

ETIC Meeting

Meeting held October 9, 2003 at CAPITAL Center

In Attendance:

Norm Armour (phone)
Gerhard Beenen
Michelle Girts (phone)
Ray Guenther
Jim Johnson
Gary Kaleta
Wally Rhines (phone)
Skip Rung (phone)
Bruce Schafer
Michele Vitali

Rich Duncombe submitted his comments via email prior to the meeting.

Prior to the meeting, all of the campus proposals were submitted and posted on the ETIC website at <http://www.oregonetic.org/03-05> (see table at bottom of page posted October 6, 2003) for the voting members to review.

Bruce alerted the members that WOU's proposal had been revised since the Council meeting to exclude the scholarships referenced in their presentation as Shirley Clark had confirmed that general funds couldn't be used for that purpose.

Additionally, the pre-college consortium had submitted revised metrics.

The total amount requested by the campuses was \$23.7 million. With placeholders for the research RFP at \$2 million and pre-college RFP at \$1 million, the total investment request was \$26.7 million versus the target of \$21.4 million. Bruce distributed an allocation analysis comparing each campus's pro-rata share of the \$40 million plan (53.5%) and the group compared those amounts to the new October proposal requests.

Michelle Girts suggested the \$3 million that was tentatively set aside for research and pre-college RFPs be trimmed out of the investment model. After clarification that this pre-college line item was indeed separate from that of the consortium's request, it was agreed by all to set the amount of RFPs to \$0.

After discussing the proposals, Jim Johnson asked whether anyone considered any of the proposals more deserving than a pro-rata percentage allocation and whether they should go back to a scaling algorithm. It was agreed that while several proposals were for slightly more than the scaling model, none of them stood out as requiring particularly high or low allocations. Feedback to the campuses should recognize and applaud their efforts as the proposals came in clear and concise. They should be reminded, however, that future recommendations would be based on producing results from investments during the biennium, specifically, those results forecasted in the metrics provided by each campus.

Further discussion ensued regarding how much to recommend for each campus. All agreed that campuses demonstrating exceptional growth in enrolling ECS students, namely PSU and OSU, should be allocated slightly higher percentages. The following table was created and Bruce was asked to request updated proposals from the campuses based on the revised table.

ETIC Meeting

Meeting held October 9, 2003 at CAPITAL Center

ETIC Tentative Allocation Recommendation

10/9/2003

	2003-2005 Capacity Plan October 2003			2003-2005 Excellence Initiatives October 2003			2003-2005 Total Allocations October 2003		
	State Funds (\$M)	Projected Private Support (\$M)	Projected Support Ratio	State Funds (\$M)	Projected Private Support (\$M)	Projected Support Ratio	State Funds (\$M)	Projected Private Support (\$M)	Projected Support Ratio
EOU	0.25	0.08	0.20				0.25	0.08	0.30
OGI (1)	2.60	4.00	1.54				2.60	4.00	1.54
OIT (2)	0.78	0.37	0.48	0.30	0.60	2.00	1.08	0.97	0.90
OSU (1) (2)	9.92	19.15	1.93				9.92	19.15	1.93
PSU (2)	4.09	4.09	1.00	0.87	1.74	2.00	4.96	5.83	1.18
SOU	0.32	0.10	0.30	0.22	0.44	2.00	0.54	0.54	0.99
UO	1.50	3.64	2.43	0.30	0.60	2.00	1.80	4.24	2.36
WOU	0.25	0.08	0.30				0.25	0.08	0.30
Subtotal / Average	19.71	31.50	1.59	1.69	3.38	2.00	21.40	34.88	1.63
Research RFP	0.00	0.00	#N/A				0.00	0.00	#N/A
Precollege RFP	0.00		#N/A				0.00	0.00	#N/A
Total Investments	19.71	31.50	1.60	3.38	6.76	2.00	21.40	34.88	1.63

(1) Combined Capacity & Excellence Initiative

(2) Precollege (included above)

OIT	0.20
OSU Extension	0.27
PSU -- Saturday Academy	0.27
Total	0.74

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.