



OFFICE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Public Meeting Notice

April 9, 2021

TO: Southern Oregon University Board of Trustees
FROM: Sabrina Prud'homme, University Board Secretary
RE: Notice of Regular Meeting of the Board of Trustees

The Southern Oregon University Board of Trustees will hold a regular meeting on the date and at the location set forth below.

Topics of the meeting will include reports from the university president, board committees, student leadership, faculty senate, and on university advancement as well as equity, diversity, and inclusion. The board also will recognize the service of a retired trustee. The board will take action on the Board Statement on Investments for the SOU Endowment Fund; student incidental fees for Academic Year 2021-22; tuition and mandatory enrollment fees Academic Year 2021-22; and a recommendation from the Governance Work Group. The board will discuss a budget update including federal and state funding, capital investments and renewal, projections and the forecast, as well as cost savings initiatives. Additional discussion items include information on the SOU-King's Education partnership; updates on the Higher Education Coordinating Commission and legislative activity; the creation of an SOU Staff Assembly; and equity, diversity, and inclusion considerations of the board.

There also will be a discussion regarding presidential search matters including action on a Board Statement on Executive Searches, Appointments and Management; discussion on presidential search guidelines; action on the engagement of an executive search firm; and information on a general timeline.

The meeting will occur as follows:

Friday, April 16, 2021

12:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. (or until business is concluded)

To view the proceedings, visit <https://sou.zoom.us/j/85882638249> at the time of the meeting.

Materials for the meeting are available at governance.sou.edu.

Public Comment

Members of the public who wish to provide public comments for the meeting are invited to submit their comments or testimony in writing during this period of pandemic protocols. Please send written comments or testimony to the Board of Trustees email address: trustees@sou.edu. Public comments also may be sent to the board via postal mail addressed to SOU Board of Trustees, 1250 Siskiyou Boulevard, Ashland, OR 97520.

If special accommodations are required, please contact Pamela Tomac at (541) 552-8055 at least 48 hours in advance.



Board of Trustees
April 16, 2021

Call to Order / Roll / Declaration of a Quorum



Board of Trustees Meeting

Friday, April 16, 2021

12:30 – 5:00 p.m. (or until business concludes)

<https://sou.zoom.us/j/85882638249>

AGENDA

Persons wishing to provide public comment shall do so in writing during COVID-19 protocols.

Please note: times are approximate and items may be taken out of order.

	1	Call to Order/Roll/Declaration of a Quorum	
10 min.	1.1	Welcome and Opening Remarks	Chair Paul Nicholson
	1.2	Roll and Declaration of a Quorum	Sabrina Prud'homme, SOU, Board Secretary
	1.2.1	Trustee Service Recognition	
	1.3	Agenda Review	Chair Nicholson
	2	Public Comment	
5 min.	3	Consent Agenda	Chair Nicholson
	3.1	Approval of January 22, 2021 Meeting Minutes	
	3.2	University Advancement Report	
	3.3	Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Report	
	3.4	Board Statement on Investments for the SOU Endowment Fund	
15 min.	4	Reports	
	4.1	President's Report	President Linda Schott
15 min.	4.2	Committee Reports	Chair Nicholson; Trustee Sheila Clough; Trustee Jonathon Bullock
5 min.	4.3	Student Leadership Report	Violet Crain, ASSOU, President

Board of Trustees Meeting

Friday, April 16, 2021

12:30 – 5:00 p.m. (or until business concludes)

AGENDA (Continued)

5 min.	4.4	Faculty Senate Report	Kemble Yates, SOU, Faculty Senate Chair
	5	Action, Information and Discussion Items	
25 min.	5.1	Student Incident Fees for the 2021-22 Academic Year (Action)	Violet Crain
60 min.	5.2	Tuition and Mandatory Enrollment Fees for the 2021-22 Academic Year (Action)	President Schott; Dr. Susan Walsh, SOU, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs; Dr. Neil Woolf, SOU, Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs; Greg Perkinson, SOU, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Josh Lovern, SOU, Director of Budget and Planning;
25 min.	5.3	Budget Update	Greg Perkinson
		5.3.1 Federal and State Funding	
		5.3.2 Capital Investments and Renewal	
		5.3.3 Projections and Forecast	
		5.3.4 Update on Cost Savings Initiatives	
20 min.	5.4	Southern Oregon University – Kings Education Partnership	Dr. Neil Woolf; Jose Flores, Kings Education
10 min.	5.5	Higher Education Coordinating Commission Update	Greg Perkinson

Board of Trustees Meeting

Friday, April 16, 2021

12:30 – 5:00 p.m. (or until business concludes)

AGENDA (Continued)

15 min.	5.6	Creation of SOU Staff Assembly	Jason Catz, SOU, General Counsel
10 min	5.7	Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Considerations of the Board	Chair Nicholson
	5.8	Governance Work Group Recommendation (Action)	Vice Chair Danny Santos
75 min	5.9	Presidential Search Matters	Chair Nicholson
	5.9.1	Policy on Executive Searches, Appointments and Management (Action)	
	5.9.2	Presidential Search Guidelines	
	5.9.3	Engagement of Executive Search Firm (Action)	
	5.9.4	General Timeline	
	5.9.5	Next Steps	
	5.10	Future Meetings	Chair Nicholson
	6	Adjournment	Chair Nicholson

Public Comment

Consent Agenda

**Board of Trustees Meeting
Friday, January 22, 2021
Videoconference**

MINUTES

Call to Order/Roll/Declaration of a Quorum

Board Members:

Paul Nicholson	Present	Deborah Rosenberg	Present
Les AuCoin	Resigned	Daniel Santos	Present
Jonathon Bullock	Present	Linda Schott (ex officio)	Present
Sheila Clough	Present	Barry Thalden	Present
Shaun Franks	Present	Bill Thorndike	Present
Lyn Hennion	Present	Steve Vincent	Present
Megan Davis Lightman	Present	janelle wilson	Present
Dylann Loverro	Present		

Chair Nicholson called the meeting to order at 12:46 p.m. in the DeBoer Room of the Hannon Library. The board secretary recorded the roll and a quorum was verified.

Other attendees and Zoom panelists included: Dr. Neil Woolf, Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs; Greg Perkinson, Vice President for Finance and Administration; Dr. Susan Walsh, Provost; Jason Catz, General Counsel; Janet Fratella, Vice President for University Advancement; Jeanne Stallman, Associate Vice President for Government and Corporate Relations; Sabrina Prud'homme, Board Secretary; Josh Lovern, Budget Office; Niko Hatch, ASSOU; Kemble Yates, Faculty Senate; Jean Bushong, CliftonLarsonAllen; Jonathan Chavez Baez and Dr. Kylan de Vries, EDI Leadership Team; and Kathy Park, Office of the Board Secretary.

Trustee AuCoin announced that he very reluctantly needed to step down from his position on the board. Trustees and staff members expressed their appreciation for Trustee AuCoin's outstanding service and dedication to SOU.

The board recognized Trustee Franks, who recently received the Rising Star award from the Medford Chamber of Commerce.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Consent Agenda

Trustee Clough moved approval of the consent agenda, as presented. Trustee Lightman seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Reports

President's Report

President Linda Schott first addressed how campus is coping with the pandemic, saying people are hunkered down, persevering, stressed, still trying to do their best, and looking to the future. It is uncertain when SOU will be included in the vaccination plan but the Student Health and Wellness Center has been approved to administer

vaccinations when the time comes. Provost Susan Walsh and the division directors have contacted faculty members to determine who might want to teach in the classroom for the spring term, either a hybrid format or fully in-person.

Athletics was severely impacted by the pandemic. SOU has 406 active student athletes. Athletes and coaches are tested weekly for the coronavirus; there were 27 positive cases in the fall and 7 in the winter. Gyms and weight rooms are closed to students by order of the governor so the athletes have to do everything outside. Volleyball, basketball and cross country opted out of conference play. A 4-game football schedule was released and there is hope to have softball and soccer conference competitions starting in March. Student athletes continue their community service and are helping to rebuild Bear Creek Greenway.

Turning to commencement, President Schott said the University Ceremonies Committee is discussing options. There are so many unknowns, including the status of the governor's orders and of the virus. The goal is to preserve as much of a traditional ceremony as possible.

Regarding SOU's financial situation, President Schott said Greg Perkinson would provide details later in the meeting but said everyone is making sacrifices helping SOU's bottom line.

Work continues on how to best use all of SOU's assets. The SOU Properties Task Force has met twice and has discussed how SOU-owned property can be utilized to the service of SOU and the community; no decisions have been made yet but she is confident this is the right time to be having this discussion.

President Schott said the big question in her mind is what SOU will look like in the post-pandemic world and what it should look like. She is thinking about how the campus will have that conversation. She said the campus must take some time to think about what has been learned, what needs to be done differently, how the university can position itself in a world that is probably going to be even more competitive and where many will be challenged to afford higher education.

President Schott said work on the Staff Assembly is proceeding. The Staff Assembly Working Group, led by Jason Catz, has met several times and is now editing the draft bylaws. Once that is completed, this new shared governance body will be announced to campus and the process of launching the Staff Assembly will begin.

President Schott said she will be participating on a panel discussion for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities on sustainability on campuses. This is another way SOU is being positioned as a leader on the national stage.

Committee Reports

Academic and Student Affairs Committee - Trustee Bullock mentioned the theme of the committee's meeting: "SOU is on the forefront of rethinking liberal arts education." This gave the committee a context by which information and reports could be interpreted and to put a focus on the work that is happening across campus. He said the committee approved a Bachelor of Science in Sustainability and Certificates in

Geospatial Science and Cybersecurity. They also had discussions on micro-credential programs and the work of the Southern Oregon Higher Education Leadership Council to improve communication between K-12 and the university. The committee also heard about the work being done to reform the general education program. Dr. Neil Woolf provided a positive report on the post-graduation employment of SOU students.

Finance and Administration Committee - Trustee Clough said Dr. Woolf presented an enrollment overview. The programs SOU delivers impact enrollment and the ability to attract and retain students impacts financial health. The committee focused on the incredible work the administrative team has done since October, important activities culminating in action and a preview on how finances are shaping up going into the fiscal year 2022 budgeting process. Greg Perkinson provided positive financial news: Jefferson Public Radio has received a Paycheck Protection Program loan and SOU will receive \$6.2 million in funding from the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA), \$1.7 million of which will support financial aid for students and \$4.5 million will support operations. Regarding the impact of the wildfires, Mr. Perkinson provided a report on the modeling the team is doing to understand the financial impact and projecting how it may impact recruitment and retention of students; this is creating awareness at the state level and may be used for future relief funding. Trustee Clough mentioned the University Properties Task Force that is analyzing how SOU can best use the property it owns. The Human Resource Office provided a presentation on the possibility of offering early retirements; the conclusion was that there may be financial benefits in later years but it is not worth it. The committee received a presentation on refinancing the bonds for the North Campus Village and recommended that the board support the plan. The committee reviewed forecasting tools for next year's budget.

Executive and Audit Committee - Chair Nicholson said the committee discussed the audit function, including the possibility of working with the other technical and regional universities (TRUs) to share an internal auditor; two of the TRUs have indicated an interest. Jason Catz is drafting a request for proposals, which will come to the Executive and Audit Committee for approval. There has been little action on the hotline. The committee spent considerable time on the external audit with Jean Bushong and recommended the board's approval. The committee also discussed changes to the president's compensation and recommended the board take appropriate action. Vice Chair Santos updated the committee on the work of the Governance Work Group regarding a separate Governance Committee, which the board also will discuss.

Student Leadership Report

Niko Hatch, the new ASSOU President, delivered the student leadership report. He said the Student Incidental Fee Process has started and ASSOU hopes to present its recommendation to the board at the spring meeting.

Mr. Hatch said ASSOU is working with Sabrina Prud'homme to recommend a new student trustee for the 2021-2022 academic year to replace Trustee Loverro due to her upcoming graduation in June. Vice Chair Santos praised Trustee Loverro, saying she is an outstanding student and contributor on the board.

Mr. Hatch mentioned the many committee and task forces on which he serves as the

student member and hopes to be as helpful to students as he can be.

Faculty Senate Report

Kemble Yates said faculty continue to work on curriculum. Andrew Gay and Dr. Brie Paddock are leading the effort to propose a new general education structure, which would be effective in the fall of 2022. The real work of the faculty has been to figure out a way to deliver a good, quality education to students in a wild and unforeseen set of circumstances. Faculty are not only focused on how to do their jobs but also have personal issues to deal with (e.g., being parents and homeschooling their own children). Mr. Yates said everyone is yearning for the day when there will be enough vaccinations that everyone can return to a more normal world.

