Minutes

1. Welcome and Introductions

Committee members present included Chair Jim Francesconi, Hannah Fisher, Dalton Miller-Jones, and Rosemary Powers.

Others present included Paul Kelly (President, OSBHE); Charles Martinez (VP, UO); Becky Johnson (CEO, OSU-Cascades); Ed Ray (President, OSU); Mary Cullinan (President, SOU); Chris Maples (President, OIT); Joel Alexander (IFS); Charles Lane (IFS); John Cieply (PSU/SEIU); Sabah Randhawa (Provost, OSU); Michael Jaeger (Provost, EOU); Roy Koch (Provost, PSU); Jim Klein (Provost, SOU); Jim Bean (Provost, UO); Bradley Burda (Provost, OIT); Kent Neely (Provost, WOU); Jim Middleton (President, COCC, HEAT); Neil Bryant (HEAT); Dave Porter; Chancellor George Pernsteiner; Vice Chancellor Susan Weeks; OUS staff: Joe Holliday, Alicia Ortega, Bob Turner, Larry Galizio, Bridget Burns, Bruce Schafer, Di Saunders, Endi Hartigan, and Charles Triplett.

Chair Francesconi welcomed back Susan Weeks from her sabbatical and thanked OUS staff Bob Turner, Joe Holliday, Charles Triplett, and others for helping staff the ASC in her absence.

Chair Francesconi introduced and contextualized agenda items in relation to the Board, Provost, Chancellor, and ASC goals to more closely align higher education to better meet the needs of the citizens in Oregon. Francesconi reported that the ASC has divided its work into 3 conceptual areas that complement the work of the Finance and Governance committees: 1) OUS portfolio and system efficiency (institution missions/portfolios, including Central Oregon and teacher education initiatives; and initiatives for graduate education developed by the Provosts’ Council); 2) alignment of the System for job creation and economic development (including initiatives of the Research Council, graduate education, sustainability initiatives, as well as regional initiatives); and 3) access and student success needs of all Oregonians (including initiatives for Latino students; rural Oregon students, Portland area students, Central Oregon students, and student success/retention system-wide). Chair Francesconi noted that the next steps for the ASC in April and May will be to seek cross-references among the many recommendations presented, and to prioritize actions based upon impact. Francesconi advised the initiative leaders to build on the work developed for the last legislative session, including the proposals developed by the previous Student Participation and Completion Committee.
ACTION

2. Approval of Minutes of February 11, 2010 Academic Strategies Committee

Chair Francesconi called for a motion to approve the February 2010 Committee minutes; Director Rosemary Powers moved to approve the minutes and Miller-Jones seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Priority Area Analysis and Development Reports; ASC recommendations regarding action items not requiring new funding

   a. Report on Latino Student Success priority area

Chair Francesconi called upon Dr. Charles Martinez, VP for Institutional Equity and Diversity at UO and Alicia Ortega, Special Assistant to the Chancellor, to present the report on Latino Student Success priority area. Martinez stated that the recommendations are being developed with the assistance of the Latino Student Success Resource Team, a multi-sector resource team including OUS campus representatives, community colleges, community organizations, elders, and others from across the state. He stressed that the reported recommendations are a draft still in progress, with two meetings of the resource team upcoming.

Dr. Martinez first provided demographic context on the Latino populations, particularly as it affects postsecondary education in Oregon. He reported that Oregon ranks with 20 other states as an exceedingly high growth state for emerging immigrant populations. In the previous decade, the Latino population in K-12 grew 250%. However, Latino students are transitioning to postsecondary education and training at low rates. K-12 drop-out rates for Latinos as more than twice those of other groups. Only 10% of Latinos living in Oregon between ages 25 and 64 have a BA or higher compared to 31% of Caucasian Oregonians. Many Oregon Latino adults are recent immigrants and there are major intergenerational issues related to education.

Dr. Martinez identified four recommended areas of focus for Latino student initiatives, the first two of which were included in the preliminary report: 1) pipeline and outreach—the connection between higher education, K-12, and families and communities; 2) overcoming access barriers—helping students, families and institutions to overcome K-16 barriers to postsecondary education; 3) improving retention and graduation; and 4) success after graduation—mentorships, career and professional pipelines, and pipelines to graduate school. Many of the OUS campuses have developed working groups that are informing these recommendations. The team has not yet completed recommendations on retention, graduation, and success after graduation.

