



Board of Trustees of the University of Oregon

Meeting Summary, September 10-11, 2015

The Board of Trustees of the University of Oregon met in the Ford Alumni Center on the UO campus on September 10-11, 2015. Below is a summary of Board reports, discussions, and actions.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m. by Board Chair Chuck Lillis. The Secretary recorded roll and a quorum was verified; all members were present. The Board approved minutes from the June 2015 meeting.

School of Journalism and Communication. School of Journalism and Communication (SOJC) Interim Dean Julie Newton provided an overview of the SOJC. Newton highlighted several SOJC faculty members and the work they are doing across the state, nation and globe. She spoke about the School's focus on innovative teaching and research. Newton also spoke about some of the international programs in which students are engaged. Newton spoke about some of the awards and accolades the SOJC and its faculty members and students have received. She provided an overview of the School's financial picture, including donor engagement that helps provided named chairs and professors, \$500,000 in scholarships annually, and faculty recruitment opportunities. Dean Newton then opened up the discussion for questions. Trustee Ann Curry inquired about the SOJC's work to help prepare students for what is to come in a changing landscape of journalism, including new technologies. Newton talked about the context courses students are required to take outside the School that help prepare students for ongoing learning and education and that a goal of the SOJC is to prepare students to be lifelong learners, which is necessary given that landscape.

College of Arts and Sciences, Humanities. The Board heard from Karen Ford, Associate Dean of Humanities in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). Ford was introduced by CAS Interim Dean Andrew Marcus. Ford talked first about what faculty typically experience as a member of the Humanities faculty. She then spoke about enrollments within the division, and what courses students traditionally take. She also addressed the notion that some of the things which draw certain students to Humanities courses are the same things that drive away others (e.g. smaller classes and writing requirements as examples). Ford also discussed the collaborative nature of the division, including partnerships with colleagues outside the Humanities and with other schools. Examples of this included Cinema Studies, Food Studies and Environmental programs. She also noted that the division will move into the new College and Careers Building once it is constructed. Ford addressed some of the challenges facing the Humanities and their goals for the future, including enrollment, recruiting, and budget constraints. Trustees engaged in a discussion with Ford and Marcus about how the division strives to maintain relevance in an ever-changing global landscape.

Public Comment. Vice Chair Ginevra Ralph reviewed the Board's public comment procedures and invited individuals who signed up to make comments. Following is a list of individuals who spoke and the general topic(s) of their remarks.

- *Randy McCutchen – custodial staff, Campus Operations*: discussed the economic situation of front line employees and the need to work together to find solutions
- *Shawn Stevenson – student; ASUO finance director*: spoke in opposition to the notion of a four-year tuition guarantee program
- *Andy Gitelson – executive director, Oregon Hillel Foundation; co-chair, Religious Director’s Association*: spoke about the role that spiritual and faith-based support groups and networks play in student life and success
- *Dorothy Attneave – office specialist, Campus Planning, Design and Construction*: spoke about recent bargaining agreements and bargaining processes between universities and classified employees
- *Casey Edwards – student; ASUO director of staff*: spoke to the incidental fee and a large upfront tuition increase with respect to a tuition guarantee concept; spoke to the question of whether tuition would be reconsidered (an issue raised in the March meeting)
- *Gabe Gardiner – student; ASUO state affairs director*: spoke about the premise of four-year completion rates; spoke about the need for ongoing student-administration dialogue
- *Amber Portratz – student; ASUO federal affairs director*: spoke to the issues faced by students with disabilities and how that relates to four-year completion goals

President’s Report. President Schill provided a report to the Board that recapped his first two months on the job. He spoke about his three primary goals: (1) build tenure track faculty and enhance the UO’s research profile; (2) maintain enhanced affordability for students and potential students, including improvements in timely graduation rates; and, (3) maintain an educational environment for students that will help them thrive. President Schill informed the Board that the issue of whether to reconsider tuition levels (passed in March) was raised prior to this meeting. He explained that a decision was made to forego that discussion given the final FY15 financial numbers (including a multi-million dollar recurring deficit) and the investment of additional state appropriations directly into student support services. The President touched on faculty and administrative hires, noting that Provost Scott Coltrane would address this issue more in-depth (*see below*) and then introduced new hires within his administration and thanked the individuals who worked to keep efforts moving forward during this period of transition. President Schill then provided a brief overview of the efforts and initiatives relating to education and prevention of sexual assault. He expressed gratitude for the efforts that led to an agreement between the universities and SEIU Local 503 the night prior. President Schill also noted that, while appreciative of additional state funding provided by the legislature during the 2015 session, state funding levels are still not high enough. We have to work harder to even further increase state investments. The President concluded by touching on the capital campaign, noting that UO is now over \$830M toward its \$2B goal.