Responding to Chair Nicholson's inquiry about transitioning to hybrid classes, Mr. Yates said there would be a myriad of faculty responses. He appreciates how the academic leadership put out the call to determine who is eager to return to the classroom and is balancing differing interests. Some faculty are hesitant to return to face-to-face classes until there is widespread vaccination. Hybrid classes accommodate students who can and cannot come back face-to-face.

University Advancement Report

Janet Fratella reviewed the giving report, saying \$1.9 million has been raised compared to the goal of \$3 million. This is well ahead of last year at this point. Ms. Fratella highlighted some of the generous donors: Peg Evans, Jim Williams, the Olsrud family, the Columbia Pacific Foundation and Harold Warner. The donations will be used for various purposes, including scholarships, the SOU Cares program and SOU Fund.

Turning to grants, Ms. Fratella said grants have been received from the Department of Education, National Park Service, Oregon Department of Forestry and Oregon Cultural Trust. Since the beginning of the fiscal year, SOU has received \$2.2 million in competitive grants.

Regarding board giving, Ms. Fratella said the SOU Foundation and governing boards are at about 64 percent participation.

Ms. Fratella said David Stork from the Lithia Motors executive team is a new addition to the SOU Foundation Board. Mr. Stork has worked with Jeanne Stallman and Stacey Derrig to develop a six-figure contract for the professional development of the Lithia Motors workforce.

Ms. Fratella said SOU has started the Raider Advocates Program, a non-partisan network to add alumni voices to the work Ms. Stallman does. When work is being done in Salem and with legislators around the state, SOU will have a group of alumni who can speak with elected officials about the university and what it needs to be successful.

Action, Information and Discussion Items

University President's Compensation (Action)

Chair Nicholson reminded the trustees that, last year, the board amended President Schott's compensation to reflect a 20 percent furlough consistent with actions taken to amend the compensation of other staff members. At that time, the board resolved to

revisit this issue no later than January of 2021. Also at that time, it was not clear if the furloughs would continue for the staff members. A decision has since been made to continue the furloughs through mid-March.

The Executive and Audit Committee reviewed the proposal to continue the reduction in the president's compensation and recommended it to the board for approval. Chair Nicholson said it is proposed that the board continue with this reduction and revisit the issue in April. At that time, if staff members' furloughs have been lifted, it would be appropriate for the board to consider the same for the president, making it retroactive if needed.

Trustee Bullock moved approval of the resolution included in the meeting materials. Trustee Loverro seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Trustee Hennion shared her concern, saying the board has to take this action but does not like doing so. Chair Nicholson and Trustee Hennion thanked President Schott for her commitment.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Update (Action)

Chair Nicholson said that, following the board's approval of its Board Statement on Black Lives Matter on Juneteenth last year, the board said it wanted a standing equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) update on its agenda. Today's presentation includes an update on what the campus has been doing in this area, comments on the House Bill (HB) 2864 report and what else the board can do to fulfill the aims of the Board Statement on Black Lives Matter.

Jonathan Chavez Baez, a member of the EDI team, said some priorities for 2020-2021 have been achieved and others are still in progress. The pandemic, wildfires and civil unrest affected progress but the team is dedicated and moving forward. Ms. Prud'homme (another member of the EDI team) and Mr. Chavez Baez highlighted two training opportunities available on campus, one being mandatory and the other optional.

Mr. Chavez Baez said the EDI website would be updated and redesigned to improve communication and share information. The website will launch soon.

Trustee Wilson discussed steps and activities Student Life and the Social Justice and Equity Center is taking to promote student success, how those actions relate to strategic directions and how they are tracked. The activities include speaker series, luncheons, equity roundtables and the governor's food drive.

Responding to Trustee Clough's inquiry, Ms. Prud'homme said communicating progress in this area is critical and it is impossible to over-communicate. Information is being disseminated but communication needs to improve. On issues requiring a response or that are urgent, President Schott or the EDI team will send out the communication, after appropriate collaboration and coordination. Changes to the EDI website will also improve communication and make EDI more visible to the SOU community and the community more broadly. Trustee Vincent recommended following activities of the Racial Justice Council, a state level group.

Cultural Competency Report - The EDI team provided an overview on specific sections

of the cultural competency report. Ms. Prud'homme reviewed the cultural competency milestones and other requirements of HB 2864, as included in the meeting materials. The EDI team addressed how the requirements of the bill have been met, including the maintenance and expansion of the President's Committee for Equity and Diversity, expanding the equity-related objectives of the strategic plan and development of training for employees and students.

Chair Nicholson asked the trustees to consider how the board, within its areas of responsibility, could fulfill the aims of the Board Statement on Black Lives Matter. He recommended the creation of an EDI Work Group, comprised of 4-5 trustees, to develop recommendations on actions the board can take to further EDI objectives.

Trustee Rosenberg made a motion to approve the formation of an EDI Work Group of the Board of Trustees. Trustee Wilson seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The Big Question: Student Success

Chair Nicholson said this meeting's big question is "Student Success," and the lens of student success should be used to examine everything that is being done. Discussion later ensued on what comes to mind when trustees think about student success, including students' experiences at SOU; whether they are engaged and expanding their minds; whether they are healthy; making sure students understand their commitment to community and democracy and seeing students fulfill that through service, volunteer work, careers and service after graduation; whether they have learned to be adaptable and resilient, to fail and to succeed; the benefits of a community mentor program; and whether they have developed critical thinking skills. In wrapping up the discussion, Chair Nicholson believed the trustees need to focus on whether they are holding themselves and the students up to those definitions of success.

Student Success: Post-Graduation Employment - Dr. Neil Woolf said the National Association of Career Educators (NACE) conducts a first destination survey. According to NACE and some additional data mining, the percent of recent graduates from SOU who are employed within six months of graduation is 68, 10 percent higher than the national average. The data is for students who are employed in their field or a related one. The percent of graduates that go on to graduate school is 17 at SOU and 19 percent nationally.

Student Success and Completion Funding Model Update - Greg Perkinson and Jason Catz provided an update on the new Student Success and Completion Funding Model (SSCM). Mr. Perkinson said the HECC staff made their recommendation and the process has transitioned to rulemaking. SOU made the most headway in the mission differentiation category; SOU may receive an increase in funding from the transition of dual credit from the mission differentiation category to the activity category. The big open issue is still stop loss - stop gain, which may only be for a one-year period.

Mr. Perkinson said the HECC would meet in February to review the rules that have been vetted through the process then, hopefully, release the new model. The new model could result in a \$1.5 million increase in funding for SOU. President Schott said that, once the model is finalized, SOU must think about how to optimize performance and maximize benefits under this model without changing its fundamental mission.

Governance Work Group Discussion

Vice Chair Santos provided an update on the Governance Work Group, saying the group started and ended with the same question: What is the problem they are trying to solve? The work group observed that this work has been taking place already within the Executive and Audit Committee. At SOU and five of the other Oregon public universities, an Executive and Audit Committee addresses governance issues.

The Governance Work Group concluded that, while a Governance Committee could be useful, creating a new stand-alone committee was not seen as a readily apparent solution. The work group posed three questions for the board's consideration: What problem do trustees believe the board will solve with the creation of a Governance Committee? Do trustees believe a stand-alone Governance Committee is the best way to solve it? What else should the work group explore before bringing back a recommendation to the board? Discussion ensued and trustees commented that governance is not given sufficient attention under the current structure, questioned whether the Executive and Audit Committee has the capacity to include more focus on governance issues, and mentioned the possibility of having the entire board address governance issues once or twice a year or convening a Governance Work Group on a regular basis. Following further discussion, Vice Chair Santos said the group would like to return with a final recommendation in April.

Fiscal Year 2019-20 Audited Financial Statements (Action)

Jean Bushong presented the FY 2019-20 financial audit results, as included in the meeting materials. CliftonLarsonAllen's (CLA's) responsibility is to determine if SOU's financial statements are accurate. CLA is not part of SOU's internal control structure. Management is responsible for having controls in place to prevent and detect fraud, error and noncompliance but the auditors would report any material weaknesses or significant deficiencies with SOU's internal control system.

The scope of the engagement included a financial statement audit and a compliance audit of the spending of federal dollars, including CARES Act funds. Ms. Bushong said the auditing guidance for CARES Act funds was issued in late December so that portion of the audit is not yet completed. COVID-19 presented unique audit items this year.

Summarizing the results of the financial statement audit, Ms. Bushong was pleased to report that CLA offered an unmodified opinion, which is the expectation. Importantly, there were no actual adjustments that changed the bottom line of the financial statements but there were three reclassifications and one past adjustment. These findings were presented in CLA's letter to governance. There were no material weaknesses or significant deficiencies in internal controls but there was a letter to management which included operational recommendations regarding information technology access rights.

Ms. Bushong explained the impact of Governmental Accounting Standards Board standard 84 on accounting for fiduciary activity, such as the North Campus Village, which necessitated the inclusion of a new financial statement in the report. Ms. Bushong then provided the required communications to governance, as included in the meeting materials.

Vice Chair Santos moved to approve the resolution accepting the FY 2019-20 audited financial statements and the 2020 Annual Financial Report for SOU, as included in the meeting materials. Trustee Franks seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

North Campus Village – Bond Refinancing (Action)

Chair Nicholson said the board's action on this refinancing item is being taken as a "belt and suspenders" approach for bond financing to provide any needed proof of the board's approval. Greg Perkinson said the option is being pursued at this time because of the low interest rates, the pandemic, the loss of millions of dollars in revenue because of the pandemic, and the need for liquidity.

Jason Catz said that, although the North Campus Village (NCV) is owned by a private entity, SOU benefits the most financially it. NCV is a net revenue project, so after expenses are taken care of, the university gets most of the revenue. With very few students in the residence halls because of the pandemic, there was very little revenue. Even so, SOU funded the refunds to students who no longer lived in the residence halls. Mr. Catz mentioned the uncertainties and the risks that existed in June and July of 2020, when the administration first began to evaluate this option.

Mr. Catz said some allowances in the existing bond relationship were negotiated. Additionally, to manage the \$2.8 million mortgage payment, SOU was able to take advantage of the lower interest rate currently on bonds. There is an estimated savings of \$3-4 million in the first 3 years. However, over the 40 years left on the bonds after refinancing, it will cost SOU more overall. However, those savings were front-loaded in the first three years. The savings will help with risk mitigation if there is a resurgence in the coronavirus or will allow SOU to retain profit if the situation improves.

Since SOU is not the borrower, Mr. Catz said the only documents SOU is executing are amendments to the management agreement and the ground lease. In this transaction, SOU is not actually incurring any debt or any cost that would normally require the board's approval. However, the bankers and underwriters will feel much better knowing the board voted on and supported this action.

Trustee Hennion moved approval of the resolution approving the refinancing of the North Campus Village, as included in the meeting materials. Trustee Clough seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Budget Update and Review of Pro Forma

Greg Perkinson reviewed the year-to-date pro forma, as included in the meeting materials. SOU will receive \$6.2 million in the next round of federal funding from the CRRSAA. All of the restrictions on how those funds must be allocated are still unclear. However, it is known that SOU must allocate directly to students an amount at least equal to that allocated from CARES Act funds, which was \$1.7 million.

In reviewing the pro forma, Mr. Perkinson stressed that the figures are notional and could change. One strategy would be to allocate \$1.1 million to the Education & General (E&G) fund and \$3.4 million to auxiliaries. This would allow a repayment of the \$1 million internal loan from the physical plant debt service fund and of the debt

incurred by the Schneider Childcare Center. These repayments would very modestly help SOU's overall net position. Including the savings from furloughs and the hiring freeze, this notional strategy may result in a 9.5 percent ending fund balance and would help SOU create as much fund balance as possible prior to the next two biennia.

Mr. Perkinson then reviewed three scenarios for the budget forecast, as included in the meeting materials: a 0 percent resident tuition increase, a 3 percent increase and a 4.9 percent increase. Assumptions for all three scenarios include: funding from the SSCM is modeled on the latest data available; enrollment is projected on a mathematical model of the trend line over the last 5 years; a 5 percent increase in nonresident tuition; a 3 percent increase in labor costs; and PEBB and PERS rates are modeled as projected.

