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

President Kelly called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m.

**Board members present included:** Directors Paul Kelly, Kirby Dyess, Hannah Fisher, Brian Fox, James Francesconi, Dalton Miller-Jones, Rosemary Powers, Preston Pulliams, John Von Schlegell, Tony Van Vliet, and David Yaden; Director Donald Blair was absent due to business conflict.

**Others present included:** Presidents Mary Cullinan (SOU), Dixie Lund (EOU); Christopher Maples (OIT), John Minahan (WOU), Edward Ray (OSU), Wim Wiewel (PSU). Others present included: Provosts James Bean (UO) and Lesley Hallick (OHSU).

**Staff members present included:** Chancellor George Pernsteiner, Michael Green, Ryan Hagemann, Jay Kenton, and Susan Weeks.

On behalf of the Board, President Kelly thanked President Cullinan for Southern’s hospitality.

Director Dave Yaden, who was appointed by the Governor to the State Board of Higher Education, effective October 1, 2008, was introduced. Mr. Yaden was formerly Executive Director of Policy and Planning for Tri-Met, served as Director of the Oregon Department of Energy, is past chair of the Sight-Line Institution, a regional sustainability think-tank based in Seattle, and is a volunteer with CASA. In response to the introduction, Director Yaden indicated that higher education is a passion for him and he was honored to be appointed to the Board.

It was announced that the first annual OUS Sustainability Conference would be held at the UO campus on October 23-24, 2008. All Board members are welcome and encouraged to participate in the Conference.

2. **REPORTS**

a. **Chancellor’s Report**

Chancellor Pernsteiner added his thanks to President Cullinan for hosting the Board. “I think that the optimism in the air at the start of the school year is palpable and evident on the campus. Clearly, the indicators are up and the optimism is high,” he observed.
Consultant Neil Bryant indicated that the Federal Stimulus Plan was likely to pass the House of Representatives and the good news for Oregonians was that timber payments are back in the plan and which will help with the next legislative session. Oregon is not a battleground state for the presidential election as it was in either 2000 or 2004, so there are fewer national appearances and events by the presidential candidates.

In terms of ballot measures, it appeared that both Measures 57 and 61 would pass and the question was which would pass with the most votes. Oregonians appear to want to be tough on crime, but they have not studied the measures very thoroughly for the financial impacts.

Measure 62, the lottery funding, is structured so that 15 percent would be designated for district attorneys and Oregon State Police lab investigation. It had been polling well. However, when voters understood that it would take resources away from education, they tended to switch to a “no” vote.

Mr. Bryant indicated that a new revenue forecast was due out in December. Obviously, the outlook for the forecast and what occurs in the next 30-45 days, nationally, will have a big impact on higher education funding.

b. Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) President (Ayers)

IFS President Ayers added her welcome to Southern and expressed her delight that the meeting was on her “home turf.” IFS was scheduled to meet after the Board meeting, the first meeting since the summer break. “Give Students a Compass,’ a tri-state signature project of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, and includes the California State University System, the Wisconsin System, and OUS, is investigating how high impact practices can integrate or re-integrate the often fragmented baccalaureate. It explores the questions of the effects of practices on under-served populations, in particular, and redefines success and assessing learning outcomes that matter. Students engage deeply when given the right tools of orientation along the way,” Dr. Ayers explained.

Craig Prins, Executive Director of the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission will address SOU students and the IFS in the afternoon following the Board meeting. He will be discussion the fiscal impacts of Measures 57 and 61 on Oregon.

Dr. Ayers expressed concern about the financial picture for Oregon higher education and the discomfort faculty and students are expressing. “Some faculty worry about class size, economic quality, delivery and access, learning outcomes and assessment mandates, and, of course, faculty retention. Compressed salaries and productivity levels are all of a different scale, thus connecting the compensation and the compression is vital for retaining faculty. It is not uncommon for many faculty in this state who are single heads of households, to have to maintain another position outside of their academic one to make it in high-cost living areas of Oregon. Investing in faculty and keeping them in our institutions is not just a salary issue. There
is much worry about money by presidents and faculty alike, with no clear answers or any mention of an educational bailout in the near future. It is clear to this faculty member that some of the best and brightest are working extremely hard and doing much overtime in this System,” she concluded. (A copy of the full IFS Report is on file in the Board’s Office.)

c. Oregon Student Association (OSA) Chair

Ms. Kelli Horvath, Student Body President at SOU and the newly elected 2008-09 OSA Board Chair, addressed the Board. She reported that OSA had held its 60th legislative meeting. These meetings mark the initiation of OSA’s advocacy process for the 2009 legislative session. OSA has noted that postsecondary education appears to be a top priority and the Shared Responsibility Model has strong support, with a significantly larger funding increase requested. “Last week, the Emergency Board granted the Assistance Commission’s request of $4 million in supplemental funding for the shared Responsibility Model. We were able to collect nearly 100 letters of support for the request and were heartened by Representative Galizio’s citing of our letters as motivational in his support for his ‘yes’ vote,” she remarked.

Ms. Horvath asked the Board for assistance in solving a problem that they have at most of the campuses where they do not have the full support of faculty in the voter registration efforts. Many faculty are reluctant to give up a small amount of class time for voter registration and it was felt that support from the Board might be helpful.

There are now students from each of the campuses on the Tuition Policy Committee being formed by the Board. OSA is open to a full discussion of tuition models for the System but will be presenting its focus on access and affordability from the students’ perspective.

Director Miller-Jones asked if it were appropriate for the Board to express support for students advocating for voter registration during class time. Chancellor Pernsteiner responded that the Board had done this in the past. It was agreed that Chancellor Pernsteiner would send a letter to institution presidents conveying the support of the Board for this matter. (A copy of the full OSA report is on file in the Board’s Office.)

3. Consent Items

a. OHSU-PSU, MBA in Healthcare Management

DOCKET ITEM:

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

The Master of Business Administration (MBA) in Healthcare Management is designed for working professionals in healthcare who will take the program on a part-time basis, but it will also be available to full time students with prior work experience in healthcare. It
particularly targets practicing managers in healthcare and those preparing for a transition into management. Potential students include physician/dentist managers, nurse managers, and managers/administrators from the full spectrum of healthcare organizations (hospitals, clinics, non-profit community providers, private practices, insurance companies, bioscience companies selling into healthcare, etc.).

The proposed OHSU-PSU MBA in Healthcare Management fits firmly within the missions of both Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) and Portland State University (PSU). PSU’s mission includes providing graduate programs that are especially relevant to the metropolitan area. In addition, the School of Business Administration’s mission is to serve the economic vitality of the region. By providing advanced professional business preparation for managers of healthcare services, the proposed program will enable local healthcare institutions to achieve greater operational and economic effectiveness and become leaders in their industry, thereby increasing the economic vitality of the city and region.

Similarly, this new MBA relates directly to the OHSU’s mission of “healing, teaching and discovery.” The proposed program recognizes and focuses upon the need for innovative approaches to addressing the high cost and quality shortcomings that characterize much of the American healthcare system. The goal will be to educate professionals who are prepared to embed modern management practices and systems thinking in the healthcare framework, thereby providing opportunities to significantly and substantially improve the organization, financing, and delivery of healthcare.

