



Oregon State Board of Higher Education Strategic Initiatives Committee

Thursday, June 14, 2007
3:30-5:30 p.m.
Portland State University
Urban Center Building
5th floor conference room

Meeting Notes

The meeting was called to order at 3:36 p.m.

Board members present included: Kirby Dyess, Jim Francesconi, Dalton Miller-Jones, and Howard Sohn.

Others present included: Vice President Lindsay Desrochers (PSU), Mary Ellen Glynn (Governor's Office), Vice Chancellor Jay Kenton, Di Saunders, Melissa Unger (OSA), Marcia Stuart, Charles Triplett, Bob Turner (Special Assistant to the Chancellor), and Vice Chancellor Susan Weeks.

Those participating by phone included: Directors Henry Lorenzen and John von Schlegell, Bridget Burns (OSAC), Tim Black (UO), and Rich Linton (OUS Research Council).

1. Progress on subcommittee work

a. Governance Committee (Chair: John von Schlegell)

Director von Schlegell will be meeting next week with Deputy Chancellor Ryan Hagemann to discuss tasks; Ryan will be looking at the Board's legal and regulatory charter, and will conduct a baseline assessment to determine what rules might need to be changed.

It was pointed out that among the issues that subcommittees will face on proposed deliverables is determining which are politically viable. During discussion, it was recommended that, for this first phase of work, the scope of analysis of potential solutions, directions, and options should be broad. At a future point, a determination can be made about options to eliminate, following full Board discussion. Director Sohn reminded the group that the work of the Strategic Initiatives Committee is being carried out in the context of a 20-year plan, and that subcommittees should not take a short-term political perspective at this point.

b. Portfolio Committee (Chair: Howard Sohn)

Director Sohn noted that his subcommittee is looking at the whole OUS portfolio as a System and the institutions as subsets of the System. The first subcommittee meeting was held on June 13th wherein members reviewed the charter and also "spent time brainstorming." This included

narrowing the task to focus on graduate and professional programs at the larger universities, and on all programs at the smaller universities, as well as identifying potential review criteria (e.g., compatibility with state economy, aligned with the needs of the student population, and citizen and community needs). Each university will have its own set of portfolio benchmarks.

Director von Schlegell asked how much detail will be used in the review of the universities (e.g., curricula). Director Sohn responded that university offerings/programs, both explicit and implicit, will be reviewed as to how they relate to their mission; how the missions, as a whole, affect cost-effective delivery (cost and revenues of missions and programs); and how potential partnerships and collaborations may complement the cost-efficiency and delivery mechanisms.

The subcommittee is looking also at future needs of the state rather than just current needs. Director Sohn noted that the difficulty will be in projecting those needs. The first assignment of the subcommittee is to look at the data and information provided by Vice Chancellor Susan Weeks (disciplines, programs, degrees, and enrollment) and to determine how they meet current and emerging needs. Another goal is to develop criteria for adding or eliminating programs.

In discussion of the campus portfolio presentations, Director Miller-Jones noted that he appreciated how the campus presentations demonstrate their unique programs, but he would like to have them identify three problem areas or challenges that they are facing. He explained that without hearing what the problem areas are, the Board does not have sufficient knowledge to help the campuses. Director Sohn agreed and added that another question is “how do we help them achieve the System mission?” Director von Schlegell asked if the subcommittee would be looking at alternative options of program delivery if a campus cannot provide a needed program. Director Sohn acknowledged this need and advised that access to methods of learning delivery will be reviewed. Another issue is developing skills to use in life as an engaged citizen (e.g., learning to learn and adaptability). Director Dyess noted that it would be helpful to map the challenges identified in the portfolio presentations to those identified in accreditation reports.

c. Student Participation and Completion (Chair: Dalton Miller-Jones)

Director Miller-Jones indicated that the first subcommittee meeting was held on June 13th. During that meeting, Vice Chancellor Weeks provided background concerning the student demographic, participation, and retention dynamics that are shaping the charge of the subcommittee. Subgroups were formed to address issues such as affordability and financial support; preparation for successful entry and retention, and pathway models through the education pipeline; campus climate and cultural issues; family dynamics that affect student participation and success; and distance learning and access in areas that are declining in college-going populations. In answer to a question of whether there is a sense of who the population is that is being served through distance education, Vice Chancellor Weeks said that such information may be available from the SCARF database. Other questions to be addressed by the subgroup include: “Is distance education working?” and “What are the barriers affecting family dynamics or cultures?”