Responding to Trustee Thalden's inquiry about the previous \$1.6 million shortfall in the budget, Mr. Perkinson explained that the additional funding from the CRRSAA helps by infusing the institution with \$4.5 million that it can allocate to either the auxiliaries or the E&G fund. The Paycheck Protection Program loan for Jefferson Public Radio also infuses designated operations with additional funds and gives the institution some flexibility moving forward.

Responding to Vice Chair Santos' inquiry, Mr. Perkinson said a tuition increase of approximately 8 percent would be needed to eliminate budget shortfalls. Dr. Walsh later reminded the trustees that any tuition increase over 5 percent must go to the HECC for approval. Chair Nicholson added that each 1 percent change in tuition represents \$400,000-\$450,000.

Responding to Trustee Wilson's inquiry, Mr. Lovern explained that the \$1.7 million in savings already identified was incorporated into the pro forma on the administrative and classified salary lines as well as retirement savings and, for the faculty and continued staff furloughs, in the line for other adjustments to labor. Mr. Perkinson added that other savings also were incorporated into the pro forma, such as those created in academic affairs.

Government Relations Update

Jeanne Stallman said the universities' common advocacy has been well received in the legislature and has been effective. The common asks include the financial request for \$900 million for the public university support fund, capital, sports lottery and research innovation funding. There will also be common support for some key bills. SOU's Cascade demolition project is still on the priority list, but with less state revenue, it is less likely to be funded.

Ms. Stallman said the 2021 legislative session will be very different, although one advantage is that students and other advocates are able to participate remotely in the legislative process, which the legislators find beneficial. Ms. Stallman stressed that, since the number-one voice with legislators is students, the goal is to find more opportunities for students to be involved.

Ms. Stallman then highlighted a few bills and concepts of interest, describing those that limit the ability of the board to refuse new mandatory incidental fees that student government passes; permit the merger of community colleges and Oregon public

universities [Senate Bill (SB) 1]; common course numbering (SB 233); create a commission to advocate for better funding for higher education (HB 2590); create a position on campus to help students access food and housing benefits to which they are entitled (HB 2835); require universities to display the cost of course materials (HB 2919); modify the HECC's membership (SB 712); and prohibiting questions about criminal backgrounds on higher education applications for admission (SB 713). She said the provosts are working on common course numbering which will help counter the perception and unsupported assertions that transfers are a problem.

Responding to Trustee Franks' inquiry, Ms. Stallman said priorities are being set now. She and her peers reviewed about 1000 of 1800 bills and prioritized 367 of them, with 60 being top priority. By end of the month, about 3000 bills will have been released and the prioritization process will continue.

Future Meetings

The board's next meeting will be on April 16, 2021.

Adjournment

Chair Nicholson adjourned the meeting at 5:36 p.m.

DRAFT

**Board Statement on Investments for the SOU Endowment Fund
Board of Trustees of Southern Oregon University**

1. Introduction

This statement governs the investment of the Southern Oregon University Endowment Fund (the "Fund").

This statement is set forth in order that the Board, the Investment Advisor, its investment managers and others entitled to such information may be made aware of the Policy of the Fund with regard to the investment of its assets.

This statement of investment policy sets forth the following:

- A. There will be a clear understanding by the Board, the Investment Advisor and staff of the investment goals and objectives of the portfolio.
- B. The Board and management have a basis for evaluation of the investment managers.
- C. The investment managers be given guidance and limitation on investing the funds.

It is intended the objectives in this policy to be sufficiently specific to be meaningful, but flexible enough to be practical. It is expected that the policy and objectives will be amended as necessary to reflect the changing needs of the endowment; however, all modifications shall be made in writing and approved by the Board.

2. Southern Oregon University Endowment Fund

The Fund is permanent and expected to operate in perpetuity, so these funds will be invested long-term. It is important to follow coordinated policies regarding spending and investments to protect the principal of the Fund and produce a reasonable total return.

3. Responsibility of the Board

The role of the Board is to recommend broad investment goals to the Investment Advisor, including spending rate information and to provide input into the asset allocation process.

4. Investment Advisor Responsibility

The Investment Advisor, and/or a designee, serves as consultant to the Board and will have the responsibility and authority to establish the asset allocation for the Fund and approve the retention and termination of all investment managers. The Investment Advisor, and/or a designee, will recommend to the Board a specific asset mix reflecting judgments of the investment environment as well as the specific needs of the Fund. Other duties assigned to the Investment Advisor, and/or a designee, include:

- A. Recommending professional investment managers;
- B. Negotiating and/or monitoring Fund investment expenses;
- C. Monitoring investment managers, on an ongoing basis;
- D. Assuring proper custody of the investments; and
- E. Reporting to the Board, on a quarterly basis, the Fund's investment results, its composition and any other information the Board may request.

5. Spending Policy

The amount of endowment return available for spending (distribution) is based on a percentage of the average unit market value of the 20 quarters preceding the current fiscal year. The distribution per unit (under Exhibit A) is determined by the Board. The distribution amount per unit is multiplied by the current number of units and any additional units added during the current year as new endowment money comes into the Fund. This shall be exclusive of investment management fees.

6. Investment Policy Guidelines

A. Asset Allocation

The most important component of an investment strategy is the allocation among the various classes of securities available to the Fund. The Investment Advisor, in consultation with the Board, will establish the target asset allocation for the investments that will most likely achieve the investment goals of the Fund, taking into consideration the appropriate level of portfolio risk.

The risk/return profile shall be maintained by establishing the following long-term "target" strategic asset allocations:

<u>Asset Class</u>	<u>Policy</u>	<u>Target</u>	<u>Benchmark</u>
Global Equities	70-80%	75%	MSCI ACWI IMI Net
Fixed Income	20-30%	25%	Barclays Aggregate
Cash	0-3%	0%	91 Day T-Bill

B. Investment Time Horizon

In making investment strategy decisions for the Fund, the focus shall be on a long-term investment time horizon that encompasses a complete business cycle (usually three to five years). An interim evaluation will be performed by the Investment Advisor, and/or a designee, if a significant change in fees, manager personnel, investment strategy or manager ownership occurs.

While the quantitative assessment of managerial competence will be measured over a complete market cycle, the Board anticipates that the Investment Advisor will make **periodic** qualitative assessments as well. Specific qualitative factors considered by the Investment Advisor may include, but are not limited to, fundamental changes in the manager's investment philosophy, changes in the manager's organizational structure, financial condition and personnel, and any changes, relative to peers, in a manager's fee structure.

7. Prudence and Ethical Standards

A. Prudence

All participants in the investment process shall act responsibly. The standard of prudence to be applied by the Board, the Investment Advisor, selected designees, SOU staff and external service providers shall be the "prudent investor" rule, which states: "Investments shall be invested and the investments managed as a prudent investor would do, under the circumstances then prevailing and in light of the purposes, terms, distribution requirements and laws governing each investment fund."

B. Ethics and Conflicts of Interest

Board members, Investment Advisory staff, selected designees, SOU staff and external service providers involved in the investment process shall refrain from personal business activity that could conflict with the proper execution and management of the investment program or that could impair their ability to make impartial decisions. These parties are required to reveal

all relationships that could create or appear to create a conflict of interest in their unbiased involvement in the investment process.

8. Investment Objectives

The investment objective of the Fund is to seek consistency of investment return with emphasis on capital appreciation over long periods of time, since the Fund will operate in perpetuity. In keeping with the performance goals included in the Policy, achievement of this objective shall be done in a manner that, over a long-term planning horizon, will meet the spending rate established by the Board (under Exhibit A) and maintain the purchasing power of the principal.

9. Manager(s) Responsibilities

A. Legal Compliance - The investment manager(s) is (are) responsible for strict compliance with the provisions of their investment management agreement.

B. Authority of Investment Manager(s) in the Managed Accounts - Subject to the terms and conditions of this Policy and the investment management agreement, manager(s) shall have full discretionary authority to direct investments of assets in the managed accounts. The Investment Advisor, and/or a designee, will recommend changes to this Policy when the advisor(s) views any part of this Policy to be inconsistent with overall market, economic conditions, or investment policies.

The Investment Advisor directs all managers to vote proxies and to vote them in the best economic interest of the Fund. When requested, managers will report to the Investment Advisor regarding how proxies were voted.

Meetings between Fund managers and the Investment Advisor will occur consistent with the policies established for the Investment Advisor's other managers, to discuss items including, but not limited to, the manager's performance, outlook, and investment decision process.

10. Reporting Requirements

Investment results will be regularly monitored by the Investment Advisor, selected designees and Board staff.

A representative of the Investment Advisor, and/or a designee, shall report investment results, or other information, to the Board no less frequently than annually. Any material non-compliance with the Investment Policy, Guidelines and Objectives of the Fund or with the investment management agreement will be reported to the Board immediately.

11. Investment Guidelines

A. **Cash:** The Fund shall maintain minimal cash, consistent with short-term requirements. Short term cash will be invested in a liquid cash equivalent investment.

B. **Fixed Income:** Fixed-income securities, for purposes of these guidelines, shall mean mortgage-backed securities, U.S. government securities, investment-grade domestic or global corporate bonds, and other fixed income securities, such as certificates of deposit and commercial paper. The objective of this component of the Fund is to preserve capital in keeping with prudent levels of risk, through a combination of income and capital appreciation. Realization of income will be subordinate to safety, liquidity, and marketability (i.e., securities should be readily marketable). This component of the Fund shall adhere to the following criteria:

1. Average portfolio credit quality shall be A or better;
2. With the exception of U.S. Government and Agency issues, no more than 10 percent of the bond portfolio, at market value, will be invested in the securities of a single issuer or 5 percent of the individual issue;
3. Below investment grade bonds shall not exceed 20 percent of the bond portfolio; and
4. Non-U.S. bonds shall not exceed 20 percent of the bond portfolio.

Fixed-income managers have full discretion over the allocation between long-term, intermediate, and cash equivalent investments.

C. Equities

1. **Objective:** The objective of the equity portfolio is to enhance total return by investing in a broadly diversified portfolio of domestic and international stocks.
2. **Strategy:** Hold a fully invested, diversified portfolio of global equity securities, including emerging markets.
3. **Permitted Holdings:** Publicly traded domestic and international common stock, and other financial instruments consistent with the guidelines of the investment management agreements.
4. **Diversification:** The Investment Advisor shall recognize the need for diversification to minimize the risk of significant losses to the Fund.

Diversification by capitalization, style, and sector distribution shall be obtained through the selection of complementary investment managers, or index strategies. Not more than 5 percent of the market value of any investment fund will be invested in any single issuer or security, unless part of an index fund.

5. Portfolio Restrictions: There will be no engagement in short sales, purchases on margin, or investments in options, futures, or private placements unless consistent with the underlying investment management agreements.

D. Performance

Performance expectations for each of the asset classes are described in Exhibit A.

12. Asset Custody and Securities Lending

Custodial responsibility for all securities is to be determined by the Board or its designee(s).

13. Conclusion

Implementation of this Policy, including investment manager selection, shall be the responsibility of the Investment Advisor, subject to the necessary approvals from the Board.

This Policy shall be reviewed by the Board at least every two years.

Approved on March 22, 2019



Board Chair



Board Secretary

Revision	Change	Date
	Initial Version	January 20, 2017
1	Investment Guidelines, Fixed Income components revised; basic edits and corrections.	March 22, 2019

EXHIBIT A

Spending Policy

The distribution rate for the Fund is up to 4 percent of the five-year moving average unit market value.

Performance Monitoring

Global equities are expected to match the performance of the passive benchmark assigned.

Fixed income accounts are expected to exceed the return of the Barclays Capital Aggregate Bond Index by 0.5 percent (after fees) over a market cycle for core bond investments.

