



Background for the Academic Strategies Committee Discussion of Institution Missions

History

During the mid-1970s, the Board and its Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs spent several years reviewing policies regarding institution missions and programs. That review is summarized in the current *Board Policy Governing Curricular Allocations, Policies and Procedures* (see Attachment 1). In its review and discussions, the Board recognized institution-, System-, and state-level perspectives and needs with respect to programs and curricula, as well as capacity, cost, and financing issues involved in implementing them. The guidelines the Board developed addressed coordinated curriculum development, program duplication considerations, differential functions for institutions and areas of specialization, the Board's particular responsibility for certain higher-cost professional and graduate programs, the need for flexibility within the framework of jurisdictional assignments to institutions, and the need to provide for adequate availability of educational opportunities without unnecessary or unwise duplication of resources.

In 1998, the Board's Governance and Structure Committee recommended review of all institution mission statements, including:

- Mission review and possible revision (EOU, OIT, OSU, PSU);
- Mission review as part of the regular regional accreditation process (SOU, UO, WOU);
- Mission review after a new institution president takes office, if so desired; and
- Development of a mission preamble "that describes how each campus mission contributes to the mission and success of the Oregon University System."

The Board approved the recommendations. Subsequently, during 1999, the Board's System Strategic Planning Committee (formerly Governance and Structure) discussed the progress on the mission revisions and preamble development, examined each institution's submission in more depth, offered comment for further consideration, and ultimately approved institution mission statements.

During 2002-2008, new presidents assumed leadership at several institutions and, in the course of their new strategic planning efforts, mission statements were revised at the campus level in anticipation of bringing them forward for Board approval. At the same time, the Board undertook a significant long-range planning effort during 2005 and 2006 that addressed institution missions through the principle of managing OUS as "a portfolio of institutions with the objective of delivering optimal overall outcomes for the benefit of all citizens across Oregon." Under the portfolio approach, individual institutions would contribute in varying ways

and with different emphases to the achievement of the Board's four broad goals¹ so that, collectively, the goals for OUS could be successfully met. The portfolio principle holds presidents and the Chancellor jointly responsible and accountable for the successful accomplishment of OUS goals and outcomes.

As a first step in the portfolio process, each president was asked to present his or her own perspective on their institution's mission, goals, characteristics, and strategic priorities. These presentations took place throughout 2007. A common template of background information was developed for each institution jointly by the institution president, provost, and the Vice Chancellor for Strategic Programs and Planning (see Attachment 2). In addition, presidents prepared and distributed their own presentation materials. The presentations addressed mission focus and commitments, programs of distinction, student characteristics, faculty teaching and research, funding, strategic priorities, and special challenges.

The intention was to conclude that phase of the portfolio review with Board discussion of themes and potential directions suggested by the presentations and background data, with the aim of bringing the results into an emerging "OUS portfolio." However, as the Board completed the first year of the strategic plan implementation in 2007, the focus of the early 2008 planning efforts shifted to specific issues related to student success, institution financial viability, needs of the Portland metropolitan area, Oregon's potential in the area of sustainability, and other broad strategic directions; the focus on institution missions and the OUS portfolio was temporarily set aside.

Meanwhile, institutional accreditation requirements led to Board approval in 2008 of new mission statements for Southern Oregon University and Eastern Oregon University. In the case of SOU, the new mission statement included a focus on programs related to regional needs. By 2009, questions arising from both inside and outside of OUS, including accrediting agencies and the Legislature, elevated the need to address institution missions and their role in defining and advancing the OUS portfolio.

Attachments

- Board Policies and Procedures Governing Curricular Allocations
- Template for 2007 portfolio background information prepared by each institution

¹ Goals: (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; (2) ensure high-quality student learning leading to subsequent student success; (3) create original knowledge and advance innovation; and (4) contribute positively to the economic, civic, and cultural life of communities in all regions of Oregon.

ATTACHMENT 1:

BOARD POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING CURRICULAR ALLOCATIONS

CURRICULAR ALLOCATIONS, POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING

Under the curricular allocations system, institutions may offer only those instructional programs and courses that have been approved for them by the State Board of Higher Education.

In the area of curriculum and instruction—as in other areas of its operation—the Board functions in accordance with well-thought-out policies. These policies guide the Board in acting and inform the institutions about the general principles the Board will observe as it deals with issues in the areas of curriculum and instruction. During the period 1973-1976, the Board and its Committee on Instruction, Research, and Public Service Programs reviewed policies in respect to curricular allocations, institutional guidelines, program duplication and elimination, and program review. Following are summaries of policy statements adopted during that review.

Board Posture Toward Curricular Allocations

1. The Board of Higher Education seeks to be sensitive to and aware of the educational needs of the state, needs that the Oregon University System ought, within its general mission, to serve.
2. The Board welcomes the efforts of its institutions to plan vigorously for meeting the changing needs for public higher education in Oregon, consistent with the missions of the institutions, and bearing always in mind that the Board must assess institutional requests for new programs in the light of whether the program can be demonstrated to be in the best interests of the state as a whole, and within the economic capacity of the state to support.

