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

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

Campus representatives present: Steve Adkison (EOU), Brad Burda (Oregon Tech), Rebecca Warner (OSU), Sona Andrews (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**

   Acting Chair Eiland called the meeting of the Academic Strategies Committee to order at 1:03 p.m.

2. **Approval of November 7th Minutes**

   Dr. Karen Marrongelle, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Strategies, noted an amendment to the November minutes. The amendment modifies the existing language to the section on faculty sabbaticals to emphasize that Chancellor’s Office staff will work with the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) to provide support for additional research and policy planning.

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

3. **Academic Program Approval**

   a. **OSU, M.S./Ph.D. in Comparative Health Sciences**

      Acting Chair Eiland called upon Rebecca Warner, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs at Oregon State University, to provide an overview of the proposed academic program. The M.S./Ph.D. in Comparative Health Sciences is to provide students with an interdisciplinary graduate degree program administered by the Graduate School in partnership with the College of Veterinary Medicine, College of Public Health and Human Services, and the College of Pharmacy. The program is designed to complement the existing M.S./Ph.D. in Molecular and Cellular Biology. In Oregon, no biomedical
science programs overlaps with the program, and the interdisciplinary organization that ranges from animal to human health sciences is distinct.

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

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

4. **Review of HECC Transition**

Acting Chair Eiland called on Dr. Marrongelle to provide an update on the work of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) Transition Planning Work Group. It was reported that the authority and process for approving program approvals will transition to the HECC in July 2014. OUS staff will continue to work with the HECC on the pragmatics of the transition, noting HECC Board Director Kirby Dyess has been appointed to lead a subcommittee for the purpose of reviewing and approving academic programs. In addition, the HECC Transition Work Group has laid out a timeline with key transition points for the remainder of the year, noting that over the next 12-18 months, the HECC will work on the principles that will guide program approvals.

**NEXT STEPS:** Staff will regularly update the Provosts’ Council and Academic Strategies Committee as planning continues.

5. **40-40-20 Strategy and Action Framework**

Acting Chair Eiland called on Director Yaden to provide an update on the HECC’s work on 40-40-20. It was noted that the work previously conducted by the Board and OUS staff on 40-40-20 has well positioned the HECC in moving the project forward. It was pointed out that work has been done to expose the mismatch of degrees produced with that of job opportunities, suggesting that HECC and OEIB leadership may opt to look at the performance of cohorts as opposed to the total population in 2025.

Following the discussion, it was agreed that the HECC may have influence in reaching agreement with stakeholders over the cost of attaining degrees within certain populations of students, as well as assisting the state in determining how many degrees they can fund based off of the investment in 40-40-20. The Committee cautioned that while coalescing support is needed, it should not be done at the expense of quality.

**INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

6. **SOU Report on Campus Retrenchment**

Acting Chair Eiland called upon Provost Jim Klein, Southern Oregon University, to update the Committee on campus retrenchment. It was noted that “retrenchment” is a technical term that stems from the campus’ collective bargaining agreement with faculty. While campuses are permitted to create as many programs as needed through the regular approval process, a separate process is needed to eliminate programs on campus: 1) a fiscal condition and 2) the retrenchment process. Provost Klein reviewed the timeline for SOU’s retrenchment and detailed points where faculty involvement intersected with this process. It was reported that SOU’s provisional plan is slated for
release on January 17th. Once the plan is released, there is a 20-day comment period that allows the campus to reflect upon the plan. In addition, SOU is considering its financial goals, which will allow for a variety of levers and greater flexibility for contingencies in the decision-making process (i.e., student enrollment, collective bargaining, etc.). The final plan is slated to be released in late February or early March.

Discussion centered on the effect of retrenchment on SOU’s campus culture and faculty, noting that the campus previously initiated a capacity study for accreditation purposes, and engaged in a prioritization process that was intended to better align the work of the institution. In addition, SOU has experienced a contraction in enrollment numbers due to an uptake in the economic recovery, noting that enrollment can significantly impact predictability indicators for retention.

7. IFS Update on Faculty Sabbatical OAR

Acting Chair Eiland called on Maude Hines, IFS Representative, to brief the Committee on faculty discussions around possible modifications to the administrative rule on sabbaticals. It was noted that the sabbatical OAR was looked at in isolation and not matched up against other issues faced by campuses and the System. IFS will begin to outline its annual priorities at the January 31st meeting, with additional conversations to follow.

After a full and frank discussion, it was noted that statewide changes to higher education may serve as a vehicle to think creatively about modifications to the Sabbatical OAR, specifically in terms of the fiscal capacity of institutions to support sabbatical requests.

NEXT STEPS: Staff will conduct a preliminary literature review of national best practices and consider consulting the Educational Advisory Board for additional research. In addition, Director Plec will collect and review campus bargaining agreements in order to learn about current policy and practice on campuses.

OTHER ITEMS

8. No other items were put forward by the committee

9. Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:34 p.m.