President's Report

Committee Reports

- **Executive and Audit**
- **Finance and Administration**
- **Academic and Student Affairs**

Student Leadership Report

Faculty Senate Report

Student Fees for the 2021-22 Academic Year (Action)



MANDATORY STUDENT INCIDENTAL FEES – JOINT RECOMMENDATION
For July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022

Date: April 8, 2021
To: The Board of Trustees of Southern Oregon University
From: Associated Students of Southern Oregon University (ASSOU)

DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST

Joint Recommendation for Mandatory Incidental Fees for Academic Year 2021-22 & Summer Term 2021

DESCRIPTION OF FUNDS

Mandatory Incidental Fees as authorized and collected according to ORS 352.105. Fees include:

STUDENT INCIDENTAL FEE	
Incidental Fee - Academic Year 2021 - 22	\$380
Incidental Fee - Prior Academic Year 2020 - 21	\$372
\$ Change from Prior Year:	\$8
% Change from Prior Year:	2.15%
Incidental Fee - Summer Term 2021	\$85
Incidental Fee - Prior Summer Term	\$82
\$ Change from Prior Year:	\$3
% Change from Prior Year:	3.66%

Programs Supported	Est. Collections
Athletics (Incidental Fee Supported Funds only)	\$1,260,095
Campus Recreation (Incidental Fee Supported Funds only)	\$649,837
Student Life & Educational Activities	\$1,919,119
Indirect Budget Authority Support	\$71,858
Building/Equipment Reserves & General Liability Easements	\$28,175
Incidental Fee Reserve	\$112,788
Sub-Total Incidental Fee Budgets:	<u>\$4,041,870</u>

GREEN TAG FEE	
Green Tag Fee - Academic Year 2021 - 22	\$13
Incidental Fee - Prior Academic Year 2020 - 21	\$13
\$ Change from Prior Year:	\$0
% Change from Prior Year:	0.00%

Programs Supported	Est. Collections
Green Tag Projects	<u>\$138,275</u>

RECREATION CENTER FEE	
Recreation Center Fee - Academic Year 2021 - 22	\$104
Recreation Center Fee - Prior Academic Year 2020 - 21	\$104
\$ Change from Prior Year:	\$0
% Change from Prior Year:	0.00%

Programs Supported	Est. Collections
Recreation Center (Building, Debt Service, Labor, etc.)	<u>\$1,032,040</u>

JOINT RECOMMENDATION

Approve Disapprove

Violet Crain
President, Associated Students
of Southern Oregon University
Violet Crain

4.9.2021

Date

Approve Disapprove

President, Southern Oregon University
Dr. Linda Schott

4.9.2021

Date

Tuition and Mandatory Enrollment Fees for Academic Year 2021-22 (Action)



ACADEMIC YEAR 2021-22 TUITION RATE RECOMMENDATION
For July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022

Date: April 9, 2021

To: The Board of Trustees of Southern Oregon University Board of Trustees

From: Dr. Linda Schott, President

DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST

Recommendation of Tuition Rates for Academic Year 2021-22

DESCRIPTION OF FUNDS

Tuition Rates as authorized and collected according to ORS 352.102. Rates include:

	2020-21	2021-22					
Undergraduate Tuition Rate per SCH	Current	Proposed	% Change from Prior AY	Difference Per SCH	Difference Per Term @ 15 SCH	Difference Per AY @ 45 SCH	Annual Tuition Cost
01-WUE SCH	\$294	\$301.50	2.55%	\$7.50	\$112.50	\$337.50	\$13,567.50
02-UG Resident SCH (incl. EXRES)	\$196	\$201.00	2.55%	\$5.00	\$75.00	\$225.00	\$9,045.00
02.2-UG JackJo Pledge	\$125	\$150.00	20.00%	\$25.00	\$375.00	\$1,125.00	\$6,750.00
03-UG Non Resident SCH	\$580	\$597.00	2.93%	\$17.00	\$255.00	\$765.00	\$26,865.00
04.1-UG Online SCH RES	\$196	\$201.00	2.55%	\$5.00	\$75.00	\$225.00	\$9,045.00
04.2-UG Online SCH NON-RES	\$196	\$201.00	2.55%	\$5.00	\$75.00	\$225.00	\$9,045.00
04.3-UG Online SCH WUE	\$294	\$301.50	2.55%	\$7.50	\$112.50	\$337.50	\$13,567.50
Graduate Tuition Rate per SCH							
05-GR Resident SCH (incl. EXRES)	\$491	\$505.00	2.85%	\$14.00	\$168.00	\$504.00	\$22,725.00
06-GR Non Resident SCH	\$593	\$610.00	2.87%	\$17.00	\$204.00	\$612.00	\$27,450.00
07.0-GR AP MBA Online SCH	\$430	\$430.00	0.00%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19,350.00
07.1-GR Online SCH RES	\$491	\$505.00	2.85%	\$14.00	\$168.00	\$504.00	\$22,725.00
07.2-GR Online SCH NON-RES	\$491	\$505.00	2.85%	\$14.00	\$168.00	\$504.00	\$22,725.00
07.3-GR AP MS.Ed Online SCH	\$369	\$369.00	0.00%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,605.00
08-GR - MEDU SCH	\$421	\$433.00	2.85%	\$12.00	\$144.00	\$432.00	\$19,485.00
Other Categories Tuition Rate per SCH							
09-Staff	\$58	\$60.00	3.45%	\$2.00	\$30.00	\$90.00	\$2,700.00
10-Waived Tuition SCH	\$0	\$0.00	0.00%	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
11-Course Based Tuition SCH	\$110	\$113.00	2.73%	\$3.00	\$45.00	\$135.00	\$5,085.00
12-Adv Southern Credit SCH	\$49	\$50.00	2.04%	\$1.00	\$15.00	\$45.00	\$2,250.00
13-Early Entry Credit SCH	\$181	\$186.00	2.76%	\$5.00	\$75.00	\$225.00	\$8,370.00

PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION

Linda Schott

Approve Disapprove

President, Southern Oregon University
Dr. Linda Schot

4.9.2021
Date



MANDATORY ENROLLMENT FEES RECOMMENDATION
For July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022

Date: April 8, 2021
To: The Board of Trustees of Southern Oregon University
From: Dr. Linda Schott, President

DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST

Recommendation for Mandatory Enrollment Fees for Academic Year 2021-22 & Summer Term 2021

DESCRIPTION OF FUNDS

Mandatory Enrollment Fees as authorized and collected according to ORS 352.102. Fees include:

Table with 2 columns: Programs Supported, Est. Collections. Rows include Building Fee Reserve, Technology Infrastructure, and Sub-Total Building Fee Budgets.

Table with 2 columns: Programs Supported, Est. Collections. Rows include Health Services Fee - Academic Year 2021 - 22, Health Services Fee - Summer Term 2021, and Student Health and Wellness Center and Programs.

PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION

Handwritten signature of Linda Schott

[X] Approve [] Disapprove

President, Southern Oregon University
Dr. Linda Schott

4.9.2021
Date

Tuition Category	Current Credit Rate Per Term	Current Tuition per Academic Year	Proposed Credit Rate Per Term	Proposed Tuition per Academic Year	Increase \$ per Credit	Increase \$ per Academic Year	Increased %
Resident Undergrad	\$196.00	\$8,820.00	\$201.00	\$9,044.91	\$5.00	\$224.91	2.55%
WUE	\$294.00	\$13,275.00	\$301.50	\$13,567.37	\$7.50	\$292.37	2.55%
Nonres Undergrad	\$580.00	\$25,740.00	\$597.00	\$26,864.99	\$17.00	\$1,124.99	2.93%
Resident Grad	\$491.00	\$17,676.00	\$503.52	\$18,126.74	\$12.52	\$450.74	2.55%
Nonres Grad	\$593.00	\$21,096.00	\$610.38	\$21,973.71	\$17.38	\$877.71	2.93%
Masters - Education	\$421.00	\$15,156.00	\$431.74	\$15,542.48	\$10.74	\$386.48	2.55%

Mandatory Enrollment & Incidental Fees							
Student Incidental & Green Tag	\$385.00	\$1,155.00	\$393.00	\$1,179.00	\$8.00	\$24.00	2.08%
Student Rec Center	\$104.00	\$312.00	\$104.00	\$312.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Student Health Services	\$150.00	\$450.00	\$150.00	\$450.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Building Fee	\$60.00	\$180.00	\$60.00	\$180.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Composite Mandatory Fees:	\$699.00	\$2,097.00	\$707.00	\$2,121.00	\$8.00	\$24.00	1.14%

Tuition & Fees Totals	@15SCH	@ 45 SCH	@15SCH	@ 45 SCH			
Resident Undergrad	\$3,639.00	\$10,917.00	\$3,721.97	\$11,165.91	\$13.00	\$248.91	2.28%
WUE	\$5,124.00	\$15,372.00	\$5,229.46	\$15,688.37	\$15.50	\$316.37	2.06%
Nonres Undergrad	\$9,279.00	\$27,837.00	\$9,662.00	\$28,985.99	\$25.00	\$1,148.99	4.13%
Resident Grad	\$6,591.00	\$19,773.00	\$6,749.25	\$20,247.74	\$20.52	\$474.74	2.40%
Nonres Grad	\$7,731.00	\$23,193.00	\$8,031.57	\$24,094.71	\$25.38	\$901.71	3.89%
Masters - Education	\$5,751.00	\$17,253.00	\$5,887.83	\$17,663.48	\$18.74	\$410.48	2.38%

Housing	Current	Curr/AY	New Rate	New/AY	Inc \$/Term	Inc \$/AY	Inc %
Greensprings - Double	\$2,662	\$7,986	\$2,741.51	\$8,224.53	\$79.59	\$238.77	2.99%
Greensprings - Double-as-Single	\$3,516	\$10,548	\$3,621.10	\$10,863.31	\$105.13	\$315.38	2.99%
Madrone - Single Apartment	\$4,107	\$12,322	\$4,229.97	\$12,689.91	\$122.80	\$368.41	2.99%
Shasta - Double	\$3,006	\$9,017	\$3,095.70	\$9,287.10	\$89.87	\$269.62	2.99%
Shasta - Single	\$3,660	\$10,981	\$3,769.84	\$11,309.53	\$109.45	\$328.34	2.99%
McLoughlin - Double	\$3,166	\$9,497	\$3,260.49	\$9,781.47	\$94.66	\$283.98	2.99%
McLoughlin - Single	\$3,931	\$11,792	\$4,048.06	\$12,144.18	\$117.52	\$352.57	2.99%
McLoughlin - Super Single	\$4,323	\$12,970	\$4,452.55	\$13,357.64	\$129.27	\$387.80	2.99%
McLoughlin - Studio Single	\$4,411	\$13,232	\$4,542.43	\$13,627.29	\$131.88	\$395.63	2.99%

Meals	Current	Curr/AY	New Rate	New/AY	Inc \$/Term	Inc \$/AY	Inc %
Red Plan	\$ 1,921	\$ 5,763	\$1,978.39	\$5,935.16	\$57.44	\$172.31	2.99%
Black Plan	\$ 1,921	\$ 5,763	\$1,978.39	\$5,935.16	\$57.44	\$172.31	2.99%
S Plan	\$ 1,612	\$ 4,835	\$1,659.94	\$4,979.82	\$48.19	\$144.57	2.99%
O Plan	\$ 1,612	\$ 4,835	\$1,659.94	\$4,979.82	\$48.19	\$144.57	2.99%
U Plan	\$ 1,612	\$ 4,835	\$1,659.94	\$4,979.82	\$48.19	\$144.57	2.99%
Rocky Plan	\$ 1,310	\$ 3,930	\$1,349.17	\$4,047.51	\$39.17	\$117.51	2.99%
Hawk Plan	\$ 901	\$ 2,703	\$927.94	\$2,783.82	\$26.94	\$80.82	2.99%
Madrone Plan	\$ 848	\$ 2,544	\$873.36	\$2,620.07	\$25.36	\$76.07	2.99%

Tuition	Current per Term	Current Per AY	Proposed per Term	Proposed Per AY	\$ ▲ Per Term	\$ ▲ per AY	% ▲
Resident Undergrad	\$2,940	\$8,820	\$3,014.97	\$9,044.91	\$5.00	\$224.91	2.55%
Mandatory Enrollment & Incidental Fees							
Student Incidental & Green Tag	\$385	\$1,155	\$393.00	\$1,179.00	\$8.00	\$24.00	2.08%
Student Rec Center	\$104	\$312	\$104.00	\$312.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Student Health Services	\$150	\$450	\$150.00	\$450.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Building Fee	\$60	\$180	\$60.00	\$180.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0.00%
Composite Fees:	\$699	\$2,097	\$707.00	\$2,121.00	\$8.00	\$24.00	1.14%
Composite Tuition and Fees:	\$3,639	\$10,917	\$3,721.97	\$11,165.91	\$13.00	\$248.91	2.28%
Housing/Meals							
Shasta Double	\$3,006	\$9,017	\$3,095.70	\$9,287.10	\$89.87	\$269.62	2.99%
Red Plan	\$1,921	\$5,763	\$1,978.39	\$5,935.16	\$57.44	\$172.31	2.99%
Composite Housing/Meals Change:	\$4,927	\$14,780	\$5,074.09	\$15,222.26	\$147.31	\$441.93	2.99%
Total Cost of Attendance							
Resident Undergrad	\$8,566	\$25,697	\$8,796.06	\$26,388.17	\$160.31	\$690.84	2.69%