Martinez highlighted several issues from the action steps in the draft written report. He explained that the Resource Team surveyed current campus activities and identified several promising practices for the creation of a college going culture for Latino students. They found that effective early college pipeline programs at Oregon campuses consistently use several common principles: they target middle school or younger students, focus on cultural strains, engage parents extensively, connect students to academic scholarship programs, and provide students visceral experiences that make college a frame of reference (class participation, graduation ceremonies). The Resource Team also identified the
importance of access to language supports throughout the pipeline and on the campuses. This includes K-12 ELL support, hiring of bilingual/bicultural faculty and staff, and providing campus print and web materials in Spanish so that parents can access information. While some departments at some OUS campuses translate materials, there is no consistency or methodologically sound approach to the methods for translation. The Resource Team also discussed OUS responsibility in training Oregon teachers to address some of the K-12 systemic challenges for Latino students.

Martinez reported that the final recommendations will reference structural issues such as the issue of tuition equity, a legally and politically complex issue unfolding in multiple states. The Latino Student Success Resource Team recognizes the complexity but will have a recommendation regarding tuition equity, as they value its importance for access for a generation of Oregonians who can be successful in K-12 but do not have access to higher education because of the cost. He also noted there is a long history of this issue in the federal DREAM Act and there is an opportunity for the Board to support certain provisions in the federal DREAM Act.

Alicia Ortega elaborated on the recommendations summarized in the draft report, noting that there are two items that could be acted upon more immediately. These include 1) inter-institutional or OUS collaboration on Spanish/English documents for parent information, and 2) use of OUS models to replicate development and implementation of outreach programs (mentoring, visitation, or family programs) at OUS institutions that currently have little or no programming in this area. Ortega added that many outreach recommendations overlap with the other initiative areas and the Resource Team wishes to collaborate with these initiatives such as the teacher education initiative. Other opportunities for action include advocacy for federal legislation within the DREAM Act or Pathways to College Act, and partnering with national and other organizations such as the Hispanic Scholarship Fund to better financially assist Latino students and provide internships and opportunities. The Pathways to College Act would potentially help Oregon’s high student-to-counselor ratio (11th nationally) and would assist in better guidance for all students in K-12.

Dr. Martinez added that there is an emerging recommendation to continue the work of the Latino Student Success Resource Team, as these conversations have not previously occurred at a state level. He acknowledged the work of the previous Student Participation and Completion Committee of the Board demonstrating the long history of unfulfilled promises in access to higher education for underserved populations. He emphasized that the Latino-focused work is in no way a replacement for the work on behalf of all of these underserved populations.

President Ed Ray asked about whether there is potential for collaborating across campuses for translation. Dr. Martinez responded that the universities certainly can either collaborate on this or devote resources to this activity at a system level.

Miller-Jones asked if the Resource Team has considered focusing on faculty effectiveness and possible campus collaboration on this area. Martinez responded that resource and graduation recommendations are still in development and will be presented in the final report.
President Ray inquired whether the team has asked the education deans about the need for bilingual teacher preparation. Martinez reported that two campus teacher education programs, WOU and UO, have explicitly prioritized preparing educators in bilingual instruction, and that there is opportunity for addressing this through partnership with the Teacher Education priority area leaders.

In response to a question from Director Francesconi regarding which campuses are not performing outreach, Ortega answered that EOU, OIT, and SOU desire to do more outreach but face challenges in identifying people on campus to establish culturally-specific programs, as well as resource challenges.

Chair Francesconi said that as with all recommendations, the new funding requests will need to be prioritized and it would be helpful to quantify the impacts of each recommendation. He asked if they were prioritized yet. Martinez indicated that the desire of the resource team is to prioritize very clearly but they have not prioritized at this point because their research and recommendations are not yet complete. After consultation with Dr. Martinez, Chair Francesconi said that the ASC would not move to adopt the report recommendations at this time but would provide direction and input.

Chancellor Pernsteiner advised Martinez to explicitly state the method by which the group arrives at prioritization and measures of efficacy. Against the backdrop of a possible 25% reduction in funding in 2011, this level of specificity will help the Board in making their decisions.

Director Dalton Miller-Jones said that access to good data is a key part of monitoring and targeting efficacy, underscoring the need for a PK-20 data system.

Rosemary Powers said that the issue of unfulfilled promises is serious, and suggested that all initiative leaders include a statement in their materials about the impossibility of advancing goals with a potential 25% cut. She emphasized the need to clarify that if we raise expectations we need to be prepared to fulfill them.

Chair Francesconi said that many of these Latino student success recommendations are simply about how we do business as a system and the resource requests are not exceedingly expensive. On tuition equity, Francesconi said the Board should recognize the legal issues, and should be thoughtful about how it approaches the issue. Martinez commented that there are practices to assist Latino students who face affordability barriers which do not involve tuition equity – for example, financial aid officers can appraise need without using the FAFSA alone.