Faculty and Administrative Hiring and Recruiting. Senior Vice President and Provost Scott Coltrane provided an overview of key recruiting efforts underway in his portfolio. He outlined the search committee chairs and timing for the searches for a Vice President for Research and Innovation and the deans of the Lundquist College of Business, the School of Journalism and Communication, the School of Architecture and Allied Arts, and the College of Arts and Sciences. He informed the Board that he has hired a new chief of staff, and that the UO is currently in negotiations with three cluster faculty hires. Trustees engaged with Coltrane on topics such as where faculty growth will be located (i.e. in what college(s) or school(s), the cyclical and lengthy

nature of faculty and administrator recruiting, and the need to hire people beyond just replacements (i.e. net positive growth).

HECC Evaluation Framework. Coltrane provided the Board a brief recap of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) and its evaluative role as outlined by statute, noting that the HECC was set to approve a draft evaluation framework by which it would complete that role. President Schill spoke to the overarching role of HECC and the University's relationship with that body, indicating a desire that HECC provide a coordinating, not a regulatory, role. President Schill also discussed the role of the HECC with regard to competition in higher education among Oregon institutions and his intent to collaborate with Oregon schools where necessary and beneficial. Coltrane informed the Board about discussions among provosts as it relates to the academic market for certain degrees and programs. Coltrane used recent approval processes for UO graduate degrees (Prevention Science and Historic Preservation) as examples of where there has been discord among schools, noting that the HECC will have to figure out how it wants to handle such situations going forward.

Legislative Overview. Hans Bernard, Associate Vice President for State and Community Affairs, provided the Board with a recap of the 2015 legislative session, starting with a 'thank you' to the many UO employees who helped to provide information in a timely and reliable fashion. Bernard outlined key objectives for the session: (1) protect governance authorities, (2) increase funding for public universities, and (3) approve capital construction requests. He noted that universities did see a sizable increase in state general fund dollars relative to previous years and explained that some of this increase is targeted toward investments in student support programs. He relayed that three UO capital projects were approved and state moneys provided. Bernard discussed a few key lessons learned, including the need to engage in better pre-planning as it relates to capital construction requests so that he and his team can be more strategic in making asks of legislators. The second issue related to the importance of educating policy makers on the importance of preserving governance authorities and the unintended consequences of certain decisions related thereto. Bernard also talked about the power of having boards and trustees from seven public universities engaged in higher education advocacy. Trustees engaged in some discussion about the role of the legislature versus governing boards with respect to setting tuition. Bernard also addressed the shifting educational landscape in Oregon with a new governor appointed during session, the abolishment of the OEIB, and the retirement of Oregon's chief education officer.

The Board recessed at 4:56 pm.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015

The public meeting of the Board was reconvened at 9:00 a.m. by Board Chair Chuck Lillis. The Secretary verified a quorum.

Governor Kate Brown. Governor Kate Brown addressed the Board of Trustees regarding higher education. She spoke about the collaboration among Oregon's public universities this year, which she indicated was better than she can ever recollect. She spoke about her goals of access, equity and inclusion, and completion for college students. The Governor posed a question to trustees about challenges and opportunities they face in their role. She and trustees engaged in a dialogue about a number of issues, including the role of the HECC as a coordinating and collaborating body

(rather than a governing body). Trustee Gary noted the value of campus-based positions (i.e. student, faculty, staff) in helping other trustees understand issues particular to academia. There was discussion about the notion that there is not always one particular path for students and that we need to be supportive of those various paths. Trustees raised the issue of UO's national presence and its role as a national research university; the Governor spoke about the importance of collaboration and public-private partnerships. Governor Brown indicated her support for the research role of the University. She spoke about the importance of identifying more stable funding and revenue sources for higher education, and noted that independent governance can help enable universities be more innovative in finding solutions for themselves as well. Trustee Mary Wilcox raised the issue of UO's presence in Portland; the Governor indicated that she believes Portland is an important component and should be used in a carefully thought-out manner and in a collaborative manner, and that a Portland presence can be a very useful tool in statewide integration, especially with regard to students before the enter college. Governor Brown noted that, given the importance of improving rural economies, she would be interested in finding ways to partner with the University to help boost those communities. She also spoke to an interest in partnership with teacher training and development. In response to questions about the longer-range look at Oregon's state budget and economy, Governor Brown spoke about the need to help smooth the "boom and bust" cycles of our economy and budget to provide more stable funding for budget issues. She spoke about the importance of a diversified economy whether it be the growing sports product industry, new areas around food innovation, or applied manufacturing.

