

**Attendance.**

Marcia Aaron	Present	Elisa Hornecker	Present	Ginevra Ralph	Present
Peter Bragdon	Present	Ross Kari	Present	Michael Schill	Present
Andrew Colas	Present	Chuck Lillis	Present	Connie Seeley	Present
Allyn Ford	Present	Laura Lee McIntyre	Present	Mary Wilcox	Present
Joe Gonyea III	Present	Jimmy Murray	Present	Katharine Wishnia	Present

**Convening and Approval of Minutes.** The Board of Trustees of the University of Oregon (Board) met via video conference on March 8, 2021. A livestream and a teleconference option were made available to the public for purposes of listening in on the proceedings. Chair Chuck Lillis called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m. PT. The secretary verified attendance and a quorum. The Board approved the minutes from the December 2020 full board meeting, December 2020 Executive and Audit Committee meeting, and February 2021 full board meeting without amendment. Below is a summary of the meeting’s proceedings; a full recording is available upon request.

**ASUO Report.** ASUO President Isaiah Boyd provided an update to ASUO activities, discussing new uses for the ASUO-managed Incidental Fee (I-Fee), particularly those focused on helping students with basic necessities and affordability discussions that will not only signal to students how significantly the ASUO cares, but also help lay a groundwork for greater success. Boyd noted that it has been a year since he first ran on a platform of change, is proud of the work accomplished, and looks forward to implementing the ASUO’s proposed programs.

**University Senate Report.** Senate President Elliot Berkman updated trustees on University Senate activities, beginning with a focus on faculty engagement and shared governance, and the important role faculty can play in minding the financial well-being of the university. He noted that it is important to ensure that faculty remain educated about the institution’s finances and the levers that can affect those finances, but it is also important for the administration to ensure that structures and systems incentivize internal education and engagement. Berkman emphasized that having open and frank conversations about priorities, and having a shared vision for the institution, are both helpful to making this work successful.

**President’s Report.** President Michael Schill discussed the status of vaccine distribution in Oregon, specifically related to the distribution to the higher education community, noting that employees (faculty and staff) should be eligible by May 1 and students should be eligible by July 1. He discussed how this schedule reinforced confidence in the UO’s ability to resume predominantly in-person classes in September and why this is so important for students and the community. Schill emphasized that there will still be a need for diligence when it comes to health and safety, and that we may have learned new ways of delivering certain services that ought to be used even in a post-pandemic world. Schill emphasized the importance of the work done on campus with regard to testing, tracing, and analysis. Schill then discussed the latest federal relief bill working its way through Congress, noting that the Senate-passed version of the bill includes resources for students and the university. Specifically, he noted that, in that version of the bill, the UO would receive approximately \$43 million in additional one-time relief resources, half of which would be dedicated to students through direct grants. However, he noted that—as welcome as this relief is—our total federal relief, all one-time funding, still does not cover all of the lost revenue

and new costs associated with managing through the pandemic, so the universities budget remains precarious and state appropriations remain a vital part of our financial health.

**COVID-19.** Andre Le Duc, chief resilience officer, provided a brief update about the status of cases and COVID operations, noting general trends in the Lane County area and the work on campus pertaining to testing and mitigation. He pointed trustees to the redlined version of the UO's Health and Safety Operational Plan; the edits will go into effect March 15. Le Duc noted the institutional objectives that guide work of the Incident Management Team (IMT). Trustees engaged in discussion and questions regarding topics including, but not limited to, research activity, Portland-based operations, variant detection and impacts, and concerns relating to Spring Break.