Di Saunders announced that a symposium will be held the week of October 8th, and Director Miller-Jones opined that this will be “a way to spread the word that this is a statewide effort in order to reach other resources in order to meet the goals.”

It was advised that there is a need to interface with school leaders and students earlier on in the students’ education pathway. Director Dyess opined that the American Indian “nations” are among the groups that should be contacted and Director Miller-Jones replied that he is coordinating with PSU’ Native American Center to bring in tribal organizations to meet and create advocacy groups.

d. Portland Higher Education Subcommittee (Chair: Jim Francesconi)

Director Francesconi indicated that the subcommittee is reviewing and editing the charter, and gathering input from the Provosts’ Council. The initial phase of subcommittee work will focus on gathering baseline information, starting with the Board’s Strategic Plan, looking at snapshots of Portland area institutions, reviewing economic development strategies and data such as the New Economy Index, and reviewing the 1990 report, *Working Together: A Community and Academic Partnership for Greater Portland*. Following the information-gathering phase, the subcommittee will conduct a gap analysis and include the results in its report to the Strategic Initiatives Committee in November.

Director Francesconi noted that the metropolitan area needs more “champions” of higher education outside of the OUS. Director Miller-Jones asked whether other metropolitan areas’ approaches will be reviewed; Director Francesconi affirmed that they will be. The subcommittee will be looking at the development potential of the south waterfront. Collaborative program opportunities will be explored. Director Miller-Jones asked whether the subcommittee would do a post-mortem on the Capital Center. Vice Chancellor Jay Kenton indicated that such a review is being done, looking at what was learned, what worked, and what didn’t.

The subcommittee will be provided the charter for review and the first meeting will be scheduled for July. Director Dyess recommended that the subcommittee include a representative from one of the large law firms. Director Francesconi added that they were also going to seek a member from the manufacturing sector.

e. Next steps

Vice Chancellor Weeks advised the committee that the work of the subcommittees for the phase through the end of October will be reported at the November 8th Strategic Initiatives meeting. These reports and the campus portfolios will be incorporated into the agenda for a Board retreat tentatively scheduled for December 2007. The retreat discussion should provide broad guidelines both for long-term planning and for development of the 2009-2011 biennial budget. Director Dyess advised she would prefer that subcommittee reports be presented in both October and November in order to begin the formation of the report to the Board. At the Board retreat, the Board will then provide further direction for future subcommittee work.

2. Discussion of the campus portfolio presentations so far and what is needed/desired for the next ones.

Director Dyess noted that presentations have been received from EOU, OIT, OSU, OSU-Cascades, and SOU and asked for observations and/or impressions. Director Miller-Jones felt that the OSU-Cascades presentation and subsequent discussion did not adequately cover the campus issues/difficulties (e.g., growth, programs, character of the campus, future plans to address regional needs). Director Sohn opined that a paragraph concerning the Cascades campus should be included as a placeholder in the System portfolio, addressing the campus' mission of access, regional needs, etc., but that further development of that piece of the OUS portfolio should be deferred until the needs of the Bend area can be more fully addressed by the Board. Director Dyess said that she has met with campus personnel and they explained what their master campus plan and future development plans are with regard to Juniper Ridge. They are fully aware of funding and accreditation issues that they would face if they were independent of OSU. Vice Chancellor Kenton added that the UO also has programs delivered at the OSU-Cascades' campus.

Director Miller-Jones raised a question regarding the delivery of teacher education programs in OUS. Director Sohn added that these are all questions that would be part of the Portfolio subcommittee discussion, including teacher preparation.

Director Francesconi thought that the presentations have been good; however, they have not covered the information that would address the issues that he thinks are pertinent. Director Dyess agreed, but added that a public forum makes it challenging to hear about campus difficulties. Director Francesconi noted that it will be critical for the Portland and Portfolio subcommittees to coordinate their analyses, and asked that Vice Chancellors Kenton and Weeks work closely together on that.

Director Dyess noted that the issue of "place" does matter, so the role of EOU and SOU is clear; OSU has a statewide mission that is clear; UO has an AAU focus—these all influence portfolio/mission. "A satisfactory portfolio meets the needs of its clientele," she noted. Director Dyess stated that UO, PSU, and OSU all compete for international students and wondered if their portfolios hindered their ability to recruit these students. Campus reputations should drive their portfolios and missions, she observed, but to what extent are the campuses developing reputations that drive their missions? Director Sohn cautioned that the institution missions should not become too parochial but, rather, should reach out to a broader audience (national and international). Discussion was held concerning graduate programs and the impact on faculty.

3. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:38 p.m.

Prepared by:
Marcia Stuart
Board Secretary