Budget Update

Summary of Federal Relief

The up-side of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA)

- ARP rules have flowed, considering allocation approach
 - \$8.9M targeted to students: what's the best way to help?
 - \$12.2M institutional portion



Federal Funding Support Summary

	CARES	CRRSAA	ARP	GEER	Total
Federal Funds (Institution portion)	\$ 1,711,039	\$ 4,491,416	\$ 5,456,500	\$ 72,755	\$ 11,731,710
Federal Funds (Strengthening Institutional Programs)	\$ 170,780	\$ 264,474	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 435,254
	\$ 1,881,819	\$ 4,755,890	\$ 5,456,500	\$ 72,755	\$ 12,166,964
Additional CARES Act funding received through the CPB: support to JPR	\$ 224,272	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 224,272
Total Federal Support Funding Coming to the University	\$ 2,106,091	\$ 4,755,890	\$ 5,456,500	\$ 72,755	\$ 12,391,236
Total Federal Support to be issued Directly Students	\$ 1,711,040	\$ 1,711,040	\$ 5,456,500	\$ -	\$ 8,878,580
Total Support	\$ 3,817,131	\$ 6,466,930	\$ 10,913,000	\$ 72,755	\$ 21,269,816

Financial Headwinds Facing SOU

- COVID direct costs and revenue losses projected to + \$33.1M
- Enrollment losses (now and over the next few years?)
 - Reduced pipeline due to COVID and Wildfires
 - Significant shortfall in Advanced Southern Credit enrollment for high school students -- Dual credit decimated
 - Demographic cliff looming
 - Transfer reductions
- Increasing direct and indirect cost base
- Lower than normal enrollments leading to less SCH and fewer graduates

Cost To Date	\$ 2,477,655
Total Cost	\$ 6,673,843
Revenue Loss To Date	\$ 10,076,437
Total Revenue Loss	\$ 26,450,646

FY 21 Budget Update

- Year to date actuals; and
- Estimate to complete FY21
- Furlough savings YTD (including new savings thru end of FY)
- Includes projected CRRSSA and ARPA federal relief
- Outcome: one-time funding provides shock absorber for next biennium and 60 days “run time” (making payroll)
- Projected \$10.8M ending fund balance

Education and General

(in thousands of dollars)

	2019-20 ACTUAL (000's)	2020-21 BUDGET (000's)	2020-21 FY Forecast (000's)
Revenue			
State Appropriations: SSCM	22,696	23,357	23,559
<i>One-time Funding Changes</i>			10,358
Total State Funding (SSCM,ETSF,SELP)	23,074	23,716	34,483
Tuition	39,365	36,945	35,754
Fees	3,167	3,373	3,308
Raider Aid	(3,965)	(3,325)	(3,207)
<i>Oth tuition & fee adjustments</i>			
Tuition, net of Raider Aid	38,567	36,993	35,855
Misc. Other Revenue	2,453	2,145	1,597
TOTAL REVENUES	64,095	62,855	71,934
Personnel Services			
Faculty	(16,083)	(17,419)	(14,910)
Admin	(9,617)	(9,097)	(8,118)
Classified	(6,362)	(6,203)	(5,467)
Student (& Other)	(1,445)	(1,643)	(1,126)
Salaries Total	(33,508)	(34,363)	(29,620)
Retirement (PERS + ORP)	(7,881)	(8,233)	(6,896)
PEBB	(7,312)	(7,613)	(7,057)
Other	(3,275)	(3,432)	(2,814)
OPE	(18,469)	(19,278)	(16,767)
<i>Vacancy Adj.</i>			
<i>Other Adj. to Labor</i>			
Net Personnel	(51,977)	(53,641)	(46,387)
Supplies & Services	(10,477)	(11,683)	(10,239)
<i>Program Investment</i>			
<i>S&S Adjustments</i>			
Total Supplies & Services, Capital Expenses	(10,477)	(11,683)	(10,390)
Cost Reductions and Savings		4,108	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	(62,454)	(61,216)	(56,778)
Net from Operations Before Transfers	1,641	1,638	15,157
Budgeted Transfers	(1,913)	(1,688)	(1,585)
<i>Transfers Adjustments</i>			(7,860)
NET TRANSFERS	(1,913)	(1,688)	(9,445)
Change in Fund Balance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (273)	(50)	5,712
<i>Fund Additional (Deductions) 4 hitting Target EFB</i>			
Beginning Fund Balance	5,354	5,079	5,081
Ending Fund Balance	5,081	5,029	10,793
% Operating Revenues	7.92%	8.00%	15.00%

Revenue Input to Budget Forecast



- One-time funding

Federal Funding Support Summary

	CARES	CRRSAA	ARP	GEER	Total
Federal Funds (Institution portion)	\$ 1,711,039	\$ 4,491,416	\$ 5,456,500	\$ 72,755	\$ 11,731,710
Federal Funds (Strengthening Institutional Programs)	\$ 170,780	\$ 264,474	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 435,254
	\$ 1,881,819	\$ 4,755,890	\$ 5,456,500	\$ 72,755	\$ 12,166,964
Additional CARES Act funding received through the CPB: support to JPR	\$ 224,272	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 224,272
Total Federal Support Funding Coming to the University	\$ 2,106,091	\$ 4,755,890	\$ 5,456,500	\$ 72,755	\$ 12,391,236
Total Federal Support to be issued Directly Students	\$ 1,711,040	\$ 1,711,040	\$ 5,456,500	\$ -	\$ 8,878,580
Total Support	\$ 3,817,131	\$ 6,466,930	\$ 10,913,000	\$ 72,755	\$ 21,269,816

- State Funding 21-23 biennium:
 - W&M co-chairs at \$887M for PUSF
 - SSCM estimate = \$24.5M next FY
(with conservative assumption on pipeline SCH and Dual Credit “losses”)
 - Sports lottery – project \$260K decrease
- Enrollment at -3%
- Tuition at 2.99% increase

21 – 23 Biennium

-3% Enrollment

- PUSF at \$887 (W&M Co-chairs funding level)
- 2.99% Resident increase
- 5% Non-resident increase
- 3% COLAs
- PEBB rates ‘holding steady’
- PERS rates increased
- Furloughs thru 9/6/21
- Includes Federal relief (allocation still pending)
- Outcomes: if we hold tuition down and allow labor increases, creates a **\$3.98M disconnect in FY 22 to maintain 15% KPI**

	2019-21 Biennium			2021-23 Biennium
Education and General <input type="checkbox"/>	2019-20 ACTUAL	2020-21 BUDGET	2020-21 FY Forecast	2021-22 FORECAST
(in thousands of dollars)	(000's)	(000's)	(000's)	(000's)
Revenue				
State Appropriations: SSCM	22,696	23,357	23,559	24,495
<i>One-time Funding Changes</i>			10,358	
Total State Funding (SSCM,ETSF,SELP)	23,074	23,716	34,483	24,873
Tuition	39,365	36,945	35,754	37,290
Fees	3,167	3,373	3,308	3,263
Raider Aid	(3,965)	(3,325)	(3,207)	(3,650)
<i>Oth tuition & fee adjustments</i>				
Tuition, net of Raider Aid	38,567	36,993	35,855	36,903
Misc. Other Revenue	2,453	2,145	1,597	2,458
TOTAL REVENUES	64,095	62,855	71,934	64,236
Personnel Services				
Faculty	(16,083)	(17,419)	(14,910)	(17,113)
Admin	(9,617)	(9,097)	(8,118)	(9,907)
Classified	(6,362)	(6,203)	(5,467)	(6,970)
Student (& Other)	(1,445)	(1,643)	(1,126)	(1,746)
Salaries Total	(33,508)	(34,363)	(29,620)	(35,736)
Retirement (PERS + ORP)	(7,881)	(8,233)	(6,896)	(9,221)
PEBB	(7,312)	(7,613)	(7,057)	(7,410)
Other	(3,275)	(3,432)	(2,814)	(3,395)
OPE	(18,469)	(19,278)	(16,767)	(20,026)
<i>Vacancy Adj.</i>				
<i>Other Adj. to Labor</i>				500
Net Personnel	(51,977)	(53,641)	(46,387)	(55,261)
Supplies & Services	(10,477)	(11,683)	(10,239)	(11,946)
<i>Program Investment</i>				
<i>S&S Adjustments</i>				
Total Supplies & Services, Capital Expenses	(10,477)	(11,683)	(10,390)	(11,946)
Cost Reductions and Savings		4,108		3,986
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	(62,454)	(61,216)	(56,778)	(63,221)
Net from Operations Before Transfers	1,641	1,638	15,157	1,014
Budgeted Transfers	(1,913)	(1,688)	(1,585)	(1,912)
<i>Transfers Adjustments</i>			(7,860)	(260)
NET TRANSFERS	(1,913)	(1,688)	(9,445)	(2,172)
Change in Fund Balance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (273)	(50)	5,712	(1,158)
<i>Fund Additional (Deductions) 4 hitting Target EFB</i>				
Beginning Fund Balance	5,354	5,079	5,081	10,793
Ending Fund Balance	5,081	5,029	10,793	9,635
% Operating Revenues	7.92%	8.00%	15.00%	15.00%

Southern Oregon University – Kings Education Partnership

Higher Education Coordinating Commission Update

Docket Item:

Strategic Roadmap, next steps; and reflections on March 9th Commission meeting relating to higher education structure

Summary:

This docket item summarizes staff recommendations to assist the Commission in concluding the process of creating an updated Strategic Roadmap for Oregon postsecondary education and training. It includes reflections and recommendations related to the special commission meeting held March 9th, 2021.

1. Completing the Strategic Roadmap

Incorporating feedback that staff and the Commission have received over the last several months, HECC staff is confident that the categories of strategies described in the attached draft Strategic Roadmap remain the generally the right directions for the future of Oregon higher education, and we recommend their adoption by the Commission:

*Ensure sustainable funding for Oregon's colleges and universities.
Align statewide higher education and workforce capacity to the needs of Oregonians today.
Right size financial aid to accomplish Oregon's priorities.
Transform and innovate to serve students best.
Make alternative pathways to employment and training available.*

As the draft Strategic Roadmap notes, we recommend that between now and September 2021, the Commission and its staff identify specific opportunities for leadership and partnership in each of these areas, including but not limited to the items detailed in the attached draft. The Commission should determine whether to incorporate those opportunities into the Strategic Roadmap and, in doing so, will indicate what its specific role in the effort will be (leader, partner, convener, etc.).

The remainder of this memo considers the question that was the focus of the Commission's March 9th meeting: "How might we design a process that helps optimize the organization of Oregon higher education so that all learners are served equitably and sustainably?" Through public and legislator testimony and the design workshop on March 9th, as well as a follow-up survey that was sent to meeting participants, the Commission and its staff have received abundant input on how these issues should be addressed. In consideration of this feedback, HECC staff recommends that the Commission not use the Strategic Roadmap to call for a unique and independent process to consider issues of higher education structure and organization, but instead consider those questions in connection with other processes already underway or planned that seek to address specific needs and outcomes for Oregon learners, as described below. This recommendation should not lessen the urgency that the HECC and many of its partners feel about the need for change in higher education to more equitably and successfully serve Oregon learners. Rather, it attempts to harness that spirit in the service of more concrete, directly-impactful actions.

