1. Call to Order/Roll/Declaration of Quorum
2. Open Comment
   To sign up for Open Comment, go to www.pdx.edu/board/sign-up-for-open-comment
3. Opening Comments and Reports
   a. Comments from Presiding Officer of the Portland State University Faculty Senate
      Faculty Senate President Gina Greco will share comments with the Board.
   b. Report from the President
4. Consent Agenda
   a. Approval of Minutes from June 11, 2015 Meeting
      Meeting Minutes June 11, 2015 - Page 3
   b. Approval of Minutes from July 31, 2015 Special Meeting
      Meeting Minutes July 31, 2015 - Page 10
5. Reports of Standing Committees of the Board
   a. Executive and Audit Committee
   b. Academic and Student Affairs Committee
   c. Finance and Administration Committee
6. Possible Executive Session
   The Board may go into executive session pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(i), to review and evaluate the employment-related performance of the chief executive officer of the University and ORS 192.660(2)(f), to consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection.
7. Action Items
   a. Approval of President Wiewel's Annual Goals
      Pursuant to the Board's Policy on Evaluation of the President, the Board will be asked to approve President Wiewel's goals for the upcoming year and three to five years.
      Cover Sheet: Approval of President’s Goals - Page 12
      Goals 2015-16 - Page 13
8. Discussion Items
   a. Strategic Plan
      The Board will be updated regarding strategic planning and the current state of the draft strategic plan, which is expected to be brought back to the Board for approval in December.
      Cover Sheet: Strategic Planning Update - Page 14
      Draft Strategic Clarity - Page 15
      Draft Strategic Plan Goals and Initiatives - Page 16
   b. Introduction to Interest-Based Bargaining Process
      PSU-AAUP President Pam Miller, PSUFA President Kelly Cowan, and PSU Vice Provost Shelly Chabon, will introduce the Board to the interest-based bargaining process being utilized by the administration and faculty collective bargaining teams.
   c. Orientation Session: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
      Dean Karen Marrongelle will provide an introduction to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
   d. HECC Evaluation of Universities with Governing Boards
      HECC Executive Director Ben Cannon will discuss the HECC's role and plans regarding evaluation of the University.
      Cover Sheet: University Evaluation Process and Framework - Page 24
      Draft University Evaluation Process and Framework - Page 26
9. Adjourn
Meeting #9  
June 11, 2015  
University Place Hotel, Willamette Falls Room  
12:00 PM – 5:00 PM  

Minutes

Board Members Present: Swati Adarkar, Erica Bestpitch, Gale Castillo, Sho Dozono, Maria Carolina Gonzalez-Prats, Maude Hines, Thomas Imeson, Margaret Kirkpatrick, Irving Levin, Rick Miller, Christine Vernier, Chair Nickerson and Wim Wiewel (ex-officio).

Board Members Not Present: Peter Stott, Fariborz Maseeh

1. Call to Order/Roll/ Declaration of Quorum

Chair Nickerson called the meeting to Order at 12:09 p.m. Roll was taken, a quorum was present, and the meeting proceeded.

2. Open Comment

The following individuals spoke to the Board for three minutes each: Gary Brodowicz, Ethel Timzen, Romain Bonilla, Lu Whippes, Scout Zabel, Alyssa Pagan, Leanne Serbulo, Alley Valkyrie for Brianna Holgate, and Sheena Sisk.

3. Opening Comments and Reports

   a. Comments from Bob Liebman, Presiding Officer of the Portland State Faculty Senate

      Bob Liebman introduced Gina Greco, Faculty Senate Presiding Officer-Elect, and provided a brief overview of last year’s accomplishments.

   b. Comments from Eric Noll, President of the Associated Students of Portland State University, and Rayleen McMillen, Vice President of the Associated Student of Portland State University

      Eric Noll and Rayleen McMillen provided a brief overview of the last year as President and Vice-President of ASPSU. They introduced Dana Ghazi and David Martinez. The new student government asked the Board to delay the vote on the Management and Implementation Plan regarding the transition of Campus Public Safety to a bifurcated department with both sworn and unsworn officers.
c. **Report from the President**

The President updated the Board regarding enrollment numbers. Enrollment numbers for Spring Term 2015 are as follows:

- Headcount is 25,765, down 211 or 0.8%
- Student credit hours (SCH) is 261,001, down 1,663 or 0.6%
- Non-resident SCH is up 5.2%
- Resident SCH is down 2.2%

Preliminary numbers for Summer Term 2015 are as follows:

- Headcount is 10,254, up 59 or 0.6%
- SCH: is 82,623, up 397 or 0.5%

New *domestic* freshman and transfer applications are up 15% from this time last year. Admitted students are up 25% from this time last year. Students who have indicated an intent to enroll is up 10% from this time last year.

New *international* freshman and transfer applications are up 7% from this time last year. Students who have indicated an intent to enroll is up to 34% from this time last year.

Ten students won Fulbright and Boren grants for international study and four students received the US Department of State critical lingual scholarship.

PSU’s Office of Academic Innovation received the national award for Excellence in Constituent Service for the development and implementation of the web-based Adviser Portal tool.

Jennifer Allen, Public Administration, was appointed to the Oregon State Parks and Recreation Commission.

Julie Esparza Brown, Graduate School of Education, won a seat on the Portland Public School Board, Zone 1.

Mark Weislogel, a mechanical engineering professor, graduate student Ryan Jenson, and Ph.D candidate Andrew Wollman, with the help of NASA astronaut Don Pettit, created the Zero-G espresso cup, which was officially launched into space last month.

Four more PSU graduate programs are now ranked among the top 25 in the nation: Biology, Linguistics, Social Work, and Urban and Regional Planning.

Elex Biotech, a startup company co-founded by researchers Drs. Robert Strongin (CLAS/Chemistry) and Jonathan Abramson (CLAS/Physics), received $220,000 to support the development of novel compounds for treatment of arrhythmias.
Laurel Singer (Graduate School of Education) received $414,000 from the Oregon Department of Education in support of the Oregon Early Learning Hub, a coordinating organization that provides educational resources focused on children and families.

Wayne Wakeland (Systems Science) received $185,000 from the Brain Trauma Evidence-based Consortium to develop a clinically useful classification system for traumatic brain injury.

PSU, in collaboration with OHSU, OSU, and U of O, has launched Innovate Collaborate Oregon a searchable technology portal designed to promote interaction between industry and Oregon’s research universities.

The President updated the Board regarding recent fundraising successes. We are planning to launch the silent phase of a $300M campaign in July. The 2015 Wine and Roses was held on May 29 and set a new record with $440,000 in donations, which is $80,000 more than last year.

A construction manager has been hired for the Stott Center project and the design team continues its work. Groundbreaking is scheduled for early 2016 and completion by spring 2018.

We are anticipating design review approval for the School of Business Administration project in July. Groundbreaking is scheduled for late summer (ceremony not scheduled yet) and completion by fall 2017.

A request for proposal seeking development ideas for University Place Hotel property resulted in 2 offers to purchase the property. Upon review, a decision has been made to not sell or develop the property at this time.

The Legislative session is drawing to a close. We expect to receive an additional $15M to $35M above the co-chairs recommendation of $670M for the operations of all 7 institutions for the biennium. We are also asking the Legislature for an additional appropriation in the February 2016 session. If we are able to reach the $755M total appropriation target by the end of the February session, we have agreed to increase tuition for resident undergraduates by no more than 2% for 2016-17. Regarding capital funds, we expect that the Oregon universities will collectively benefit from a deferred maintenance pool in the range of $50M to $71.9M. We also feel very optimistic about the likelihood that the Legislature will approve $55M to $60M in state-issued bonds for Neuberger Hall.