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

OHSU developed the initial concept of the MBA in Healthcare Management two years ago, independently of PSU. Thus, much of the market research on the regional demand for the program, as well as on similar programs elsewhere in the country, was conducted by OHSU and the initial framework for the program structure was developed based on those findings. The research led OHSU to focus on the leadership components of healthcare management and to recognize that a MBA from an AACSB institution provides greater value to the candidates. PSU’s School of Business Administration is AACSB accredited and, in addition, had introduced a strong leadership development component into the MBA program in 2004, which has been very successful. The School of Business Administration is also aware of the growing importance of healthcare in the region, and while it had developed a limited option in healthcare for its MBA students, does not have the depth of expertise to develop a specialized MBA in the field itself. Discussions between the two institutions uncovered these mutually beneficial overlaps and the fact that much of the core business knowledge of the OHSU-designed program is already taught in the School of Business Administration MBA program core courses. Thus, the synergies from the two institutions offering the program as a joint degree were apparent and that a joint program leverages the region’s resources much more effectively than an independent program.
3. *Are there similar programs in the state? If so, how does the proposed program supplement, complement, or collaborate with those programs?*

This will be the only MBA program in the Oregon University System schools that is focused specifically on management in healthcare. Multi-industry MBA programs exist at PSU, Oregon State University (OSU), University of Oregon (UO), and Eastern Oregon University (EOU). Additionally, there is the Oregon Executive MBA (OEMBA), which is a joint program of PSU, UO, and OSU. There is also a Master of Management program at Southern Oregon University. The Master of Public Health (MPH) programs at both OSU and PSU have tracks in Health Management and Policy. Finally, PSU’s Master of Public Administration (MPA) has a concentration in Health Administration.

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 program will require no new resources. The direct and indirect costs of the program are supported by tuition revenue. The program will utilize existing faculty from OHSU and PSU, as well as selected industry experts and some faculty from other institutions of higher education in the state.

All appropriate University committees and bodies at OHSU and PSU and the OUS Provosts’ Council have positively reviewed and approved the proposed program.

*Recommendation to the Board:*
The OUS Provosts’ Council recommended that the Board authorize Oregon Health & Science University and Portland State University to establish a joint instructional program leading the Master of Business Administration in Healthcare Management, effective Winter 2009.

b. **PSU, Graduate Certificate in Environmental and Resource Economics**

**DOCKET ITEM:**

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

The Department of Economics at Portland State University has identified the area of environmental and natural resource economics as one of its emerging strengths. This program would provide an educational product that is currently unavailable in the Portland area and of value locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. This program promotes Portland State University’s commitment to moving toward a more sustainable world in which our economy, environment, and social institutions prosper simultaneously.
2. What evidence of need does the institution have for the program?

Letters of support for a graduate program in the specific area of Environmental and Resource Economics have been received from current students, previous graduates in the Economics Department, and prospective employers in the region. Support from both community and business individuals indicate that there is particular interest from local businesses (energy consulting companies), industry (local utilities), and from non-profit organizations interested in promoting energy efficiency and conservation and more general environmental and climate stewardship.

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

None

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 core courses and electives for the graduate certificate are presently being taught for Master’s students in Economics and have the capacity for additional students. Current reference sources at Portland State University and materials available online are adequate for offering the new program.

The Economics Department anticipates an increased need of about .25 FTE for clerical support staff to help with administration of the program and for a .5 course release for the faculty director of the program. With the Dean’s support, these needs have been included in the Department’s future budget.

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 Portland State University to establish an instructional program leading to a Graduate Certificate in Environmental and Resource Economics, effective Fall 2008.

c. OSU, Resolution Regarding Classified Information for U.S. Department of Defense

DOCKET ITEM:
The Industrial Security Manual issued by the U.S. Department of Defense requires that owners, officers, and executive personnel of corporations and regents or trustees of colleges and
universities whose employees have access to classified materials in the course of working with Department of Defense contracts delegate to others the authority for fulfilling the requirements of the Industrial Security Manual and exclude themselves from access to classified information.

The resolution recommended for adoption is that which is required by the Manual and is, except for changes in the date and names of Board members, identical to that which has been previously adopted by the Board.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board:**
Staff recommended that the Board adopt the following resolution regarding access to classified information related to the Department of Defense material.

**RESOLUTION**
That those persons occupying the following positions for Oregon State University shall be known as the Managerial Group as described in the Industrial Security Manual for Safeguarding Classified Information:

- President
- Vice President for Research
- Vice President for Finance and Administration
- Facilities Security Officer
- Alternate Facilities Security Officer

That the chief executive and the members of the Managerial Group have been processed or will be processed for a personnel clearance for access to classified information to the level of the facility clearance granted to this institution as provided for in the aforementioned Industrial Security Manual.

That said Managerial Group is hereby delegated all of the Board’s duties and responsibilities pertaining to the protection of classified information under classified contracts of the Department of Defense or User Agencies of its Industrial Security Program awarded to Oregon State University.

That the following named officers and members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education shall not require, shall not have, and can be effectively excluded from access to all classified information in the possession of Oregon State University and do not occupy positions that would enable them to affect adversely the policies and practices of Oregon State University in the performance of classified contracts for the Department of Defense or User Agencies for its Industrial Security Program awarded to Oregon State University.

**Officers and Board Members**
Paul J. Kelly, Jr., President
James L. Francesconi, Vice President
d. EOU, Presidential Search Process

DOCKET ITEM:

Following the resignation of Eastern Oregon University President Khosrow Fatemi in June 2007, an interim President was appointed, Dr. Dixie Lund, who agreed to serve in this important position for a period of two years, until a search was concluded and a new president named. The Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Higher Education are grateful for the leadership of Dr. Lund and her efforts during this interim period for the betterment of EOU and the eastern Oregon community. Pursuant to Board Internal Management Directive 1.140(2), the Board and Chancellor have undertaken a search for interim President Lund’s successor.

As a Regional University and center for education, scholarship, and culture in Eastern Oregon, EOU needs a dynamic, accomplished, and collegial leader committed to instruction, service, research, and community involvement. All are critical requirements of a public university focused on providing a well-rounded education with an emphasis on learning and achievement as demonstrated through all aspects of university life. The person will support EOU students, faculty, staff, and alumni in demonstrating a deep sense of vocation and will work for positive change across rural Oregon as the University provides opportunities for further learning in the region. The process by which the new president is selected must be conducted in a way that reflects the values and aspirations of the campus community and external constituencies, ensures that the very best candidates are engaged and rigorously evaluated, and concludes with the successful appointment of a president who can provide leadership to one of the key educational assets in Eastern Oregon and the state, overall.

