



**Board of Trustees of the University of Oregon
Academic and Student Affairs Committee
Meeting Minutes, September 10, 2014**

The Academic Affairs Committee (ASAC) of the Board of Trustees of the University of Oregon (Board) met in the Ford Alumni Center on the UO Campus on September 10, 2014. Below is a summary of the committee discussions and actions.

Opening Remarks by the Chair

Committee Chair Mary Wilcox called the meeting to order at 3:01 PM. Roll was taken – all members were present. Chair Wilcox introduced Acting Provost Bronet and ASUO President Beatriz Gutierrez, who participated as a non-trustee guest for the day. The Committee approved minutes from the June meeting as presented.

On Campus Visits

The Committee discussed a campus visit by Trustees Wilcox, Chapa and Ralph in July. Wilcox indicated that others interested in such meetings should coordinate with Secretary Wilhelms. Chapa echoed Wilcox’s sentiments that it is important to meet people on campus. Trustee Ann Curry asked those who attended the meetings what is one thing every board member needs to know. Chapa said it was simply learning how much they don’t yet know.

Mission Statement.

Chair Wilcox informed the committee that they are not going to adopt a Mission Statement today as it needs more work. President Coltrane will take thoughts and comments from the committee and other trustees and work with the document more. The Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) is aware of and OK with the modified timeline. Trustee Ralph said she was looking for the 1-2 key lines about the actual mission. Trustee Kurt Willcox indicated agreement with Ralph’s comments about needing a focused statement, and would like the draft to better show energy and spirit, and could better differentiate the UO. Trustee Connie Ballmer noted the difficulty in crafting something that appeal to everyone and reported hearing from Governor Kitzhaber that this statement needs to help differentiate us. She further indicated that the branding company could play a role in reviewing. President Coltrane noted that differentiation is difficult if you want to also keep it broad and goal-oriented. Curry noted that parents are also an audience, and that it needs to be a more succinct statement that establishes a broader sentiment. Regarding next steps, Chair Wilcox notes that Coltrane and Bronet should work on it and prepare a revised version to present to ASAC for a future phone meeting. Additional comments were added at the end of this discussion regarding a mission that is inclusive of all students, that part of the UO’s legislative charge is to educate Oregonians, and that the mission statement should be for the UO, not the HECC.

Program and Curricular Review. Chair Wilcox introduces Ruth Keele, an Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs who provided an overview for the committee of the processes involved in the academic review of new programs. Keele explained that the process involves a relatively lengthy self-study, an external review site visit, and approvals by the undergraduate or graduate councils. She notes the difference between certificates and minors as opposed to full degrees. Law School Dean Michael Moffitt used a new undergraduate law minor to illustrate the process for a minor and the intensive decennial review. Keele noted there might be a backlog right now as some programs waited to understand the new governance model before moving forward. Board Chair Chuck Lillis noted that the process seems awkward and slow. President Coltrane suggested that the UO needs to be better about reviewing programs that aren't working and suggests ASAC is the appropriate place. Keele then moved to an explanation of curricular review. The committee generally discussed the need to be more nimble in reviewing programs and perhaps need to not take so long to review programs that are not in demand. Associate Vice President for State and Community Affairs Hans Bernard joined the table to discuss the role of the HECC in programs review. Bernard walks through HECC handouts noting the role of the provosts' council. The Committee discussed the HECC's interest in not duplicating programs throughout the state.

Enrollment. VP for Enrollment Management Roger Thompson is introduced and provides a report on the recently-released US News and World Report rankings and the UO's upward movement in this year's report. He then provides a presentation about unofficial 2014 enrollment numbers. All 50 states and almost 100 countries are represented at UO, and the demand for UO is growing. The biggest challenge remains that the number of high school graduates in Oregon is shrinking. Thompson explains the relationship with students and how it starts when they are suspects, then prospects, then moves to applicants and enrollees. Curry asks for more information about minority student success and that private schools in the northeast are targeted minority students with scholarships.

Student Conduct Code Resolutions. Chair Wilcox introduced VP for Student Life Robin Holmes to discuss resolutions relating to the student code of conduct. Holmes began with an overview of the code and its purpose, reminding trustees that student conduct codes are not criminal codes, nor have they ever been, thus they take a different approach than a legalistic one – and students should not need lawyers to get through the process. Such codes can also serve as educational tools. Codes are meant to facilitate the resolution of complaints and conflicts. Codes need to be able to change as the needs of the university and general behaviors do. One resolution before the Committee deals with six proposed changes, three permanent and three temporary. The proposed permanent changes have been worked on over the course of years and had been vetted by the campus community. The temporary changes are in line with best practices that should be in place before school starts so they are proposed as temporary while a campus vetting process unfolds. Resolution was moved and seconded. President Coltrane reiterated that the temporary changes are a bare bones version of what needs to be done while the campus goes through a consultative process. Motion approved by voice vote without dissent. The second resolution related to compliance with state law, bringing the code in line with changes in state law (from SB 270). Resolution moved, seconded and approved by voice vote without dissent.

Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM.