Oregon State Board of Higher Education

Academic Strategies Committee

Thursday, January 9, 2014
1:00-3:00 p.m.
ASRC 515, Portland State University

Agenda

ACTION ITEMS
1. Approval of November 2013 Minutes (5 minutes) .......................................................... 3

2. Academic Program Approval (5 minutes)
   ▪ OSU, M.S./Ph.D. in Comparative Health Sciences ................................................. 9

DISCUSSION
3. Review of HECC Transition (Marrongelle, 30 minutes)

4. 40-40-20 Strategy and Action Framework (Yaden, 15 minutes)

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
5. SOU Report on Campus Retrenchment (Klein, 15 minutes)

6. IFS Update on Faculty Sabbatical OAR (Hines, 15 minutes)

OTHER ITEMS
7. Other items put forward by the Committee

8. Adjournment
Minutes

Committee members present: Chair Jim Middleton, Brittany Kenison, Emily Plec, and David Yaden. Committee members absent: Jim Francesconi, and Jill Eiland.

Chancellor’s staff present: Karen Marrongelle, Anna Teske, Joe Holliday, and Marcia Stuart.

Campus representatives present: Steve Adkison (EOU), Brad Burda (Oregon Tech), Sona Andrews, Debbie Koreski and Laxmi Rsmasubramanian (PSU), Jim Klein (SOU), Scott Coltrane (UO), Steve Scheck (WOU), David Robinson (OHSU), and Maude Hines (IFS).

Others present: Ben Cannon (HECC).

ACTION ITEMS

1. Call to Order

Chair Middleton called the meeting of the Academic Strategies Committee to order at 3:05 p.m.

2. Approval of September 20th Minutes

   ACTION: Directors David Yaden made the motion to approve the minutes and Emily Plec seconded. Motion carried.

3. Approval of EOU Institutional Core Themes

Chair Middleton called upon Steve Adkison, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Eastern Oregon University (EOU), to provide an overview of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) Year-3 review, which resulted in ongoing discussions in how to streamline mission fulfillment objectives. The Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment Team suggested integrating Core Theme Four, and its associated objectives into Core Theme Two and Core Theme Three.

   ACTION: Directors David Yaden made the motion to approve the minutes and Brittany Kenison seconded. Motion carried.

4. Academic Program Approvals

OSU, Ph.D. in Business Administration

Chair Middleton called upon Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Oregon State University, to provide an overview of the proposed academic program. The Ph.D. in Business Administration is designed to offer two graduate options:
Innovation/Commercialization and Accounting. The proposed program will serve as a terminal degree, extending the graduate programs that already exist in the College of Business. This program will help eliminate the shortage in academically qualified business faculty, and complements a similar program offered by the University of Oregon that offers concentrations in Accounting, Decision Sciences, Finance, Management, and Marketing.

**ACTION:** Directors David Yaden made the motion to approve the program, and Brittany Kenison seconded. Motion carried.

**NEXT STEPS:** Staff will work with the provosts to revise the program proposal template to reflect both expenditures and revenue.

**PSU, Ph.D. in Health Systems and Policy**
Chair Middleton called upon Sona Andrews, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Portland State University (PSU), to provide an overview of the proposed academic program. The Ph.D. in Health Systems and Policy is designed to complement the PSU/OHSU Joint School of Public Health. The program builds upon PSU’s existing strengths in Public Affairs and Policy, and expands current faculty involvement in health services research and health systems reform in Oregon. The curriculum of the program is designed to help students integrate coursework with applied research practice, and underscores community-based learning. This program has operated at PSU for the last 20 years and will continue to operate with the same resources it as had as a track in the Public Affairs and Policy Ph.D. program.

**ACTION:** Directors David Yaden made the motion to approve the program, and Brittany Kenison seconded. Motion carried.

**PSU, Ph.D. in Community Health**
Chair Middleton called upon Dr. Sona Andrews to provide an overview of the proposed academic program. The Ph.D. in Community Health is designed to provide students with advanced learning in research and instruction in public health, social and behavioral determinants of health, social epidemiology and gerontology. Curriculum has been designed to utilize interdisciplinary faculty with backgrounds in public health, communications, psychology, social work, and sociology. The development of the Ph.D. is intended to compliment other programs that will fall under the OHSU/PSU Joint School of Public Health.

**ACTION:** Directors Brittany Kenison made the motion to approve the program, and David Yaden seconded. Motion carried.

**OHSU, Ph.D. in Epidemiology**
Chair Middleton called upon David Robinson, Executive Vice Provost at OHSU, to provide an overview of the proposed academic program. The Ph.D. in Epidemiology is intended to meet community needs as public health grows nationally. The program will generate public health/health protection practitioners prepared to combat disease outbreaks as they occur. The new program will be rolled into the OHSU/PSU Joint School of Public Health in order to continue collaborations and to build a strong portfolio.
ACTION: Directors David Yaden made the motion to approve the programs, and Emily Plec seconded. Motion carried.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

5. HECC Transition Planning

Chair Middleton called on Karen Marrongelle, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Strategies, to provide an update on the work of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) Transition Planning Work Group. It was reported that Director Forbes convened the Work Group at the direction of Board Chair Donegan, in order to successful facilitate the transfer of responsibilities from the State Board of Higher Education and Chancellor’s Office to the HECC. The Committee reviewed the charge of the Work Group, and discussed the scope of work and connections/communications needed in order to execute the transition successfully.

