Provosts’ Council Report on Mission Alignment

Overview

Our goal is to organize and display the alignment of our institutional missions with the various aspects of the OUS mission and goals. We then present a process for inferring performance metrics from the OUS mission to each institution. We envision four steps:

1. Extracting aspects from the OUS mission and goals that must be covered by the collection of institutional missions
2. Aligning of our missions to cover the goals
3. Developing performance metrics for each OUS mission aspect
4. Inferring institutional metrics from 2 and 3.

This document reflects the assessments of provosts regarding their institution’s focus on the mission elements portrayed. These assessments were made with the understanding that the Board will ultimately judge whether they reflect the array, distribution, and intensity of focus needed across OUS to meet the Board’s goals.

Premises

1. The OUS mission is complex. Various aspects of its mission require different types of educational processes and institutions. In total, the missions of the institutions must cover the aspects of the OUS mission to the extent possible with current funding.
2. Each OUS institution is complex and contributes to multiple aspects of the OUS mission.
3. There are many variations of strategic planning; hence, there are many approaches to developing mission statements. The current institutional mission statements come from different planning styles, formats and constituencies, making it difficult to recognize relationships beyond a single campus. Institutions must also meet NWCCU accreditation requirements in their expression of mission and core themes, and those requirements have just undergone revision. Rather than work directly with institution mission statements, the Provosts’ Council approach is to create a “translation” that presents the OUS portfolio clearly.

Duplication

There are many aspects of the OUS mission that are covered by more than one institution. This duplication is necessary at some points, desirable at some points, and perhaps wasteful at some points. We believe there are multiple reasons for having duplicate coverage of a mission aspect:

1. It is necessary as part of the educational core at all comprehensive institutions (sustainability, general education, sciences, humanities, arts);
2. High demand may require multiple programs in the same discipline;
3. Similar program titles may mask important differences and diversity in program content and approaches;

4. Multiple programs in a given discipline may be necessary to bring in funding not provided by the state; and

5. Duplication may be wasteful and should therefore be reconciled.

Aspects of the OUS Mission

The OUS mission and goals (see appendix) are the guide for the institutional missions. However, the institutions have multiple stakeholders and the need to attend to these varied constituencies may lead to missions that go beyond the OUS scope.

From the OUS mission and goals, we extracted three sets of mission aspects: undergraduate access, program mission intensity, and innovation/research. The focus of Undergraduate Access and Program Mission Intensity is primarily on meeting Oregon’s needs. In the case of Undergraduate Access, specific geographic regions represent areas that institutions primarily serve, focusing on students in and from those regions; a “statewide” category reflects the level of draw of students to an institution from throughout the state; and “via distributed education” reflects an institution’s activity in and commitment to serving students through online or distance education. The Program Mission Intensity aspect reflects the array of academic programs, broadly defined, available to Oregon students across OUS institutions.

In contrast, the elements of Innovation/Research need to be viewed in the larger national and international context to meet the Board’s goal of achieving globally competitive research. Further definition of “innovation/research” is under way to address, for example, innovations in pedagogy as well as disciplinary research.

During our work session of February 11, 2010, we developed the following elements within each set of mission aspects.

**Undergraduate Access**

1. Educated citizenry and economic development special to **specific geographic areas** of the state:
   a. Portland
   b. Eastern Oregon
   c. Southern Oregon
   d. Central Oregon
   e. Coastal Oregon
   f. Willamette Valley

2. Educated citizenry and economic development **statewide** (students not from the primary region of the institution)

3. Educated citizenry and economic development **via distributed education**
Program Mission Intensity

1. General education
2. Sciences
3. Humanities and social sciences
4. Engineering/technology
5. Natural resources
6. Healthcare
7. Business
8. Journalism/Communications/Digital media
9. Preparation of educators
10. Arts
11. Architecture
12. Law

Innovation/Research

1. Sciences
2. Humanities and social sciences
3. Engineering/technology
4. Natural resources
5. Healthcare
6. Business
7. Journalism/Communications/Digital media
8. Preparation of educators
9. Arts
10. Architecture
11. Law

