University to establish an instructional program leading to a Graduate Certificate in Water Conflict Management and Transformation, effective Spring 2008.

**b. OUS Honorary Degrees for Individuals Held in WWII internment Camps**

**DOCKET ITEM:**

In 2007, the Oregon Legislature passed House Bill (HB) 2823. The legislation authorizes OUS institutions to award honorary degrees to particular individuals that were held in internment camps during world War II and did not graduate because of the internment. As previously reported to the Board, the University of Oregon, under the authority of this legislation, would like to award honorary degrees – 18 bachelor’s degrees and one master’s degree – to 19 individuals at a ceremony on Sunday, April 6, 2008.

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education has a policy on honorary degrees. Under that policy, OUS institutions are required to promulgate institutional policies on how those to receive honorary degrees are selected and are to present the names of those candidates to the State Board of Higher Education for approval at least 90 days before the award of the degree. In order to facilitate and encourage OUS institutions to comply with the letter and spirit of the legislation, staff proposes suspending application of this policy for those to receive honorary degrees under the legislation.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board:**
Staff recommends the Board suspend application of the honorary degree policy, including the 90-day requirement, for the University of Oregon and any other OUS institution that would like to award honorary degrees to individuals pursuant to HB 2823 passed by the Oregon Legislature in 2007 and approve the University of Oregon awarding these degrees on Sunday, April 6, 2008, and any other OUS institutions awarding honorary degrees under this legislation in the future.
BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:

General Counsel Hagemann indicated that House Bill 2823 was passed by the Legislature. “I consulted with my general counsel colleagues of the larger campuses,” he explained, “and walked through the statute and we felt there was a little bit of a snag between the language of the statute and the existence of our own honorary degree policy.” The result of the conversation was that it would be advantageous to not have to follow the honorary degree policy and all of the mechanics embedded in it in this instance. The recommendation is to suspend application of that policy to these individuals and allow OUS institutions to go forward whenever they chose to award degrees to individuals that meet the definition in the statute.

It was moved by Director Van Vliet and seconded by Director von Schlegell to approve the staff recommendations. Those voting in favor: Directors Dyess, Blair, Fisher, Francesconi, Kelly, Fox, Powers, Miller-Jones, von Schlegell, and Van Vliet. Those voting no: none.

Motion passed.

4. REPORT ITEM

a. UO, Arena Update

President Frohnmayer structured his presentation around five topics: neighborhood and community concerns; property acquisition progress; parking and transportation issues; bonding; and construction and contracting.

Neighborhood and Community Concerns: The UO is continuing to work actively with the City of Eugene and the Fairmont Neighborhood Association. Eugene’s land use law requires municipal and public review of the University’s plans and that is well advanced. Building the arena requires vacating a small alley that is surrounded by University buildings. Additionally, there must be an analysis of the traffic impact and a report of strategies for minimizing or mitigating traffic impacts. A neighborhood liaison committee is continuing to develop recommendations on a range of issues. There have been two public forums with students as well.

Property Acquisition: President Frohnmayer reported that all properties have been secured and the schedule for demolition of building calls for working from west to east along Franklin Boulevard. The timeline is extremely important in terms of the economic impact of the project. “This is a $200 million project, so we’re talking a little less than half a billion dollars of infusion of economic activity into this region at precisely the time when the national economic indicators are showing that this could not be more welcome,” the president pointed out. He emphasized that it was important to stay on schedule to open the arena in the fall of 2010.

Parking and Transportation: An underground parking facility adjacent to and as a part of the arena and alumni center is increasingly likely. A traffic impact and analysis and traffic demand is being conducted by David Evans and Associates. They are preparing a management plan.
Bonding: The UO anticipates appearing before the Board in May for bond sale approval. With the current volatility of the financial markets, it is important to assess a variety of options that include both interim and long-term financing and either none, a little, a lot, or all taxable bonds.

Construction and Contracting: The UO will enter into a contract with NCP, a limited liability corporation that is a subsidiary of the University of Oregon Foundation, to serve as developer of the project. President Frohnmayer reported that during the last four or five years, NCP has done a significant amount of design and planning work that has enabled the UO to maintain an accelerated schedule toward a November 2010 opening of the arena. Finally, it was pointed out that “the Board’s rules permit a sole source contract, in this case the NCP, when no other entity can provide the service of this quantity and quality. No other entity, other than NCP has, in fact, maintained a level of involvement in, let alone made a major substantial contribution to, this project over the past five years. And, because of its unique relationship to the University of Oregon Foundation, it was able to secure interim financing,” President Frohnmayer emphasized.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Director Kelly asked if the sole source contract required Board approval and Legal Counsel Wendy Robinson indicated that the Board’s rules do require Board approval. Continuing, Director Kelly indicated that it than appears to be a fait accompli since there is no realistic alternative, yet he had the feeling that the Board had not had a real opportunity to make a determination.

Director Dyess remarked that when the UO originally presented the plan for the arena to the Board, President Frohnmayer indicated that he was strongly recommending a sole source contract and the Board discussed the issue at that time. Director Van Viet observed that if this project were all private funding, there would be no question about a sole source. “When you’re using state-bonded money, you run into more of a foggy area about the fact that normally those require some sort of open bidding procedure. Now, we seem like we’re almost backed up against the wall, but I would hope we would be a little more open the next time around on something like that and really investigate when state funds are involved,” he concluded.

Chancellor Pernsteiner interjected that the actual construction work will be divided into five bid packages and these packages will be competitively bid. “What you’re talking about here, with respect to the sole source, is essentially creating the structure of accountability for the overall job,” he advised. “This is a very common approach for us on major projects – to create an umbrella, a construction manager general contract (CMGC) or framework. For many years, it has been countenanced by the state rules and our rules that those kinds of jobs would not be bid, but rather competition for the CMGC would be based upon a qualifications-based selection.” The Chancellor concluded by emphasizing that there are very few firms in the state that have either the bonding capacity or the expertise to mount a building project of this size. The actual construction will be going to bid and will have the same requirements for minority, women, and emerging small business, wages, and so forth.
5. **Discussion Item**

a. **OUS, Strategic Planning**

Director Kelly, chair of Committee reported that they are moving more slowly than anticipated. One of the reasons is that they are collecting some historical information from as far back as 2004 that has relevance to the current governance discussion. Secondly, the Committee is considering some obtaining some external assistance. In the context of structural changes, Director Dyess floated the suggestion that perhaps Board meetings should be held quarterly, with monthly meetings being teleconferenced. This would save considerably on travel and staff time.

Director Blair remarked that the Committee is looking for opportunities to put the regional institutions on a stronger, sustainable financial platform. This would include an aspect of reducing costs as well as increasing enrollment. The first areas chosen for examination were admissions, financial aid, and registration. “The reason we picked those is there is about $7 million of spending in those areas across the four regional institutions,” he observed. The consulting firm, MGT, will be contracted with to assist with the project. An objective is to actually improve performance by doing some best practice work across the four institutions. The target for the Committee is to have a draft report back to the Board in June. Another area of focus is financial management and how it can be better leveraged across the four institutions. One of the first challenges is to build a consistent platform of information. Leveraging shared services requires first that all institutions are speaking the same language.

Director Blair concluded his report by emphasizing that these are the main thrusts at the present time and his hope is that taking these steps will give the Committee confidence that there are some more thanks that can be done cooperatively as a System. Then, this could provide momentum to branch out in other directions.

In beginning his report from the subcommittee on Portland Higher Education, Director Francesconi observed that there is an increasing amount of cooperation and collaboration among the institutions as demonstrated by the UO and PSU collaborating on a joint approach to architecture. Secondly, he indicated that the first requirement for an effective Portland higher education agenda is a very effective president at PSU. The search for a new president is nearing completion and there is good reason to assume that a strong and fierce advocate for PSU is among the candidates. The Search Committee has been looking for someone who can forward the OHSU, Oregon State, PSU life sciences and medical program, initiatives toward sustainability, the challenge of access and how to increase access to education, beginning with a more effective K-12 system in the region and state, and finally elevating the importance of civic engagement.

Provost Hallick from OHSU indicated that there is interest in enough programs in the pipeline to fill several buildings. OHSU has the potential of bringing to the table an anonymous donor-funded interdisciplinary health care and capacity enhancement program. The collaborative educational activities include: three universities involved in the MPH program; a joint program between OHSU and OSU in pharmacy; Oregon State, Portland State, and OHSU collaborative on
a biomedical engineering program. On the collaborative research side, Dr. Hallick mentioned OTRAID, chemical biology, pharmacy, and biomedical engineering. A third area of planning is research development and application, tech transfer, and thinks like incubator space, a good manufacturing practice laboratory for creating items that would then go into people. These do not have to be huge, but researchers need a place where they can coordinate clinical trials.

Director Francesconi added that in the area of sustainability, the focus would be on: the built environment would be a large part; transportations, sustainable communities, and planning; and climate change. Various institutions have unique programs in place that touch these areas and collaborative initiatives can expand them. Several school districts in and around Portland have expressed a willingness to put some resources into the area of access. Civic engagement remains one of the hardest areas to adequately address. The Portland Business Alliance and the Oregon Business Council are assisting but the issue is the business community and other aspects of the community access to higher education institutions for their workers, for internships, and for research projects.

