

Board of Trustees of the University of Oregon
Academic and Student Affairs Committee
Meeting Summary | June 7, 2018

Committee Membership

Connie Ballmer	Present	Will Paustian	Present
Ann Curry	Absent	Michael Schill	Present
Allyn Ford	Present	Mary Wilcox, Chair	Present
Laura Lee McIntyre	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 7, 2018. Below is a summary of committee discussions and actions. An audio recording is maintained on file.

Convening and Approval of Minutes. ASAC Chair Mary Wilcox called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. The secretary recorded roll and a quorum was verified. The committee approved the minutes from the March 2018 meeting without amendment. Wilcox welcomed Marcia Aaron, the board’s newest trustee, to the meeting.

Provost’s Report. Provost and Senior Vice President Jayanth Banavar provided an overview of key initiatives and issues within the office of the provost and throughout the academic units of the institution. He updated trustees on key academic leadership searches, including the Graduate School dean, Clark Honors College dean, and AVP for online and hybrid education. Banavar also updated trustees on the current effort on campus to develop, finalize, and implement metrics relating to the academic mission at the department level. He let the board know that the provost’s office has launched a department head training program for those taking on administrative management roles within academic units. Banavar also spoke about efforts within the academic units around diversity, particularly active recruitment of underrepresented minority faculty. Banavar thanked outgoing University Senate President Chris Sinclair and welcomed incoming Senate Vice President Elizabeth Skowron.

Student Conduct Code. Kris Winter, Dean of Students, provided a brief overview of the committee process that led to recommendations to change the Student Conduct Code before the committee and recognized the good work of committee members. She provided a brief overview of 17 changes widely supported by the conduct committee and the Dean of Students Office (DOS). The conversation turned to two proposed changes that do not have support of both the committee and the DOS; there is one change proposed by each and opposed by the other. Winter presented the first change (referred to as “Change 18”) in meeting materials, which is proposed by the DOS and would expand the Code’s jurisdiction to violations of local, state and federal law. Winter explained that there is no way to address actions such as possession of child pornography, kidnapping, homicide, sexual abuse of a minor, vehicular manslaughter, large-scale vandalism, and natural resource damage in our current Student Conduct Code, and the proposed provision would help hold students accountable for these serious criminal behaviors. Trustees asked about current procedures for addressing student criminal behaviors and whether faculty and staff had similar provisions in their conduct codes. Chair Wilcox asked Kevin Reed, General Counsel, to address the trustees’ questions regarding faculty/staff conduct violations. Reed explained that the university does not have a faculty/staff conduct code rather the university has a

set of policies and collective bargaining agreements that govern the behavior of its employees. He also explained procedures for assessing employee criminal convictions and cause for separation. Keegan Williams-Thomas, undergraduate student and member of the Student Conduct Committee (SCC) discussed the SCC's opposition to "Change 18". The SCC opposes "Change 18" for reasons such as lack of clarity around enforcement and scope of off-campus jurisdiction, unclear specifications for what constitutes a violation law (i.e., arrest, arraignment, conviction), and concerns around the double punishment of students. Chair Wilcox asked if the DOS could reframe the language to satisfy the SCC's concerns over the lack of specificity in their definition of "violation of law".