2. All is not awry

When considering the general question of the organization and structure of Oregon's higher education system, HECC staff begins with the premise that there is much that seems to be working about the current system. We note the following:

1. The transition to institutional boards for public universities -- and the creation of the HECC as a consolidated state agency and commission – between 2013-15 resulted in remarkably few disruptive impacts on students and other members of college/university communities, especially given the magnitude of the governance changes.
2. Public university Boards of Trustees are meeting their statutory responsibilities for university governance, as documented in the HECC’s biennial evaluations, and appear to provide a “closer-to-the-ground” perspective than the state governing board they replaced.
3. The HECC has assumed and is successfully fulfilling the state-wide policy making, oversight, student support, and coordination role envisioned by the Legislature serving the whole of higher education in Oregon.
4. Student outcomes continue to improve. Over the last five years, the number of degrees awarded to Oregon resident students has increased by 10%, the number of STEM degrees has increased by 18%, and the number of degrees awarded to students of color has increased by 43%. Completion rates continue to inch upward in both the community college and public university sectors. While large racial/ethnic equity gaps persist for most outcome measures, some of those gaps are narrowing.
5. Since the Great Recession, state funding for higher education has increased more than almost any other state in the country on a per-student basis and, as of 2020, Oregon was one of only seven states where public funding had recovered to its pre-recession levels. Still, Oregon’s funding levels lag the national average by about 15% per student.
6. With the HECC’s adoption in 2015 of an outcomes- and equity-focused funding allocation formula for public universities, and its update in 2021, the Commission has established among the nation’s strongest performance accountability systems for higher education to rely principally on funding incentives to promote positive outcomes, rather than top-down, prescriptive requirements.
7. The HECC has established strong partnerships with institutional leaders and other higher education stakeholders across the postsecondary landscape, including community colleges, public universities, private colleges/universities, trade schools, and other workforce partners. Postsecondary education’s rapid, collaborative, and largely successful response to the COVID crisis was the result, in part, of strong working relationships, including institution-to-institution and between institutions and the HECC/State.

This is only a partial list of accomplishments. But it suggests that HECC and its partners have an opportunity to more clearly and publicly share what is working about the current system, as we build on those strengths to improve it.

Still, numerous stakeholders and some legislators have indicated dissatisfaction with various aspects of the current system. Based on the Commission meeting March 9th and other inputs, we believe there are three broad areas of critique. While they overlap in some respects, they are also different enough to suggest to staff they require different responses.

3. Critique A: Transfer student issues

Sen. Steiner-Hayward’s comments at the March 9th HECC meeting, echoed by Sen. Johnson, epitomized the longstanding, serious, broadly and deeply-felt concern of Commissioners, some legislators, and some other stakeholders that transfer students within Oregon public higher education find the system cumbersome to navigate, resulting in loss of credit or, more typically, credits earned through high schools or at community colleges that are not directly applicable to their eventual degree and major requirements. This system failure imposes increased costs upon the student in the form of additional time and tuition, as well as upon the State. HB 2998, passed in 2017, represented a step in the right direction but, as HECC staff have [previously detailed](#), that legislation failed to include a mechanism for resolving inter-

institutional differences and permits wide variance to persist.

HECC staff is highly encouraged that [SB 233](#), sponsored by Sen. Dembrow and currently under consideration by the Legislature, appears poised to address many of the concerns that we have raised about this issue. Proposed amendments would empower HECC to adopt rules for the establishment of a common course numbering system (by Fall, 2025) and for the continued implementation of the foundational curriculum and major transfer maps created as a result of HB 2998. The bill, with proposed amendments, would place primary responsibility for this work on a faculty- and administrator-based Transfer Council, supported by HECC staff, but would permit the Commission ultimately to ensure that the requirements of the bill are met. By incorporating the HECC-introduced [SB 76](#), it would also provide new navigation tools for students and their advisors. With these amendments, SB 233 would represent groundbreaking legislation that would result in a significantly more coordinated system of public higher education in Oregon.

It is our hope and expectation that SB 233 will establish a process and outcomes that, over the next several years, will set the “transfer issue” largely to rest. While maintaining this system will require continued institutional and HECC staffing -- and ultimately the Commission’s engagement on the most difficult-to-resolve issues that emerge between institutions – we are optimistic that the proposed structure will work. This will require all parts of the system to center our efforts on needs of students and the State, as expressed in our adopted priorities.

4. Critique B: Institutional transparency and accountability

At the Commission meeting on March 9th, as well as in other venues, some stakeholders, including some student and labor representatives, have indicated a desire for greater levels of transparency, state accountability, and/or oversight of public higher education institutions, particularly public universities. Some student leaders and other stakeholders have expressed their perspective that institutional priorities, including for capital projects and philanthropy, are not always student-centered.

In reflecting on these concerns, we note that a *decentralized* system of higher education such as Oregon’s is not inherently an *unaccountable* one. The local elections of community college boards of directors ensure that voters, ultimately, have the final say over the governance of those institutions. For public universities, Boards of Trustees, like the HECC itself, are Governor-appointed, Senate-confirmed entities that must conduct their business in public, consistent with Oregon public meeting law. It should be expected that institutional governing boards will make decisions that are at times unpopular, at least with some constituencies. Under the Oregon system, the public maintains the ability to influence the governance of its public higher education institutions via the ballot box and/or lobbying their elected representatives, over and above the direct access that it has to boards via testimony at public meetings and to board members as public officials.

As a coordinating commission, the HECC does not generally exert authority over the governance of individual higher education institutions. But it is worth noting the role that HECC plays in providing greater transparency into both institutional and systematic issues. The HECC collects student-level data from public institutions and publishes a variety of reports based upon it, including [institutional and sector-level snapshots](#), statewide [Key Performance Measures](#), [public university evaluations](#), and [others](#). Additionally, the HECC collects limited staffing data and annually publishes a legislatively-required [report on higher education employees](#). Finally, the HECC collects financial data from all Oregon community colleges and public universities and uses it for the purpose of informing the public, Commission, and Legislature through tools such as the [Community College Financial Information System](#) (CCFIS) and reports such as its [2021 Report on Financial Conditions of Public Universities](#). The HECC has developed and improved these tools and reports over the years in response to legislative and gubernatorial requests and mandates, as well as in response to the Commission’s adopted Strategic Framework that emphasizes the role of HECC reporting in creating a virtuous cycle of accountability for student success and equity.

Whether justified or not, concerns about transparency and accountability seem to reflect, in part, a view that university boards may sometimes privilege institutional success and well-being over the collective, public interest of Oregonians. On the one hand, it should not be surprising that the boards of public universities – which compete in some arenas for students and resources – would focus principally on ensuring that their institutions flourish in fulfilling their own missions. We should also acknowledge that the mission statements of Oregon’s public universities – which the HECC is legislatively empowered to approve – typically commit those institutions to serve their communities and the State of Oregon. At the same time, it is clear that Oregon higher education has not fully understood the need nor realized its potential to engage board and commission members and their staffs in cross-institutional and cross-sector work to discover common purposes, build a common public agenda, share successful practices, and develop new programs and partnerships. As a coordinating commission, the HECC has a leadership role in fostering these types of interactions and building these relationships within Oregon higher education, public and private. We recommend that as the HECC fleshes out the Strategic Roadmap, it consider emphasizing the need for convening, learning, relationship-building, and disseminating within Oregon higher education, especially at a leadership level.

5. Critique C: Innovation and re-imagination

The third significant category of concern that some legislators and stakeholders have shared that focuses on issues of organization and structure, exemplified by Sen. Courtney’s testimony on March 9th, is that Oregon higher education has failed to be sufficiently bold, innovative, and transformational. Often this critique cites demographic changes, the affordability crisis, the rise of distance learning and other new learning models, and changing employer expectations as among the reasons that higher education must undertake much more profound change than it has undergone so far – including potentially at the systemic and structural level. Proposed “solutions” run the gamut but include institutional mergers, three-year Bachelors degrees, community college-delivered baccalaureates, expanded competency-based education, eliminating the quarter system, online academies, student-ready universities, eliminating testing requirements, etc.¹

One of the five proposed Strategic Roadmap categories (“transform and innovate to serve students best”) reflects the Commission’s lack of satisfaction with the status quo and support for innovation that promotes equity and student success. Now the Commission must consider where we go from here, and what is the HECC’s role? How do we further develop, facilitate, and coordinate an “innovation agenda”?

In general, HECC staff does not believe that it is appropriate, necessary, or fruitful for the Commission to try to unilaterally direct or impose these types of change upon higher education institutions. Successful innovation, especially within a complex and decentralized system like ours, is likeliest to arise from the actors and institutions that are closest to higher education’s core activities of teaching and learning, workforce development, research, and service. That said, the State of Oregon, via the HECC, plays a critical role representing stakeholders’ concerns and their desire for more accessible and effective education opportunities and outcomes for all Oregonians. To promote innovation and transformation, the HECC should:

- Create the right conditions. The HECC can use its existing responsibilities, including for state policy and budget development, funding distributions, program approvals, and reporting, to create incentives for institutional leaders, boards, and other stakeholders to design and implement learner and equity-centered change. For example, the Commission could consider whether to create for public universities a strategic fund, perhaps akin to the strategic fund it

¹ Brian Rosenberg, former president of Macalester College, is among the many higher education leaders nationally to voice this perspective in a recent *Chronicle of Higher Education* column, [It’s Time to Rethink Higher Education](#).

administers for community colleges, that could help defray the initial costs of getting innovations “off the ground” at an institutional level.

- Remove barriers. The HECC will identify and work to remove or reduce state policies that stand in the way of innovation. Moreover, the Commission can actively and publicly support Oregon higher education leaders who take risks for change.
- Plant seeds. While we do not believe that the HECC’s role typically is to design or impose new models for higher education, the Commission and its staff can help promote innovation through information-sharing. We can use our existing ability to analyze what’s happening in other states and at other institutions, spotlighting change that appears to be successful. We can collect and disseminate knowledge and ideas from within Oregon, helping to ensure that it’s broadly shared. Through our reports, our convening, and the public attention we draw to Commission meetings or through news releases, we can use the HECC’s platform to promote transformational opportunities that we believe deserve further exploration.

6. Additional next steps

This memo and the next steps it suggests for HECC will not satisfy everyone, including some of those who have expressed dissatisfaction with Oregon’s current structure and arrangements. While we do not at this time recommend that the HECC call for an independent assessment of Oregon’s higher education structure, we acknowledge that these concerns, for some, are likely to linger. It remains valid for anyone to wonder “whether we got it right” when Oregon’s current structure was established in 2011-15, and to ask, “How can it be improved?” To the extent that the HECC, its partners, and legislators take up these questions – beyond the ways that have already been suggested in this memo -- we recommend doing so in connection with particular and explicit goals, and not abstractly. The legislative Task Force on Student Success for Underrepresented Students ([HB 2590](#)), proposed by Rep. Alonso-Leon, seems to us an appropriate vehicle for evaluating structural questions during the 2021-22 interim. It is right, we think, to view these questions firstly through the prism of how they impact the success of underrepresented students. HECC’s staff stands ready to support the Task Force in evaluating if and how structural issues – along with myriad other dimensions of higher education that are likely to arise – should change in order to respond to the voices and needs of underrepresented students.

Finally, we would suggest that how a person experiences higher education is largely a function of *culture* and *environment* – probably more than the structural dimensions of higher education discussed here. And the quality of those experiences has an enormous impact on the outcomes HECC measures: completion rates, time to degree, equity gaps, etc. Whether the institution’s culture and environment (including physical and non-physical attributes such as curriculum) instills students with a sense of worth and belonging, for example, matters enormously for the student’s success. As HECC and its partners populate the Strategic Roadmap with specific proposals, we encourage them to consider how State, institutional, and other actors can influence the cultural and environmental characteristics of Oregon higher education.

The HECC and other state policymakers may find operating at this level less instinctive than operating on systems and structures, and to require a greater level of nuance. For the Commission, this can start to be achieved by adopting and maintaining a leadership posture that reflects the transformation we wish to see. The Commission can align itself with those who have asked higher education to shift away from its historically dominant mindset of, “Are students ready for college?” to instead, “Are colleges ready for students?” In the Commission’s analysis of underperformance and equity gaps, it can push back against those who situate blame elsewhere (eg individual students, the K-12 system), and instead accept higher education’s responsibility to transform programs, supports, cultures, and environments to meet all Oregonians where they’re at. The Commission can consistently insist that the “underrepresented” populations whom we often portray as “underperforming” – including emerging bilingual Oregonians, members of Indigenous communities, immigrants, and Oregonians who experience racial and ethnic

diversity – in fact represent our State’s greatest potential for meeting the local and global challenges of 21st Century with creativity, compassion, and cross-cultural fluency. The Commission can continue to evaluate Oregon higher education’s success on the basis of how it lifts up disadvantaged individuals and communities, more than any other factor.