**University Finance & Treasury.** Jamie Moffitt, vice president for finance and administration and CFO, provided an update on quarterly projections for Education and General (E&G) funds, noting that the overall projected E&G fund deficit has decreased from \$3.4M to \$2.3M for Fiscal Year 2020-2021 (FY21). She indicated that this is because, while the UO saw a decrease in revenue due to reduced student credit hours and tuition revenue, the institution has had some offsetting cost savings (e.g., reduction in pay or staffing levels in certain departments, limited travel, and hiring and pay action freezes) and has received some one-time federal relief. She also provided more detail regarding specific revenue and expense line projections. Moffitt then provided an update on treasury activity, including returns and debt service. She then moved to an update on projections for major auxiliary units, including Housing and Dining Services, the University Health Center, Intercollegiate Athletics, the EMU, and PE & Rec. In total, losses in these areas are projected to total more than \$75 million in FY21, the bulk of which (\$63M) is attributable to Intercollegiate Athletics. Moffitt provided a brief update on how the university has used funding received through federal relief packages, including the designated student support, testing, protective equipment and custodial needs, and other areas. She reiterated that, while the university is immensely grateful for the relief funding, it is indeed one-time funding that does not cover even one-time losses and costs. Finally, Moffitt provided an update—as required by a June 2020 Board action—on whether any adjustments are necessary to the FY21 expenditure authorization, noting that no such changes are needed. Trustees engaged in discussion and questions regarding topics including, but not limited to, recruitment, admissions, and enrollment for fall 2021; winter term retention; I-Fee budget management; whether units within the institution are available for certain federal relief outside of higher education funding (e.g., funding for the arts or performance centers); other issues potentially impacting Athletics' finances; and the status of individual cost-saving measures.

**Utility Upgrade Project.** Mike Harwood, associate vice president and university architect, introduced a request for Board approval of a capital project relating to the UO's utility infrastructure. He described the benefits of installing a thermal storage tank, particularly as compared to other options, being useful to life, safety, maintenance, and flexibility. Estimated cost for the project is \$8.5 million and the funds are already on-hand through cash saved over time specifically for this project. The project would begin in this year and be completed in the fall of year 2022. Trustees engaged in discussion and questions regarding topics including, but not limited to, return on investment for capital projects, project need, and location.

*ACTION: The resolution to approve the utility upgrade project and associated expenditure authorization was moved by Trustee Gonyea and seconded by Trustee Aaron. It passed by a voice vote without dissent.*

**Academic Initiatives.** Patrick Phillips, provost and senior vice president, provided an overview of his primary institutional academic initiatives. He spoke about the crosscutting themes that apply to these initiatives including, but not limited to, transdisciplinary work, engagement with the world, opportunities for student engagement and external impact, resonance with Oregon as a place and the UO as a public institution, and the value of a university as a pathway to lifelong economic and social impact. The provost noted that creating successful initiatives is expensive and requires commitment, and that, in part, he looks to initiatives that build on existing strengths, leverage one another and current faculty activities, and opportunities for philanthropy to support initial efforts. He then provided a deeper look at each of the five initiatives, looking at topics such as areas of focus and goals, partnerships, leadership and staffing, key accomplishments, current activities, and next steps. The five initiatives are: (i) Data Science, (ii) The Environment, (iii) Entrepreneurship and Economic Transformation, (iv) Racial Disparities and Resilience, and (v) Sports and Wellness. Trustees engaged in discussion and questions regarding topics including, but not limited to, the university’s overall long-term strategy, particularly in light of changes stemming from or accelerated by the pandemic; the inclusivity of the initiatives; and disruption in higher education.

**Recess/Reconvening.** The meeting recessed at 11:13 a.m. and reconvened at 12:37 p.m.

**Public Comment re FY22 Tuition and Fees.** The board offered an oral public comment session for which two individuals had registered. Trustees reconvened for this session but adjourned when no individuals appeared. Those who registered were contacted about whether they wished to submit written comment before the March 9 discussion on the topic.

**Recess/Reconvening.** The meeting was recessed at 12:39 p.m. and it reconvened at 8:32 a.m. on March 9. Attendance and a quorum were verified.

**Day 2 Attendance.**

Marcia Aaron	Present	Elisa Hornecker	Present	Ginevra Ralph	Present
Peter Bragdon	Present	Ross Kari	Present	Michael Schill	Present
Andrew Colas	Present	Chuck Lillis	Present	Connie Seeley	Present
Allyn Ford	Present	Laura Lee McIntyre	Present	Mary Wilcox	Present
Joe Gonyea III	Present	Jimmy Murray	Present	Katharine Wishnia	Present