To advise the Chancellor in recommending the best candidate to the Board for appointment, a broadly representative search committee has been formed, chaired by Board of Higher Education Director Tony van Vliet and consisting of faculty, students, EOU administrators and staff, alumni, local and regional business leaders, and other education and government leaders. Members of the search committee include:

- Tony van Vliet, Chair and OSBHE director
- Katy Barnett, President, Associated Students of EOU
Kerry Bullard, Office Specialist, EOU  
Kirk Creech, Director of Facility Operations, EOU  
Mary Cullinan, President, Southern Oregon University  
Mike Daugherty, Interim Dean of Students, EOU  
Sue Dobson, Portland Center Director, Distance Education, EOU OIT/Clackamas and PCC Sites  
Colleen MacLeod, Commissioner, Union County  
Adriana Mendoza, Graduate Student, EOU, and former OSBHE director  
Ray Naff, Director, Intergovernmental Relations & Economic Revitalization Team for the Governor, Office of the Governor  
Don Rougamoux, Advisory Board Member, Malheur County  
Tim Seydel, Associate Vice President, Marketing, Development, and Public Affairs, EOU  
Kim Sorensen, Assistant Professor, Accounting, EOU  
Bill Tenpas, Vice President, Oregon Dental Services  
John Turner, President, Blue Mountain Community College  
Peter Wordelman, Professor, Music, EOU  
Dr. Jerry Young, President, EOU Foundation  
Diane Saunders, Ex-officio/committee staff, and OUS Director of Communications  
Kristen Bingaman, Committee staff, and Executive Assistant, EOU

Following an RFP (Request for Proposal) process and subsequent subcommittee review of proposals from national search firms, the firm of Storbeck/Pimentel & Associates has been retained to assist the search committee in its work; with Ms Sharon Tanabe, firm partner, as the lead director of the search for the firm, with help from Mr. Pimentel, a managing partner of the firm. The executive search roots and experience base of Storbeck/Pimentel & Associates are among one of the most extensive and highly-regarded in higher education executive search. Over one-third of all the searches they conduct are for the positions of president and chancellor, and an even larger proportion are for the wide array of senior officers, including provosts, vice presidents, and deans. Storbeck/Pimentel & Associates (SP&A) is a minority and women owned business exclusively dedicated to serving the higher education and not-for-profit sectors. SP&A is comprised of over 34 consultants and support staff located in two main offices (Los Angeles and Philadelphia) with three affiliated offices in Vermont, Boston, and Virginia. Collectively, they have conducted more than 1,500 executive-level searches for higher education clients over the course of the last 20 years.

The search committee has begun to develop the detailed job description and is engaging the campus and community in identifying the essential qualities needed in the next president. Chancellor Pernsteiner hosted campus forums in June on campus and will hold two additional campus and community forums on the EOU campus in early October.

During fall 2008, the search committee and Ms. Tanabe will focus on broadly recruiting top candidates, from which a pool will be identified for more intensive consideration. By winter 2009, the search committee will focus on a set of finalists, with the top choices visiting Oregon...
to meet with the campus community and Board during the early spring. The Chancellor anticipates making a final recommendation to the Board for approval in April 2009.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board:**
Staff recommended that the Board adopt the search process and considerations described above for the search for the next Eastern Oregon University president.

**BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:**

President Kelly pointed out that a fourth item had been added to the Consent Agenda regarding the EOU Presidential Search Process. The request is for Board adoption of the search process as presented. Director Van Vliet added that the Committee had met and interviewed two well-qualified search firms to assist in the process. Storbeck/Pimentel has been selected and will begin work immediately with the Committee on recruitment efforts.

Director Fox highlighted that the OHSU-PSU, MBA in Healthcare Management is a “joint program that leverages the regions resources much more effectively than an independent program. I would like to applaud the efforts of PSU and OHSU to work together on a critical shortage in this industry and to build off the combined skills to produce a better degree for the state of Oregon.

It was moved by Director Dyess, seconded by Director von Schlegell, to approve the staff recommendations for the Consent Items. Those voting in favor of the motion: Directors Dyess, Fisher, Fox, Francesconi, Kelly, Miller-Jones, Powers, Pulliams, von Schlegell, Van Vliet, and Yaden. Those voting no or abstaining: None. Motion passed.

4. **Action Items**

a. **OUS, Proposed Tuition Policy Work Group**

**DOCKET ITEM:**

**Background:**
Every June, when tuition and fees for the subsequent academic year are presented for Board approval, there are numerous questions and comments about principles and practices used to guide this process. The Board meeting in June 2008 was no exception and many Board members were more emphatic in calling for a group to review pertinent polices and to make recommendations regarding principles that could be used to better guide this process.

Given these concerns and given the progress that was made with the ad hoc committee on resource fees last year, the creation of a new Tuition Policy Work Group is being proposed, comprised of an equal number of students and administrators, as illustrated below, who, if authorized, would be given the following charge and timeline.
Proposed Membership with Equal Representation of Students and Administrators.

Students:
- Brian Fox, OUS Board Member, Chair
- Katy Barnett, EOU, ASEOU President
- Ryan Mann, OSU, ASOSU President
- Virginia Vickery, PSU, ASPSU University Affairs
- Katherine Gohring, SOU, ASSOU
- Matt Rose, UO, ASUO
- Max Beach, WOU, ASWOU President
- Tamara Henderson, OSA Executive Director

Administrators:
- Jay Kenton, OUS, Staff Support
- Virginia Key, EOU Finance and Administration
- Tracey Lehman, OIT Financial Aid
- Kate Peterson, OSU Enrollment Management
- Michael Fung, PSU Budget
- Matt Stillman, SOU Student Affairs
- JP Monroe, UO Institutional Research
- David McDonald, WOU Enrollment Management

Governor’s Office Liaison:
- Margie Lowe

Proposed Charge:
This work group will be exploratory and advisory to the State Board of Higher Education. The work group charge is to review OUS tuition policy with a primary focus on resident undergraduate tuition. Said review to include an examination of other systems of higher education and other public universities’ tuition philosophies, how they set tuition, fee remissions policies, and other affiliated policies, and to make recommendations to the Board of Higher Education regarding:

1. Tuition philosophy and principles to guide the process. For example, access to a quality education; affordability; balance between state and student share of costs; competitive with similar programs in other states; and some guiding principles/policies that are both rational and predictable.
2. Factors to be used in setting tuition. For example, state General Fund appropriations, institutional mission, peer rates, program costs, perceived value of the degree as measured by salaries in the field, etc.
3. Financial aid policy recommendations as related to tuition with a focus on fee remission policies and practices. For example, what level of fee remissions and what type (merit or need based) should be granted.

Proposed Timelines:
The work group will begin fall 2008 with a preliminary report to the OUS Board at its January 2009 meeting and final recommendations by late winter/spring 2009. It is anticipated that the
full work group will meet once per month, but that subgroups will have additional assignments/meetings each month.

This concept has been discussed with the vice president for finance, the presidents, and OSA leadership and their input has been incorporated into the membership, charge, and timelines reflected above.

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommended that the Board authorize the formation of and charge to this work group as outlined above.

**BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:**

Vice Chancellor Kenton reminded the Board that it adopts tuition and fee rates for the summer session during January and for the academic year at the June meeting. At last June’s meeting, there was discussion about guiding principles and philosophies regarding tuition levels and it was agreed that there was a lack of clarity and that work should be done before the Board was faced with these decisions again.

The present action item is a proposal to form a work group, to be composed of an equal number of students and administrators, to examine these issues and help determine what guiding principles might be adopted and factors to be used in setting tuition and financial aid. The current plan is to present a first draft of recommendations to the Board in January 2009 for discussion and deliberation and a final set of recommendations in early spring. The recommendation, therefore, is the formation of an ad hoc work group that would be comprised of the members as listed and under the leadership of Director Fox. Dr. Kenton would provide support to the group.