Institutional Coverage of OUS Mission

The OUS mission aspects are achieved by one or more institutions committing themselves to each aspect. We now present a first pass at mapping the missions of each institution to the various OUS aspects. We present this mapping as a set of three matrices, each listing mission aspects in the row categories and the institutions across the columns. The numerical entries in the cells represent mission intensity for that institution’s commitment to that OUS mission aspect. A value of 1 implies primary mission intensity for that institution – a commitment to a leadership responsibility in providing that aspect coverage. A value of 2 indicates secondary mission intensity – substantial involvement by the institution but not a commitment to leadership of the area. A value of 3 indicates some involvement by that institution in that mission aspect. A blank cell indicates that the institution is not materially involved in that mission aspect. It is important to note that these are institution declared mission intensities and do not address quality of program or number of students involved.

Table 1: Undergraduate Access Mission Intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Program Mission Intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GenEd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HumSoc</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engin/Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaturalRes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour/Comm/Digital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The core-program cells in black in Table 2 indicate programs that must be present for any comprehensive university. Hence, it is expected that all institutions have some program mission intensity in these programs. The gray cells reflect inclusion of OHSU to indicate where it serves as a strong collaborator with OUS institutional missions.

It is important to note the number of aspects rated at primary mission intensity (“1”) by each institution. As expected, the three larger institutions have many more “1s” than do the smaller institutions.

It should be an annual process of the Presidents’ Council, Chancellor, and Board to review these matrices and evaluate any changes and duplications. This review should also be incorporated into the annual performance measurement process.

### Table 3: Innovation/Research Mission Intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOU</th>
<th>OIT</th>
<th>OSU</th>
<th>PSU</th>
<th>SOU</th>
<th>UO</th>
<th>WOU</th>
<th>OHSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HumSoc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engin/Tech</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaturalRes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jour/Comm/Digital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The core-program cells in black in Table 2 indicate programs that must be present for any comprehensive university. Hence, it is expected that all institutions have some program mission intensity in these programs. The gray cells reflect inclusion of OHSU to indicate where it serves as a strong collaborator with OUS institutional missions.

It is important to note the number of aspects rated at primary mission intensity (“1”) by each institution. As expected, the three larger institutions have many more “1s” than do the smaller institutions.

It should be an annual process of the Presidents’ Council, Chancellor, and Board to review these matrices and evaluate any changes and duplications. This review should also be incorporated into the annual performance measurement process.
Performance Metrics

We believe we should define performance metrics for each aspect of the OUS mission and goals rather than for each institution. Through the mission intensity matrices above, those metrics are then inferred by the institutions.

Below is the first pass at a metrics framework based on the mission aspects defined above. These metrics will be further developed by provosts, presidents, and Chancellor’s staff as part of ongoing performance measurement activities that address both System-level and campus-specific performance measures. In addition, the metrics will need to align with the larger performance framework discussions currently in progress with the Board’s Governance and Policy Committee. Meanwhile, the metrics displayed below are intended to serve as a placeholder pending further work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Aspect</th>
<th>Suggested Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Undergraduate Access        | • Enrollment of students from the designated geographic area or through distance education  
                              | • Degrees awarded to students from the designated geographic area or through distance education |
| Program Mission Intensity   | • Enrollment of students in the designated program area (number of majors and credit hour enrollment)  
                              | • Degrees awarded in the program area  
                              | • As appropriate for the program, pass rates for licensure or certification |
| Innovation and Research     | • Grants, contracts, and gifts in that discipline area  
                              | • Statewide, national, or international awards in that discipline area  
                              | • Other scholarly or research output, as appropriate for the discipline, such as: patents, licenses, and startups; books and articles published; juried performances and exhibitions |

By pairing the mission intensity matrices with these metrics, a special set of metrics is inferred for each institution. Analyses can be done of temporal changes in values for each institution-metric pair and across institutions compared on performance on any metric for which they share a mission aspect. We believe these comparisons will be valuable management tools for both the institutions and the Board.

