January 10, 2014

INTERIM REPORT

In our first report to the OUS Board on October 4, 2013, we outlined the assumptions and framework for our work plan. On November 15, we reported to Board committees and others on the progress of our work plan, with a special focus on a number of questions that had been raised by various individuals and groups that needed to be posed to HECC representatives prior to proceeding on a detailed work plan.

Fortunately at our work group meeting of November 15, 2013, Ben Cannon—newly appointed executive director of HECC—and Bill McGee from the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) were able to attend and respond to the questions. This has allowed us to make considerable progress in outlining a time frame and detailing the items that will transfer to HECC by July 1, 2014.

We agreed at the November meeting to outline a 6- to 12-month plan that both OUS and HECC support and will follow for each major category of responsibilities: academic affairs, budgeting and finance, and capital requests. This plan forms the basis for the Interim Report to the Board.

Due to the incredible work of the OUS and HECC staff, I am confident that we will be able to outline all of the areas of responsibility that will transfer to HECC on July 1, 2014 prior to that deadline.
Budget Operations – Status of Transitions to HECC as of 1/6/14

Recent Activities

November 15, 2013  HECC Transition Planning Work Group met with Ben Cannon and Bill McGee for initial transition discussion

November 19, 2013  Jay Kenton and Jan Lewis presented budget information at HECC meeting

Materials provided:
- RAM line item descriptions
- Detail General Fund allocations for FY14 by campus
- Comparison of RAM line items from 1999-00 to 2013-14
- Five-year history of tuition rates for resident undergraduates by campus
- Twenty-year history of tuition and fees for resident and nonresident, undergraduate and graduate students by campus

December 2, 2013  Requested data provided to HECC staff (state funding, tuition revenues, FTE data, degrees awarded, and completion rates)

December 4, 2013  Jay Kenton and Jan Lewis presented information to the HECC Subcommittee meeting on Achievement Compacts, Budgets and Funding

Materials provided:
- Typical OUS Biennial Budget Development Cycle (will attach)
- Considerations for 2015-17 Budget Development (will attach)
- Information about the 2013-15 Budget process
- OUS Capital Project Prioritization Scoring

December 18, 2013  Jan Lewis spoke with Ben Cannon regarding the three universities preparing 2015-17 budget requests in expectation of meeting April 1 deadline referenced in SB 270. [will provide more details]

December 30, 2013  Melody Rose and Jan Lewis attended a meeting with Ben Cannon, Tim Nesbitt, Duncan Wyse and others to discuss 2015-17 budget development and possible approaches the HECC might take

January 3, 2014  Requested information on recent tuition buy down provided to HECC staff
Upcoming Meetings

January 9, 2014  HECC meeting (OUS not scheduled to present; agenda includes HECC Budget Subcommittee update)

January 14, 2014  OUS Budget Operations staff scheduled to meet with HECC staff for an OUS budget orientation including identification of resources

January 15, 2014  HECC Achievement Compacts and Biennial Budgets Subcommittee meeting

Specific Transition Goals

January 2014 Remaining items to be provided to HECC prior to Jan Lewis’ transition to OSU

- Transition brief on any statutory parameters that may affect HECC (likely to be Clinical Legal Education funding and tuition/fee remissions)
- Transition brief on Sports Lottery funding and allocation process
- Transition brief on allotment process
- Background and contact information for national surveys (state funding and tuition surveys)
- Other specific information as may be requested by HECC

February 2014 Capital request to W&M (likely to be staffed by Jay Kenton with participation of campus representatives)

Fiscal Impact Statement support to be continued by Trina McGaughy

March – June 2014 Support for HECC in 2015-17 budget development (OUS staffing resources: Jay Kenton, Trina McGaughy plus Jan Lewis on loan from OSU if needed)

June 2014 “Run the RAM” for FY14 settle-up on General Fund and Tuition Buy Downs

“Run the RAM” for 2015-17 planning to provide a baseline from which HECC will then determine actual recommendations/requests

Will need to identify specific RAM elements that are affected by final outcome of Shared Services entity (such as disposition of IT Fifth Site funding)

(OUS staffing resources: Jay Kenton, Trina McGaughy, Ken Mayfield (on wage apt as needed)
Academic Program Approval Timeline and Recommendations DRAFT

Proposed Timeline for Program Approval Transition:

December, 2013: OUS and CCWS Staff initially meet with Chair Nesbitt, Commissioner Dyess, and Executive Director Cannon to introduce commissioners to the current program approval practices.

