



OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Academic and Student Affairs Committee Meeting

Thursday, October 15, 2015

1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. (or until business concludes)

DeBoer Room, Hannon Library

MINUTES

Call to Order and Preliminary Business

Chair Teresa Sayre called the meeting to order at 1:33 pm.

Roll Call

The following committee members were present: Teresa Sayre, Sheri Bodager, Judy Shih, Joanna Steinman, Steve Vincent and Roy Saigo (ex officio). Les AuCoin participated by video teleconference. Trustee April Sevcik also was in attendance.

The following member was absent: Shea Washington.

Others in attendance included: Liz Shelby, Chief of Staff and Director of Government Relations; Craig Morris, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Dr. Susan Walsh, Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs; Jason Catz, General Counsel; Sabrina Prud'homme, Board Secretary; Penny Burgess, USSE, Director of Treasury Operations; Ryan Brown, Head of Community and Media Relations; Dr. Matt Stillman, University Registrar and Director of Enrollment and Retention Assessment; Chris Stanek, Director of Institutional Research; John Stevenson, IT User Support Manager; Don Hill, Classroom and Media Services Manager; Lisa Garcia-Hanson, Associate Vice President for Enrollment and Retention; Ginny Lang, University of Oregon; Kathy Park, Executive Assistant; Dave Coburn, OSA; Marianne Golding, SOU; Emily Pfeiffer, ASSOU; Deborah Rosenberg, SOU; and Olena Black, League of Women Voters.

Consent Agenda

Trustee Vincent moved to approve the September 17, 2015 minutes as drafted. Trustee Steinman seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

Public Comment

No public comment was made.

Provost's Report

Dr. Susan Walsh described a productive Director's Council retreat in early September at Callahan's Lodge. Approximately 25 Academic and Student Affairs administrators and staff spent the day planning, identifying issues that needed to be addressed and discussing the importance of academic advising. A major item on the agenda was retention, especially ways to improve it. American Association of State Colleges and Universities information also was presented at the retreat.

Chris Stanek presented the enrollment update. Detailing SOU's progress toward meeting its retrenchment target of 4,214, he stated the current full time equivalency is 4,271 and said that number will continue to rise as remaining dual credit courses are entered into the system. He also explained the admissions funnel would not be changing much since the 2015 numbers are available.

Discussing headcount, Mr. Stanek compared the current 5,377 to last year's 6,248 and expected the number to continue increasing through the fourth week of classes. He also discussed the numbers of resident and non-resident students as well as their importance in the new funding model.

Student diversity also increased from last year. In response to a question from Trustee Vincent, Mr. Stanek said the international student category could be broken out from the diversity demographics since it does not count toward minority allocations for funding purposes. Responding to a follow-up question from Trustee AuCoin about the relevance of the data specifically tied to the funding model, Mr. Stanek said that, in the future, SOU could have an entirely different set of reports geared toward the funding model. Chair Sayre then asked if SOU currently has the capacity to begin tracking the categories outlined in the funding model. Mr. Stanek replied that SOU does have that capacity. Concluding the discussion, Trustee AuCoin added that enrollment should also be included.

SOU Provost, Dr. Walsh, then presented the Five-Point Framework for Academic Year 2015-2016 that was introduced at the recent Director's Council retreat and the SOU Opening Breakfast. First, she encouraged everyone to become familiar with and embrace the new funding model. Second, she asked attendees to think about recruitment to encourage growing enrollment numbers. Third, she said retention must remain a top priority, noting that attendees should continue to do good work and think of one thing they can do differently each week. Dr. Walsh's fourth point was to have everyone think about how they can show appreciation for faculty and staff authentically, and in public ways; she noted that when people believe they are valued, they project that belief to others. And finally, she encouraged everyone to become engaged in campus conversations - be present, listen and be engaged. Chair Sayre said she attended the breakfast and was impressed by every speaker.

Curriculum Approval Process

Chair Sayre led the discussion on the proposed curriculum approval process, which was patterned after Portland State University's model and is being recommended for SOU in order to allow a more timely response to proposals for new degree programs. The committee was presented a full outline of each step of the process at an earlier meeting. Dr. Walsh explained that: 1) the HECC meetings are not held as frequently as OUS meetings, so reviewing curriculum proposals will not happen as frequently; and 2) HECC wants to receive curriculum proposals as consent agenda items.