Resolutions from Committee. The Board considered several resolutions referred to the Board from committees on September 10. Chair Lillis reminded trustees that they received committee updates via email yesterday. There was a brief discussion about the need to have printed, distributed reports and oral reports from committee chairs so long as committees were meeting concurrently, but that electronic reports would suffice if meetings were not concurrent.

Amendment to Statement of Governance and Trustee Responsibilities. Chair Lillis presented a resolution with amendments to the Statement of Governance and Trustee Responsibilities ("Statement"), which was approved unanimously by the EAC. He noted that the version approved by the EAC and forwarded to the Board contained small edits from the version first presented to the Committee, and that those amendments were emailed on Thursday. He outlined the proposed amendments to the Statement. Trustee Willcox expressed that he intends to vote no because he does not believe the changes are necessary, but that he appreciated the conversation. Vice Chair Ralph expressed value for the geographic diversity on the Board and the recognition that it is time consuming and costly (both financial costs and opportunity costs) for members to attend and participate, encouraging the Board to look at technology and creative innovations as a means for participation as well.

ACTION: The resolution was moved by Ross Kari and seconded by Ginevra Ralph. The resolution was approved by vote of 12-2 with Trustees Schlegel and Willcox dissenting.

Amendment to Bylaws. A resolution offering amendments to the bylaws was presented by Chair Lillis. Chair Lillis explained the proposed changes.

ACTION: The resolution was moved by Mary Wilcox and seconded by Connie Ballmer. The resolution was approved by a vote of 14-0.

Consent Calendar. The September 11 Consent Calendar included the below resolutions from the September 10 FFC meeting. All resolutions were moved, seconded and received unanimous support in committee. There was discussion about the agreements regarding the Sports Performance Center and Hayward Field and whether those projects would result in any impact to the academic budget. VPFA/CFO Jamie Moffitt reported that the intention is to have no impact on the central academic budget and any additional costs would be borne by the Athletic Department. There was agreement among trustees that there should indeed not be an impact to the academic (i.e. E&G) budget. Moffitt did clarify, however, that the Hayward Field project includes some academic space and that she did expect there to be costs to the academic budget associated with maintaining and operating these new faculty labs.

- Authorization for capital construction projects (Klamath Hall, Chapman Hall, College & Careers Building)
- Approval of an agreement for the Marcus Mariota Sports Performance Center
- Approval of an agreement for renovations to Hayward Field
- Approval of an updated FY16 budget and expenditure authorization
- Modifications to the tuition-setting process for earlier student input
- Approval of an e-commerce contract for the athletic department.

ACTION: The Board considered the consent calendar. The Consent Calendar was approved by a vote of 14-0.

Sponsored Projects Research. Interim Vice President for Research and Innovation Brad Shelton spoke to trustees about sponsored projects, which is a key portion of the research portfolio at the University. Shelton and trustees discussed a number of relevant issues, including: overhead and administrative costs, current NIH and federal grant funding trends, success rates for grant applications, the changing nature of the research cycle, innovation from sponsored research, peer metrics related to research and sponsored projects, and the need for increased seed funding. Trustees engaged in a discussion with the presenters about how best to increase our competitiveness in seeking awards and support for faculty in engaging in competitive processes.

Associate Vice President and Research Professor Cassandra Moseley spoke to trustees about her direct experiences with sponsored projects through multiple, diverse grants ranging from \$10,000 to \$5.8M. She also addressed the highly-regulated nature of sponsored projects work, outlining the many different restrictions and regulations that various agencies place on their respective awards.

Professor and Institute of Molecular Biology member Karen Guillemin shared her experience with a more traditional grant portfolio, and also spoke to her work as a grant reviewer for the NIH. She spoke to the importance of the institution's investment infrastructure and research support as it relates to how the NIH might view an application. For example, Guillemin noted that when she puts together a successful grant, she often needs to put together and articulate multiple different funding sources to cover personnel costs.

Executive Session. The Board of Trustees went into executive session for purposes of deliberating with those authorized to carry out labor negotiations on behalf of the university pursuant to ORS 192.660(4). Prior to entering the executive session, Willcox spoke to trustees about classified staff bargaining issues, relationship-building with the bargaining unit, and general economic statistics surrounding classified employees.

Adjournment. Following the executive session, the meeting was adjourned at 1:02 p.m.