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

Chancellor’s staff present: Karen Marrongelle, Anna Teske, Charles Triplett, and Marcia Stuart.

Campus representatives present: Brad Burda (Oregon Tech), Sukhwant Jahj (PSU), Jim Klein (SOU), Scott Coltrane (UO), Steve Scheck (WOU), and David Robinson (OHSU).

### ACTION ITEMS

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

   Director Yaden called the meeting of the Academic Strategies Committee to order at 3:18 p.m.

2. **APPROVAL OF JUNE 2013 MINUTES**

   **ACTION:** Directors Emily Plec made the motion to approve the minutes and Jim Middleton seconded. Motion carried.

3. **ACADEMIC PROGRAM APPROVALS**

   - **Oregon Tech, M.S. in Marriage and Family Therapy**

   Director Yaden called upon Brad Burda, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Oregon Tech to provide an overview of the proposed academic program. The M.S. in Marriage and Family Therapy is designed to prepare students to become effective and ethical marriage and family therapists. The program emphasizes in-depth skill development, supports the campus mission to offer rigorous applied degree programs, and provides licensure opportunities for students in the Klamath Basin. Currently, four degree programs have been approved for Licensed Marriage and Family Therapist Licensure; however the Oregon Tech program is the only one of its kind in the region and helps to meet the demand for counseling programs.

   **ACTION:** Directors Emily Plec made the motion to approve the programs, and Jim Middleton seconded. Motion carried.
NEXT STEPS: Staff will generate a report detailing the academic programs that have been approved by ASC over the last five years.

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

4. EXCEPTION TO POLICY FOR ON-SITE EXTERNAL REVIEW

Director Yaden called upon Karen Marrongelle, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Strategies to review the work of the Provost Council on the development of process for authorizing Virtual External Review as part of the program approval process. The Provost Council is currently considering options for integrating this approach into the existing program approval process, and would require virtual visit to be approved by the Council before advancing to the Academic Strategies Committee for full program consideration.

David Robinson, Executive Vice Provost, Oregon Health & Science University (OHSU) discussed the requested policy exception for on-site external review for OHSU’s PhD in Epidemiology and Portland State University’s (PSU) PhD in Community Health. This exception would permit PSU and OHSU to conduct a coordinated virtual review, as a means for fulfilling the site visit component of the program review process. Since the programs will eventually be linked to one another in a single school of public health, the same reviewers have been assigned to assess both programs. The external review process is robust, and the programs do not require on-site review of special instruction or lab space.

ACTION: Directors Jim Middleton made the motion to approve the policy exception, and Emily Plec seconded. Motion carried.

NEXT STEPS: Committee members would like PSU and OHSU to report back to the committee on the process, detailing pros and cons, as well as what was learned from the virtual review experience.

5. FY14 INCENTIVE FUNDING

Director Yaden asked Dr. Marrongelle to update the Committee on the process for disbursing Campus Incentive Funding. The model of distributing funds follows the method that was used in the prior biennium. The Provost Council and Finance & Administration Committee both support the continuation of this practice. For Fiscal Year 2014, $3,368,841 was set aside to reward and incentivize institutions based on a performance funding model. The allocations are based on two metrics:

- Metric 1- Half of available funding for the number of degrees at each institution awarded to Oregonians in 2012-13.
- Metric 2- Half of funding for the number of degrees each institution awards to underrepresented and/or rural Oregonians in 2012-13.

Discussion centered on how the funds are used on campus, what happens if campuses do not reach the projected goals, and what consideration has been given to modifying the metrics to assist campuses in thinking more broadly about 40-40-20.
ACTION: Directors Jim Middleton made the motion to approve FY 14 Incentive Funding, and Emily Plec seconded. Motion carried.