Chair Francesconi said action will be taken on the Latino student success initiatives upon hearing the resource team’s final report.

b. Report on Central Oregon Student Success priority area

Chair Francesconi called on Di Saunders, Director of Communications, OUS, to begin the report on the Central Oregon Student Success priority area for HEAT (Higher Education Assessment Team) on behalf of Director Kirk Schueler who leads the initiative but could not be present. Saunders introduced Becky Johnson, CEO of OSU-Cascades, as well as HEAT members (by phone) Jim Middleton, President of
Central Oregon Community College (COCC), and Neil Bryant. Saunders provided background on the Board’s interest in Central Oregon, describing the large projected population growth in the Bend area as the reason for this strategic focus in the Board strategic plan. Bend was the fastest growing area of the state through 2008 and leaders still expect a population of 215,000 by 2025. The goal of HEAT is to address the collective higher education needs of Central Oregon given this population growth, and to link postsecondary education to economic and workforce needs in the region.

HEAT’s first recommendation is to transition to a “Home Campus” model for students who attend OSU-Cascades. OSU-Cascades currently has a traditional 2+2 model by which students spend 2 years at each institution, COCC and OSU. HEAT recommends that the campus shift this to a “home campus” model by which each student experience all four years as if they were on just one campus. Functions between COCC and OSU-Cascades would be aligned, and students would have a more central and transparent learning experience including one registrar and one office of financial aid, for example. The goal is for students to feel like they are cohorts in a single program.

Becky Johnson said that students in general prefer a 4-year experience, and they are working to identify what constitutes a 4-year experience to help retain more dually-enrolled students and attract more students. The retention rate for dually enrolled students at this time is significantly lower at OSU-Cascades/COCC than for other dually-enrolled OSU students. The home campus model will enhance the current learning experience by connecting students earlier with a collaboration of OSU and COCC faculty, and adding learning communities in the freshman year, while maintaining the cost advantage of COCC delivering lower division classes. President Jim Middleton added that this home campus will be a challenging but necessary intermediate step that will better meet the needs of students, and will keep the door open in the future for the transition to an independent university.

Saunders explained that some of the costs of the home campus model involve technology and capital investments, including a new building estimated at about $30M to handle the increased enrollment and to house the home campus learning cohorts. There would be a need for a 50% private match for this. Johnson said that OSU-Cascades currently leases their building from COCC, which results in their cost of instruction being quite high, and this building is used at capacity. A new building would house the first learning cohorts next door to the lower and upper division courses, contributing to home campus model. Neil Bryant added that the community is very excited and rejuvenated by these proposals and a 4-year campus is very important to the community in the long term. Middleton reported that COCC has a 200-acre campus with ample space for the physical expansion. In the last three years, their community college enrollment has increased by 85% so they have a capacity crunch.

Saunders reported that a second major component of the HEAT recommendations includes expansion of regional delivery points. The Bend campus would be the hub for postsecondary education delivery and deliver education throughout Central Oregon at satellite sites in Redmond, Prineville and Madras, for example. Because of the geographic isolation and the great size of Central Oregon, it is not feasible for many to move or to commute to Bend to pursue postsecondary education, and the resources of OSU-Cascades and COCC are critical to serve this population. HEAT is working to identify and expand course offerings at these sites that link to the economic needs of these areas. Johnson said this could link well with the applied baccalaureate developments and the Rural Student Success initiatives, and
Central Oregon might be a pilot site for some of these strategies. Middleton added that Senate Bill 442 work also emphasizes strategic use of satellite campuses by sharing physical facilities and offering courses by multiple institutions.

Director Powers commented that the Central Oregon and Rural initiatives have many commonalities, and asked whether the HEAT has collaborated with EOU distance learning. Saunders responded that they have not yet held those discussions with EOU but identifying these synergies is on the agenda for an upcoming meeting.

Saunders said additional recommendations include building partnerships for more precollege preparation, providing access points for adult learners including remedial programming, and ensuring that programs and coursework are tied to the economic and workforce needs. They are researching the possibility of additional graduate programs and signature research related to high-tech industry needs in the area. HEAT is also embarking on a set of public outreach meetings and focus groups to determine public input on these initiatives.

Director Powers suggested that since the Rural Student Success initiative team is also organizing public forums, it would be beneficial to keep each other informed.