It is to be emphasized that curricular planning includes not alone identification of unmet educational needs and the development of coursework designed to serve them; it includes, as well, the responsibility to evaluate existing programs in some systematic, orderly way, and to reduce or to eliminate those whose continuance at current levels "cannot be justified by defensible criteria."

3. The Board's decisions on instructional requests for authorization of new instructional programs must rest upon a solid base of factual data relating to:
 - a. The extent and nature of the state's need for the proposed new program (considering the existence of any similar programs already being offered in the System or by the community colleges or independent colleges and universities).
 - b. The appropriateness of the proposed new program to the institution's mission and objectives.

- c. The capacity of the requesting institution to offer a program of substantial quality.
- d. Costs to the state—both initial and long term—of financing a program of reasonable quality of the kind being requested.

The outline endorsed by the Board March 23, 1976, as the basis for developing requests for authorization of new degree and certificate programs, is included as an Appendix A, Guidelines for Review of New Programs.

Basic Premises Underlying Curricular Allocations

1. Based upon more than 45 years of corporate experience in the field, the State Board of Higher Education reaffirms its support of the principles of curricular allocations as being fundamental to effective curricular planning and development within the Oregon University System.
2. Board's reaffirmations of curricular allocations rest on the following premises:
 - a. A system of coordinated development of collegiate curricula is vital to Oregon since it enables the conservation of limited resources and their allocation in accordance with a strategy that assures adequate availability of educational opportunities for qualified youths.
 - b. Not all duplication of curricula is wasteful. Duplication of courses or of curricular programs is an evil only when it results in unnecessarily costly courses or instructional programs, or a reduction in the quality of the courses or programs either existing or to be offered.

In many instances, student interest in and need for given courses, or for access to given instructional programs, is sufficiently great that these courses or programs can be offered at two or more institutions without unnecessarily high costs and without reduction in the quality of the offering.

- c. The concept of differential functions for institutions lies at the heart of the curricular allocations concept. Such differentiation promotes:
 - (1) Specialization by the institutions, leading to the development of high-quality programs in curricular areas assigned any given institution. This is particularly critical in the professional and graduate areas, where anything less than a program of the first order puts Oregon students at a genuine disadvantage. Limitation of institutions to certain specified professional and graduate programs lessens the possibility that funds needed to maintain these programs at a high level of excellence will be drawn off for

support of other programs the institution might otherwise seek to establish.

- (2) Effective concentration of the state's limited resources in the development of at least one high quality program in a given professional or graduate area, in lieu of several anemic, deficient ones.
- d. Within certain professional, semi-professional, or graduate areas, requiring costly equipment, highly specialized faculty, and/or unique building facilities, a single institution should be given exclusive responsibility for development of a program of excellence. Other System institutions wishing to offer the prerequisite or initial courses in the field should be authorized to do so only if the program they intend offering is keyed to that of the institution having exclusive jurisdiction in the subject area.
 - e. The assignment of exclusive jurisdiction to an institution cannot be considered irrevocable. Population shifts, changes in career choices, and other economic and social changes require that curricular allocations be adaptable to changing needs. There must be avenues for reassessing curricular allocations with a view to changing them where circumstances warrant.

Nonetheless, whatever curricular allocations are in effect at any given moment must be clearly understood by institutions as binding, and must be adhered to until and unless, on the evidence available, the Board changes the allocations.
 - f. In meeting its curricular responsibilities, the Board should have as its primary consideration the assurance of adequate availability of educational opportunities for qualified youth without unnecessary or unwise duplication of educational resources.

Graduate and Professional Education

Graduate programs and some professional programs (both undergraduate and graduate) tend to cost more than other programs. Without an allocations system in these areas, the resources of the state will be inadequate to the needs of providing a truly high-quality program at any single institution in the state.

However, the Board recognizes that in some graduate and in some professional areas, characterized by widespread student interest and moderate costs, it is feasible for the System to establish new (additional) programs to serve additional students (some of whom would find it difficult financially to enroll in the existing programs) in lieu of

continued expansion of existing programs. In considering institutional requests for authorization of graduate and/or professional programs:

1. The Board will consider each request on its merits. Institutions making such requests will be expected to evaluate their proposals for the Board in such terms as the following:
 - a. The relationship of the proposed program to the objectives of the institution as these are apparent in the approved System and institutional guidelines.
 - b. The relationship of the proposed program to existing System programs in the same field. Is the new program intended to supplement, complement, or duplicate existing System program? In the light of the existing System programs in the same field, why is the proposed new program needed? Is it designed to serve primarily a regional need? A state need?
 - c. The growth prospects of the proposed program. How many students will it serve now? In the immediate future? In the distant future?
 - d. If it seems pertinent to the subject area in question, the employment opportunities for persons prepared in the proposed program.
 - e. The capacity of the institution to offer a high-quality program in the subject area being considered.
 - (1) What facilities has the institution appropriated to the needs of a high-quality program in the field (library, laboratory, or other facilities and equipment)?
 - (2) How many faculty members are qualified to participate in the program?
 - (3) Does the institution have such related undergraduate and graduate programs as may be essential to give needed support to the proposed new program?
 - (4) What elements of the program, if any, are presently in operation in the institution?
 - (5) In instances in which the institution has an undergraduate program in the subject area or field in question, has the undergraduate program been fully accredited by the appropriate accrediting agency?