NEXT STEPS: Staff will follow up on the details of how the amount of Incentive Funding set aside, is determined by the F&A committee.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

6. **DIVERSITY GOALS REPORT**

Director Yaden called on Dr. Marrongelle to provide an overview of the Diversity Report, including the addition of action steps, aspirational goals for degree completion, and the foundation for a qualitative study for students of color. In addition, staff reviewed regional demographic data for campuses without statewide missions, and evaluated how well enrollment numbers matched with regional high school graduation rates. The Diversity Report also identifies areas for further study, and looks at the impact of high and low socioeconomic status on completion.

Discussion centered on staff sharing the document with other statewide stakeholders like the Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB) and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC), highlighting the need to use the document as a tool for holding institutions accountable for their aspirational goals.

NEXT STEPS: Staff will share the Diversity Report Document with both the OEIB and the HECC.

7. **40-40-20 STRATEGY AND ACTION FRAMEWORK**

Director Yaden opened the discussion on 40-40-20, by teeing up several important questions for the Academic Strategies Committee. It was noted that Committee Leadership would like to wrap this project up over the course of the next few meetings, in order to hand the work off to the HECC for additional planning. The 40-40-20 Discussion Paper highlighted three discussion points: 1) how is the 40-40-20 goal defined; 2) should allocating targets be a top down or bottom up approach; 3) methods for incorporating other policy considerations into the framework.

The Committee agreed that several factors must be taken into consideration when defining the goal, noting that the State should target a specific age group of students, and position them to reach the goal by the time they reach age 35. The discussion centered on possible models for a bidding process, based on the portion of set assumptions each institution is willing to take on, based on institutional mission, resources and capacity, etc. Within these considerations, campuses must also consider gaps in the job market and determine how academic programs may help to address growing industry needs, as assess where there is existing capacity for growth.

In addition, the Committee discussed target allocation and whether it should be framed as a top down or bottom up approach. It was agreed that a bottom up approach provided the greatest degree of flexibility for campuses, suggesting that leading indicator that established benchmarks, would help the state incrementally gauge whether or not the goal is being reached, with feedback...
circulating through a central system that could reconfigure strategies as needed. Reference was made to the relationship between capital investment and the rate at which goals are achieved, noting that metrics ought to be paired with investments in order to see concrete results. Furthermore, the Provost Council advocated that the conversation should center on the types of investments needed for campuses and the State to reach 40-40-20.

The final question considered by the committee focused on how values are weighted, and whether these weights are adjusted by individual campus and/or sub-targets. After a full and frank discussion, the Committee agreed that any bidding model should reflect the dialogue about achievement gaps, and allow institutions to say what they are willing to take on, while communicating what is needed to achieve the 40-40-20 goal and establishes an accountability structure that is locally based.

Following the discussion, reference was made to the role private institutions and OHSU in taking on a portion of the 40-40-20 goal.

**NEXT STEPS:** Staff will consider the role private institution and OHSU play in moving towards the 40-40-20 goal. In addition, the Committee will focus future conversations on the development of sub-targets, specifically around graduate degrees and the impact on the State’s economy.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

8. **HECC ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CREDIT FOR PRIOR LEARNING REPORT**

Director Yaden called upon Karen Marrongelle to provide an overview of the HECC’s Credit for Prior Learning Report (CPL) and policy development. House Bill 4059 (2012), directs the HECC to work with education stakeholders to develop specific goals for expanding and improving access to CPL. The HECC’s advisory committee, worked to identify strategies, including the development of statewide policies that ensure high quality CPL opportunities for students.

It was noted that a great deal of the policy framework was informed by the OUS CPL Policy, which was approved by the Academic Strategies Committee in June. Both policies provide essential components that guide campuses through the development of local policies that reflect institutional needs. This fall, the HECC CPL Advisory Committee is seeking feedback on the proposed implementation strategy in order to ensure that it is enacted effectively and efficiently. A final report on CPL standards will be delivered to the HECC in November, with a full report to the Legislature in January.

**OTHER ITEMS**

9. **NO OTHER ITEMS WERE PUT FORWARD BY THE COMMITTEE**
10. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.