January – March, 2014: OUS staff continue to work with HECC Executive Director, staff, and Commissioners on the transition of Program Approval to HECC. Work will include (but not limited to):

- Developing or adapting documentation for program approval to be submitted to the HECC
- Developing principles for program approval
- Developing frequency of Provosts’ Council meetings and HECC subcommittee meetings
- Developing protocol for programs to be presented to the HECC
- Communication of the above to the Provosts

April, 2014: By this time, the following questions should be answered and Provosts’ Council meetings scheduled for July – December, 2014.

- Who will co-chair the Provosts’ Council?
- Who will provide administrative support to the Provosts’ Council?
- Who will keep records for the Provosts’ Council?
- How will OUS program approval records be archived, copied, or transferred?

Updates to the Provosts’ Council about Program Approval transition are ongoing and will continue through June, 2014.

Recommendations

Recommended membership of the Provosts’ Council: Provosts from all seven public universities, provosts from OHSU, Inter-institutional faculty senate representative, OUS representative (for ’14-’15), community college representative.

We recommend the Provosts’ Council retain the co-chair structure, appointing (with Presidential approval) a new Provost co-chair to begin July, 2014 and a HECC staff member as the second co-chair.

We recommend at least a 0.25 FTE support staff to assist with the Provosts’ Council meetings and record-keeping.
Academic Program Approval Questions DRAFT
The following list is a set of questions to help the HECC Commissioners and Executive Director develop principles for academic program approval for Oregon’s public universities. For each question below, the HECC may consider also the implications for community college; specifically what aspects will be the same in university and community college requirements and which will be different.

Which program changes will be required to be reviewed by the HECC?
Current practice:
- All new undergraduate and graduate programs must be approved by the OSBHE.
- Change in location, including moving an on-site program to an online program and new certificates are approved by the Provosts’ Council only (no Board approval needed)

Questions:
1. What kinds of programs need HECC approval? For instance, adding a track to an existing degree program? Re-naming a program? Offering the program in a new location?

Nuts and Bolts
Current practice:
- Programs are submitted to the Provosts’ Council administrator at least two weeks prior to the Provosts Council meeting and forwarded to all of the Provosts for review.
- Once the program is approved by the Provosts’ Council for forwarding to the Academic Strategies Committee, it typically takes at most a month for Academic Strategies final approval.
- All new graduate programs require external review before undergoing final review by the Provosts’ Council and Academic Strategies Committee.
- OUS provides a template for program and budget review.

Questions:
2. How long should it take to get approval from HECC once a program is submitted?
3. Which programs warrant an external review (e.g., Ph.D only, all graduate, etc.)? What is the weight and role of external review in the approval process?
4. What role should the HECC play in determining the balance of on-site versus online programs?
5. What documentation will be submitted to HECC for program approval? Should forms be consistent across campuses or will campuses be able to submit documentation unique to the school?
6. What evidence will expected for (basically quality, need, cost...others?):
   a. Relationship to institution mission/goals
   b. Faculty quality
   c. Need/demand
   d. Outcomes
   e. Program quality assessment
   f. Impact on other programs in the state
   g. Financial sustainability
   h. Integration/collaboration
Considerations for Program Approval and Program Management

7. What is the role of institutional mission in approving programs?
8. What approach will HECC take to program management (e.g., “portfolio” approach)?
9. What is the value on inter-institutional partnerships in developing new programs?
10. What view on assessment, outcomes, and accountability will the HECC bring to program approval?
11. How will new programs be tied to budgeting?
12. What is the right balance of minimizing duplication versus creating a marketplace to respond to demand? How will the “best” producer be identified?
13. Does the HECC want to see a short-term (4-5 year) plan from the campuses regarding programs that they are thinking about developing? If so, how will campuses report on this and what impact (if any) will it have on the program approval process?
14. How will programs be evaluated/reviewed by HECC, if at all, and under what timeline, and understanding that institutions engage in review processes with their accreditors?
15. Will the HECC initiate program elimination?
16. What will be the role of the Provost’s Council?
   a. What if not all Provosts agree on a program? What if the majority do?
17. What will be the role of accreditation and communicating with accreditors?
18. Would the HECC ever send proposals back to the Provosts Council or back to the campuses for more work? Under what conditions?

Feedback from Stakeholders outside of HECC

19. How will HECC view the offerings of the Private institutions in Oregon when considering program approval?
20. What should be the industry voice in the program approval process, particularly for those programs that are in high visibility industry in Oregon?
21. What should be the voice of other educational institutions in the program approval process?
22. What kind of opportunity for public comment should be made available?
Academic Program Approval Flow Chart – taking effect July 1, 2014

Institution completes internal program approval process (department, college, senate, etc.) and is submitted to institutional governing board (OSU, PSU, UO) or State Governing Board (EOU, OIT, SOU, WOU for AY 2014-15)

Proposal is submitted to Provosts’ Council

Proposal is submitted to HECC

Institution provides notification to NWCCU.