Chair Sayre pointed out that regular meetings of the SOU Board of Trustees are quarterly, while the committee meets monthly. The proposal before the committee would ask the board to allow the committee to make the recommendations for approval or disapproval. The committee would also have regular program reports to the full board.

Trustee Shih asked what will happen to the curriculum proposal if at any point in the process, it is not approved. Dr. Walsh said there are different levels where it can be returned to an appropriate level for revisions. Replying to Trustee Bodager's question, Dr. Walsh affirmed that all academic programs have to go through this approval process.

Regarding Trustee Vincent's question about the external review requirement for graduate programs, Dr. Walsh said the external review is a holdover from OUS, that graduate programs are held to a higher standard, and that the external review is beneficial.

Trustee Shih commented the flowchart presented to the committee outlines the process, not the criteria. Dr. Walsh said the submission materials ask for proposal details and Chair Sayre added that the committee would have the opportunity to review the submission and could comment on the established criteria to ensure the committee is in agreement with the criteria. Chair Sayre agreed with Trustee AuCoin that once SOU has a strategic plan and identifies its niche, the committee could consider determining if or how the program fits SOU's niche. Chair Sayre said an important role of the board is to review SOU's mission and vision and make sure everything goes through that filter. Part of this process asks how the program ties into SOU's mission and vision.

Regarding timing of the proposed process, Dr. Walsh answered Trustee Steinman that the flexibility people previously had will no longer exist; any late submissions will not be approved until the following year, due to difficulties of HECC meeting timing. Chair Sayre, stressing Trustee Steinman's point, said the process is to ensure the board has seen the proposal, it has gone through all the proper steps and that all appropriate groups have seen it along the way. The Provost's Council is the cooperative mechanism to ensure parties are working in a coordinated fashion within the system that has been created in the state.

Trustee Vincent moved that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee adopt the new academic program approval process. With this, the committee also recommends the board delegate authority to establish new academic programs and curricula to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, and with this delegation of authority, the committee will be responsible for keeping the board informed of new proposals at regular meetings of the board and more often when necessary. Trustee Shih seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

SOU-Klamath Community College (KCC) /SOU-Rogue Community College (RCC) Faculty Staff Rates MOU

Chair Sayre advised the committee members that their packets contained draft information for the proposed MOU terms.

Dr. Matt Stillman explained the current employee benefit privilege that exists among the seven Oregon public universities, the various restrictions and limitations, fees, and that these employees pay 30 percent of the resident undergraduate tuition rate, even if taking graduate courses.

Responding to Trustee Shih's question, Dr. Stillman said the benefit is reciprocal with the seven universities and Mr. Morris added that, starting this fiscal year, the institutions will settle with each other. Trustee AuCoin later asked about SOU's costs for sending students to other colleges. Mr. Morris didn't have that information yet because SOU is at the

beginning of the year; however, when looking back at the last 5-6 years, SOU's net average cost was around \$100,000.

Regarding questions from Trustees Steinman and Shih about the online courses, Dr. Stillman noted that the restrictions apply to all the universities, with limited exceptions. He also noted that he did not have readily available information about online cost differences between programs.

Trustee Shih asked if participants were mostly dependents and Dr. Stillman indicated they were. He cited that 30 SOU employees and 45 dependents currently participate, which is typical. The vast majority of these students are degree-seeking students.

Regarding questions from Trustees Steinman and Sevcik about general restrictions and limitations, Dr. Stillman said determining these is institutional prerogative, seemed to be based on demand or perceived costs to the university, and are usually specialty, niche, or costly-to-deliver programs. He further noted that the current program limits participation to 12 credits, which is considered full-time, and participants can take more than 12 credits at full price for the extra credits. Mr. Catz said that while SOU can change this, the limitation is linked to agreements with other institutions and SOU probably would not change it without consulting with the other institutions.

Dr. Stillman reviewed the modeling assumptions made in the analysis he presented, covered revenue generation, and potential positive and negative ramifications.

President Saigo added that as SOU builds relationships with the community colleges, SOU wants to educate as many people as possible. He discussed this as a pilot program with KCC's President Gutierrez and felt that a survey of how many people would be interested would be informative. President Saigo hopes to create relationships and build loyalty in the Rogue Valley. If it will not cost SOU much or if SOU can ask the institutions to help, he thought it would be worth considering. Instead of focusing on the negative possibilities, the President was interested in focusing on positive ones.

Trustee Sayre redirected the conversation to the items in the draft proposal. She discussed the list and saw the need to define any limitations to full-time employees or extension to half-time employees.

While the draft proposal included face-to-face courses as well as online courses, Dr. Walsh mentioned that the proposed MOU with KCC includes some online courses. Dr. Stillman believed that functionally, it would not be possible for the registrar's office to extend staff rate privileges for online courses to a select audience. Trustee Shih sought baseline data on both face-to-face and online courses to determine how many people are taking classes now, then how many take advantage of the program under the MOU, and the impact to SOU. If the goal is to encourage more students to transfer to SOU, then SOU should track the number of students who transfer from KCC to SOU to track success.

Responding to a question about possibly incentivizing KCC students to transfer to SOU to offset costs, Mr. Catz opined that there may be a legal objection to such an arrangement.

Chair Sayre asked if the participants could be limited to enrollment on a space-available basis. Dr. Stillman thought that would be hard to do and believed the best way to accomplish that would be to restrict the timing of the participants' registration.

Mr. Catz said the MOU could include a reimbursement provision as in the current programs with the seven TRUs.

Dr. Stillman advised that it would be extremely difficult to start a pilot program in the winter term and recommended a fall 2016 start. Dr. Walsh said the board needs to make a decision by December 31, 2015 on whether SOU will participate in a program with KCC but that there is no commitment to a particular start date. Mr. Catz said the committee can discuss its proposal with the full board and ask for a delegation of authority to President Saigo and Dr. Walsh to pursue MOUs with the two community colleges. The trustees discussed several provisions that should be included in the MOU and Mr. Catz stated those could be included in the delegation of authority.

Trustee Vincent moved that this committee recommend to the full board, approval to authorize staff to develop a staff tuition rate privilege agreement between Klamath Community College and Rogue Community College, subject to mutually agreeable terms and conditions, to start fall term of 2016. Trustee AuCoin seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The trustees discussed the terms that should be included in the MOU (e.g., pilot program, caps, online courses) and the need for further review of the MOU. It was decided those issues could be discussed in the full board meeting. Mr. Catz said that procedurally, the MOU can go to the Executive and Audit Committee or full board for a decision. Trustee Shih said the staff working on the MOU should take into consideration the points raised and reflected in the minutes. Chair Sayre and Dr. Walsh said that would be the committee's expectation.

Institutional Review Report and HECC Conditions Report

Chair Sayre reintroduced the institutional review report presented to the trustees in prior meetings and asked if the committee members had any questions, concerns or desire for more information.

Trustee Steinman asked about attracting new non-resident students and whether there is still a big push to do that. Dr. Walsh informed her that it's about the mix and SOU is having conversations about where to best focus energy. Demonstrating the point, Mr. Morris said there was a time when a WUE student was at 150% of tuition and brought in less money than a resident student with state allocation. As state allocation dropped, that changed and now a WUE student brings in more money than a resident student. In time, it will flip again and then recruiting WUE students will be disadvantageous.

Discussion ensued among Trustee AuCoin, President Saigo and Dr. Walsh about the complexity of the HECC graduation matrix and the importance of a strategic recruitment and retention model. It was suggested that SOU has to build sociological and institutional capacity to retain and graduate different types of students. Chair Sayre pointed out that money has been set aside for strategic investments, specifically student success initiatives, which Dr. Walsh further explained.

In response to a question from Chair Sayre regarding a reference in the report to thin staff, Mr. Morris explained that over the last five years, when SOU had to make cuts, the focus primarily was on classified staff rather than faculty. As a result, SOU was criticized by OUS for being too thin on staff. One solution to this was creating the Service Center to consolidate administrative functions without hiring new employees. President Saigo added that the staff was so thin it bordered on noncompliance and Mr. Morris confirmed this as one of the reasons SOU needs an internal auditor to review processes, reports and requirements to help ensure compliance.

Further discussion ensued regarding other items in the report, including but not limited to: division directors' three-year plans; faculty retirements; and budget provisions for the Provost to use to work with the academic directors.

Regarding the May/June 2015 HECC Conditions Report, Trustee AuCoin asked for clarification on the mission refinement. Mr. Morris noted that EOU and SOU are in agreement that their presentations to HECC will approach mission through mission fulfillment as seen through the accreditation process.

Adjournment

Chair Sayre adjourned the meeting at 3:35 pm.

Date: November 19, 2015

Respectfully submitted by,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Sabrina Prud'homme", written over a horizontal line.

Sabrina Prud'homme
University Board Secretary