Director Dyess asked if the group might consider enrollment management, in general, as one of the inputs and Director von Schlegell added that he would ask the group to consider the “one-size-fits-all” for all institutions. Director Fox indicated that, at this point, all of ideas are on the table. Vice Chancellor Kenton added, “I would hope that it would be an open book, without consideration of the history, even though you have to take the history into account in the process. At the same time, I think we have to recognize where we are today and anything that we propose, we need to consider how it impacts on where we are and how it will guide the Board in future deliberations.”

Director von Schlegell added that he would not want ideas like high-tuition, high-aid models, and access and affordability left out of the discussion. “I know, affordability is a paramount issue. But I think, as a Board, we need to be looking at all of these models for the sustainability of the whole System. So, I think that it is important that everything is on the table with this Committee.”
Director Dyess moved, seconded by Director von Schlegell, that the Board approve the staff recommendation that the Board authorize the formation of and charge to the Work Group as outlined in the docket. Those voting in favor of the motion: Directors Dyess, Fisher, Fox, Francesconi, Kelly, Miller-Jones, Powers, Pulliams, von Schlegell, Van Vliet, and Yaden. Those voting no or abstaining: None. Motion passed.

b. OUS Academic Program Review Policy

DOCKET ITEM:


BOARD DISCUSSION AND ACTION:

Vice Chancellor Weeks noted that, at the last Board meeting, the Academic Program Review Policy was discussed. Board approval is now sought for the policy. The recommendation was for two things that are imbedded in one request. First, Board approval was sought for the substance of the policy as previously discussed. Additionally, staff sought to have the item approved as a Board Policy, rather than as an Internal Management Directive (IMD).

“We currently have two Board items or rules. We have an Internal Management Directive that describes academic program review; and, we also have another Board policy that describes academic program review. There are some common elements, but there are also some contradictions in the processes described in each of those. What we are proposing is, as part of a broader effort, to better organize some of these IMDs and Board policies.

“We are recommending that we rescind the IMD and replace the guidance through the Board policy as described in the Board docket material. One thing I do want to note is that at the end of this board policy, as I have also seen in other Board policies and I took the liberty of adding a ‘Note to the Board,’ because I think it’s critical to embed this in the policy. That is, should you approve and adopt this policy, we don’t actually have the resources to implement it in terms of staffing and organizational structure. I wanted to highlight that,” Ms. Weeks explained.

Director Francesconi noted that how to staff these things keeps coming up. “At the end of the last meeting, a request was made that what we wanted was a job description as to what you needed with the budget with resources attached to it. I think we still need that because if we are going to adopt a policy we need to know how to implement it.”

The issue of staffing had been discussed at the Provosts’ Council meeting and the nature of a position, some characteristics of it, of the kind of person needed, and the skill set that would be needed to address and implement the policy. The provosts also recognized that some of the issues might be part of the discussion at the Board retreat and might become part of other considerations that the Chancellor needs to make.
Provost Randhawa, co-chair of the Provosts’ Council, added that implementation of the policy, in and of itself, would be a full time FTE job. “I think what we have been looking at is the overall portfolio that the Provosts’ Council handles and this is part of that in terms of support needed, whether it is some of the K-12 initiatives and so forth. So we have been thinking, not just so much in terms of a position description for implementing the academic policy, but what is the total support structure needed to sustain a number of activities that are ongoing.”

Director Francesconi continued the discussion by adding that on this issue, “I think that is the Chancellor’s responsibility to present what is needed in terms of implementing this policy and make a recommendation to the Board. Getting to the other subsequent issue on the policy, one of the great works that the Board did before I was ever connected with it was the portfolio discussion through the strategic plan. You don’t want the Board micromanaging this,” he added.

However, Director Francesconi indicated that he had a major problem with the policy as proposed. “You do not have language on existing programs in new locations. There is no appeal process from the provosts to the Board. One of the reasons that we created the Portland Higher Education Committee was for precisely that reason. And we haven’t resolved it. As a Board, we talk about a whole lot of things and we have to be in a position to make the ultimate call. I’m going to make a motion that Director von Schlegell will second, to insert that same language on the section on Existing Programs and New Locations.”

Vice Chancellor Weeks attempted to clarify Director Francesconi’s request. “The major change is that we do not currently bring existing programs in new locations to the Board and you are recommending that we do bring those to the Board, along with new program proposals, only in cases where they cannot be otherwise resolved by the Provosts’ Council.”

Chancellor Pernsteiner indicated that program review, in the past, was very circumscribed with and bound by rules and policies. “In 2004, the Board got rid of a lot of that and we went through a period where the Provosts’ Council was trying to figure out what was the right balance. This is the first attempt to strike a balance.

“As Provost Randhawa said, we need to look at how we staff the Provosts’ Council, generally. Right now, the staff for the Provosts’ Council is technically provided by someone on a less-than-half-time basis who is retired, who has been the record keeper for the provosts for many years, and that is the only staffing that we dedicate to that entire operation, other than what Susan can beg, borrow, and steal from her own time. So, when Sabah and Susan said that we need to figure out the broader staffing for the academic areas dealt with by the Provosts’ Council, it was in that context. So we will come back to you with that proposal, but it will be in a broader context than just this policy.”
It was pointed out that part of the discussion at the December retreat would be to deal with roles and responsibilities of different entities, including the Chancellor’s staff, the presidents, and the Board. Out of that, an overall staffing plan will be developed for the different areas.

President Kelly added that in the discussions about governance and proposed changes, the issue has been raised as to whether the Board should look at re-creating of a position of vice chancellor of academic affairs, a position that was eliminated about four years ago that relates to this and staffing capabilities.

Director Yaden asked who had stewardship, in the broad sense, of the notion of the portfolio. Chancellor Pernsteiner indicated that a bit of historical context might be helpful. “At the time of the big re-organizational changes, the sentiment was that the academic programs of the system were institution programs and, therefore, that authority over those programs would be best vested in the provosts and that the aggregation of them and the approval of changes to them would be the responsibility of the Provosts’ Council as the chief academic officers at each campus. As time went on, we began to see both the positives and the negatives of that approach and, in the beginning, we as the Chancellor’s Office had no representation on the Council. Over time, that evolved into the system that we have now, in which Vice Chancellor Weeks is the co-chair of the Council along with, this year, Dr. Randhawa.

“Why are we involved in the discussion? There are two reasons: one is the one that shows up here where you have an agreement; the second reason is that we now have a framework, a philosophical framework called the strategic vision and plan that the Board adopted a year or more ago and that gives us sort of a goal towards which, collectively, we are aiming and it is appropriate then, that we be involved in order to assure that we are moving toward that goal.”

President Ray opined that no one else could be the keeper of the portfolio approach, in a delegated authority basis, other than the Chancellor. “And then there is delegated authority to the Provosts’ Council and others to work out the details. You don’t want too heavy a hand, you don’t want to micromanage every institution’s programs. You want the provosts, as academic leaders, to do that. You want them and their best effort on a delegated authority basis to be in alignment with the Board’s wishes regarding the portfolio structure. You can treat the Chancellor as a pass-through. If the Council works, as it should in 99 percent of the cases, the Chancellor will certify that, with the assistance of the vice chancellor. In fact, this passes the test of being compatible with the goals of the portfolio model, but I think it has to go formally from this group to the Chancellor and, with the Chancellor’s endorsement to the Board.”