This powerful reframing, already internalized by many who work at Oregon colleges and universities, should draw our attention – and that of our partners -- to the levers that must be pulled at different levels to influence results. While those may encompass issues of organizational structure and governance, the Commission and partners are encouraged to address those issues in connection with State goals, other specific objectives of the Strategic Roadmap, and the cultural and environmental context that most directly impacts student experience.

Material:

Draft Higher Education Strategic Roadmap (attached)

Staff Recommendation:

That the Commission endorse the five categories for the Strategic Roadmap, and use the accompanying descriptions, along with the recommendations in this memo, to further develop a set of actions that can be undertaken in partnership with colleges, universities, workforce partners, and other stakeholders, in 2021-23.



STRATEGIC ROADMAP

Oregon Postsecondary Education and Workforce Training

DRAFT April, 2021



BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS (Fall 2019 – Fall 2020)

In August 2019, the HECC launched the development of a new strategic plan for meeting the State’s postsecondary goals, consistent with its responsibilities under ORS 350.075 (d). The Commission expressed that this plan should help generate a new consensus among legislators, institutions, stakeholders, and the Commission about an ambitious path forward for postsecondary education that expands opportunity and equity for Oregonians through increasing levels of public investment, public accountability, coordination, and responsiveness to student and workforce needs.

The Commission determined that a new Strategic Plan should be developed in conjunction with partners, take a holistic view of Oregon’s postsecondary system, be grounded in the [Oregon Equity Lens](#), and anticipate the changes that will be required in order to meet state goals for increased access, affordability, attainment, and equity. It indicated that the completed Plan should not be regarded as a “*HECC* Strategic Plan”, but rather as a roadmap for postsecondary education and training in Oregon generally, with implications not only for the HECC but also for its many partners including the Legislature, Governor, public and private colleges and universities, other education and training partners, as well as faculty, students, and staff.

Between October 2019 and March 2020, HECC and its consulting partner Coraggio Group conducted large-scale public and stakeholder outreach and published key findings in an [Insights Report](#).

Key Findings from Insights Report:

Oregonians do not have positive perceptions of higher education, with concerns ranging from its perceived inefficiency to concerns about declining return on individual and state investment. As a result, Oregon’s education leaders need to forge a compelling “rallying cry” that establishes clarity, focus, and purpose for postsecondary education.

Many stakeholders perceive competition and duplication among higher education institutions, and are confused about who is leading the system’s education and training vision for the future. They seek more cooperation, collaboration, and alignment.

As postsecondary education in Oregon has shifted from a state-funded model to a primarily student-funded model, affordability has diminished. Oregon should simultaneously address both the rising costs of higher education and the insufficient level of public investment.

To meet the needs of Oregon’s increasingly diverse population, higher education must focus resources, including wrap-around services and other supports, on traditionally underserved groups.

Different parts of the state have different needs based on their cultural, geographic, and industry-related uniqueness. While a strategic plan should look holistically, it must contain enough flexibility to respond to unique needs, trends, and opportunities at the regional level with tailored solutions.

With the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, the HECC began to reassess the Strategic Roadmap to take into account the pandemic’s profound economic and educational disruptions and the country’s simultaneous reckoning with racial injustice. The Commission’s [COVID-19 issue brief](#) noted the disproportionate impact of the pandemic on BIPOC communities, continuing racial/ethnic educational equity gaps, severe enrollment declines, and that the majority of pandemic-related unemployment claims were filed by those with a high school diploma or less. It concluded:

“The pandemic has exposed new weaknesses and exacerbated weaknesses in Oregon’s higher education and workforce systems, from the college affordability crisis, to the deep disparities in access and student success for historically underserved populations, to the longstanding funding challenges institutions and programs face. At a time when postsecondary education is more important than ever to help Oregonians recover from the recession, Oregon is losing out on the talents of many students who have chosen not to or are unable to enroll this fall. In addition, unprecedented fiscal uncertainty facing higher education institutions limits their ability to be resilient and to respond flexibly to learner needs. Multiple complementary strategies are necessary to abate the most harmful impacts of the pandemic and to position Oregon for a strong recovery.”


ROADMAP CATEGORIES FOR ACTION (April, 2021)

Taking into account our pre-pandemic outreach and our understanding of pandemic-related impacts, the draft Strategic Roadmap now contains five categories of action for Oregon higher education.



1. Ensure sustainable funding for Oregon's colleges and universities:

Protect and sustain the core funds that support public postsecondary education and training for Oregonians to keep tuition increases moderate and fund necessary programming.



2. Align statewide higher education and workforce capacity to the needs of Oregonians today:

Bolster the statewide capacity of postsecondary education and training to serve Oregonians where they are and who they are, with a focus on the marginalized and underserved.

- Take action to align postsecondary education opportunities statewide to enrollment trends and the needs of Oregon's diverse population.
 - Lead with racial justice and equity in making policy/funding choices.
 - Adopt policies and strategies that encourage in-state and highly mobile students—including transfer students, non-traditional students, and adult learners—to enroll and persist to completion.
-



3. Right size financial aid to accomplish Oregon's priorities:

Protect college affordability for Oregonians who are struggling most by bolstering funding of state-funded financial aid.


- Invest in state financial aid programs.
- Drive more resources to students in need.
- Retool financial aid to work for non-traditional students



4. Transform and innovate to serve students best:

- Invest in the infrastructure and faculty training necessary that makes online education a quality option for students of all backgrounds to choose from.
- Support outreach and flexibility of programming to reach communities of color, non-traditional students, and marginalized communities.
- Ensure student support services are available widely, including remotely when online education is the primary delivery channel.

Support institutions and workforce partners in continuing to transform and redesign the delivery and flexibility of education and training opportunities to meet the needs of today's learners.



5. Make alternative pathways to training and employment broadly accessible:

- Invest state resources to support learners with work-based learning, apprenticeships, career-connected learning, and short-term certificate programs.

Ensure paths to quality employment opportunities are available for those who do not take a traditional collegiate pathway.

THE ROLE OF THE HECC

Since launching this process in 2019, the Commission has envisioned that the Strategic Roadmap should constitute a set of activities for Oregon postsecondary education and training to collectively undertake. The Commission may play a leadership role in some of these activities and a facilitator role in others.

To support the Commission and its staff in clarifying HECC's specific role and responsibility in the work that is to come, HECC staff recommends that the Commission recommit itself to the **four areas of strategic action** that it adopted in its 2017-21 Strategic Framework; namely:

- **REPORTING** to steer progress
- **FUNDING** for success;
- streamlining learner **PATHWAYS**; and
- expanding opportunity through **OUTREACH**.

Staff recommends that these remain the primary avenues through which the HECC will conduct its work.

Action in these areas should be designed to reach HECC goals for **STUDENT SUCCESS, EQUITY, AFFORDABILITY,** and **ECONOMIC & COMMUNITY IMPACT**, as measured by the HECC's KPMs and other measures.

NEXT STEPS (April – September, 2021):

Between April and September 2021, the Commission should work with partners and the public to finalize the Strategic Roadmap categories, further identify specific actions within each category, and determine which entities are responsibility for execution as leaders, as facilitators, or as other participants.

Creation of SOU Staff Assembly

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Considerations of the Board

The Oregon Equity Lens was adopted by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) in 2014 as a cornerstone to the State’s approach to education policy and budgeting. The Equity Lens was originally developed by and adopted by the former Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB), and is implemented by the Oregon Chief Education Office in addition to the HECC.



Oregon Equity Lens: Preamble

In 2011, the Oregon Legislature created the Oregon Education Investment Board, which had a vision of educational equity and excellence for each and every child and learner in Oregon. The OEIB believed that we must ensure sufficient resource is available to guarantee student success, and that the success of every child and learner in Oregon is directly tied to the prosperity of all Oregonians. As the Higher Education Coordinating Commission, with our Oregon education partners, we continue this critical work started by the OEIB and reaffirm that the attainment of a quality education strengthens all Oregon communities and promotes prosperity, to the benefit of us all. It is through educational equity that Oregon will continue to be a wonderful place to live and make progress towards becoming a place of economic, technologic and cultural innovation.

Oregon faces many growing opportunity and systemic gaps that threaten our economic competitiveness and our capacity to innovate. The first is the persistent gap of student growth as measured by graduation rates, state assessments and daily attendance for our growing populations of communities of color, immigrants, migrants, and rural students navigating poverty. While students of color make up 35% of the educational pipeline in our state¹—our opportunity and systemic gaps continue to persist. As our diversity grows and our ability to meet the needs and recognize the strengths of these students remains stagnant or declines—we limit the opportunity of everyone in Oregon. The persistent educational disparities have cost Oregon billions of dollars in lost economic output¹ and these losses are compounded every year we choose not to properly address these inequalities.

The second opportunity gap is one of disparity between Oregon and the rest of the United States. When the OEIB started this work, Oregon’s achievement in state benchmarks had remained stagnant—and in some communities of color had declined—while other states had begun to, or had already surpassed, our statewide rankings. Disparities in educational attainment can translate into economic decline and a loss of competitive and creative capacity for our state. We believe that one of our most critical responsibilities going forward is to implement a set of concrete system changes and policies to deliver a truly student-centric education system that improves outcomes and opportunities for students across Oregon.

The primary focus of the equity lens is on race and ethnicity. While there continues to be a deep commitment to many other areas, we know that a focus on race by everyone connected to the educational milieu allows direct improvements in the other areas. We are committed to explicitly identifying disparities in education outcomes for the purpose of targeting areas for action, intervention and investment. We are simultaneously committed to identifying strengths in communities and promising practices in our educational systems.²

Chief Education Office Vision Statement

Our vision is to build and coordinate a seamless system of education that meets the diverse learning needs of students from cradle to career, and ensures each student graduates high school with the support and opportunities to prosper.

Higher Education Coordinating Commission Vision Statement

The State of Oregon’s Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) is dedicated to fostering and sustaining the best, most rewarding pathways to opportunity and success for all Oregonians through an accessible, affordable and coordinated network for educational achievement beyond high school.

Oregon Equity Lens: Beliefs

We believe that everyone has the ability to learn and that we have an ethical and moral responsibility to ensure an education system that provides optimal learning environments that lead students to be prepared for their individual futures.

We believe that speaking a language other than English is an asset and that our education system must celebrate and enhance this ability alongside appropriate and culturally responsive support for English as a second language.

We believe students receiving special education services are an integral part of our educational responsibility and we must welcome the opportunity to be inclusive, make appropriate accommodations, and celebrate their assets. We must directly address the over-representation of children of color in special education and the under-representation in “talented and gifted.”

We believe that the students who have previously been described as “at-risk,” “underperforming,” “under-represented,” or minority actually represent Oregon’s best opportunity to improve overall educational outcomes. We have many counties in rural and urban communities that already have populations of color that make up the majority. Our ability to meet the needs of this increasingly diverse population is a critical strategy for us to successfully reach our State education goals.

We believe that intentional and proven practices must be implemented to return out of school youth to the appropriate and culturally sustaining educational setting. We recognize that this will require us to challenge and change our current educational setting to be more culturally responsive, safe, and responsive to the significant number of elementary, middle, and high school students who are currently out of school. We must make our schools safe for every learner.

We believe that ending disparities and gaps in achievement begin in the delivery of quality Early Learner programs and culturally appropriate family engagement and support. This is not simply an expansion of services—it is a recognition that we need to provide services in a way that best meets the needs of our most diverse segment of the population—0-5 year olds and their families.

We believe that resource allocation demonstrates our priorities and our values and that we demonstrate our priorities and our commitment to rural communities, communities of color, English language learners, and out of school youth in the ways we allocate resources and make educational investments.

We believe that communities, parents, teachers, and community-based organizations have unique and important solutions to improving outcomes for our students and educational systems. Our work will only be successful if we are able to truly partner with the community, engage with respect, authentically listen, and have the courage to share decision-making, control, and resources.

We believe every learner should have access to information about a broad array of career opportunities and apprenticeships. These will show them multiple paths to employment yielding family-wage incomes without diminishing the responsibility to ensure that each learner is prepared with the requisite skills to make choices for their future.

We believe that our community colleges and university systems have a critical role in serving our diverse populations, rural communities, emerging bi-lingual students and students with disabilities. Our institutions of higher education, and the P-20 system, will truly offer the best educational experience when their campus faculty, staff and students reflect this state, its growing diversity and the ability for all of these populations to be educationally successful and ultimately employed.

We believe the rich history and culture of learners is a source of pride and an asset to embrace and celebrate.

Finally, we believe in the importance of supporting great teaching. Research is clear that “teachers are among the most powerful influences in (student) learning.”³ An equitable education system requires providing teachers with the tools and support to meet the needs of each student, and a dedicated effort to increase the culturally and linguistically diverse educators who reflect Oregon’s rapidly changing student population.

Case for Equity

Oregonians have a shared destiny.

Individuals within a community and communities within a larger society need the ability to shape their own present and future, and we believe that education is a fundamental aspect of Oregon’s ability to thrive. Equity is both the means to educational success and an end that benefits us all. Equity requires the intentional examination of systemic policies and practices that, even if they have the appearance of fairness, may in effect serve to marginalize some and perpetuate disparities. Data are clear that Oregon demographics have been changing to provide rich diversity in race, ethnicity, and language.⁴ Working toward equity requires an understanding of historical contexts and the active investment in changing social structures and practice over time to ensure that students from all communities have the opportunities and support to realize their full potential.

Oregon Equity Lens: Purpose

The purpose of the Equity Lens is to clearly articulate the shared goals we have for our state, the intentional policies, investments and systemic change we will make to reach our goals of an equitable educational system, and to create clear accountability structures to ensure that we are actively making progress and correcting where there is not progress. As the Chief Education Office executes its charge to align and build a cradle to career education system and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission executes its charge to foster pathways for postsecondary success, an equity lens is useful to ensure every learner is adequately prepared by educators for meaningful contributions to society.

The Equity Lens confirms the importance of recognizing institutional and systemic barriers and discriminatory practices that have limited access and success for many students in the Oregon education system. The Equity Lens emphasizes historically underserved students, such as out of school youth, emerging bilingual students (English language learners), and students in some communities of color and some rural geographical locations, with a particular focus on racial equity. The result of creating a culture of equity will focus on the outcomes of academic proficiency, civic awareness, workplace literacy, and personal integrity. The system outcomes will focus on resource allocation, engagement, communications, data collection and analysis and educator hiring, preparation, and development.

Oregon Equity Lens: Objectives

By utilizing the Equity Lens, the Higher Education Coordinating Commission aims to provide a common vocabulary and protocol for resource allocation, partnership, engagement, and strategic initiatives to support students and communities.

The following questions will be considered for resource allocation and evaluating strategic investments:

1. Who are the racial/ethnic and underserved groups affected? What is the potential impact of the resource allocation and strategic investment to these groups?

2. Does the decision being made ignore or worsen existing disparities or produce other unintended consequences? What is the impact on eliminating the opportunity gap?

3. How does the investment or resource allocation advance opportunities for historically underserved students and communities?

4. What are the barriers to more equitable outcomes? (e.g. mandated, political, emotional, financial, programmatic or managerial)

5. How have you intentionally involved stakeholders who are also members of the communities affected by the strategic investment or resource allocation? How do you validate your assessment in (1), (2) and (3)?

6. How will you modify or enhance your strategies to ensure each learner and communities' individual and cultural needs are met?

7. How are you collecting data on race, ethnicity, and native language?

8. What is your commitment to P-20 professional learning for equity? What resources are you allocating for training in cultural responsive instruction?

Creating a culture of equity requires monitoring, encouragement, resources, data, and opportunity. The HECC will apply the Equity Lens to policy recommendations, and internal, and external practices as education leaders.

Oregon Equity Lens: Definitions

Equity: Equity in education is the notion that each and every learner will receive the necessary resources they need individually to thrive in Oregon’s schools no matter what their national origin, race, gender, sexual orientation, differently abled, first language, or other distinguishing characteristic.

Underserved Students: Students whom systems have placed at risk because the systems have operationalized deficit-based thinking. Deficit thinking is the practice of having lower expectations for certain groups of people based on demographics or characteristics that they share. In doing so, an “at-risk” narrative is formed, in which students navigating poverty, culturally and linguistically diverse students, and/or historically underserved groups, and their families are pathologized and marginalized. This includes students who are treated differently because of their gender, race, sexual orientation, dis/ability, and geographic location. Many students are not served well in our education system because of the conscious and unconscious bias, stereotyping, and racism that is embedded within our current inequitable education system.

Race: Race is a social—not biological—construct. We understand the term “race” to mean a racial or ethnic group that is generally recognized in society and often by government. When referring to those groups, we often use the terminology “people of color” or “communities of color” (or a name of the specific racial and/or ethnic group) and “white.” We also understand that racial and ethnic categories differ internationally, and that many local communities are international communities. In some societies, ethnic, religious and caste groups are oppressed and racialized. These dynamics can occur even when the oppressed group is numerically in the majority.

White Privilege: A term used to identify the privileges, opportunities, and gratuities offered by society to those who are white.

Embedded Racial Inequality: Embedded racial inequalities are also easily produced and reproduced—usually without the intention of doing so and without even a reference to race. These can be policies and practices that intentionally and unintentionally enable white privilege to be reinforced.

40-40-20: In 2011, the State of Oregon enacted legislation (ORS 350.014) creating the 40-40-20 educational attainment goal: that by 2025 all Oregonians will hold a high school diploma or equivalent, 40% of them will have an associate’s degree or a meaningful postsecondary certificate, and 40% will hold a bachelor’s degree or advanced degree.⁵ 40-40-20 means representation of every student in Oregon, including students of color.

Disproportionality: Over-representation of students of color in areas that impact their access to educational attainment. This term is a statistical concept that actualizes the disparities across student groups.

Opportunity Gap: The lack of opportunity that many social groups face in our common quest for educational attainment and the shift of attention from the current overwhelming emphasis on schools in discussions of the opportunity gap to more fundamental questions about social and educational opportunity.⁶

Culturally Responsive: Recognize the diverse cultural characteristics of learners as assets. Culturally responsive teaching empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills and attitudes.⁷

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate.

² Alliance for Excellent Education. (November 2011). *The high cost of high school dropouts: What the nation pays for inadequate high schools.*

³ Hattie, J. (2009), *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to student achievement.* P. 238.

⁴ ODE (2016), *Oregon Statewide Report Card, 2015-16: An Annual Report to the Legislature on Oregon Public Schools.*

⁵ *The Opportunity Gap* (2007). Edited by Carol DeShano da Silva, James Philip Huguley, Zenub Kakli, and Radhika Rao.

⁶ The 40-40-20 statute was updated with the passage of HB 2311 (2017), refocusing it on students in the educational pipeline.

⁷ Ladson-Billings, Gloria (2009- Second Edition, 1994). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children*; Gay, Geneva (2010). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

* NOTE: *The Equity Lens* was edited in 2017 by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission with technical and data related updates.

Governance Work Group Recommendation (Action)

**Southern Oregon University
Board of Trustees
Governance Work Group**

RECOMMENDATION

Better-Incorporate Governance

Regarding the governance function of the Board of Trustees of Southern Oregon University, the Governance Work Group recommends the Board of Trustees better-incorporate matters of governance into the work of the Executive and Audit Committee. The Governance Work Group does not recommend the creation of a standalone Governance Committee at this time.

Identify a Work Plan

To enable improvements in the incorporation of governance matters, the Governance Work Group recommends that it determine agenda items necessary for the Executive and Audit Committee's and Board of Trustees' review and/or action, develop a schedule for the formal consideration of those items, and identify possible deliverables for the committee's and the board's approval. The agenda topics, schedule, and deliverables will be available for the board's review and approval at the next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Composition of the Governance Work Group

The Governance Work Group also recommends that the work group maintain its current membership composition. Additionally, the work group may invite a rotating trustee guest to its meetings or to contribute to its work based on the subject matter being discussed, various trustees' expertise, or trustees' interest in participating with the work group. The Governance Work Group will report to the board its progress.

One Year Pilot

The Governance Work Group further recommends that the board pilot this course of action through June of 2022. At that time, the Governance Work Group will submit a final report to the Executive and Audit Committee and the Board of Trustees. The final report will describe the group's work, accomplishments, challenges, other pertinent details of the pilot period, and ultimately, will make a final recommendation on the structure of the governance function of the Board of Trustees.

Presidential Search Matters

Policy on Executive Searches, Appointments and Management (Action)

Presidential Search Guidelines



Presidential Search Committee

2016 COMMITTEE OVERVIEW

The Presidential Search Committee is charged with assisting the Board in identifying, recruiting, evaluating and recommending possible candidates for the position of university president. This Committee will forward recommended finalists to the Board of Trustees for consideration. The Presidential Search Committee consists of trustees (5), faculty (3), students (2), staff (2), another Oregon university president (1), and community members (2). Six ex officio, non-voting members serve the Committee in a coordinating or advisory capacity.

It is important to note that the Presidential Search SOU Board of Trustees will Committee will not select or appoint the university president; this is solely the responsibility of the SOU Board of Trustees. Final decisions by the be made as part of a public meeting and all of the Board's deliberations and discussions leading to a final decision will be in accordance with Oregon's public meeting laws.

Duties of the Committee or members of the Committee may include but are not limited to:

- Development of a position profile (position description) and related documents for the position of SOU President;
- Pre-screening of applicants and narrowing of the applicant pool;
- Interviewing selected candidates as necessary;
- Providing the Board Chair with candidate recommendations;
- Other duties and activities as necessary for recruiting, information gathering, evaluation, management and administration of the search.

Members:

Lyn Hennion, Chair; Paul Nicholson, Vice Chair; Ed Battistella, Ph.D.; Amy Belcastro, Ph.D.; Jeffrey DeBoer; Darius Kila; Chris Maples, Ph.D.; Colleen Martin-Low; Joan McBee, DBA; Tamara Nordin; Teresa Sayre; Dennis Slattery; Chris Stanek; Torii Uyehara; and Shea Washington.

Ex Officio Members (non-voting):

Jason Catz; Janet Fratella; Craig Morris; Sabrina Prud'homme, Search Coordinator; Marjorie Trueblood-Gamble; Sue Walsh, Ph.D.

2016 Presidential Search Committee

MEMBERSHIP GUIDELINES

- I. **Confidentiality:** All Committee members shall keep in strict confidence all information to which they have access by virtue of their Committee membership. This obligation shall continue even after the Committee completes its work and includes, without limitation, the following:
- A. the identity of all candidates whose names are submitted to or considered by the Committee or members of the Committee;
 - B. the content of all written materials or other information (including electronically transmitted information) acquired by the Committee regarding such candidates, whether received from the candidate, the search firm or some other source;
 - C. all deliberations of the Committee including, without limitation, questions and answers from candidate interviews and all views expressed by Committee members, the search firm or outside contributors, about given candidates; and
 - D. any documents distributed for the purpose of conducting or participating in Committee business or meetings, whether by way of electronic or traditional mail, facsimile or photocopy.

The Chair of the Committee (or designee, as appropriate) has the sole authority to disseminate information to individuals other than members of the Committee and its staff about the Committee's deliberations and the candidates under consideration by the Committee.

No Committee member may solicit from non-committee members, whether at SOU, at a candidate's current or previous place of employment, or elsewhere, comments or opinions regarding any particular candidate except as authorized by the Chair. Committee members are not to discuss the status of the Committee's actions with non-committee members.

- II. **Open Search:** In an open search, confidentiality remains key. The Committee will deliberate in confidence and information about the search candidates will not be shared publicly until final candidates are announced.
- III. **Spokesperson:** Only the Chair of the Board of Trustees (or designee, as appropriate) has the authority to speak with the press or others publicly, whether on or off the record, about the search, the Committee's work or deliberations. Members should send any inquiries, from on or off campus, to the Search Coordinator, who will manage information requests and work with the Board and/or Committee Chair to respond as appropriate.
- IV. **Attendance:** Attendance at all meetings is mandatory. Exceptions will be made for illness and emergent situations, including conflicts beyond a member's control. Repeated absences will be a basis for removal from the Committee. If removal from the Committee is deemed necessary, the Chair of the Board of Trustees, in

consultation with the Chair of the Presidential Search Committee, shall appoint a new member. Committee members may not send substitutes to meetings.

- V. **Non-discrimination:** Southern Oregon University is an Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Employer. The Committee should never utilize any criteria related to “protected classes” under federal and state law to screen or question candidates. If you have additional questions in this area, please consult Human Resources.
- VI. **Compliance:** Compliance with these membership guidelines is a prerequisite of Committee membership. Any violation may result in removal from the Committee.

For Discussion Purposes Only

Engagement of Executive Search Firm (Action)

General Timeline

Next Steps

Future Meetings

Adjournment