Ben Cannon, Executive Director of the HECC, commented that the HECC would like to work with an engaged Academic Strategies Committee in order to continue important conversations around shared services, academics, and student success. It was noted that the HECC does not have answers to all of the questions surrounding the transition at this time; however, the HECC will rely on our resident experts to inform decision-making. Discussion centered on the need for the HECC and institutions to more clearly define the roles and responsibilities of institutional boards, or legacy board in this process, and to maintain quality assurances. It was agreed that once the HECC delineated the role of the Board in providing guidance, they would know where to focus the Committee’s energy.

It was reported that the Work Group developed a set of key questions for the HECC, specifically, as it relates to university budget development. The key questions include approaches for: FY 2015 budget allocations, 2015-2017 budget requests, capital and facilities planning, and coordination of legislative responses/fiscal impact statements. Mr. Cannon inferred that, while some changes will occur this year, the HECC will not propose anything highly disruptive for FY15, as changes to the current system need to be made with enough advanced notice for stakeholders to respond accordingly. It was also noted that information about the process for vetting policy proposals has not been released by the Governor’s Office; however, the HECC will likely convene a subcommittee to manage the process once details become available. Other issue areas currently under discussion include: capital and facilities planning, allotment process, and the coordination of legislative responses under the direction of the HECC.

In addition to budget development, Cannon briefed the committee on the transition of academic program approvals to the HECC. Prior to June 30, 2014, the HECC will develop a process and priorities for its authority and responsibilities related to program approvals. It is anticipated that the HECC will engage the Provosts’ Council in this work, as this body is the appropriate entity to advise the Commission. The Provosts’ Council questioned how expectations of the HECC may differ from that of the Board, and how the HECC will maintain quality assurances in relation to accreditation requirements of specific institutions. It was noted that additional conversations are needed so as not to conflate and confuse the process for universities with that of community colleges.
NEXT STEPS: Staff will meet with Ben Cannon, Executive Director of the HECC, to discuss the expectations for the Board in crafting transition recommendations. In addition, staff will update the Transition Matrix as needed with updates for critical needs and legislative responsiveness.

6. 40-40-20 Strategy and Action Framework

Chair Middleton called on Director Yaden to provide an update on the transition of 40-40-20 to the HECC. Previously, Director Yaden presented the work on 40-40-20 to date, including methods for a possible bidding process, assumptions based on institution mission, resources, industry needs, and an assessment of existing capacity for growth. Reference was made to the relationship between capital investment and the rate at which goals are achieved.

Following the discussion, the Committee cautioned that 40-40-20 should not be viewed as a complete mission statement for higher education, noting that decision-makers should take into consideration the many factors that serve as indicators for student success and its impact on the economic vitality of the state. Mr. Cannon stated that Regional Achievement Compacts are based on a collective impact model that supports high impact, shared strategies that move institutions toward outcomes. While a regional model is supported, the Provosts’ Council cautioned that we should do more than match degree production with regional workforce needs, suggesting that universities also strive to create well-rounded citizens that contribute to civic needs as well.

NEXT STEPS: Director Yaden will provide the Committee with the PowerPoint used for the HECC presentation. Staff will tee up conversations with HECC leadership about how to align the 40-40-20 goal with funding/allocation systems in place.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

7. Five-Year Inventory of Academic Programs

Chair Middleton called upon Dr. Marrongelle to provide a review of the Five-Year Inventory of Academic Programs. Institutions are responsible for individual program review through the accreditation process; however, the Chancellor’s Office does keep a record of programs that have been approved by the Board. Archived approval information include: the institution, name of program and degree, date of approval, term and year of program implementation, and anticipated follow-up date for Five-Year review date.

8. Proposed Revisions to Faculty Sabbatical OAR

Chair Middleton called on Director Plec to brief the Committee on faculty discussions around possible modifications to the Sabbatical OAR. It was noted that two specific concerns have been raised in faculty senate conversations: 1) Due to lower salaries, some faculty cannot afford to take sabbatical as it is currently structured, making it difficult to take advantage of leave to produce scholarship; 2) under current OAR, faculty do not become eligible until they are considered for promotion and tenure, limiting the opportunity to promote scholarship early on. Discussion centered on possible changes to the OAR as a possible faculty recruitment and retention tool, noting that adjustments to eligibility would have a dramatic impact on access to
scholarship opportunities. While not codified, the OAR does not prevent campuses from granting pre-tenure sabbaticals, providing junior faculty the opportunity to negotiate a lighter workload in order to pursue scholarship and research opportunities.