It was underscored that this process means that the Board must clearly articulate its goals, where it wants to go, and its philosophy. “It has to be clear and we spend too little time in this body doing that. We spend too much time on boilers,” Director von Schlegell pointed out, “but it is not a top-down approach. The Chancellor has to be in the linkage in order to ensure that, by the time something gets to the Board, everyone is aligned.”
Provost Hallick indicated that, as one who has been in the System for quite awhile, “the pendulum swings back, and I want the Board to hear that, in addition to all of the things that have been said, and I agree with them, the other kind of yearning from the Provosts’ Council that is now manifested itself in a very welcome addition of Vice Chancellor Weeks, was to have a strong voice around academic programs in the Chancellor’s Office and with Board members. So it is partly the real workload and the adjudication from a neutral position. But it is also just the voice of academic programs being in the mix of the conversations in the Chancellor’s team. I think that is a hole that we had been feeling, as well, and I just wanted to make sure that it is clear,” she concluded.

It was moved by Director Pulliams, seconded by Director Dyess, to: 1) rescind the current Internal Management Directive 2.015; and 2) adopt the new Academic Program Review Policy, subject to the essence of the revisions that were discussed in the meeting and that a final version be brought to the Board in November. Those voting in favor of the motion: Those voting in favor of the motion: Directors Dyess, Fisher, Fox, Francesconi, Kelly, Miller-Jones, Powers, Pulliams, von Schlegell, Van Vliet, and Yaden. Those voting no or abstaining: None. Motion passed.

5. **Reports**

a. **Research Council Update**

Dr. John Cassady, Chair of the Research Council, provided an overview of some of the areas in which the Council is engaged on their “innovation agenda.” This involves efforts to align the strengths, as research universities, to have an impact on economic development and, eventually, on the workforce and these areas include work in collaboration with the Oregon Innovation Council. A current area of concentration is to establish a process to report on the Research Council’s progress with regard to the OUS venture fund, a gap fund for supporting translational activities at the institutions. Two of the gap funds have been set up and there is sufficient funding to actually allocate the first projects from those funds for both Oregon State University and the University of Oregon. The goal is to have a $10 million fund for OUS that will be a substantial support for research and development.

According to Dr. Cassady, it is difficult to predict the situation for R&D at the federal level and it is also one of the hardest times in recent history for faculty to compete for funding. This situation is the result of several things: one, the budget at the federal level is flat; and the National Institute of Health budget has been doubled, resulting in more people vying for funds from a flat budget. Nevertheless, the research portfolios of the institutions are up significantly this year – a testament to the work of the faculty. Federal agencies are attempting to stretch resources by expecting an institutional match in areas that, in some cases, are not currently required but may be needed to increase competitiveness.
In Oregon, there is an effort to pull together the Sustainability Centers of Excellence as an OUS designated center. At some point a decision must be made whether to designate core facilities and centers of excellence.

Dr. Cassady indicated that, as the new chair of the Research Council, he has a goal of doing a better job or orientation for the Board on the work of the Council.

The working committees of the Research Council have been established to work in alignment with audit to assure that areas of “high-risk” are being addressed. “We have identified those high-risk areas and the top two are in the areas of individual and institutional conflict of interest. The third area that we are going to examine that is becoming more significant as an area of risk is post-award accounting, especially with regard to time commitment of faculty on grants and contracts,” he observed.

Director Dyess highlighted that private funds available for research in OUS institutions is increasing across the board. There is a widely help recognition within the business community that research is fundamental to the work of the universities. Additionally, she pointed out that Oregon, as a state, is in the top one-third in the translation of research – patents per citizen are in the top 10 percent nationally.

Continuing the discussion, Dr. Cassady reported that Oregon was recently designated by the Department of Energy, in its first competition for centers of this type, as one of the first two federal centers in the area of renewable energy around wave energy. “The thing that I want to point out about this is that it was important to have the Innovation Council investment in the Oregon Wave Energy Initiative. It was important to have state investment in the infrastructure on the coast where the R&D site is located; it was important to have the technology impact that we had with our strong programs in the Department of engineering; but, more than that, it was important to have excellence in areas like environmental biology, the institute of natural resources, and the seed grant. They came together and developed a package, not just of technology, but a package that handled regulatory and environmental aspects. We’re talking about a total package over the next five years of $10 to $12 million.”

It was pointed out by Director Van Vliet that the general public doesn’t know the effect that the universities are having on the economy of Oregon. “That message doesn’t seem to make the leap over the legislature and I think that is something we have to worry about. The second thing that I’m worried about is the loss of some of our institutional shining lights because some of them are losing funding. As they lose funding, they basically need to have us be aware of that because they will need to be bolstered up if we’re going to maintain their high-standing as a center of excellence.”

6. **Discussion Items**

   a. **OUS, Diversity Issues Discussion (Continuation)**
DOCKET ITEM:

During the September 2008 meeting, the Board interacted with a panel of OUS representatives to discuss several items relating to diversity issues within OUS. The discussion included efforts associated with 1) student outreach and participation, 2) workforce development, 3) vendor issues, and 4) efforts to enhance campus climate for all participants. The October meeting will continue this discussion with a focus on best and emerging campus practices in several areas, including the promotion of student achievement (in connection with the work of the Student Participation and Completion Committee), hiring and retention of diverse faculty and staff, and contracting issues.

OUS continues to view diversity issues broadly, with consideration given to racial/ethnic, gender, geographic, socioeconomic, cultural, and disability issues among others. Campus programming reflects attention to underserved populations through a variety of initiatives. In relation to students, many campus efforts support the Board's recommendations through its Student Participation and Completion Committee; workforce development issues include campus efforts to recruit and provide outreach to diverse candidates as well as efforts to enhance the practices of search committees and campus departments; OUS vendor issues have recently been fortified through the adoption of a Systemwide policy to enhance opportunities for minority, women-owned, and emerging small businesses (MWESB) that encompasses business practices at both the campus and System levels; and enhancements to campus climate have taken numerous forms as faculty, staff, and students collaborate to provide growth in knowledge and practice throughout campus communities.

With each OUS institution engaging in unique diversity-related initiatives designed to address their missions in regard to campus, local, regional, and statewide needs, the Board will have the opportunity also to connect this discussion with their considerations of institutional missions and goals.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Dr. Yvette Webber-Davis reminded the Board that the present discussion was a continuation of the one begun at the September Board meeting. At that meeting, the discussion focused primarily on workforce issues within OUS. The primary focus for the current discussion was student participation and campus climate. Ms. Martha Balsham, Professor of Sociology at PSU and Special Assistant to the President for Diversity, and Di Saunders, Director of Communications in the Chancellor’s Office, participated in the discussion.

Last year the student Participation and Completion Committee conducted a number of forums around the state. Ms. Saunders provided an overview of those meetings and some of the areas of discussion. Students, faculty, staff, and practitioners from the communities participated in the forums. There was a great deal of discussion around the issues facing students from diverse backgrounds as they are attempting to get into college. “The Committee heard again and again about how appreciative the speakers were for having a venue to talk about these critical issues
that present barriers to our diverse under-served students in Oregon,” Ms. Saunders said. “They helped us realize how few opportunities these community members have to give voice to their concerns and talk to the education leaders in the state about these issues.”