Conclusion

We believe this exercise shows that the OUS Institutions are accomplishing the mission and goals set out by OUS in its Long Range Plan. The mission intensity matrices show that many aspects of the mission are covered by multiple institutions. Much of this duplication is necessary and appropriate. We look forward to working with the Presidents and Board to improve efficiency where possible, though we do not believe there is much wasteful duplication.
Issues Needing Further Discussion

1. Adequacy of coverage of all board goals across the three matrices
2. Defining the values more explicitly and calibrating them across institutions
3. The number of “1s,” “2s,” or “3s” an institution should have, adjusting for institution size and broad mission
4. The array of discipline/program categories to be included in Tables 2 and 3 – is this the right set?
5. How to handle “innovation of pedagogy” in Table 3
6. How to reflect an institution’s commitment to graduate education (apart from innovation and research)
7. Refinement of metrics
8. Use of this document by the Board, including comparisons across institutions
Appendix: OUS Mission and Goals

OUS Mission Statement

The Legislative Assembly declares that the mission of all higher education in Oregon is to:

1. Enable students to extend prior educational experiences in order to reach their full potential as participating and contributing citizens by helping them develop scientific, professional and technological expertise, together with heightened intellectual, cultural and humane sensitivities and a sense of purpose.
2. Create, collect, evaluate, store and pass on the body of knowledge necessary to educate future generations.
3. Provide appropriate instructional, research and public service programs to enrich the cultural life of Oregon and to support and maintain a healthy state economy.

ORS 351.009 [1993 c.240 §5]

OUS Goals

The Board, on behalf of OUS, seeks to accomplish four broad goals to produce the highest level of educational outcomes for Oregonians:

1. Create in Oregon an educated citizenry to support responsible roles in a democratic society and provide a globally competitive workforce to drive the State’s economy, while ensuring access for all qualified Oregonians to quality postsecondary education.
   a. OUS will provide leadership in promoting a culture of educational attainment in Oregon, encouraging high aspirations, supporting solid performance, facilitating lifelong learning, and helping Oregonians to see the opportunities and new possibilities that greater (and higher) education can offer.
   b. OUS will endeavor to provide affordable access to high-quality postsecondary education for all Oregonians, and encourage Oregonians from every income level, region, gender, age, and racial/ethnic background to seek such opportunities. In the evolving global environment, the pool of qualified Oregonians OUS will serve includes recent high school and community college graduates, a more ethnically diverse student population, and older Oregonians seeking postsecondary educational opportunities for economic, re-training, or other reasons.
   c. Because regional, national, and international diversity enriches the campus learning environment and broadens the marketplace of ideas within which OUS students are educated, OUS will also serve an appropriate mix of students from other states and countries (at least some of whom are likely to stay in and contribute to Oregon during their working careers, or make later contributions as alumni).
2. Ensure **high-quality student learning** leading to subsequent student success.

   a. The Board of Higher Education believes that access without quality is meaningless.
   b. Quality instruction requires the development and sustenance of high quality academic programs which, in turn, are dependent on a strong base of top-notch faculty. Student success should be measured both in terms of subjective and objective program quality and student success following program completion. Graduates of OUS must be educated to be globally competitive in the marketplace and responsible in their contributions to the well-being of society.
   c. Recognizing that significant contributions to student success occur outside of the classroom as well as in class, the Board believes that effective on-campus student support services are critical to successful student performance and degree completion.

3. Create **original knowledge** and **advance innovation**.

   a. Creating new knowledge and advancing innovation through its application and integration in the sciences, technology, professions, humanities, and creative arts is a mission vested primarily in universities and in the Oregon University System. The purpose of knowledge creation and dissemination is to infuse teaching with state-of-the-art developments in the disciplines; advance knowledge and technologies toward improving the health and welfare of all citizens; expand and deepen our understanding of society and ourselves through literary and artistic creation; and where possible, bring the products of discovery and innovation to the civic, cultural, and economic benefit of all Oregonians.
   b. One rationale for identifying knowledge creation as a desired outcome is the development of a globally competitive advantage for OUS and the State of Oregon.

4. Contribute positively to the **economic, civic, and cultural life of communities** in all regions of Oregon.

   a. In addition to the value provided to the State by preparing students to be productive members of society and creating original knowledge, OUS institutions themselves have significant positive impacts on the State and its communities.
   b. OUS universities will actively foster effective partnerships with business and civic organizations to leverage the academic resources of the campus in support of the economic, civic, and cultural assets of the state and its communities.
   c. OUS universities will serve as exemplars in their communities, embodying democratic principles and promoting tolerance and inclusion.