The Annual President’s Diversity Awards ceremony was held on May 20. Seventeen students, faculty, staff, alumni and donors were honored for their leadership in promoting diversity at Portland State University. There are many multicultural graduation ceremonies scheduled to occur over the next week: Honor Day graduation (recognizing Native American, Alaska Native and Asian Pacific Islander graduates); Lavender Graduation (recognizing LGBT graduates); Multicultural Graduation
(recognizing undergraduate and graduate diverse students); and Las Mujeres Latin’s Graduation (recognizing Latino and Latina graduates).

The administration and AAUP’s collective bargaining teams have begun bargaining using an interest-based bargaining (IBB) approach. Both parties agree to continue facilitated bargaining meetings through the summer. The teams have agreed upon ground rules for the negotiations and have identified issues and articles for the initial bargaining session. We believe both teams are committed to the IBB process and also realize that we have some significant challenges ahead of us. There will be a briefing regarding this bargaining process in September. In addition, the administration and PSUFA’s collective bargaining teams have also agreed to utilize an IBB bargaining model and will begin training shortly. SEIU bargaining is continuing at a state-wide level.

Finally, the strategic planning process continue. The 8 topic teams have made considerable progress. There will a writing team that prepares a draft of the plan over the summer. We anticipate a draft plan by October and will report to the Board at the December meeting.

4. Consent Agenda

a. Approval of the minutes from the March 12, 2015 meeting.

ACTION: Kirkpatrick moved to approve the minutes. Dozono seconded. The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

5. Reports of Standing Committees of the Board

a. Executive and Audit Committee

Chair Nickerson reported that the Executive and Audit Committee met on April 8, 2015 and May 27, 2015.

At the April 8, 2015 meeting, on behalf of the full Board, the Committee approved the Resolution Approving Internal Financing for School of Business Administration and Stott Center/Viking Pavilion Projects. The resolution is published on the Board’s website. This action was necessary to assure that the University could certify that it had set aside the matching funds necessary for the state to issue the full amount of bonds authorized for the Stott Center and School of Business projects. This was a short-term and time-sensitive need to increase the amount that the University could borrow from its own funds for a particular purpose, and was necessary so that critical capital projects could proceed as planned.

At the May 27, 2015 meeting, on behalf of the full Board, the Committee approved the Resolution Acknowledging Institutional Responsibilities Under Program Participation Agreement Related to Title IV Financial Assistance Programs. The resolution is published on the Board’s website. This action was necessary to comply with US Department of Education requirements that apply when a public university experiences a change in governance. In such a case, the new governing authority is required to acknowledge the institution’s
responsibilities to the federal government as a recipient of federal student aid funds. This was a time-sensitive necessity handled by the Executive and Audit Committee.

In addition, at the May meeting, the Committee received a status report from our Internal Auditor on the status of the annual audit plan and the completed audit of the Athletics department. The Committee finalized a new Policy on the Evaluation of the President, which is on the agenda for full Board approval. And the Committee spent considerable time discussing the President’s contract and is recommending a new three-year contract for the full Board’s approval.

b. Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Margaret Kirkpatrick, Chair of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, reported that the Committee met twice since the March Board meeting.

At the committee’s April 7, 2015 meeting, Vice President John Fraire for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs and Provost Sona Andrews presented information about costs and affordability at PSU. The committee also discussed PSU’s Achievement Compact with the State.

At the committee’s May 8, 2015 meeting, the committee approved the B.S. Quantitative Economics Academic Program Proposal. The committee also voted to recommend PSU’s Achievement Compact with the State, which is on the agenda for consideration by the full Board. The committee also received a budget update from an academic and student affairs perspective and was presented with an overview of the School of Public Health Initiative.

c. Finance and Administration Committee

Rick Miller, Chair of the Finance and Administration Committee, reported that the Committee met on May 28, 2015. At that meeting, the committee received a briefing regarding the University’s minority, women and emerging small businesses (MWESB) contracting program and statistics and expressed its agreement that the University should continue to expand of purchasing from MWESB contractors. The committee also received a briefing from Penny Burgess, Director of Treasury Operations for the University Shared Services Enterprise (USSE), regarding investment strategies for university funds. The committee reviewed Q3 2014-15 financial reports and a comparison of budget-to-actuals. The committee then spent the remainder of its meeting reviewing the 2015-16 University budget, which is to be presented to the full Board for approval.

6. Action Items

a. Achievement Compact

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommends approval by the Board of the University’s 2015-16 Achievement Compact. Provost Sona Andrews explained the purpose and elements of the compact, and the status of legislation that is likely to eliminate the compacts going forward.
ACTION: Hines moved to approve the Achievement Compact as presented. Vernier seconded. The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

b. 2015-2016 Budget

The Finance and Administration Committee recommends approval by the Board of the University’s 2015-16 budget. Vice President of Finance and Administration Kevin Reynolds and Alan Finn provided a brief overview of the recommended 2015-16 budget. The proposed budget is balanced and provides units with their current budget plus three percent. The budget forecasts one percent revenue growth, which could be the result of enrollment growth or a change in the mix of students. Revenue from such growth would fund additional student remissions, the cost of the growth itself, and strategic investments. Vice President Reynolds noted that the budget does not spend all available funds, in part because of remaining uncertainties regarding the state appropriation and enrollment.

ACTION: Levin moved to approve the resolution. Vernier seconded. The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

c. Policy on Evaluation of the President

The Executive and Audit Committee recommends to the Board approval of a new policy regarding presidential evaluation. Chair Nickerson explained the history and the development of the policy. At its meeting on December 11, 2014, the Board requested that the Executive and Audit Committee return to the full Board in June 2015 with a Board policy on presidential evaluation. The policy was prepared in consultation with the President. It is derived from principles and examples contained in the AGB publication Assessing Presidential Effectiveness (Morrill, 2010).

ACTION: Miller moved to approve the policy. Castillo seconded. The vote was unanimous. The motion passed.

d. Presidential Contract

The Executive and Audit Committee recommends to the Board approval of a new three-year employment agreement with Presidential Wim Wiewel. Chair Nickerson explained that the proposed new employment agreement is based on AGB’s Model Employment Agreement for university presidents, modified to incorporate terms from the President’s current contract and Oregon law, as applicable.

ACTION: Castillo moved to approve the contract. Levin seconded.

Gonzalez-Prats moved that the Chair should seek to renegotiate the employment agreement to increase the president’s current salary and to lower the President’s salary upon his return to the faculty to be no greater than the highest paid faculty. Bestpitch seconded the motion.
The vote was two yeas (Gonzalez-Prats, Bestpitch), ten nays (Adarkar, Castillo, Dozono, Hines, Imeson, Kirkpatrick, Levin, Miller, Vernier, Nickerson) and zero abstentions. The motion did not pass.

Hines moved that the Chair should seek to renegotiate the employment agreement so that: 1) the sabbatical terms are the same as the terms generally available to members of the faculty; 2) the difference in salary during a sabbatical be added to the President’s salary during the next three years; and 3) the President’s salary upon joining the faculty after his presidency be $1,000 greater than the then-highest paid faculty member. Gonzalez-Prats seconded the motion.

The vote was three yeas (Bestpitch, Hines, Gonzalez-Prats), nine nays (Adarkar, Castillo, Dozono, Imeson, Kirkpatrick, Levin, Miller, Vernier, Nickerson) and zero abstentions. The motion did not pass.

A vote on the original motion was called for. The vote was nine yeas (Adarkar, Castillo, Dozono, Imeson, Kirkpatrick, Levin, Miller, and Verner), one nay (Gonzalez-Prats), and two abstentions (Bestpitch and Hines).

e. Campus Safety Management and Implementation Plan

The Special Committee on Campus Public Safety recommends to the Board approval of the Management and Implementation Plan regarding transition Campus Public Safety to a bifurcated department with both sworn and unsworn officers.

During the Board discussion, IAC member Marlene Howell asked to address the Board. Howell asked to have her name removed from the report.

ACTION: Castillo moved to approve the report. Levin seconded. The vote was nine yeas (Bestpitch, Castillo, Dozono, Imeson, Kirkpatrick, Levin, Miller, Vernier, Nickerson), three nays (Adarkar, Gonzalez-Prats, Hines), and zero abstentions. The motion passed.

7. Discussion Items

a. Orientation Session: College of the Urban and Public Affairs

Dean Stephen Percy provided an introduction to the College of Urban and Public Affairs.

b. Research and Strategic Partnerships Presentation and Tour

Due to the lateness of the time, Vice President Jon Fink offered to defer his presentation regarding research at PSU and to move instead immediately to a tour of the Science Research and Teaching Center (SRTC) and the laboratory of Dr. Tami Claire. The tour occurred immediately after the meeting adjourned.

8. Adjourn

Chair Nickerson adjourned the meeting at 4:47 p.m.
Minutes

Board Members Present: Swati Adarkar (conference call), Erica Bestpitch (conference call), Gale Castillo (conference call), Thomas Imeson, Margaret Kirkpatrick, Irving Levin (conference call), Rick Miller (conference call), Pete Nickerson, Peter Stott (conference call), Christine Vernier, and Wim Wiewel (ex-officio).

Board Member(s) Not Present: Sho Dozono, Carolina Gonzalez-Prats, Maude Hines, Margaret Kirkpatrick, and Fariborz Maseeh.

1. Call to Order/Roll/ Declaration of Quorum

Chair Nickerson called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Roll was called and a quorum was established.

2. Resolution Revising 2015-16 Tuition Rates.

President Wiewel reminded the Board that on March 12, 2015, the Board considered and approved a recommendation that tuition and mandatory student fees for the 2015-16 academic year be increased. At that time, the level of support for the University from the State of Oregon for the 2015-17 biennium was unknown. The recommendation in March was based on an assumption that state funding would be at the level proposed by the co-chairs of the Legislature’s Joint Committee on Ways and Means. President Wiewel stated his intent, and the Board expressed its agreement, to bring forward a reduction of the recommended tuition increase in the event that student funding for the 2015-17 biennium is greater than the amount previously anticipated.

In June, the Legislature approved, and the Governor signed, a 2015-17 appropriation bill that provides Oregon’s seven public universities with approximately $30 million more than had been anticipated at the time that the tuition increase was considered. The Legislature expressed its expectation that these additional funds be used to address affordability and improved student retention and graduation.

The President now recommends that the Committee reduce the approved tuition increase for resident undergraduate students from a $7 per credit hour increase to a $5 per credit hour increase. This would reduce the overall increase in tuition and mandatory fees for a full-time
resident undergraduate student to approximately 3%. He does not recommend revision to the previously approved tuition rates for graduate or non-resident students or to the previously approved mandatory fees.

Reducing the tuition increase in this manner is intended to improve affordability for resident undergraduate students, maintain a balanced University budget, provide additional funding for strategic investments associated with student success, and permit for enhanced risk mitigation and reserves.

ACTION: Castillo moved that the resolution reducing tuition as proposed be approved. Vernier seconded. The motion passed unanimously. The resolution was approved.

3. Adjourn

Chair Nickerson adjourned the meeting at 10:30 am.
AGENDA ITEM: 7.a.

DATE: September 10, 2015

TITLE: Approval of President’s Goals

COMMITTEE ACTION: The Executive and Audit Committee discussed the President’s evaluation and goals on August 26, 2015.

SUMMARY OF ITEM: The Board’s Policy on Evaluation of the President states that President will present his goals to the full Board for approval at the Board’s September Board meeting. The approved goals will then be relevant for future years’ evaluations.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE DISCUSSION: The Committee discussed the President’s evaluation and self-assessment in executive session. Feedback from the Committee will be provided by the Chair to the President to occur during the week of September 7th and prior to the full Board meeting. Following that meeting between the Chair and the President, the proposed goals will be provided to the trustees and added to the Board docket.

REQUESTED BOARD ACTION: A motion to approve the President’s goals for the next 3-5 years.

ATTACHED BACKGROUND READING: None at this time. The proposed goals for the President will be provided to the trustees under separate cover and will be added to the docket once they are available.
PRESIDENT’S GOALS 2015-2016

With the adoption of the new Strategic Plan (hopefully in December), PSU will have a new roadmap to help guide our development over the next five years. Specific initiatives in the plan align with many existing priorities. Thus, we already know that there are a number of new and ongoing efforts that will continue over the next several years. Below are the key goals for the institution; these may be adjusted once the strategic plan is finalized.

One year goals

- Complete the year-seven NWCCU re-accreditation process.
- Obtain additional $55 million in biennial funds for Oregon’s public universities in the February session.
- Conduct marketing and advocacy campaign to improve PSU’s image leading to increased student recruitment, philanthropy, and possible public financial support.
- Successfully conclude union contract negotiations.
- Develop Key Performance Indicators to measure progress and comparison with peers.

One-two year goals

- Increase advocacy with the HECC and legislature to clarify HECC’s role vis-à-vis university administrations and boards.
- Enhance faculty roles through changes in the status and experience of Non-Tenure Track Faculty and implementation of Post-Tenure review.

One-five year goals

- Improve first-year and transfer student persistence and success.
- Fully implement the five-year comprehensive fundraising campaign.
- Continue growth in research expenditures and in philanthropy.
- Continue to foster a positive campus atmosphere.
- Rebuild University reserves in line with standards being developed by Finance and Audit Committee.
- Implement other components of the Strategic Plan.

9/8/15
AGENDA ITEM: 8.a.

DATE: September 10, 2015

TITLE: Strategic Planning Update

SUMMARY OF ITEM: At its meeting on September 11, 2014, the Board approved a resolution directing the President to engage in a campus-wide strategic planning initiative. That process occurred through the 2014-15 academic year. A drafting team has been working over the summer on preparing a draft for the larger Strategic Plan Development Team to review and finalize when the academic year begins. Board committees will be asked to consider elements of the Plan during committee meetings in the fall, the Board will have an opportunity to consider the Plan in depth in November, and we anticipate bringing the final Plan to the Board for approval in December.

At this meeting, the President will bring the full Board up to date regarding the Strategic Plan.


ATTACHED BACKGROUND READING:

1. Draft Strategic Clarity

2. Working Draft of Strategic Goals and Initiatives
LET KNOWLEDGE SERVE THE CITY: THE STRATEGIC GOALS OF PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY, 2015-2020

STRATEGIC CLARITY

Vision
Option 1: PSU creates the foundation for an equitable and sustainable future by providing comprehensive access to excellent teaching and urban research.

Option 2: Portland State creates the foundation for an equitable and sustainable future by providing academic excellence, urban engagement and expanding opportunity for all.

Option 3: PSU leads the way to an equitable and sustainable future.

Mission
- We serve and enhance a vibrant urban region through our creativity, collective knowledge and expertise.
- PSU is dedicated to collaborative learning, innovative research, sustainability and community engagement.
- Our research and teaching have global impact.
- We educate a diverse community of lifelong learners.

Values
- We promote access, inclusion and equity as pillars of excellence.
- We commit to curiosity, collaboration, stewardship and sustainability.
- We strive for excellence and innovation.
- We believe everyone should be treated with integrity and respect.

Reputation
- Accessible
- Innovative
- Collaborative
- Transformative
- Sustainable

Position
- We are an anchor institution, providing Portland with a highly educated workforce, substantial economic impact and distinctive contributions to the culture of the city.
- We contribute unique scholarship and research that support quality of life through problem solving.
- We deliver on our access mission, contributing to an educated and diverse community.
Working Title: PSU 20/20: THE STRATEGIC GOALS OF PORTLAND STATE UNIVERSITY

Cover Page: Use photo in Coraggio Mockup

Inside Cover Left: Letter from the President (Harry Esteve)

Inside Cover Right: Table of Contents (Coraggio)

Introduction: (Steve Percy)

Trends in Higher Education: (Mark Wubbold)

The Strategic Planning Process: (Kari St. Peters)

———

STRATEGIC CLARITY

VISION

What is the ideal future state we are trying to create?

PSU creates the foundation for an equitable and sustainable future by providing academic excellence, urban engagement, and expanding opportunity for all.

—OR—

PSU leads the way to an equitable and sustainable future.

—OR—

PSU creates the foundation for an equitable and sustainable future by providing comprehensive access to excellent teaching and research.

MISSION

What is our purpose? What are we here to make happen?

› We serve and enhance a vibrant urban region through our creativity, collective knowledge and expertise.

› PSU is dedicated to collaborative learning, innovative research, sustainability, and community engagement.

› Our research and teaching have global impact.

› We educate a diverse community of lifelong learners.
VALUES
What is our internal vision and the fundamental beliefs that shape how we work together and serve our mission?
› We promote access, inclusion, and equity as pillars of excellence.
› We commit to curiosity, collaboration, stewardship, and sustainability.
› We strive for excellence and innovation that solves problems.
› We believe everyone should be treated with integrity and respect.

REPUTATION
What do we want to be known as? What is the enduring perception or emotion that describes the total experience of our organization?
› Accessible
› Innovative
› Collaborative
› Engaged
› Sustainable
› Transformative

POSITION
What unique and sustainable value do we deliver, where do we deliver it, and for whom?
› We are an anchor institution, providing Portland with a highly educated workforce, substantial economic impact, and distinctive contributions to the culture of the city.
› We contribute unique scholarship and research that support quality of life through problem solving.
› We deliver on our access mission, contributing to an educated and diverse community.

STRATEGIC IMPERATIVES
What must be accomplished over the planning horizon?

1. ELEVATE STUDENT SUCCESS

We define success in many ways, but we are particularly focused on offering a rigorous and enriching academic experience, ensuring students complete their degrees with the least amount of debt possible, and preparing them for the modern workforce. We strive to make PSU a place where all students feel welcome and supported. We will improve administrative processes and systems so they aid student progress toward graduation.

Background: (insert)

Objectives:
Graduation rate
Retention rate
Percentage of PSU degree recipients employed full-time in their chosen field within one year of graduation
Percentage of students registered for all desired coursework on the first day of classes, with required materials in hand

**Initiative #1: Clarify Academic Pathways**

Clarify and simplify university requirements to help students navigate their course work more effectively efficiently toward graduation.

**Initiative #2: Focus on Retention**

Increase advising capacity. Employ best practices and cultural competencies to support students from diverse communities. Add retention and completion specialists. Use advanced analytics to improve student outcomes.

**Initiative #3: Prepare for Academic and Career Success**

Prepare students for success at PSU and in the workforce by providing innovative skill-development training that enhances achievement during their academic career and job skill preparation to make them career-ready when they graduate.

**Initiative #4: Put Students First**

Take action to identify and remediate administrative policies and procedures that impede student access to courses, support services and programs they need to progress towards degree completion.

**Equity Lens Considerations:**
In implementing this imperative and its initiatives PSU should take these equity issues into consideration: the need for a holistic definition of “our students” that includes all underrepresented groups; recognition that disparities in the retention and graduation rates of underrepresented groups justifies investments in culturally specific advising; that additional advisors who are hired as a result of this initiative should possess the necessary cultural competencies to effectively serve all underrepresented students; that faculty should receive cultural competency training to foster better relationships with underrepresented students; and that accommodations should be provided to students who may not be able to participate in community based learning experiences due to issues of accessibility.

---

2. RECOGNIZE AND DEVELOP EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND RESEARCH
We will attract, support and retain great faculty, students and staff to produce excellent research, teaching, learning, and creative activity that serves the Portland region and beyond.

**Background: (insert)**

**Objectives:**
- Number of faculty with externally-funded projects each year
- Percentage of externally-funded projects within PSU-defined “areas of excellence”
- Number of publications and citations of PSU-originated research
- Percentage of teaching-intensive faculty with continuous employment contracts

**Initiative #1:** Recognize Excellence in Teaching

Create opportunities for continuous employment and shared governance for non-tenure eligible, teaching-intensive faculty. Establish a new adjunct appointment category that recognizes sustained teaching excellence and offers competitive compensation. Make professional development for all faculty an institutional priority.

**Initiative #2:** Recognize Outstanding Research

Establish a Distinguished Research Faculty ranking to recognize outstanding research, scholarship and creative work.

**Prioritize for Impact**

**Initiative #3:** Prioritize research investment in areas where PSU is known for excellence, that show the greatest potential for collaboration and in which we have a competitive advantage. Promote, fund and incentivize faculty research that solves local problems and addresses regional issues, especially in areas of equity and inclusion.

**Equity Lens Considerations:**
In implementing this imperative and its initiatives PSU should take these equity issues into consideration: the need to make internal resources available to support academic, research and creative activities that diversify our scholarly portfolio and the knowledge we generate on campus; the possibility of re-branding PSU’s scholarly outputs to reflect specific values related to equity, collaboration, and reciprocity -- that are community-based and partnership focused -- with knowledge transfer as the desired outcome.

3. **STRENGTHEN OUR LEADERSHIP IN ENGAGEMENT**
We will build on PSU’s reputation for urban engagement and make PSU a hub for the next generation of students, scholars and practitioners committed to solution-oriented partnerships.

**Background:** (insert)

**Objectives:**

- Number of institutional strategic partnerships
- Number of Capstone students who agree or strongly agree that they have a better understanding of how to make a difference in the community (in end-of-course survey)
- Hours of service to the community each year
- Percentage of internships that are both paid and give academic credit
- Percentage of internships that lead directly to paid employment in chosen field

**Initiative #1: Support Lifelong Community Engagement**

Sustain the community engagement experience throughout the lives and careers of alumni. Connect students and campus initiatives to alumni who wish to remain engaged. Commit PSU to ongoing dissemination of knowledge about collaborative practice, community-building and social justice to empower the lifelong engagement of PSU graduates in their communities.

**Initiative #2: Make PSU’s Engagement More Visible and Accessible**

Organize, communicate and disseminate information on collaborative opportunities, projects and outcomes. Use it to facilitate opportunities for partners who wish to join us for community-based learning, applied and collaborative research, internship placement and initiatives that build community. Create a research academy to analyze the practice and impact of engagement and inform the world about effective community collaboration through research, data collection and academic writing.

**Initiative #3: Enhance Internship Opportunities**

Encourage every curricular unit to establish an internship program. Expand community-based learning opportunities prior to the senior capstone. Ensure internship opportunities include students who face challenges in balancing family, work and learning responsibilities.

**Equity Lens Considerations:**

In implementing this imperative and its initiatives PSU should take these equity issues into consideration: that authentic community engagement is reciprocal; that despite our size and assets PSU must be committed to collaboration that is mutually beneficial and brings real value to (and does not harm or diminish) its community partners; that partnering helps both PSU and its partners build greater capacity for advancing community well-being and that a well designed
partnership maximizes social justice and racial equity. We should also recognize that internships, service-learning, and experiential learning are pedagogies with costs that must be taken into consideration when developing partnerships. Since they require dedicated time outside of the classroom, students with limited financial resources may struggle to balance family and work with community based learning.

No. 4. COMMIT TO EQUITY

We will institutionalize our commitment to equity by providing comprehensive access to a diverse community of learners and evaluating all decisions with University-wide impact through an equity lens.

**Background: (insert)**

**Objectives:**
- Enrollment of diverse students as a percentage of total enrollment
- Number of students successfully completing study-abroad opportunities
- Number of international students enrolled at PSU in degree programs

**Initiative #1: Promote Diversity through Hiring**

Adopt best practices for recruitment, retention and advancement to ensure that staff and faculty reflect PSU’s diverse student body.

**Initiative #2: Broaden International Opportunities**

Offer all students the opportunity for international and cross-cultural learning experiences, including study abroad, internships, community-based learning and co-curricular programs. Develop strategies to increase international and cross-cultural perspectives in the classroom. Offer financial support to increase the number and demographic diversity of study abroad participants. Create opportunities for international and intercultural engagement in existing campus housing, cultural and recreation programs. Develop innovative language immersion programming.

**Initiative #3: Create a More Inclusive Campus**

Create expectations, training, incentives and support for faculty, staff, and students to regularly participate in culturally responsive learning and sharing opportunities. Provide an assessment mechanism to ensure the safety and inclusion of multiple identities. Develop a decision-making review process that explicitly calls attention to issues of equity and utilize it in appropriate decision making situations.
Initiative #4: Define and Measure Diversity Learning Outcomes

Incorporate assessment of diversity learning outcomes in all academic units and the Diversity Action Plan. Create a toolkit and training for faculty to incorporate diversity elements in their courses.

Equity Lens Considerations: (INSERT)

No. 5. INNOVATE FOR LONG-TERM STABILITY

We will develop innovative operating policies, revenue generation and communication strategies that emphasize student success, simplify internal operations, increase financial stability and keep our community connected.

Background: (insert)

Objectives:
- PSU’s value of economic impact in the region (in dollars)
- Number of alumni involved as volunteers in PSU programs

Initiative #1: Improve University Systems

Identify efficient strategies for combining or eliminating practices or systems that are duplicative, unnecessary, or that add unnecessary costs to a PSU education.

Initiative #2: Inspire More Community Support

Engage the broader metropolitan community, particularly PSU alumni and business partners, to support the University through local revenue generation, scholarships, capital investment, community partnerships and other means.

Initiative #3: Advance University Communication Systems

Conduct a comprehensive audit of campus-wide communications to determine the most effective ways to keep our community informed.

Initiative #4: Catalyze New Ideas

Create a catalytic environment where new ideas can advance PSU’s mission. Convene a leadership body of students, faculty, administrators, staff and community members to generate ideas for continuous improvement of PSU.

Initiative #5: Develop an Anchor Institution Strategy

Develop a strategy for leveraging PSU’s purchasing, employment, and investment priorities to advance regional goals for equity and community wealth-
building. Provide leadership for a Portland Metropolitan Anchor Institution Alliance to leverage the actions of PSU and other public sector and not-for-profit institutions in the region on behalf of regional equity and community wealth-building goals.

Initiative #6: Resiliency

Prepare for natural disasters and other extraordinary occurrences that result in loss of services to the campus community. Provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure rapid response and restoration of all critical services after an event.

Equity Lens Considerations:
In implementing this imperative and its initiatives PSU should take these equity issues into consideration: as an educator, employer, purchaser, workforce developer, business accelerator, researcher, real estate developer and community partner, PSU has a responsibility to see that all of its stakeholders benefit equally from its investments and resource allocations. This means providing a campus that is welcoming and accessible. It also means controlling costs, expanding and protecting resources so PSU continues to provide access to higher education and to attainable degrees for all residents of this region who seeking them. This means making conscious efforts to leverage University operations and purchases to increase the amount of business it does with under-represented contractors and suppliers.
AGENDA ITEM:  8.d.

DATE: September 10, 2015

TITLE: University Evaluation Process and Framework, Presentation by Ben Cannon, Executive Director of the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC)

SUMMARY OF ITEM: ORS 352.061 (as amended by SB 215(2015)) states that the HECC is to submit to the Legislature an annual evaluation of each university with a governing board. In doing so, the HECC may make recommendations regarding the ability of the university to meet academic goals and to fulfill its fiduciary responsibilities. The evaluation must include at least the following items:

(a) A report on the university’s achievement of outcomes, measures of progress, goals and targets;
(b) An assessment of the university’s progress toward achieving the mission of all education beyond high school as described in ORS 351.009 [the state's 40-40-20 goals]; and
(c) An assessment as to how well the establishment of a governing board at the university comports with the findings set forth in ORS 352.025 [legislative findings that the state will benefit from having universities with governing boards that provide transparency, public accountability and support for the university, that are closely to and closely focused on the individual university, that lead to greater access and affordability for Oregon residents and do not disadvantage Oregon residents relative to out-of-state students, and that act in the best interest of both the university and the state of Oregon as a whole; legislative findings that there are economies of scale to having a coordinated university system, that shared services may continue to be shared among the universities, and that the Legislature has a responsibility to monitor the success of governing boards at fulfilling their missions and the principles stated by statute].

The HECC has been working on an evaluative framework for carrying out this responsibility. On September 10 (the same day as our Board meeting), the HECC is expected to adopt the evaluative framework.
ATTACHED
BACKGROUND
Docket Item:
University Evaluation Process & Framework

Summary:
During the August 2015 Commission Meeting staff presented the recommendations received in relation to the university evaluation framework tool. During that time, staff indicated that matrices associated with economies of scale and financial metrics were under development via a collaborative effort between HECC University Finance & Budget staff and university Vice Presidents of Finance and Administration.

After review of the framework, the Commission provided feedback and shared concerns regarding faculty engagement particularly in the areas of academic quality and shared governance. As a result of that feedback staff proposes further discussion and information sharing with university faculty leadership, with particular focus on areas of Commission concern. This will likely take the form of a questionnaire, which faculty leadership will be requested to complete during the data collection phase as indicated below in the evaluation timeline.

Attached is a revised version of the evaluation framework which includes the economies of scale and financial metrics.

**University Evaluation Timeline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 13, 2015</td>
<td>Commission update (framework &amp; process)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10, 2015</td>
<td>Commission Adoption of Evaluation Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10 – 25, 2015</td>
<td>Data collection – SCARF Data points completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28, 2015</td>
<td>Framework due to the Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28 – October 16</td>
<td>Data collection – Institutional Data points completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October – November 2015</td>
<td>Rollout and Implementation (initial phase PSU, OSU and UO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2015</td>
<td>PC update on report template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2015</td>
<td>HECC update and template review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16, 2015</td>
<td>Institutional data due to HECC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1-6, 2015</td>
<td>Institutional review of draft report language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2015</td>
<td>HECC 1st Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 19, 2015</td>
<td>Institutional updates if requested by HECC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 2015</td>
<td>PC update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 10, 2015</td>
<td>HECC report adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 2015</td>
<td>Report due to Legislature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff Recommendation:**
Approve the proposed university evaluation timeline and framework as a tool to be used in the university evaluation process.
DRAFT University Evaluation Framework

Green boxes are the measure that map onto the HECC KPM

The University Evaluation Framework will be used annually for measuring institutional performance and success at Oregon’s public universities with governing boards. The framework will be used to collect quantitative and qualitative data and information which meet the criteria established in ORS 352.061(2) and to prepare an annual report to the legislature, the HECC (Commission), and the public. The report will first be issued in 2015.

University Profile Information academic year: 2014-15
Institution: ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total enrollment (See Definitions and Notes section for definitional information)</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE: HECC (with exception of Veterans)</th>
<th>DATA SOURCE: INSTITUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian: Headcount: ______ &amp; ______%</td>
<td>Pell Recipients: Headcount: ______ &amp; ______%</td>
<td>Student FTE to Faculty FTE Ratio: ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American: Headcount: ______ &amp; ______%</td>
<td>Gender: Female: Headcount: ______ &amp; ______%</td>
<td>Non-tenured Track Faculty: Headcount: ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaska Native: Headcount: ______ &amp; ______%</td>
<td>Gender: No response: Headcount: ______ &amp; ______%</td>
<td>Full-time Faculty: Headcount: ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Headcount: ______ &amp; ______%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races, not Hispanic: Headcount: ______ &amp; ______%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown: Headcount: ______ &amp; ______%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated: 8-31-15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Focus Area</th>
<th>Evaluation Component</th>
<th>Data Points</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Data Source and Methodology Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Affordability¹</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF (STUDENT p. 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF CREDIT_HRS p.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF (CREDIT_HRS p.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underrepresented Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF (RACE_ETHNIC - all but W, A, and T when W+A p.227) Also exclude foreign students from the URM category (codes of ZZ and FN).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF (FAIDCAT Pell Grant code 1302 p. 139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF (RESIDENCY p. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonresident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF (RESIDENCY p. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF (S_LEVEL p. 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate (Masters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF S_TYPE in (H,J,P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate (Doctorate and Professional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF S_LEVEL = FP + S_TYPE = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF (aggregated CREDIT_HRS? p. 7) or ? Note: zero-out credit from courses taken as part of the collaborative OHSU Nursing programs. These are identified when the first four digits of the CIP (p. 149) are ‘5116’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underrepresented Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF same as above for all except W, A, or T if W+A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCARF same as above for all who have Pell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ ORS 352.061 (2)(c) requires HECC to assess governing boards against the findings set forth in ORS 352.025 including that Governing Boards lead to great access and affordability for Oregon residents and do not disadvantage Oregon students relative to out-of-state students.

Updated: 8-31-15
| Student Debt | Amount of Average Student Debt for those bachelor’s degree recipients with debt (HECC KPM 24a) average amount of debt among Bachelor’s recipients with debt | Average student debt load | $ | SCARF FAIDCAT + Loans (5 types) p. 139 (Average debt load for the graduating class of 2014, for each institution) 2015 will not be ready yet |
| Proportion of bachelor’s degree recipients with debt HECC KPM 24b = Percentage of students with debt | | % | SCARF? (Percentage of bachelor’s degree recipients with debt in the class of 2014) |
| Resident | SCARF (same as above with RESIDENCY) | | | |
| Nonresident | SCARF (same as above with RESIDENCY) | | | |
| Loan Default Rate (HECC KPM 25a) student loan default rates – Three-year official cohort student loan default rates: Public Universities | All Students (Only graduate students in the DOE database for 2009-2010-2011?) | | DOE Reported Information 3-Year Official Cohort Default Rates (borrowers defaulted/total borrowers in repayment = cohort default rate) |
| Retention & Completion | Degrees Granted | Degrees Granted: Undergraduate (HECC KPM 17) | All Students | SCARF (count of MPIDM, ACAT= 23,24, p. 175)? (DEG_ACADYR = 201415 p. 181)? |
| Underrepresented Minorities | | | SCARF same as above for all except A, W, and T if A+W see above |
| Pell Grant Recipients | | | SCARF same as above who have Pell |

---

2 ORS 352.061 (2) stipulates that HECC’s evaluation of universities include an assessment of the universities progress toward achieving the mission of all education beyond high school as described in ORS 351.009 (40-40-20 goal).
### Degrees Granted:

**Graduate (Masters)**  
(HECC KPM 18)

#### All Students
- SCARF count of MPIDM, ACAT = 42

#### Underrepresented Minorities
- SCARF URM same as for enrollment, and above

### Degrees Granted:

**Graduate (Doctorate and Professional)**  
(HECC KPM 18)

#### All Students
- SCARF count of MPIDM, ACAT = 44,31

#### Underrepresented Minorities
- SCARF URM same as for enrollment, and above

### Graduation Rates

**Graduation Rates (for first time/full-time freshman)**  
Cohort Beginning Date: **2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total in cohort</th>
<th>Data calculated from many SCARF fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4 Yr: All Students**  
SCARF (how many students who began in fall 2008 graduated by spring 2012?)

**4 Yr: Underrepresented Minorities**  
SCARF (The URM measure was required only in 2010 but the calculation will be possible with the inclusion of multi-ethnic in URM)

**4 Yr: Pell Grant Recipients**  
SCARF (students who began in 2008 and graduated by 2012 and received a Pell grant in any year)

**Still retained at 4 years**  
SCARF (students who began in 2008 and were still enrolled in fall 2012)

**5 Yr: All Students**  
SCARF (how many students who began in fall 2008 graduated by spring 2013?)

**5 Yr: Underrepresented Minorities**  
SCARF same as above in 4-yr rates

**5 Yr: Pell Grant Recipients**  
SCARF (Students who began in 2008 and graduated by spring...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Student Graduation Rates within six years</strong></td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>SCARFA Admitted AT, AU, AS in fall 2008 and graduated by spring 2014 / Count of ADMIT_Decision = AT, AU, AS in fall 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Underrepresented Minorities</td>
<td>SCARF (The URM measure was required only in 2010 but the calculation will be possible with the inclusion of multi-ethnic in URM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients</td>
<td>SCARF Admitted AT, AU, AS in fall 2008, received a Pell grant any year 2008-2014 and graduated by spring 2014 / Count of ADMIT_Decision = AT, AU, AS in fall 2008 and received Pell grants 08-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still retained at 5 years

SCARF (students who began in 2008 and were still enrolled in fall 2013)

6 Yr: All Students (HECC KMP 16)

SCARF (how many students who began in fall 2008 graduated by spring 2014?)

6 Yr: Underrepresented Minorities

SCARF same as above in 4-yr rates

6 Yr: Pell Grant Recipients

SCARF (students who began in 2008 and graduated by spring 2014 and received Pell in any year)

Still retained at 6 years

SCARF (students who began in 2008 and were still enrolled in fall 2014)
### Retention

**First Year Retention Rates (HECC KPM 15)**

“First-year retention rate % of Oregon public university students starting in a fall term and returning to an Oregon public university the following fall.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students in Freshman Cohort fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>SCARF Students who first enrolled (new student or transfer) in the institution fall 2013, and also enrolled in fall 2014 in any Oregon Public Institution (includes interinstitutional transfer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented Minorities</td>
<td>SCARF same as above for all URM as defined above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients</td>
<td>SCARF same as above with Pell grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Impact

**Entrepreneurial Activities**

- **royalty revenue**
- **number of startups enabled by university research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All faculty, staff and students</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All faculty, staff and students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment (HECC KPM21b)

**% of resident graduates who are employed in Oregon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>HECC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>HECC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td>HECC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% of nonresident graduates who are employed in Oregon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>HECC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td>HECC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td>HECC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 ORS 352.061 (2)(c) requires HECC to assess governing boards against the findings set forth in ORS 352.025 including that Governing Boards act in the best interest of both the university and the State of Oregon as a whole.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Research Expenditures</th>
<th>All faculty, staff and students</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Beginning Date:</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5 years from graduation date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Board Focus Area</td>
<td>Evaluation Question</td>
<td>Supporting Narrative (documentation may include links to materials on board website)</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency (ORS 352.025(1)(a))</td>
<td>Board meets at least quarterly. ORS 352.076(6).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board provides public notice of agenda and meetings. ORS 352.025(1)(a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board operates in a transparent manner and in compliance with Public Meetings and Public Records laws. ORS 352.025(1)(a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board has adopted bylaws. ORS 352.076(5).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability (ORS 352.025(1)(a))</td>
<td>The Board demonstrates its accountability on behalf of the university and awareness of its mission and fiduciary duties.</td>
<td>(Please describe your Board’s efforts to receive and understand important financial information regarding the institution, to ensure fiscal responsibility and stability, to safeguard institutional resources, to assess its own operations and effectiveness, and to otherwise operate in a manner that is consistent with governance best practices.)</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board has established a process for determining tuition and mandatory enrollment fees that provides for participation of enrolled students and the recognized student government of the university. ORS 352.102(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board selects and regularly assess the university president. ORS 352.096.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement in the University’s Mission (ORS 352.025(1)(b))</strong></td>
<td>The Board adopts the mission statement. ORS 352.089(2).</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination across the State of Oregon (ORS 352.025(1)(e))</strong></td>
<td>The Board forwards the university’s mission statement to the HECC. ORS 352.089(1).</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real Property Holdings (ORS 352.025 (2)(c))</strong></td>
<td>Legal title to all real property, whether acquired before or after the creation of a governing board, through state funding, revenue bonds or philanthropy, shall be taken and held in the name of the State of Oregon, acting by and through the governing board.</td>
<td>Board of Trustees or Finance VPs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Shared Services and University Collaborative Efforts

**Service Participation:**
Please indicate “P” for Participation and N/P for Non-Participation. See Notes section for additional information regarding these terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Specific Services</th>
<th>University Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Shared Services Enterprise (USSE, hosted by OSU)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Asset Accounting (currently only OIT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll &amp; Tax Processing (includes relationship w PEBB, PERS/Federal retirement*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology/5th Site ¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Management Services:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Debt Services-Post Issuance Tax Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Debt Services-Debt Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Legacy Debt Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Reconciliations (and other ancillary banking services)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Miscellaneous Statements of Work:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provosts Council Administrative Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Fiscal Impact Statement Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Analyst (TRUs only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon State University (statutorily designated provider³)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public University Fund Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Plans *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy 401(a) Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy 403(b) Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Retirement Plan (ORP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax-Deferred Investment (TDI) Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other University Collaborations
Highlight areas of collaboration between the university and other universities and describe how collaborative efforts advancing the mission of the institution and the State's higher education goals. Examples include the multiple university council’s such as Presidents Council, Provosts Council and the VPFA group, joint programs or degrees, non-USSE “back office” services, RAIN, or other research endeavors which span university boundaries.

Please indicate “P” for Participation and N/P for Non-Participation. See Notes section for additional information regarding these terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other University Collaborations</th>
<th>University Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public University Councils:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provosts Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Presidents for Finance and Administration (VPFAs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Counsels (GCs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Officers (PIOs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Advisory Council (LAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Contracting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Construction Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NERO Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbis Cascade Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONAMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide narrative describing your institution’s work in collaborative activities with other postsecondary institutions in Oregon. Examples may include but are not limited to Dual Enrollment Partnerships and facility sharing agreements. *(Please limit narrative to three examples with a 600 word limit)*
Institutional financial metrics, when viewed together and over time, provide information regarding the overall financial health of the university. The metrics outlined below are industry standard and provide an overview of the strength of an institution’s balance sheet, operating results and the capacity of an institution to service its debt. All data utilized will be available from the audited financial statements of an institution and its component units or from one of three principal US bond rating agencies and will include four years of information to allow for trend analysis. Institutions will be required to submit their audited financial statements and bond ratings, if they so desire, and to calculate the metrics during the evaluation process. The definitions and notes section of this document provides information related to purpose and metric calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio Type</th>
<th>HECC Metrics</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Sheet</td>
<td>Viability Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Reserve Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Ratios</td>
<td>Net Operating Revenues Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Return on Net Assets Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Level</td>
<td>Bond Rating(^1) or Debt Burden Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

\(^1\) An institution may submit its most recent bond rating in lieu of calculating the Debt Burden Ratio if the rating is issued during the same fiscal year as that being examined. The rating must be issued by one of three primary U.S. bond-rating agencies, Moody's, Standard and Poor's or Fitch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data Point</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| External Measures           | Accreditation                                       | Institution provides a copy of NWCCU Commendation & Recommendations and where the institution is in the accreditation process (eg Yr. 1, Yr. 3, Yr. 7)  
Ask institution to provide bulleted list of specialized accredited programs.                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Institution |
|                             | Academic Program Review and Approval Processes     | Institution provides assurance that processes/policies exist and provide a link to the policies.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Institution |
| Internal Measures           | The institution evaluates faculty using an identified faculty evaluation process. | Institution provides a link to the documents supporting and related to the process.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Institution |
|                             | Institution supports Faculty Professional Development | Short narrative describing some activities that support Faculty Professional Development *(Please limit narrative to three examples with a 600 word limit)*  
Institution                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Institution |

Institution to attach copy of latest NWCCU self-study (1, 3 or 7 year depending on where they are in the cycle)
Definitions and Notes

**University Profile Information:**

**Total Enrollment:** Race – Ethnicity, %

- H Hispanic
- A Asian
- P Pacific Islander
- B Black or African American
- I American Indian – Alaska Native
- W White
- O None of the Above
- D Declined to Respond
- T Two or More Races, not Hispanic
- ZZ Non-Resident Alien
- FN Foreign National
- U Unknown/Unidentified

Notes: ‘None of the Above’ and ‘Declined to Respond’ are reported as ‘Unknown’, and ‘Foreign National’ is reported as ‘Non-resident Alien’

**Veteran:** Student who receives a Veterans Administration Grant because they are a veteran

Notes: As well as having VA grants identified in SCARF, we also identify certain fee remissions that are given to veterans (Voyager Fee remission, Nonresident Veteran Fee Remission, Yellow Ribbon Program Fee Remission). We also track the newly created special program for Resident Tuition Equity for Veterans.

Or S_VET The student’s veteran status reported in FAFSA.

**Pell Recipients:**

FAIDCAT: Financial Aid Category
Categories of aid include loans, grants, scholarships, work-study, and fee remissions. In general, awards within each category are identified according to the source of aid (e.g., federal subsidized loan, Oregon Opportunity Grant).
Note that need alone is not always sufficient to distinguish grants from scholarships. Grants are need based; scholarships require that recipients possess specific attributes, including, often, merit, but scholarships may also impose a requirement of need.

Pell: question about summer Pell awards. Pell Grant = Grant 1302

**Faculty Status:** for IPEDS it depends on the institution

- Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty
- Non-Tenured Faculty
- Full-Time Instructional Staff
- Less than Full time Instructional Staff

"Instructional Staff", as defined by IPEDS, is comprised of staff who are either: 1) Primarily Instruction (PI); or 2) “Instruction combined with Research and/or Public Service” (IRPS). The intent of the “Instructional Staff” category is to include all individuals whose primary occupation includes instruction at the institution. “Primarily Instruction” are those individuals whose primary responsibility can be defined as teaching (e.g. the majority of their total time). “Instruction combined with Research and/or Public Service” (IRPS) are those individuals who have instruction as part of their job, but it cannot readily be differentiated from the research or public service functions of their jobs (e.g. they teach, but a percentage of time spent teaching is not discernible since their teaching responsibilities are not clearly differentiated from their other responsibilities). Instructional staff could include postdoctoral students, if they meet the criteria for one of the above two categories. Adjunct Instructional Staff would also typically meet the criteria.