After a full and frank discussion, Chair Middleton suggested that the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) should have a follow up conversation in order to determine whether there is a strong desire among faculty to reconsider elements of the OAR. In addition, IFS should discuss national best practices that meet faculty sabbatical needs, and consider possible opportunity costs of changes to the OAR in light governance changes and institutional boards.

**NEXT STEPS:** IFS will discuss the Sabbatical OAR at the November meeting, and craft a statement if there is consensus among the campuses.

**OTHER ITEMS**

9. **No other items were put forward by the committee**

10. **Adjournment**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:52 p.m.
Oregon State University seeks Board approval to offer an instructional program leading to a M.S./Ph.D. degree in Comparative Health Sciences.

1. Describe the purpose and relationship of the proposed program to the institution’s mission and strategic plan.

The purpose of this proposal is to establish a new Master of Science (M.S.) and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Comparative Health Sciences degree program at Oregon State University (OSU). This interdisciplinary graduate degree program will be administered by the Graduate School with participation by the College of Veterinary Medicine, College of Public Health and Human Sciences, and the College of Pharmacy. The proposed program will complement OSU’s existing interdisciplinary M.S., Ph.D. degree program in Molecular and Cellular Biology. At the master’s level, the proposed program will replace the M.S. in Veterinary Science program.

In Phase II of OSU’s Strategic Plan, one of the three signature areas of distinction is to improve human health and wellness. As stated in the plan, this means “building more holistic and interdisciplinary approaches to healthy aging, chronic infectious disease control, new drug development, mental health, and disease prevention to enhance the human lifespan, decrease health care costs, and maintain a healthy population.” This proposal, which facilitates collaboration across colleges and departments, promotes the development of an interdisciplinary program that meets this goal. Consistent with the University and Division of Health Science’s strategic plans, faculty across the three colleges will collaborate to provide an integrative and unique academic program that is designed to investigate, teach, and train students in the areas related to the multidimensional causes of chronic diseases, and the discovery of new health promotion/disease prevention strategies.

2. What evidence of need does the institution have for the program?

There is an urgent need for cross-disciplinary graduate programs in underserved areas of clinical and translational research and graduate programs involving animal models of disease and biomedical investigation. The proposed program will be used as an organizational infrastructure to develop and facilitate a community of students and faculty across OSU’s Division of Health Sciences and other life sciences units on the OSU campus.

Based on data published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2010-2011 Edition), the market demand for biomedical scientists is predicted to grow “much faster than average” over the next decade. Employment of graduates trained in comparative health sciences and related areas of biomedical research is expected to
increase by 40 percent by 2018, an expansion of the relevant job market that will add approximately 40,000 jobs. Considering that the median annual wage of these graduates is approximately $73,000, the potential economic impact of the graduate program is significant.

3. Are there similar programs in the state? If so, how does the proposed program supplement, complement, or collaborate with those programs?

No biomedical science program in Oregon overlaps with the proposed program. The interdisciplinary organization that extends from animal to human health sciences is unique. Collaborative opportunities exist with other biology and health sciences programs at the University of Oregon and Oregon Health & Science University, respectively.

4. What new resources will be needed initially and on a recurring basis to implement the program? How will the institution provide these resources? What efficiencies or revenue enhancements are achieved with this program, including consolidation or elimination of programs over time, if any?

All of the needed resources are currently in place. For example, graduate student/resident salaries for the M.S. students will be committed by the College of Veterinary Medicine. The College currently funds 15 post-DVM clinical residency positions, all of which are being transitioned to dual graduate student-clinical residency positions. These financial resources will be supplemented with additional funding, derived from the earnings of a $1.2 million trust ($60,000 per year) that has been committed to graduate student scholarships. Approximately $5,000/year will be committed by the College of Veterinary Medicine for miscellaneous services and supplies.

Recent faculty position recruitments selected by the Division of Health Sciences through the Provost’s Faculty Investment Initiative are considered to be exceptionally well suited to participation in the program – thus demonstrating strategic relevance. Taking into account these new faculty position hires, the College of Veterinary Medicine has sufficient faculty FTE capacity to meet the workload demands of creating and delivering the program core and option-specific curricula. In addition, the College of Veterinary Medicine will commit 0.2 and 0.5 FTEs, respectively, to director and staff support. These commitments will be accomplished through reassignments of existing personnel.

All appropriate University committees and the OUS Provosts’ Council have positively reviewed the proposed program.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE
The OUS Provosts’ Council recommends that the Board’s Academic Strategies Committee authorize Oregon State University to establish an instructional program leading to a M.S./Ph.D. degree in Comparative Health Sciences, effective Spring 2014. With Committee approval, a five-year follow-up review of this program will be conducted in 2019-20.

(Committee action required.)