Williams-Thomas voiced support for amending "Change 18" to include a more detailed definition of what constitutes as a violation of law. Williams-Thomas presented the second change (referred to as "Change 19") in meeting materials, which is proposed by the SCC and involves the reimplementation of a panel hearing option for students at the point of first adjudication (with the exception of Title IX-related cases). Winter presented the DOS's opposition to "Change 19". She explained that the UO community already participates in the oversight of the student conduct process through the university's Appeal Panel. She also explained that using different processes for Title IX related cases is ill-advised because it is suggestive of discrimination. Other DOS concerns for the reimplementation of panel hearings include limited staffing capacity, training issues, and breach of confidentiality. Chair Wilcox asked Williams-Thomas how the SCC proposes to distinguish between Title IX cases from non-Title IX cases, especially in situations where the cases may overlap. Williams-Thomas explained that the process would primarily involve distinguishing free speech cases from non-free speech cases. Trustees asked questions about how the training process for the Appeals Panel compares to that of hearing panels, and what percentage of cases go through to the Appeals Panel. Jill Creighton, Assistant DOS, explained that the DOS is seeing about a half dozen to a dozen appeals a month, and that the training process for the Appeals Panel is a lot less significant because they aren't a first-finding body. Trustees also asked about the current process for allowing students to participate on the Appeals Panel. Winter explained that the ASUO recommends students for the panel and Williams-Thomas discussed the ASUO's procedures for selecting students to participate. Chair Wilcox asked Darci Heroy, Title IX Coordinator, if the Title IX office had any thoughts regarding the proposed changes. Heroy expressed her support of the law violation provision because she feels that the University could process cases involving child pornography or sexual abuse of a minor more efficiently. She also explained that there is concern over using separate processes for Title IX-related cases and that those concerns would have to be addressed if the hearing panel was reinstated. Chair Wilcox then asked Reed for his input on the proposed changes. Reed also voiced his concerns with using a different process for Title IX-related cases, stating that the University may receive more allegations of discrimination if a separate process is in use for addressing Title IX-related cases.

ACTION: A motion was made to adopt the 17 agreed upon changes appearing in both Version A and Version B as presented to the Board. The motion was moved by Ford and seconded by McIntyre. The motion carried without dissent.

ACTION: A motion was made to adopt the change presented as number 18 (found in Version A as presented to the Board). The motion was made by Ballmer and seconded by McIntyre. It was approved with one dissenting vote (Ford).

ACTION: A motion was made by Paustian to adopt the change presented as number 19 (found in Version B as presented to the Board). There was no second; the motion was declined.

Introduction of SOMD Dean. Provost Banavar introduced Sabrina Madison-Cannon, the incoming dean of the School of Music and Dance. She provided a few remarks about the future of the School and her enthusiasm for joining the UO community. Provost Banavar thanked Dean Brad Foley, who will step down as dean of the School but who will remain a faculty member.

Institutional Hiring Plan. Provost Banavar provided a brief overview of the 2018 institutional hiring plan (IHP), which establishes the authorized list of tenure-track faculty searches across the schools and colleges. Trustees were provided a list of the authorized searches in board materials. Banavar talked about the process behind the IHP, and addressed trustees' questions around strategic intent behind the areas of focus (including data science), the university's success rate in filling IHP searches, and the types of goals that feed into the decisions.

Student Success. President Schill provided a brief introduction to Associate Vice Provost for student success Doneka Scott, presentation, referencing high level goals around improving graduation rates, advising, and other areas of outcomes for students. He talked about the planning and goals for Tykeson Hall with regard to advising, improved wrap-around advising services modeled after PathwayOregon, and the expansion of PathwayOregon. President Schill also spoke to a planned investment from the recent anonymous gift to kick-start this expanded—and necessary—advising plan for undergraduate students.

Scott walked trustees through the reorganization of Undergraduate Studies (UGS), which focuses on realigning student services and enhancing the team's focus on the student success agenda. Reorganization initiatives included a new student success summit held in May to celebrate achievements, brainstorm ideas, and share best practices, and the formation of two subcommittees for peer advising and transfer students. The subcommittees will address the unique needs facing various undergraduate student populations. Scott spent some time articulating the plans for Tykeson Hall, including academic and career advising centered on clustered themes of student interest. Scott also discussed the new external partnerships UGS is engaged with to help improve access to best practices and new tools. She then updated trustees on some new electronic tools available through UGS for students to help track courses, get advising scheduled, and generally access support and resources that will help improve their individual success. Lastly, Scott discussed some curricular improvements underway. These include, but are not limited to, a review of core requirements, a new multi-cultural requirement, expanding opportunities for courses that have high DFW (did not finish) rates, and improved sequencing for high volume required classes.

Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 a.m.