President Ray noted that the currency and brand of an OSU or UO degree are valuable, and asked if HEAT has discussed how to determine the trigger points to move toward a stand-alone university. Saunders said they are working to build reputational capital with the new home campus model, and HEAT believes that with this model there is an ability to attract students from other parts of the state. They envision there will need to be more of a unique brand for the OSU-Cascades campus, and that in the future there will likely be a stand-alone university. Johnson added that in the transition period, the value of the OSU and UO degrees are very important. She said that often the critical-mass point for the transition to new stand-alone university occurs when enrollment reaches about 2,000 students.

Provost Randhawa commented that the University of Washington-Tacoma campus went through a similar 2+2 transition and it would be useful to look at lessons learned. He also commented that since currently the Cascades campus is accredited as part of OSU, the timing of this transition is critical.

Provost Jim Bean commented that UO offers about half the undergraduate credit hours in Bend and they need HEAT to help them identify the appropriate involvement of UO in Central Oregon. UO’s objective is to optimize what’s right for the people of Central Oregon.

Chair Francesconi asked the Board to discuss these recommendations. He noted that approving these recommendations would be a significant action because they would be accepting the long-term vision of a stand-alone campus in Bend with a strategy and action steps over time to get there. Francesconi added that he is in favor of the long term view of this report because this is a growing and important region of the state.

Director Miller Jones moved that the ASC accept the report from HEAT, with the exception of new funding requests, and endorse the ongoing work of HEAT. Director Powers seconded the motion.
Miller-Jones said we should recognize the excitement and energy which has occurred around HEAT regarding Central Oregon postsecondary education needs and economic development; he strongly supports the vision of this report and asked the Board to endorse the vision without endorsing yet the particular funding adjustment. He explained that while there have been arguments questioning OSU-Cascades, suggesting that these students should attend one of the existing larger universities, the fact is economic circumstances require people to stay place-bound. These initiatives would also better serve the Latino and Native American populations in this area.

Director Powers expressed support for the home campus model, and the emphasis on collaboration which needs to be a principle in better meeting the needs of Oregonians. Director Fisher also expressed support. President Ray commented that in order to maintain the college-going rate with an anticipated 37,000 more students by 2025, the system will need to build in order to increase capacity.

Board President Paul Kelly commended HEAT for their work, but asked for clarification on what the motion would adopt, noting the myriad issues and cost questions. Director Miller-Jones clarified that the motion was to accept the report, endorsing continuing work, but not commit to the financial issues in it. Chair Francesconi clarified that this would be similar to previous motions of the ACS which would endorse the report’s vision statement including the concept of a home campus, and would approve actions that are possible without reallocation or new funding.

The motion was approved unanimously.

c. Report on Graduate Education priority area

Chair Francesconi called upon OSU Provost Sabah Randhawa to present recommendations from the Provosts’ Council for initiatives related to graduate education. Randhawa reported that the proposals for graduation education were vetted in the past legislative session development and were focused on increasing competitiveness, but the Provosts have further prioritized their key proposals this year. The focus is more specific than in the last legislative cycle to better capitalize on synergy with other OUS goals in regard to sustainability and research. The two key elements of this proposal are to increase doctoral education capacity and to build professional science master’s programs.

Randhawa reported they are focusing on doctoral education because it is critical to driving research and the knowledge base for economic development. They are proposing an increase in resources in three key disciplines: sustainability; health/life sciences; and engineering, applied science and advanced manufacturing. The state has already invested in these areas through the signature research areas and ETIC (at an undergraduate level), and the doctoral focus would complement these state investments. These represent interdisciplinary areas and collaborations between all OUS campuses and OHSU. The OUS research enterprise has grown significantly without any net increase in faculty but that growth cannot be sustained indefinitely. The proposal includes investment in new faculty in these areas as well as competitive stipends and fellowships for graduate students.
The second recommendation is to build Professional Science Master’s (PSM) programs linking business management with science disciplines. Professional science masters programs are growing across the country with about 80 programs nationwide; they focus about 2/3 on the science discipline and 1/3 on business management. OUS is starting in this process and support of this growth can help the universities to make competitive proposals to the National Science Foundation which has funding for building such programs.

In response to a question on the subject focus, Provost Randhawa said the primary focus of these programs is generally in science, math, and emerging technologies. Director Francesconi suggested that the report make explicit these areas of focus.

President Ray commented that research is a critical part of graduate education and suggested the Board look at research challenge dollars to provide bridge and seed funding for research.

Chair Francesconi commented that these recommendations represent opportunities for advancement in the state at this time, and expressed his support for the proposals, noting that the Research and Portland Economic Development groups are looking at similar issues. Provost Koch commented that this proposal marks the first intentional alignment of OUS initiatives arising through ETIC, Oregon Inc, and sustainability so that they reinforce each other.