The results of the forums were described at last year’s Board retreat in a document entitled,” Breaking Barriers: Oregon Community Forums on College Access and Success.” The policy option package, “Student Success,” is being forwarded to the Governor and legislature to improve the success of underserved populations in the institutions. It is important as it is pointed directly at underserved students. The package would accomplish two things: 1) increase capacity or the number of underserved diverse students served in pre-college academic and other college prep programs for both middle and high school student; and, 2) increase the number of underserved diverse students in on-campus retention programs,” Ms. Saunders highlighted. The policy option package calls for $15 million in funding to implement the programs.

Key themes of model retention programs designed by the campuses are that they are very staff-intensive; students are provided direct support; and, at times, intervention from the campus staff and faculty. There are many more students on campus than can be served by the services currently available.

Ms. Balsham noted that there is a considerable body of research from the business world that has shown the importance of organizational climate on feelings of inclusion and well-being. The same goes for institutions of higher education and climate has both direct and indirect effects. “People speak of feeling like they belong, feeling like the organization cares about them, or feeling that a workplace or a school, or whatever, is welcoming or not welcoming. Research in the business world shows that it is particularly important to those who have any reason to feel less than sure about whether people who carry the identities that they do are welcome in a place,” she pointed out. The same is true for our institutions of higher education. It is an educational process and this is found in the diversity training programs that PSU has on campus.

One of the best practices that Ms. Balsham discussed was setting measurable goals with regard to the climate at PSU. Many of the measures are from the National Survey of Student Engagement. “For instance, at PSU we have students from the non-dominant racialized groups who are less likely to report that they have had a serious conversation with someone of another race. We found that male students are less likely to be aware of the diversity commitment of the institution.

“In terms of our internal research, we have done an audit of all of the planning documents, down to the college level. We found that the diversity commitments of the institutional goal are communicated best at the institutional level and not at the college level. The website, where parents, perspective students, and others get their information is important,” she pointed out. The second best practice she highlighted dealt with public communication and involvement in leadership.
Ms. Lindsey Desrochers, Vice President for Finance and Administration, discussed a training program for institutions and organizations sponsored by a national organization. Former President Dan Bernstine, Provost Koch, and she agreed to training that started at the top of the organization with the president and vice presidents, deans, and others. “Almost the entire leadership of the institution began this training. In addition, I made a decision to do the training for everyone in the Finance and Administration units. I think the reason this program was more successful was because the leadership was saying that it was something that the leadership wanted the institution to do and we were going to be paying attention to these goals,” she explained. “The other thing is that it is also a matter of each individual executive or management person paying attention to personnel issues, interactions, and calling up issues when you see them and talking to people when they occur, and working on them in a very individualized way,” she concluded.

President Minahan observed that the institutions might be further along in many respects than is generally thought to be the case. “We have a very high retention rate at Western for minority students. The graduation rate is 88 percent completion in six years and 80 percent in four. Our participation rate tracks the distribution of people in the state, generally, by minority or ethnicity and is actually higher than that,” he said. WOU has found that having bilingual people in the student services areas is extremely important for success. A major problem has been to keep salaries competitive, a general concern throughout the system.

“Our main effort has been to look at people of color and Spanish ethnicity in the mid-valley. Twenty-six percent of our population in the mid-valley is Hispanic and we are probably at 12 or 13 percent in terms of our student participation. We try to recruit parents because the decision as to who goes to college is a parental decision. We would prefer to do better. I do think we have practices now that yield much higher than average retention rates at Western.”

President Ray spoke to the importance of the critical nature of the faculty in helping institutions attract and retain students through to graduation. “Most of us at this table look the way we do and are who we are, at some fundamental level. We don’t get the sense of the imperative, the sense of outrage, the sense of marginalization of not being valued that many of those who we want to be successful feel. We need a holistic approach. At OSU there are university action plans, diversity action plans in every college and every major support unit and they include metrics. We adopted a strategic plan four years ago that has specific metrics that deal with issues of inclusiveness, community, and diversity,” President Ray concluded.

At the University of Oregon, each of the schools and colleges, as at OSU, did an independent plan and each year they are required to update their progress relative to their plans. “It is reviewed and, more importantly, posted on the web so that everyone can see what progress is being made,” Provost Bean reported. This year, the UO has introduced “Pathways Oregon,” a program that targets some of the least advantaged students in the state. “We raised private funds – about $750,000 – to bring in 400 first-generation and all Pell Grant-eligible students into the University. The exciting thing about the program is that it is not just money to come to
school, but a whole separate success support structure to lead those students through the daunting structure of getting used to being on the University of Oregon campus, which, for many of them, is nothing that their family ever thought possible,” he observed.

President Kelly noted that the Board had spent about three hours over the last two meetings discussing the diversity issues and programs. “I have asked Director Pulliams if he would work with Director Miller-Jones and Dr. Webber-Davis about where the Board should go from here.” Director Miller-Jones suggested that at the December retreat there be a structure of the issues at a policy level for Board consideration. Director Pulliams added that he thought it was important to take the critical issues and make a public statement regarding them. “There is a key role of the Board in this process. There needs to be provided some cover for those who are out there in the field in terms of working in this area and pushing it forward. So I do want to encourage a discussion at the retreat, certainly. But I want to discuss how we can, as a policy, set a direction toward which we will move.”

Director Pulliams indicated that he has previously advocated raising millions of dollars across the state to guarantee a college education for those who are doing the right things, who have the grades, but who may not have the money.

Director Francesconi added that there were three areas of focus. First, he suggested that the Board needed to set measurable goals, tied to the Chancellor’s and presidents’ job descriptions. “Measurable goals on the disparity in graduation rates, disparity in faculty, contracting procedures, to name a few, I’m interested in continuous improvement principles. A second area is about diversity training. We need to move forward, but let’s target where the immediate problems are as a place to begin the efforts. The third area is, ‘how are we going to partner with others.’”

b. Review of Institution Mission Statements and Broad Goals

In 1998, the Board initiated a review of all Oregon University System institution mission statements, with adoption of those mission statements in December 1999. OUS universities are now at different points in the evolution of their mission statements. The Board approved a new mission statement for Southern Oregon University in February 2008. Three universities—Eastern Oregon University, Oregon State University, and Western Oregon University—have recently engaged in comprehensive strategic planning processes that resulted in institutional development and adoption of new mission statements. Those statements have not yet been brought to the Board for approval. Three other universities—Oregon Institute of Technology, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon—are currently using the 1999 Board-approved mission statements. In some cases, those mission statements are under review and proposed revisions will be brought to the Board during the coming year.

Although university mission statements properly provide broad, long-term declarations of purpose, they do not necessarily distinguish the specific constituencies served, signature program areas offered, level of commitment to each of the three major areas of higher
education’s mission (teaching, research, and service), significant partnerships or affiliations, or unique institutional features. Those distinguishing features may be better identified through a set of goal statements.

The purpose of the October Board discussion is to:

1. **Consider the mission statements of the OUS institutions wishing to bring their mission statements to the Board for approval at the November meeting.** In some cases, November Board action may focus on a reaffirmation of the current mission statement; in other cases, institutions may seek approval of mission statements currently in use at the institution but not yet approved by the Board.

2. **Provide guidance where mission statements are undergoing review** and will be brought to the Board for approval later in the year.

3. **Review with all seven OUS presidents the institutional goals and directions presented,** in light of the connection of those goals to the institution’s mission and to Board strategic priorities; consider how well those goals and directions serve to clarify the institution’s mission and offer a means of distinguishing that institution from others.

