

Engineering Technology Industry Council
Meeting held June 28, 2002 at the CAPITAL Center

In Attendance:

Ron Adams	OSU
Norm Armour	LSI Logic
Phil Barrett	OGI/OHSU
Bob Broeg	WOU
Dave Brown	Tektronix
Bill Carter	OIT
Steve Cox	Intel
Phil Creighton (<i>by phone</i>)	EOU
Martha Anne Dow	OIT
Mike Driscoll	PSU
Bob Dryden	OUS
Rich Duncombe	HP
Charmagne Ehrenhaus	OUS
Terri Fiez	OSU
Ron Geason	OUS
Joseph Graf	SOU
David Hackleman	Hewlett-Packard
Jim Johnson	
Bill Lewis	OIT
Gary Lietke	OUS
Richard Linton	UO
Mark Lonergan	UO
Marc Manley	Rogue Wave Software
Amy McKinley	OIT
Howard Thurston	OIT
Janet Rash	Intel
Jim Rise	Xerox
Wally Rhines	Mentor Graphics
Skip Rung	New Economy Coalition
Bruce Schafer	OUS
Bill Scott	OR ECDD
Ed Thompson	OGI/OHSU
Diane Vines	OUS
Michele Vitali	OUS
Larry Wade	SAO
Michal Young	UO

Wally Rhines, ETIC Chair, opened the meeting by asking for approval of the May 23, 2002 meeting minutes. Motion was made, seconded and approved.

David Hackleman announced that effective 6/28 he is retiring from Hewlett-Packard and his alternate, Rich Duncombe, will take over the voting position.

Scorecard Presentations

The following 2X Plan Scorecards were presented and can be viewed at http://www.oregonetic.org/investment_indicators/investment_indicators.htm

- Oregon Institute of Technology – Martha Anne Dow
- University of Oregon – Michal Young (CIS) and Mark Lonergan (MSI)
- Southern Oregon University – Joe Graf

Overview of '03-'05 Planning Task Force Recommendations

Wally presented the recommendations of the '03-'05 Planning Task Force to the general council. A copy of the presentation is at <http://www.oregonetic.org/meetings/tf%20minutes/02-0628recommendations.pdf>. The recommendations follow several months of meetings of the ETIC 2003-2005 Planning Task Force including a conference call June 27th. The overview of the recommendations will be completed over the next three weeks for submission to the Oregon State Board of Higher Education in July.

Wally explained that the overall philosophy of the Task Force was to integrate the existing 2X and Top Tier programs into one single plan that encompasses both quality and quantity. They looked at measurable items like what will improve ingoing and outgoing students as well as national rankings. The new plan will have an emphasis on leveraging the private match -- the Task Force requested a 2.0x match ratio on the excellence initiatives and, depending on the university, a 0.3x to 2.0x match ratio on the investment plans.

Wally reported that the Task Force spent considerable discussion on the capacity issue and although we are no longer facing a critical hiring shortage, the assumption was made that the need will come around again. Excellence proposals were reviewed relative to task and viability. Members were impressed with the programs and metrics, including the ranking systems that were used in some cases. They appreciated the willingness of the institutions to commit to challenging match ratios and the collaboration that took place between universities in several cases. Wally presented the Overall Investment Levels table below that includes the \$40 million main plan as well as the \$27 million back-up plan.

Overall Investment Levels

\$M	With collaborative allocations		
	2001-2003	2003-2005	
	2X	Main Plan	Back-up Plan
OGI	\$ 2.26	\$ 3.16	\$ 2.49
OIT	\$ 1.13	\$ 1.58	\$ 1.24
UO	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.80	\$ 2.20
OSU	\$ 6.63	\$ 9.28	\$ 7.29
PSU	\$ 4.00	\$ 5.60	\$ 4.40
SOU	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.50
EOU	\$ 0.14	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.25
WOU	\$ 0.16	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.25
Pre-college	\$ 0.37	(2)	(2)
Other (OMSE)	\$ 0.56	\$ -	\$ -
Subtotal	\$ 17.65	\$ 23.92	\$ 18.62
Research (1) & Pre-College	\$ 0.95	\$ 2.08	\$ 1.38
Excellence Initiatives		\$ 14.00	\$ 7.00
Total	\$ 18.60	\$ 40.00	\$ 27.00
Notes:			
(1) Based on at least 1-to-1 private support.			
(2) For the 2003-2005 Plan, Pre-College programs should be included in campus proposals. Target totals are as follows:			
Pre-college		\$ 1.30	\$ 1.00

Engineering Technology Industry Council
 Meeting held June 28, 2002 at the CAPITAL Center

Bob Dryden noted that the Oregon State Board of Higher Education had already been informed of the \$40 million request and that this is the same amount we requested two years ago. While times are tight, engineering education appears to be in the best position to receive a special allocation. He also mentioned that the thing that made our proposal so credible last time was a page that Jim Johnson prepared including signatures from all of the universities and industry members and it will be important to go forward with that kind of solidarity again this time.