**FY22 Tuition and Fees.** President Schill introduced his FY22 tuition and mandatory fee recommendations, the details of which are in the meeting materials, which he noted was based on the recommendations of the Tuition and Fee Advisory Board (TFAB). Schill began with a short overview of the Oregon Guarantee, a tuition guarantee program implemented by the Board in March 2020. He recapped the overall tuition recommendations for undergraduate and graduate tuition, as well as administratively controlled mandatory fees. Schill then took a moment to discuss a significant change in the programming supported by the I-Fee, which was the cessation of funding for an athletic ticket lottery program, and explained his proposed solution to continue allowing access to discounted tickets. Schill thanked TFAB for its work on this important topic. Kevin Marbury, vice president for student life, provided trustees with an overview of the tuition-setting process used at the UO, including TFAB makeup, the TFAB meeting schedule and associated topics, communications tools, and public input opportunities such as the TFAB forum, president’s forum, and online survey. Marbury noted that TFAB discussed subjects such as the new tuition guarantee program, COVID-19 impacts, campus growth, long-term financial projections, plans for cost management, state support history, comparative data, and general UO budget information. Marbury then provided some background information, including FY20 tuition and fee revenue breakdowns; historical undergraduate tuition and mandatory fee rates at the UO; data that compares UO’s undergraduate

tuition, fees, and state appropriations to other AAU public institutions; and cost of attendance information for public Pac-12 universities.

Moffitt then provided some current contextual data regarding the university's E&G funds. She discussed current (FY21) fund characteristics as well as recent history, and discussed anticipated major cost drivers, such as contracted salary increases, health insurance cost increases, and increases in other institutional expenses such as utilities or leases. She noted that these major cost drivers—which are not inclusive of all possible cost increases—will amount to approximately \$10.6 million in increased costs for FY22. Moffitt then provided more detail on the Oregon Guarantee and what returning undergraduate students will see with regard to tuition and administratively-controlled mandatory fees next year. (Graduate tuition, graduate student mandatory fees, and the I-Fee are not part of this program.) She reminded trustees that students who entered this past academic year (summer 2020 or later) will see no changes to these items as they are fully in the program. She also reminded trustees that undergraduate students who had enrolled before the program took effect (i.e., enrolled prior to summer 2020) will see a three-percent increase, a rate which was established by the Board in March 2019 as the annual rate of increase for those students for the next four years. Moffitt then discussed specific components of the proposal with trustees. (Full details are available in Exhibits B-C attached to the associated resolution in the meeting materials.) First, she noted that the new per credit hour rate for new nonresident undergraduate students would be 3.0% higher than this year's cohort (\$844.83) and the per credit hour rate for new resident undergraduate students would be 4.5% higher than this year's cohort (\$266.08). These rates—as well as the rates set for administratively-controlled mandatory fees—would be locked for five years for this cohort. She also discussed the differential tuition rate for Clark Honors College students; provided a summary of the range of graduate tuition rates proposed; and noted one FY21 proposed tuition change, which was due to an error in the FY21 tuition and fee tables adopted last year (but which ultimately did not impact what students paid). Moffitt provided trustees with some modeled information about FY22 E&G fund budget dynamics, taking into account a host of factors, such as the anticipated FY21 budget gap, nonrecurring COVID-related expenses, anticipated FY22 cost drivers, and projected FY22 state appropriation and tuition revenue. She noted that these proposed rates still result in an anticipated FY22 budget gap, but that a decision was made that this should not be balanced any further through tuition and fees. Moffitt provided an overview of the recommendation for administratively-controlled mandatory fees (Building Fee, Health Service Fee, Rec Center Fee, Student Union Fee, and Technology Fee), again noting the rates as they apply to students enrolled before summer 2020, students enrolled this year, and new incoming students. Although housing room and board rates are not part of the tuition and fee proposal before the Board, by request Moffitt provided some information about current housing room and board rates and how our standard rates compare to other public Pac-12 institutions. She noted that these rates vary within the institution due to different types of rooms and different meal plan options.

Trustees engaged in discussion and questions on a variety of topics including, but not limited to, the importance of state investment in a nationally-prominent research institution; the market for non-resident students; concern about the new student ticket plan, specifically on low-income students; the difference between administratively-controlled fees and the I-Fee; I-Fee budgeting; the importance of transparent, thorough processes; and gratitude for the work put into the process by many individuals.