**Shared Services and University Collaborative Efforts**

**Participation:**

- No information required. It is presumed that if an institution is participating in a non-mandatory shared service that it is either cost-competitive in the marketplace or the institution does not have the capacity to insource the service at competitive prices or to manage the outsourcing of the service to a non-shared vendor.
- If an institution wishes to provide information relating to the cost, service or dynamics associated with services which they have elected to, or are required to, participate in they may do so here.
Non-Participation:

- Data Section: highlighting the fiscal impact of choosing to not elect to participate in an offered shared service and the cost associated with insourcing or outsourcing the service indicating cost savings or additional expense associated with the option selected by the institution. Where possible the impact of the individual institutions choice on the total cost of services for all institutions will be evaluated.
- Written Section: provides an opportunity for the university to highlight the decision making framework which precipitates their choice of service provider/framework. This section will include expected or realized benefits associated with the service delivery model.

Notes regarding service participation:

1 IT Fifth Site was a service shared only by the TRUs prior to dissolution of the university system; it is continued as a shared service for the TRUs through USSE. UO participates in database management related to their management of retirement plans.
2 PSU performed its own bank reconciliations even while part of the Oregon University System.
3 During the 2014 Legislative Session, HB 4018 established the Public University Fund (PUF) for the purposes of pooling cash balances of the public universities. Under the provisions of HB 4018, public universities that desired to participate in the PUF selected OSU as the “Designated University” under the statute and OSU agreed to serve in that capacity.

Financial Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Purpose and Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viability Ratio</td>
<td>Purpose: The Viability Ratio measures one of the most basic determinants of clear financial health the availability of expendable net assets to cover debt should the University need to settle its obligations as of the balance sheet date. Calculation: For public institutions, the numerator includes all unrestricted net assets and all expendable restricted net assets, excluding those to be invested in plant, on a GASB basis plus unrestricted and temporarily restricted net assets on a FASB basis for its FASB component units, excluding net investment in plant and those temporarily restricted net assets that will be invested in plant. The denominator is defined as all amounts borrowed for long-term purposes from third parties and includes all notes, bonds and capital leases payable that impact the institution’s credit, whether or not the institution directly owes the obligation. Long-term debt includes both the current and long-term portions. This would include debt of the institution’s affiliated foundations, partnerships and other special-purpose entities. It would also include amounts owed to a system or state-financing agency as it represents debt issued on the institution’s behalf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \frac{(\text{Expendable Net Assets} + \text{FASB C.U. Expendable Net Assets})}{(\text{Long-Term Debt (total project-related debt)} + \text{FASB C.U. long-term debt (total project-related debt))}} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Title</th>
<th>Purpose:</th>
<th>Calculation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Reserve Ratio</strong></td>
<td>The Primary Reserve Ratio measures the financial strength of the institution by comparing expendable net assets to total expenses. Expendable net assets represent those assets that the institution can access relatively quickly and spend to satisfy its debt obligations. This ratio provides a snapshot of financial strength and flexibility by indicating how long the institution could function using its expendable reserves without relying on additional net assets generated by operations. Trend analysis indicates whether an institution has increased its net worth in proportion to the rate of growth in its operating size.</td>
<td><strong>For public institutions, the numerator includes all unrestricted net assets and all expendable restricted net assets, excluding those to be invested in plant, on a GASB basis plus unrestricted and temporarily restricted net assets on a FASB basis for its FASB component units, excluding net investment in plant and those temporarily restricted net assets that will be invested in plant. The denominator comprises all expenses on a GASB basis in the statement of revenues, expense and changes in net position, including operating expenses and nonoperating expenses such as interest expense, plus FASB component unit total expenses in the statement of activities. Again, investment losses should be excluded from expenses for both the institution and its component units.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Operating Revenues Ratio</strong></td>
<td>This ratio is a primary indicator, explaining how the surplus from operating activities affects the behavior of the other three core ratios. A large surplus or deficit directly impacts the amount of funds an institution adds to or subtracts from net assets, thereby affecting the Primary Reserve Ratio, the Return on Net Assets Ratio and the Viability Ratio.</td>
<td><strong>For public institutions, the numerator is available from the GASB statement of revenues, expenses and changes in net position and the FASB component unit statement of activities. The numerator includes nonoperating revenues and expenses, including governmental appropriations, investment income and operating gifts since these items support operating activities of the institution. Nonoperating expenses, such as interest on plant debt, are also related to operating activities. Plant and endowment gifts and capital appropriations are excluded since these are not for operating activities. For FASB component units, the numerator includes the total change in unrestricted assets from the statement of activities. The denominator is equal to GASB total operating revenues plus total net nonoperating revenues, excluding capital appropriations and gifts and additions to permanent endowments, plus FASB component units total unrestricted revenues, gains and other support, including net assets released from restrictions. If unrestricted investment losses are reported with expenses for the component unit, this amount is included as a reduction to total unrestricted revenue.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\left( \frac{(\text{Expendable Net Assets} + \text{FASB C.U. Expendable Net Assets})}{(\text{Total Expenses} + \text{FASB C.U. Expendable Net Assets})} \right)
\]

\[
\left( \frac{(\text{Operating Income (loss)} + \text{Net Non-Operating Revenues} + \text{C.U. Change in Unrestricted Net Assets}^*)}{(\text{Operating Revenues} + \text{Non-Operating Revenues} + \text{C.U. Total Unrestricted Revenues}^*)} \right)
\]

*eliminate any inter-entity amounts*
| **Return on Net Assets Ratio** | Purpose: This ratio determines whether the institution is financially better off than in previous years by measuring total economic return. This ratio furnishes a broad measure of the change in an institution’s total wealth over a single year and is based on the level and change in total net assets, regardless of asset classification. Thus, the ratio provides the most comprehensive measure of the growth or decline in total wealth of an institution over a specific period of time.  
Calculation: For public institutions, the numerator is the change in GASB total net assets plus the change in FASB component unit total net assets regardless of whether they are expendable on nonexpendable, restricted or unrestricted. This information can be found in the GASB statement of revenues, expenses and changes in net position and the FASB component unit statement of activities. The denominator is the beginning of the year total net assets that can also be found in the GASB statement of revenues, expenses and changes in net position and the FASB component unit statement of activities.  
\[
\frac{\text{[(Change in Net Assets + Change in C.U. Net Assets)]}}{\text{Total Net Assets + C.U. Total Net Assets}}
\]  
* eliminate any inter-entity amounts  
\* beginning of year Net Assets |
| **Debt Burden Ratio** | Purpose: The Debt Burden Ratio is a key tool in measuring debt affordability and should be considered as a key financial indicator for any institution using debt. This ratio examines the institution’s dependence on borrowed funds as a source of financing its mission and the relative cost of borrowing to overall expenditures. It compares the level of current debt service with the institution’s total expenditures. Debt service includes both interest and principal payments.  
Calculation: For public institutions, the numerator of this ratio includes interest on all indebtedness, which is approximated by interest paid, plus the current year’s principal payments; both generally are available from the GASB and FASB component unit statements of cash flows. However, if an institution or affiliate has refinanced debt, the statement of cash flows would reflect a large principal repayment amount, and the contractual principal amount would be more appropriate to use, which can usually be found in the notes to the financial statements. The denominator is total GASB operating expenses plus nonoperating expenses less depreciation expense plus debt service principal payments, plus FASB component unit total expenses less depreciation expense plus debt service principal payments. Even if the component units are fundraising entities, inclusion of their expenses in the denominator is appropriate. Including the component unit portion in the numerator calculation would not be appropriate unless the component units were operating entities.  
\[
\frac{\text{[(Principal Payments + Interest Expense + C.U. Principal Payments + C.U. Interest Expense )}}{\text{Total Operating Expenses + Total non-Operating Expenses – Depreciation + Principal Payments + C.U. Total Expenses – C.U. Depreciation + C.U. Principal Payments}}
\] |