Wally then presented the Proposed Excellence Allocations table below. He noted that OSU continues to be heavily weighted but the plan provides increases for all of the schools over the current biennium.

Proposed Excellence Allocations

\$M	2001-2003		2003-2005	
	\$5M "Top Tier" after reductions	Main Plan	Back-up Plan	
OGI	\$ -	\$ 1.50	\$ 0.75	
OIT	\$ 0.31	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.50	
UO*	\$ 0.21	\$ 1.00	\$ 0.75	
OSU	\$ 1.39	\$ 8.00	\$ 3.50	
PSU	\$ 0.47	\$ 3.00	\$ 1.50	
Total	\$ 2.38	\$ 14.00	\$ 7.00	
* Joint material science program with SOU				

Discussion of '03-'05 Planning Task Force Recommendations

At this time, Wally welcomed comments from everyone on the recommendation.

- Mike Driscoll, PSU, noted that as the match level was moved up industry should acknowledge that it is reasonable to expect the increased level of support from private industry and individuals.
- Ed Thompson, OGI/OHSU, noted that while he realized there was no guarantee, it would be nice to have some kind of notion as to the commitment over the following two biennia and that they would be more willing to take the reduced allocation provided there was a notion that of sustained funding over time. Bruce Schafer said that one legislature could not bind the next one and that the legislature had historically followed through on investments from one biennium to another. Jim Johnson noted that ETIC planning and the oversight process is performance based and that each university is in control of their destiny.
- Martha Anne Dow, OIT, noted that the proposed \$0.5 million level for OIT would not support the scholarships that were in the current OREC plan. She also expressed discomfort with committing to high match levels from exclusively private sources. Wally suggested that the Research RFP process in the 2003-2005 biennium might be a source of funding for OREC.

Engineering Technology Industry Council

Meeting held June 28, 2002 at the CAPITAL Center

- Rich Linton, UO, noted that we seem to be getting away from the entrepreneurial focus and argued that the more tenure track hired in the biennium, the more money you need to sustain a long-term commitment. He would rather see an open competition and have schools work on sustainability of their new programs. Wally agreed that if a plan is not committed to self-funding we should be concerned about seeding the investment. Skip Rung suggested we add tenure-track faculty as a metric.
- Norm Armour passed along a comment he received from Dave Johnson of UO MSI, stating that the endorsement by ETIC of new programs is helpful in obtaining additional campus resources.
- Joe Graf, SOU, noted disappointment that the Task Force did not give a token of support to their Information Assurance Center. Wally mentioned they might be a candidate for the research grant as well. Joe also requested that allocation of funds to SOU be broken out as a separate line item in the Excellence Initiative table.
- Ed Thompson and Martha Anne Dow expressed some concern about details of Back-up Plan. Jim Johnson said the back-up plan will not be what ETIC recommends to the legislature but should the final allocation be less than \$40M, we will have done our “homework” in advance, reducing the risk that EEIF funds would be assigned to the Emergency Board, thereby delaying their availability.

Bruce went over the next steps for the council. Assuming we move forward with no changes, we have less than two weeks to turn the docket into the OSBHE in advance of their meeting on July 19th. We will be rolling up the numbers and presenting one \$40 million plan at this time. A summary of what we have accomplished this biennium will also be included.

Bob Dryden mentioned that the OSBHE funding priorities are currently:

- (1) funding existing enrollment growth;
- (2) funding forecasted enrollment growth; and
- (3) investments in engineering education.

He said that it was noteworthy that engineering figured so prominently on the priority list.

At this time it was asked if the plan was acceptable to everyone in the room and would anyone be uncomfortable with signing the proposal? No one objected and all agreed a consensus was needed. Due to the short turnaround time and upcoming holiday, signatures were collected at the meeting in advance of the final proposal, with the promise that a final draft would be emailed out the following week for final review.

Terri Fiez of OSU closed the meeting with a presentation on “Building the #1 Mixed Signal Research Center” which is located on the website under Future Investments/June table/OSU/[mixed signal research presentation](#).

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.