



**Board of Trustees of the University of Oregon  
Academic and Student Affairs Committee**

**Meeting Minutes, December 10, 2014**

The Academic and Student 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 December 10, 2014. Below is a summary of the committee discussions and actions.

**Committee Membership**

Rudy Chapa	Present
Scott Coltrane	Present
Ann Curry	Present
Allyn Ford	Present
Helena Schlegel	Present
Mary Wilcox	Present
Kurt Willcox	Present

**Opening**

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 pm by Committee Chair Mary Wilcox. The Secretary took roll; all members were present and a quorum was verified. Wilcox introduced Trustee Helena Schlegel, the newly-appointed student trustee, and then provided a brief overview of the meeting's agenda. Minutes from March, September and November 2014 were approved en bloc by a voice vote without dissent.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Strategic Planning Update**

Acting Provost Frances Bronet provided the ASAC with an overview of and update regarding the current strategic planning initiative. She began with a review of four key themes articulated within the competitive excellence goals, explaining how these became the basis for four working groups that comprise the university-wide strategic planning effort in November. She reported that work groups are made of faculty, staff and students, and that there are a total of 50 people on these groups. Each team has a faculty and administrative lead with the administrative side providing the staffing. Bronet noted that she and University Senate President Rob Kyr will co-chair the overarching steering committee. The goal is to provide the Board an update at its June meeting. Bronet also provided the ASAC with an update on the campus physical framework plan. The UO has hired architects, planners and landscape architects to create an overarching vision.

Trustee Allyn Ford inquired about the timing of strategic planning (scope). Bronet noted that the goal is to make sure there is an expertly-crafted, long-term planning goal for the UO's physical plant and that various components of the strategic plan will be on 3-, 6- and 10-year scopes. Bronet and President Coltrane also provided the ASAC with a quick update on academic plan updates, noting that those efforts will wait until the completion of strategic planning work groups so that they are in line with one another.

Board Chair Chuck Lillis asked whether thought had been given to identifying those areas in which the UO could be in the top five or ten in the nation. Bronet explained that planning is not yet at that phase, but that certain issues (such as this) will cross thematic work groups in the strategic planning process. Chair Lillis noted that agreement on these areas of excellence would be helpful in guiding resource allocation. Trustee

Ann Curry noted that it might be difficult for groups to agree on areas of focus, since some individuals might want to select their own projects or programs for support rather than what is truly most excellent. Bronet also noted that unexpected things will emerge in the course of discussion and that we have to be prepared to manage and support those items.

### **Clusters of Excellence and Cluster Hires**

President Coltrane provided some history regarding the clusters of excellence initiative and noted that a major component of that effort is to hire 150 new faculty. He recapped that one of the selected clusters received endowed funding and that the UO had identified internal funding for two additional clusters. He also announced potential resources from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to help with an additional cluster.

President Coltrane then transitioned to the issue of faculty retention. He explained that the UO analyzes what faculty members were offered elsewhere, but also tries to identify retention needs prior to that point ever arising. He noted that the UO needs to look at funding made available to Deans for retention offers, spousal issues, and the like. Coltrane noted that more than half of faculty recruited by places “better” than the UO choose to stay. Curry asked whether there are opportunities for faculty to leave for a short period of time and then return. Coltrane reminded the committee that of the 700-plus tenure related faculty, in the last year seven went to another institution. He also noted that the UO made an effort to build the pool of talented faculty during the recession, which means the school now has a farm team of rising stars.

Trustees and administrators discussed the nuances of timing, recruiting, retirements, and other issues that impact hiring and retaining faculty members. These factors noted included budgets, national trends, areas of study, faculty age, delivery models of higher education, and others.

### **Sports Product Management**

Chair Wilcox turned the ASAC’s attention to the Sports Product Management (SPM) graduate program, which was before the committee for approval. Bronet introduced Professor Roger Best from the Lundquist College of Business (LCB) who helped design the program. Bronet noted that Oregon – specifically Portland – is considered an alpha cluster for the sports product industry. She reviewed the proposed SPM graduate program, the corresponding need and niche it would fill, and how it is different from other LCB programs, the sports product design program under development, and Portland State University’s undergraduate programs. She noted internship opportunities, multi-modal delivery, and cross-collaboration. Bronet noted that there are students waiting in the wings to officially apply for the program, which will be housed in Portland near White Stag.

Bronet noted that she is before the Board asking for its approval on the new program so that it could be sent to the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC). She reviewed the internal UO process underwent by the program in order to bring it to the Board. The committee then discussed the overall timeline of program approval and the processes (internal, external, Board, state, etc.) associated therewith, including possible bottlenecks and areas for efficiency improvement.

*Action: The resolution approving the SPM and authorizing its submission to the HECC was moved by Ann Curry and seconded by Kurt Willcox. The resolution passed by a voice vote with no dissent.*

The committee continued its discussion with administrators about the need for process efficiency, and the need to take advantage of extraordinary opportunities in program development.

### **UO Ombudsperson**

Chair Wilcox asked Bruce McAllister, UO Ombudsperson, and Sam Hill, Associate General Counsel, to join the committee. President Coltrane introduced the issue and resolution before the committee. He noted that – as the ombuds office was being formed – there were certain state rules that required mandatory reporting for the ombuds, thus prohibiting confidentiality within that office. Interim General Counsel Doug Park explained to the committee that an old Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) applied to the UO and required mandatory reporting for prohibited discrimination and sexual assault. That OAR is now a UO policy (per the governance transition in July 2014) and the Board has the authority to amend the policy to allow confidentiality within the office of the ombudsperson. Park explained that the resolution before the committee is narrow and specific to the ombuds office, and seeks to provide a safe haven for individuals who otherwise might be chilled from coming forward in a mandatory reporting setting. McAllister noted his support for this resolution and provided a brief introduction of himself to the committee. Curry asked what sort of information would be reportable to the Board while protecting confidentiality, and McAllister noted that he intends to provide consolidated information to help the governing board and administration identify and solve possible issues on campus. Trustees and McAllister discussed philosophies behind ombuds offices, institutional responsiveness and systemic improvement.

*Action: Prior to the vote, a typographical error was pointed out and amended in committee on page one of the proposed resolution. The resolution was moved by Helena Schlegel and seconded by Kurt Willcox. The resolution passed by a voice vote with no dissent.*

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:18 pm.