Director Miller-Jones reported that the Student Participation and Completion Committee was developing option packages that would have resources attached to them. He indicated that the Committee is working with the Portland Access Group as well as the Provosts’ Council around issues of assessment and teacher education. The Committee is striving to establish meaningful outcomes and metrics to benchmark progress. In that regard, the Committee is going to use a mathematical or logistical model to determine where the most needs are. If a state does not have replacement people for the workforce, then companies will import skilled labor from other states and countries, or will relocate to other states, or never locate to Oregon initially. This produces a “loop of negative productivity,” Director Mill-Jones declared. “This, in turn, equals a declining economy in Oregon unable to support positive population or financial growth, a growing population with greater social service needs for those with greater social service needs and who are high users of state social programs funded by a declining population of contributors to the state general fund resources which equals a state that cannot sustain its own population, attract and retain businesses and industry, and cannot support a quality pre-K – 20 educational system.” The policy packages of the Committee will focus on increasing the educational attainment rates for citizens who currently have the lowest access to, and opportunity for, post-secondary education in the state. In closing, Director Miller-Jones expresses a “great sense of exasperation with the notion that in order to achieve many of the objectives in our POPs, we’re asking for money when, in fact, we could do an awful lot of these things if we shifted our own priorities and devoted existing funds to this enterprise.”

Director Blair concurred with Director Miller-Jones’ closing comments and added, “Our job is educating students. The students we’re going to get are the ones you described. That’s our job. So we have to figure out in this budget cycle how to be more explicit, exactly as you said.”

Chair Dyess called on Ruth Keele to address the topic of the Best Board Practice Report, which came out of the 2005 Legislative Session. DAS and the Legislative Fiscal Office (LFO) both received a budget note to develop a performance measure that was reflective of best practices with regard to governance and oversight of boards and commissions. A set of criteria was
developed to identify applicable boards and commissions and a template for the particular best practices to be addressed with the performance measure. The State Board of Higher Education is required to adopt this performance measure because, according to Ms. Keеле, “It meets the two criteria: it has an independent state budget and the Board hires the agency’s executive director.” The Board, therefore, is required to implement the measure and report it first in the 2008 annual performance report to the state, which is due in August. Board members were reminded that they had received an assessment form that includes 15 best practice standards that were outlined by DAS and LFO, as well as some documented current practices that are undertaken by the state or by the agency to which they pertain.

Although the process seems cumbersome, Chair Dyess encouraged all Board members to respond immediately to the questionnaire. Vice Chancellor Hagemann has collected them and has summarized the findings to date. The suggestion was to have a discussion of the findings and then consider what future action the Board might want to take toward improvement.

OIT Presidential Search – Director Kelly reported that on April 17, the Search Committee for the OIT presidency would receive the first list of candidates from Isaacson Miller, the search firm with whom they are working. At the meeting, the Committee will determine if it can complete the search by the end of the present academic term, or if it will be moved to be completed in the fall.

Sustainability Conference – Director von Schlegell reported on the Sustainability Conference was held the day before the Board meeting. He indicated that there were between 40-50 people in attendance and they met for four hours. “What we heard,” he said, “is that this is the time and Oregon’s the place on sustainability.” The participants agreed to provide funding for approximately a dozen or so specific seminars or sessions on selected topics. It was agreed that the Conference had been extremely stimulating and positive.

6. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Standing Committee Reports**

      i. **Oversight Committee on Sexual Assault**

The Committee met the day prior to the Board meeting and heard a report from Jonathan Eldridge, Vice President at SOU on a study that had been done several years ago in Oregon on the campuses by one of the national health institutes. Using random sampling, information was gathered on the amount of sexual assault that was occurring on the campuses. “It is one of the hidden problems that we have on our campuses that is not spoken about. We do not have a common policy,” Director Van Viet observed. The Committee agreed that the study should be updated on the campuses. The first step is the need to agree on common definitions of what is being described as sexual assault. From that, the Committee is hoping to develop a policy that could be used on all campuses.
ii. Finance and Administration

Director Blair passed on making a report since most of the board members had been in attendance at the previous day's Finance and Administration meeting.

iii. UEE

Director Miller-Jones had no report.

b. Other Board Committees

i. OHSU Board

Chair Dyess had no report. She did take the opportunity to once again thank OHSU for a great visit to the campus.

ii. 529 College Savings Plan

Chair Dyess is a member of the Board of the Savings Plan and indicated that in the future there would be some recommendations on prepaid college tuition and that can be accomplished without putting the institutions at risk.

7. Public Input

No public comments were submitted.

8. Board Comments

There were no further comments from Board members. President Dyess recognized OIT President Woodall. After complimenting all institutions on the quality of their athletes, he said, “Well, we have wonderful athletes at OIT, too. Borrowing a page from the playbook of my mentor, Martha Anne Dow, I want to pass out hats to the members of the Board and to the Presidents, celebrating our second national championship in basketball in five years.”

President Ray added that he was reminded when OIT won the championship for the first time. “One of the memories I’ll never forget is Martha Anne passing out the hats, including for the Chair of the Board, who was so exuberant he suggested that they should have a picture commemorating the event, to which Martha Anne replied, ‘Be still my heart!’”

9. Delegation of Authority to Board’s Executive Committee

Director von Schlegell moved and director Van Viet seconded the motion to approve the Delegation of Authority. All Directors voted in favor of the motion.
10. **ADJOURNMENT**

President Dyess adjourned the meeting at 1:35 p.m.