



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

**June 1, 2017**

**Committee Membership**

Connie Ballmer	Present
Rudy Chapa	Present
Ann Curry	Present
Allyn Ford	Present
Michael Schill	Present
Will Paustian	Present
Mary Wilcox, Chair	Present
Kurt Willcox	Present

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee (ASAC) of the Board of Trustees of the University of Oregon (Board) met at the Ford Alumni Center on the UO’s Eugene campus on June 1, 2017. Below is a summary of committee discussions and actions. An audio recording is maintained on file.

**Convening.** ASAC Chair Mary Wilcox called the meeting to order at 8:12 a.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum verified.

**Approval of Minutes.** The committee approved the minutes from the March 2017 meeting without amendment.

**School and College Finances: Allocation Redesign, Provost Hiring Initiative, and Existing Gap Analyses.** Brad Shelton, senior vice provost for budget and planning, and Christoph Lindner, dean of the School of Architecture and Allied Arts, presented to the board about school and college finances, focusing first on the new academic budgeting system, which fundamentally changes the way general funds are allocated to academic units. A primary shift in the model is that allocations shift annually informed by metrics. Shelton explained that the system now recognizes four different types of expenditures within academic units and how each will be addressed and approached, including the shift in approach to have more central budgeting around long-term faculty commitments. Trustees asked questions of Shelton around the proportion of costs associated with research and instruction. Shelton noted that a fundamental shift of the budget system relates to where responsibility for funding faculty positions lies, which will now be within the Office of the Provost. He also discussed how allocations may change year over year and spoke to the data and metrics used to inform these decisions. Noting that metrics will vary by type of expenditure, Shelton explained the use of a campus committee which is currently in the process of developing these metrics.

The new model culminates in the Institutional Hiring Plan (IHP), which Shelton described as a significant culture change on campus, but one which better allows the university to align faculty hiring with the mission of the university. The IHP does not shift authority for faculty hiring, which always rested with the Provost, but creates a more centrally-coordinated effort, rather than allocating funds to schools and colleges which then in turn make individualized hiring decisions. Deans submit hiring proposals to the Provost, who in turn creates a draft IHP that is vetted by the Deans Council and a faculty advisory group. Once finalized, the IHP articulates those positions for which deans may begin searches. In return, the Provost “owns” those faculty lines and is responsible for the funding required to pay for investments in faculty hired through this plan. The IHP for fiscal year 2018 includes 67 approved searches; a supplemental document was provided

to trustees (and is included in meeting materials) articulating those positions. Dean Lindner offered his perspective on the first year of working through the IHP process, noting that it was a smooth and very collegial and collaborative process.

Shelton moved into a conversation with trustees about the budget vs. expenditures gap analyses conducted in each school and college over the past two years and the work done with each of those units to close gaps within the next two to four years. He noted that school and college expenditures in FY17 will be approximately \$9.5 million more than annual allocations, a figure that is anticipated to drop to approximately \$4 million in FY18. Shelton noted how difficult it was and continues to be as schools and colleges reduce these gaps, given that the majority of expenses are human costs and thus resulted in nonrenewal of several employees. He also noted that, throughout the gap analysis process, several opportunities arose for cross-collaboration and efficiencies – particularly in administrative services – across schools and colleges.

**Student Health Insurance Models.** Roger Thompson, vice president for enrollment management, spoke to trustees about the University Health Center (UCH) and, specifically, the model currently employed for students to purchase health insurance. He was joined by Richard Brunader, the UHC medical director and one of its physicians. They walked trustees through the current model of UHC funding and the ways in which student insurance factors into the business operations (i.e., billing back for services) and student access. Thompson discussed the goals of a future model, including meeting expanded student needs, compliance with laws such as FERPA and HIPPA, controlling cost increases, and providing exceptional customer service.

**Adjournment.** The meeting adjourned at 10:27 a.m..