Director Miller-Jones expressed support as well as concerns around synergism and the danger of siloing of disciplines. He expressed concern about the increasing vocational focus of higher education. He cautioned about disinvesting in other units of the university, and said OUS needs to be careful to not shortchange our creative edge and the innovation that arises from a larger educational enterprise, as all the disciplines need each other.

Director Powers reinforced Miller-Jones’ comment and emphasized the value the humanities to the sciences. She also commented that in the Boards’ diversity-related initiatives they have focused on the role of better preparing teachers to serve underserved students. She is disappointed that the proposal doesn’t include a greater emphasis on the graduate preparation of educational professionals.

Provost Randhawa reported that the Provosts discussed teacher education but their prioritization was made because of the current resource environment and the alignment with other developments. The next step may be to link with education initiatives.

Chair Francesconi suggested that the diversity goals be made more purposeful in the proposal. Roy Koch reported that there is a minority science project across several OUS institutions focusing on developing pathways to get more minority students into graduate school.

Francesconi also reported that recent discussions with the arts communities have revealed opportunities for more partnerships between the arts economic clusters and higher education. He said that while the focus is on the sciences now in this economic environment, it will need to broaden to link to the economy in new ways and strategically expand this focus in the future. He also expressed support at this time for the focus as it stands, given the current economic climate.
Director Fisher moved to adopt the recommendations of the Provosts’ Council on graduate education, which would accept the focus on doctoral education and professional science masters programs but would not accept funding recommendations. Director Miller-Jones seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously.


Chair Francesconi called upon Provosts Kent Neely and Jim Bean to begin the report of the Provosts’ Council on the OUS portfolio. Provost Neely explained that the Provost Council was charged at the last Board retreat with looking at how to align and provide measurable dimensions for serving the OUS mission by institution. Provost Jim Bean said that after looking at the missions and functions of each institution, they realized the complexity of this task. Given that each institution is different, they drew on different strategic planning/faculty governance processes to develop mission statements. It was not surprising that these statements did not come together easily as a portfolio, because they were developed differently. Therefore, the Provosts decided that instead of adjusting the mission statements to align the missions, they would first embark upon a process of translating these mission statements to link the institutions to the OUS missions and goals.

They began with the four goals in the Board’s strategic plan and sought to determine if the universities are satisfying the Boards’ missions and goals, and whether they are doing so effectively and efficiently. They realized that in order to answer this requires translation into more specificity. For example, part of the OUS goal is to provide access to higher education for Oregonians from all areas of the state. The Provosts’ translated this to more specific level categories, such as educating Portland students in Portland, educating Eastern Oregon students in Eastern Oregon, statewide education of Oregon students who are not place-bound, and distance education. They ultimately broke out the goals into a set of 3 aspects and developed three matrices to show the interaction between the institutions and these aspects. These three aspects are undergraduate access, program mission intensity, and innovation and research, and they worked to define and clarify these aspects.

They then sought to link the institutions to these aspects. They asked each institution to rank its intensity level in each programmatic area. Level 1 implies leadership responsibility in this area. Level 2 would mean a mission in this area, contributing but not taking primary responsibility. Level 3 would mean a slight involvement, participation, but not a significant player. The level 4 or “blank” category implies no participation. To encourage a common use of the rankings, the institutions will be compared on the intensity level they reported with other schools that rank themselves the same.

There have been very few changes from the universities in their entries, and the process has already allowed the Provosts to learn about each other’s complex missions. They are already seeing interesting findings. For example, they are finding in some areas such as teacher preparation, many “1” rankings. In geographic coverage, they are discovering gaps; for example, no institutions ranked access for coastal Oregon to be a primary mission focus. This process will begin to make clear where there are areas that are not being covered in the mission and goals of OUS, and possible areas of duplication. Then, they will be able to focus on exploring good versus wasteful duplication.
Kent Neely reported that this inventory process has been very collegial, and he thanked Bob Turner for staffing this work in preparation for the provosts’ work session.

President Mary Cullinan said one of the true values of this process at SOU has been in the resulting campus conversations among leadership. One of the issues discussed was how to arrive at metrics to determine intensity levels in focus areas. For example, in the innovation area, they explored the question of whether to include just traditional research or the broader sense of pedagogical research and arts excellence.

Provost Michael Jaeger commented that they are looking at supply side rather than the needs of Oregonians in an effort to bring to light what the system is not doing.

Bob Turner commended the provosts for their work and collegial interaction. Chair Francesconi noted the importance of this systemic approach for the governance issues being discussed.

4. **Adjournment**

Chair Francesconi adjourned the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

*Minutes prepared by Endi Hartigan*