- f. The cost implications of the proposed program—both current and capital costs. What is estimated to be the total costs of instituting a high-quality program in the field in question—both immediate and long-range costs?
 - g. The relationship of the proposed new program to future aspirations of the institution. Is the proposed program the first of several curricular steps the institution has in mind in reaching a long-term goal? What are the next steps to be, if the Board approves the program presently proposed?
 - h. Projected student credit hour cost of instruction in the proposed program. Given the estimated costs of operating a program of excellence in the fields in question and the number of students who can be expected to enroll, will the student credit hour cost be a reasonable one? If not, can the student credit hour cost be justified on any rational basis?
2. The Board will seek to inform itself concerning at least three other relevant questions:
- a. What is likely to be the impact of the proposed program upon similar programs in the System? Professional programs tend to be expensive programs. If, by the addition of a second or third graduate and/or professional program in the same field in the System, there would appear to be a threat to the continued accreditation of an existing program, the Board will wish to give approval to the new program only if the advantages of such approval outweigh the disadvantages.
 - b. Can the same program be offered more efficiently or to the benefit of more students in some other institution of the System?
 - c. What other alternative means are there for meeting the needs that have been identified in the proposal?

General Policies Applying to Professional Programs. The following general policies will guide the Board in assessing institutional requests for authorization of professional programs. The Board will:

1. Approve a new professional program only if the Board feels assured of the availability, at the time or in the immediate future, of sufficient funds to develop the program to a respectable standing, to enable it to become accredited, and, once accredited, to maintain its accreditation. Cost estimates should be in terms of an ongoing, high-quality program—not a minimal, beginning program.
2. As a general principle, establish new professional programs, not before offered by the System, at the most appropriate institution, considering such factors as: institutional mission, the locus in the System of such supporting programs and other institutional or community resources as are required to give strength to the

new program, the location in which the program would be accessible to the most students.

3. Act on the principle that as a general policy, with some provision for justifiable and planned exceptions for cause, if the System's first program in a professional field is situated at the University of Oregon or Oregon State University, the second authorized program should be developed where it can serve the largest number of students at the least personal financial cost. The program at the resident institution would serve the entire state; the second program would serve primarily the needs of the students in the region in which the institution is located.
1. As a general principle, be reluctant to approve any professional program that, as it is conceived, cannot, within a reasonable period of time, be accredited. A professional education should offer a student the basis for advancement in the field and flexibility of employment.

ATTACHMENT 2:

TEMPLATE FOR 2007 PORTFOLIO BACKGROUND INFORMATION
PREPARED BY EACH INSTITUTION

[INSTITUTION NAME]

PART 1: Mission, Programs, Students, and Faculty

Mission

- Mission statement
- Focus on access to instructional programs
- Commitment to original research
- Scope & nature of public service

Programs

- Programs of national distinction
- High cost programs
- High demand programs
- Graduate/professional programs

Students

- Admissions selectivity
- Regional access
- Diversity
- Out-of-state & international students

Faculty

- Teaching load expectations
- Research expectations
- Faculty mix (research versus teaching, regular rank full-time versus adjunct or part-time)

PART 2: Economic and Organizational Approaches

	Current	2010	2015
Economic model			
▪ State funding			
▪ Tuition			
▪ Financial aid & fee remissions			
▪ Other revenue source			
Organizational model			
▪ Governance			
▪ Branch campuses			
▪ Collaborations			

PART 3: Key Metrics and Targets

Measure	Current	2010	2015
Enrollment (Current: Fall 2006)			
▪ Total fall headcount			
▪ Percent resident			
○ Percent from rural Oregon ¹			
○ Percent from metro/near metro			
▪ Percent from other states			
▪ Percent international			
Degrees awarded (Current: 2005-06)			
▪ Total			
▪ Undergraduate			
▪ Masters			
▪ Doctoral & professional			
▪ Priority labor force areas ²			
Retention and graduation rates			
▪ Freshman first year retention – within OUS (2005 to 2006)			
▪ Freshman 6-year grad rate – completing within OUS (2004-05)			
▪ Freshman 6-year grad rate – completing at institution (2004-05)			
Faculty (Current: 2005-06)			
▪ R&D expenditures per faculty			
▪ Students per full-time faculty			
▪ Percent faculty who are part-time			
▪ Faculty salary as % of peer average			
Other campus-specific			
▪ [TO BE ADDED BY CAMPUS]			

¹ Rural Oregon counties include: Baker, Clatsop, Coos, Crook, Curry, Douglas, Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Hood River, Jefferson, Josephine, Klamath, Lake, Lincoln, Malheur, Morrow, Sherman, Tillamook, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Wasco, and Wheeler.

² Degrees awarded with a double major in distinct disciplines are counted twice.