4. Place the discussion of mission statements, goals, and directions into **the broader context of the OUS Portfolio.**

5. **Suggest a timeline for periodic Board review and approval** of institution missions and goals.

The mission statements currently in use by OUS universities are attached as background for the discussion.
Mission Statements Currently in Use at OUS Institutions

Eastern Oregon University
(March 2006)

Mission Statement
EOU guides student inquiry through integrated, high-quality liberal arts and professional programs that lead to responsible and reflective action in a diverse and interconnected world.

As an educational, cultural and scholarly center, EOU connects the rural regions of Oregon to a wider world. Our beautiful setting and small size enhance the personal attention our students receive, while partnerships with colleges, universities, agencies and communities add to the educational possibilities of our region and state.

Oregon Institute of Technology
(Approved by the Board in December 1999)

Preamble
As the OUS institution with a focused mission to deliver technology education statewide, Oregon Institute of Technology develops and maintains partnerships with public and private institutions, businesses and industries, health care organizations, and government agencies to ensure quality programs that meet the needs of students and the organizations that employ them. Increasingly, OIT is participating in initiatives to increase access to its technology programs by sharing facilities and human resources with other OUS institutions and community colleges throughout the state.

Mission Statement
Oregon Institute of Technology, the only public institute of technology in the Pacific Northwest, provides degree programs in engineering and health technologies, management, communications, and applied sciences that prepare students to be effective participants in their professional, public, and international communities. Six objectives are central to our mission:
• Provide degree programs that enable graduates to obtain the knowledge and skills necessary for immediate employment.

• Enable students to be effective communicators, responsible citizens, and lifelong learners by assisting them in the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills, and ethical and cultural awareness.

• Offer continuing and distance education and advanced professional studies to meet the emerging needs of today’s citizens.

• Provide informational and technical expertise to regional, state, national, and global publics in applied research.

• Develop and maintain partnerships with public and private institutions, business and industry, and government agencies to ensure quality programs that meet the needs of students and the organizations that employ them.

• Provide statewide access to address the needs of the Oregon workforce.

Oregon State University
(March 2006)

Preamble

Oregon State University is a comprehensive, public, research-extensive university and a member of the Oregon University System serving as the state’s land-, sea-, space- and sun-grant institution - one of only two universities with such designation in the country. OSU programs and faculty are located in every county of the state and are dedicated to investigating the state’s greatest challenges. OSU considers the state of Oregon its campus and works in partnership with the P-12 school system, Oregon community colleges and other OUS institutions to provide access to high quality educational programs. Strong collaborations with industry and state and federal agencies drive OSU’s research enterprise.

Mission Statement

As a land grant institution, Oregon State University promotes economic, social, cultural and environmental progress for people across Oregon, the nation, and the world through our graduates, research, scholarship, and engagement activities.

Portland State University
(Approved by the Board in December 1999)

Preamble

As part of the Oregon University System, Portland State University's vision is to enhance recognition of the value of higher education by continually strengthening the metropolitan environment and utilizing that strength for its own growth toward standards of excellence in
accessible high-quality research, teaching, and outreach programs. As a microcosm of the global society, the metropolitan environment becomes a laboratory for Portland State in this vision. It is the vision of a university that will set the standard for institutions located in an urban setting.

Mission Statement

The mission of Portland State University is to enhance the intellectual, social, cultural, and economic qualities of urban life by providing access throughout the life span to a quality liberal education for undergraduates and an appropriate array of professional and graduate programs especially relevant to metropolitan areas. The University conducts research and community service that support a high-quality educational environment and reflect issues important to the region. It actively promotes the development of a network of educational institutions to serve the community.

Southern Oregon University
(Approved by the Board in February 2008)

Mission Statement

Southern Oregon University is an inclusive campus community dedicated to student success, intellectual growth, and responsible global citizenship.

Commitments

Southern Oregon University is committed to:

- A challenging and practical liberal arts education centered on student learning, accessibility, and civic engagement;
- Academic programs, partnerships, public service, outreach, sustainable practices, and economic development activities that address regional needs such as health and human service, business, and education; and
- Outstanding programs that draw on and enrich our unique arts community and bioregion.

University of Oregon
(Approved by the Board in December 1999)

Preamble

The University of Oregon is a comprehensive research university that serves its students and the people of Oregon, the nation, and the world through the creation and transfer of knowledge in the liberal arts, the natural and social sciences, and the professions. It is the Association of American Universities flagship institution in the Oregon University System.
following statement describes the mission of the University of Oregon and the ways in which it contributes to the Oregon University System.

Mission Statement (summarized)
The University is a community of scholars dedicated to the highest standards of academic inquiry, learning, and service. Recognizing that knowledge is the fundamental wealth of civilization, the University strives to enrich the public that sustains it through: (1) a commitment to undergraduate and graduate education; (2) a recognition that research, both basic and applied, is essential to the intellectual health of the University, as well as to the enrichment of the lives of Oregonians; (3) the establishment of a framework for lifelong learning; (4) the integration of teaching, research, and service as mutually enriching enterprises; (5) welcoming and guiding change rather than reacting to it; (6) dedication to the principles of equality of opportunity; (7) a commitment to international awareness and understanding; (8) freedom of thought and expression; (9) cultivation of an attitude toward citizenship that fosters the wise exercise of civic responsibilities and individual judgment; and (10) a continuing commitment to affordable public higher education.

Western Oregon University
(From WOU Strategic Plan, 2004)

Mission Statement
Western Oregon University is a comprehensive university that creates personalized learning opportunities, supports the advancement of knowledge for the public good, and maximizes individual and professional development. Our environment is open to the exchange of ideas, where discovery, creativity, and critical thinking flourish, and students succeed.

BOARD DISCUSSION:
In opening the discussion, Vice Chancellor Weeks remarked that, “Mission statements, by their nature, are broad and high-level, which is probably appropriate. Part of the reason for the commonality of the statements is that every institution in the System has a common mission of student success, learning outcomes, and scholarship.”

Part of the Board’s responsibilities is to approve campus mission statements. Currently there are a set that were approved in 1999 and several campuses have engaged in strategic planning efforts that have resulted in new mission statements that are being used and have been widely vetted and accepted at the campus-level but have not yet secured Board approval. Still other campuses are re-evaluating their 1999 mission statements but are not ready with a revised one at the present time. Therefore, the institutions are at different stages. However, the plan is to have all of the mission statements approved in 2009.

The purpose of the present discussion was another way to consider how the OUS portfolio looks today and what each institution’s contribution is to the whole in terms of the broad
mission. “We want to ensure that the mission statements are written in such a way that they reflect and empower the institution and the Board to assure that the institution can then have strategies, goals, and directions that contribute to the OUS portfolio in the appropriate way,” Ms. Weeks concluded.

Director Dyess suggested that it would be helpful if the institutions focused on how they are different and how they fit into the whole portfolio. In other words, what are the areas where the institution is focused relative to the goals that the Board has put in place through the strategic plan.

It was agreed that Directors Dyess, Van Vliet, and Yaden would function as a liaison team to the presidents to act as a sounding board as they work on the mission statements. Director Yaden remarked that, “from my perspective, I will be looking at them to the degree that they communicate to larger audiences what, why, and so what about these institutions in a manner that basically is going to lead to more resources. These statements have to point backwards and upwards to broader principles and the mission statements and the goals that flow from those.”