*ACTION: The resolution to approve FY22 tuition and fees was moved by Trustee Ford and seconded by Trustee Ralph. It passed by a vote of 13-1 (No votes: Wishnia).*

**Student Success.** Kimberly Johnson, interim vice provost for undergraduate education and student success, opened a discussion on student success, which was focused on transfer students and other non-

traditional students. She began by providing some demographic and class standing information for transfer students and noted that other non-traditional students are typically those who are age 24 or above. Jim Brooks, associate vice president and director of financial aid, dove deeper into transfer student data, noting that overall UO transfer enrollment actually decreased 39% between 2012 through 2020, but that they still make up a significant number of UO students (962 in fall 2020, or 20% of that particular incoming cohort). He drew a correlation between this UO decline and the overall decline in community college attendees in Oregon (40% over the same time period). Brooks also provided a breakdown of the top feeder community colleges for UO transfers and then spoke about the various challenges in recruiting transfer students. Items mentioned included, but were not limited to, fewer students attending community college in Oregon, cost and a lack of transfer-specific aid, lack of online degree offerings, lack of student preparation (i.e., they are not admissible), and general perceptions about how selective or transfer-friendly the UO is. Brooks then spoke about the challenges transfer students face in their transition into the UO, such as technology, orientation, advising, and costs. He also spoke about recent positive developments aimed at helping the transfer student experience, such as dedicated work groups and transfer teams, transfer-specific recruitment and orientation efforts, and partnerships with other post-secondary institutions in Oregon on statewide transfer initiatives. Johnson then provided an overview of time to degree data for transfer students based on students' entering class standing, data about six-year retention and graduation rates for entering transfer students, and some of the most important issues to and corresponding academic priorities for transfer students (e.g., advising, timely articulation, course sequencing, scheduling flexibility, and career orientation.) Maria Kalnbach, coordinator for nontraditional and veteran student engagement and success in the Dean of Students' office, provided some additional background on non-traditional students who may not be straight transfer students (i.e., those over the age of 24). She noted several characteristics of non-traditional students, including age (24+), military veteran or active duty status, families, full-time workers, those looking to change careers, those returning to or starting college after a break from school, those who are alter-abled, and those who are first generation students and/or low-income students. She noted how these characteristics can provide challenges that are common for transfer or non-traditional students, which can range from a sense of belonging to the need to manage child care during school. Kalnbach noted the opportunities that UO has to better support these students, including advising and mentorship services, focused seminars or interest group work, offering more robust distance learning options, eliminating perceived and real barriers to transfer admission, and providing other services more directly geared toward housing or child care. Trustees engaged in discussion and questions on a variety of topics including, but not limited to, relationships between universities and community colleges; the focus at various state entities (e.g., legislature, HECC) on transfer student access and success; the importance of recent investments in advising to help provide space and bandwidth to serve students; the benefits of remote student support, such as advising; the importance of focusing on success and not just volume; and the lack of scholarship and aid support for transfer students, generally.

**Textbook Affordability.** Rayne Vieger, eLearning and OER librarian, provided an overview of the UO's Textbook Affordability Task Force, which is sponsored by the Office of the Provost and the University Senate. She noted the underlying legislation that led to formation of the task force, House Bill 2213 (2019), and the goals that legislation articulated for the group's work. Vieger also noted current textbook affordability strategies underway at the UO, including digital collections and print reserves, textbook subsidies and lending libraries, flexible options through the Duck Store, the use of open educational resources (OER), and peer-to-peer programs. Vieger then provided a deeper look at what OER are and some examples of what OER are being used at the UO today. Nick Keough, a UO student who transferred from Lane Community College and an ASUO senator, provided some additional context about why textbook affordability matters. He provided examples from current students about what they are paying

for textbooks and provided quantitative data regarding textbook costs since the 1970s (1000%) and in the period between 2006 and 2016 (88%). Keough also provided information from a recent survey that looks at how the cost of course materials can impact other facets of student life and success, such as enrollment in specific courses, the need to work additional hours, or even food security. Vieger then provided information about a recent faculty survey which sought to get a sense of whether current faculty understood OER or knew that UO Libraries could help faculty lower costs for students. The survey also sought to gauge faculty interest in using OER going forward and what barriers might exist to moving more toward OER. For example, 40% of faculty respondents indicated that a lack of time to redesign a course is a barrier to using OERs. This is something that UO Libraries is working to help with. Keough outlined the next steps for the task force, which include additional consultation during spring term and, ultimately, a recommendation for various institutional approaches to help mitigate textbook costs and expand open resources. Trustees engaged in discussion and questions on a variety of topics including, but not limited to, statewide and national efforts; the role of publishers in the market, particularly as it relates to publishing new editions and increasing costs; how faculty approach this work, particularly in sequenced courses; obstacles to the development of OER, most notably time and funding; approaches by other states; how best to prioritize the work in this space (e.g., focusing on courses that impact the most students); the fact that textbook affordability is an issue beyond just usage of OER; and the overall importance of this topic.

**Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 11:07 a.m.