7. **Committee Reports**

a. **Standing Committee Reports**
Director Van Vliet reported that the Eastern Oregon University presidential search is making progress. Additionally, Director Van Vliet reported that the Oversight Committee on Sexual Assault would be meeting in the next week.

b. **Other Board Committees**
Director von Schlegell observed that the legislative session would soon begin and he asked what the Board’s response was going to be if OUS didn’t perform as well as it should. “I just want to plant the seed to get ahead of it this time and talk as a Board about what we do because the economic picture is not going to be good on revenues.”

Relative to the Portland Higher Education Group, Director Francesconi reported that there was nothing that needed to be discussed at this meeting but there would be in November. “We are making some progress on the idea of not creating another OUS committee, but having an advocacy group that is going to look beyond the next legislative session at some of the questions that Director von Schlegell referred to. So, we are making some real progress in terms of recommendations that come from an informal group to create a 501(3)(c) and get resources from various foundations. The presidents were very helpful at the last discussion.”

8. **Public Input**

Mr. Bob Sexton, president of SOU/SEIU, addressed the Board concerning the union’s concerns at Southern Oregon.
9. **Presidents and Board Comments**

**Southern Oregon University** -- President Cullinan: “We have had two really challenging years: we have built, re-built, reorganized, and restructured. So our hope was to really have some smashing, new numbers this fall. They are good and that has created a wonderful sense, a buzz, on campus,” the president began. She added: the new building opened in Medford; there are a number of new academic programs; the fund balance was doubled and is at 7.6 percent of revenues; enrollment headcount at the start of the term was up 4.5 percent over last year; and the Medford enrollment may be up as much as 20 percent in duplicated headcount from last year. “So, the spirit on campus is very good and I’m extremely excited to be starting this third year,” she concluded.

**Oregon State University** – President Ray: This past year, OSU brought in research awards totaling $231 million and in the Department of Defense budget just passed, there is $13.5 million marked for ONAMI, the poster child for System collaboration. The first OSU fundraising campaign was launched a little less than a year ago with a goal of $625 million by June 2011. The campaign is currently over $440 million. The goal to raise $100 million for scholarships is currently at $70 million. The “Bridge to Success” program was announced last year with the hope that putting together scholarships, Pell Grants, and other monies, up to 1,500 scholarships could be provided that would relieve students of all tuition and fees and give up to half of them access to resources for books and incidental expenses. Support was provided this fall to 2,400 Oregonians’ tuition and fee, full-coverage, full-ride scholarships. “That represents 10 percent of all of the Oregon students who are at OSU,” President Ray emphasized. Another goal is to rebuild all four of the cultural centers on campus.

**Eastern Oregon University** – President Lund: “The repositioning plan that many of you in this room approved for us in January is working,” President Lund pointed out. Enrollment continues in a positive trend and that, coupled with better stewardship of financial resources is contributing to a positive energy on campus, she added. Dr. Camille Consolvo from Bowling Green State University is the new Dean of Student Affairs. “We use the phrase ‘two for one,’” because Dr. Consolvo’s husband, Dr. Mike Dannells, also has a very impressive higher education background and he was following her this time with her career. We happen to have a position open as Director of Admissions that is now using his background in an interim appointment,” the President added. EOU has been asked by the Oregon National Guard and the Oregon State Police to enter into partnerships with them. Preparations are underway for the ten-year Northwest Accreditation visit. The surrounding communities have continued their renewed support and have increased it financially with scholarships; heightened visibility in stores and offices of EOU posters and displays; and increased attendance at athletic events, art receptions, and other functions.

**Oregon Institute of Technology** – President Maples -- One new building is finished and the Center for Health Professions is nearing completion. Ground breaking will be in mid-October for the Sustainable Village and new residence hall. Drilling will start on the new geothermal power on the OIT campus in October. This project has generated a lot of interest both on campus and around the state. OIT’s paramedic program has been involved in work to prepare Sri Lankans
for emergency services; the women’s volleyball team was ranked in the top 20 for the first time ever; and, students were recognized for doing community clean-up and painting over graffiti in Klamath Falls.

Western Oregon University – President Minahan – WOU will be celebrating the opening of the nursing/mathematics building in the coming weeks. It was finished on time and on budget and the appropriate number of students is enrolled. There will be a record enrollment this fall, record retention, and the financial picture has remained strong throughout the year. “It has been a good start of a good year,” the President added.

Portland State University – President Wiewel – At his convocation, the President identified five themes as teaching priorities for the coming year: 1) to provide civic leadership through partnerships which is based on PSU’s role as an anchor institution in the Portland area; 2) improving the quality of the student experience, the most direct measure of which relates to improving the retention and graduation rates for all students; 3) achieving global excellence in areas such as sustainability which has been greatly aided by a $25 million Miller Foundation grant and being recognized by U.S. News & World Report as number seven of “up and coming institutions to watch;” 4) enhancing education opportunity through initiatives such as the collaboration with the Portland Community Colleges around the guaranteed tuition plan, the newly formed task force with the Portland Public Schools, and expanding on-line courses; 5) acquiring the resources and enhancing effectiveness.

University of Oregon – Provost Bean -- The UO welcomed 1,250 more freshmen this year than the previous year, a growth of about one-third in the freshman class. This past week, the White Stag complex was launched in Portland. This building will allow the UO to interact more effectively with the Portland community and with Portland State University in a number of programs. The primary collaborative programs are the architecture fifth year program and a new program in strategic communication. The final stage of the “Transforming Lives” campaign has begun. It had a target of raising $600 million and currently stands at $825 million. This was a very good year in research funding, increasing about $30 million from last year on an $85 million base.

OHSU – Provost Hallick – The OHSU Board met in a retreat and reviewed the status of accomplishments as outlined in the strategic plan, “Vision 20-20.” Over-riding themes were partnerships and interdisciplinary trans-professional and aligned missions and the consensus was that “we got it right,” Dr. Hallick explained. “By aligned I mean integrating the research priorities with the clinical priorities with the education priorities and focusing on workforce,” she went on to explain. Recent discoveries in the research area cross an incredible number of lines. One is that a group in ophthalmology announced the first cloning of the gene responsible for the most common form of macular degeneration. When you are talking about things like that, it is conceivable to think about altering blindness. So, the kinds of break-through, cutting edge work still has years to go before it has practical applications, but they lend very exciting motivation and reassurance that those are worth doing and they are important.” OHSU has a research practice network among rural clinics where there are now 47 rural clinics enrolled.
This has created, essentially, a research network. The Meyer Foundation just awarded OHSU $500,000 to support these rural clinics to become involved in diabetes research. The primate center has announced the first successful effort to create stem cells from the skin cells of primates. For the first time, OHSU has begun to experience faculty loss and departures. “I just want to end with a thank you to my colleagues. The collaborations and the partnerships that seem to be accelerating, that we’ve been working on for many years, are coming to fruition. It is a very exciting time of year,” she concluded.

10. **Delegation of Authority to Board’s Executive Committee**

It was moved by Director Dyess to adopt the delegation of authority as stated in the docket. Those voting in favor of the motion: Directors Dyess, Fisher, Francesconi, Kelly, Miller-Jones, Powers, Pulliams, von Schlegell, Van Vliet, and Yaden. Those voting no or abstaining: None. Motion passed.

11. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 1:54 p.m.
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