Wasden leaving MU Health to take post in Oregon

University of Missouri Health Care CEO Mitch Wasden will leave the university in February to become executive vice president of Oregon Health & Science University in Portland.

In a news release issued Tuesday, the Oregon university announced Wasden would take the post, which also includes the title of chief executive officer of OHSU Healthcare, on March 1. Wasden has led MU Health Care since January 2013 and was earning a salary of $625,000 per year.

In a letter sent Tuesday to staff, students and faculty, Wasden wrote that he told interim Chancellor Hank Foley on Monday that he was taking the new position. Wasden promised to work for a smooth transition before departing Feb. 24 and praised his colleagues for their hard work.

“Your skills, experience and dedication to our patients and families have made MU Health Care the premier health system in the state,” Wasden wrote. “I know that, in your capable hands, our health system will continue to excel.”

Wasden joined MU Health Care as chief operating officer in June 2012 after a period as chief executive for Ochsner Medical Center in Baton Rouge, La. As CEO, Wasden presided over efforts to expand the health system’s reach by affiliating with and acquiring local medical practices and discussing a relationship with Boone Hospital Center when its current lease expires in 2020.

In a campus email announcing the departure, Foley praised Wasden for expanding MU Health facilities, creating affiliations and earning leadership awards. Under his direction, Foley wrote, MU Health “has made tremendous strides in advancing the health of Missourians and establishing MU Health as one of the premier health systems in the state.”

The OHSU news release said Wasden will lead and manage all aspects of health care operations.

Under Wasden’s direction, MU Health Care’s operating revenues increased to $840 million in fiscal 2016, from $657 million in fiscal 2012, and net operating income almost tripled, to $73.5 million from $26.6 million.
MU Health Care's CEO, Mitch Wasden, is leaving to become executive vice president and CEO of Oregon Health & Science.

Wasden's resignation will take effect Feb. 24, and an interim CEO will be named "in the coming months," Interim MU Chancellor Hank Foley said in an email Tuesday to the campus community.

Wasden became chief operating officer at MU Health Care in 2012 and CEO in 2013, according to his LinkedIn profile.

Wasden will start his new position March 1, Foley's email said. The academic health center in Portland, Oregon, is engaged in medical care, teaching and research.
COLUMBIA — Mitch Wasden, the University of Missouri Health Care System's chief executive officer, will take over the same role at Oregon Health and Science University.

OHSU announced Tuesday Wasden was appointed CEO and executive vice president of the university after a national search. In an email sent campus-wide, MU Chancellor Hank Foley said Wasden's resignation from MU Health will take effect February 24th.

According to MU, Wasden joined MU Health Care in 2012 as chief operating officer. He then took over as CEO in January 2013.

"In that time [he] has made tremendous strides in advancing the health of Missourians and establishing MU Health as one of the premier health systems in the state," Foley wrote.

"Among his many accomplishments are the growth and expansion of facilities, including the opening of South Providence Medical Park, Mizzou Quick Care clinics and the expansion of Missouri Orthopaedic Institute; numerous affiliations and collaborations, including Columbia Family Medical Group, MD Anderson Cancer Network, Columbia Surgical Associates and the Health Network of Missouri; and several leadership awards and recognitions, including the Transformational Leadership award from the College of Healthcare Information Management Executives and the American Hospital Association, recognition by Becker’s Hospital Review for advancements in health care, the nation’s “Most Wired” health system award by the American Hospital Association, and the UHC Quality Leadership Award for ranking among the 12 top-performing academic medical centers for delivering high-quality, safe, efficient, patient-centered and equitable care, among others," Foley wrote.

In an email sent to MU Health Care System employees, Wasden wrote he knows MU Health will continue to excel.

"I will be working with Chancellor Foley to ensure a smooth leadership transition and anticipate he will appoint an interim CEO in the near future," Wasden wrote.

In a release, OHSU officials said Wasden’s primary responsibilities will be to lead and manage all aspects of OHSU Healthcare operations, including financial performance and the delivery of care and services. Wasden also will work closely with other OHSU executives to support and further OHSU’s research and education missions within the clinical enterprise, school officials said.

Wasden said he starts his new role March 1.
MU Health Care CEO Stepping Down for New Position in Oregon

**The Chief Executive Officer of University of Missouri Health Care will be leaving his post – effective February 24, 2017.**

Mitch Wasden became the chief operating officer of MU Health Care in 2012, and then also took over the CEO duties in 2013. Earlier this year MU hired a new COO, and Wasden continued his work as CEO.

According to an email from the MU Chancellor’s office, Wasden made “tremendous strides in advancing the health of Missourians” during his tenure.

Interim MU Chancellor Hank Foley also lauded Wasden’s leadership as a time of growth and expansion for the MU Health Care system.

Wasden begins his new position as executive vice president and CEO of Oregon Health & Science, an academic health center in Portland, Oregon, on March 1.

Foley wrote that an interim CEO will be named in the coming months.
MU Health Care CEO appointed as OHSU Healthcare CEO, effective March 1

COLUMBIA, Mo. - Oregon Health and Science University has announced Tuesday that they've appointed Mitch Wasden, Ed.D., as the chief executive officer (CEO) of OHSU Healthcare and executive vice president of OHSU. Wasden will be starting in the new position on March 1, 2017.

Wasden has a doctor of education degree from George Washington University in Washington, D.C., a master’s degree in health services administration from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor and a bachelor’s degree from Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah.

**Wasden currently works at University of Missouri Health Care, where he is the CEO.**

Wasden joined MU Health Care as chief operating officer (COO) in June 2012 and was the CEO in Jan. 2013. He previously served as CEO for Ochsner Medical Center in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, COO and vice president of Tympany Medical Inc. in Stafford, Texas and vice president of clinical services for Ochsner Health System in New Orleans.

MU Health CEO Announces Resignation

MU Study Finds Students with Disabilities are Bullied More than Their Peers

Generated from News Bureau press release: Bullying Rates Remain Higher for Children with Disabilities, Even As They Mature


Mizzou gives most staff members a week off work

By Ashley Jost St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 17 hrs ago

As a gesture of good faith — and since many employees haven’t received a sizable raise during years of constrained budgets — leaders at the University of Missouri-Columbia are giving most staff members a few extra days off the week after Christmas.

Mizzou is closed on Monday and Jan. 2 to make up for Christmas and New Years days that fall on weekends this year. But most staff members will now take Dec. 27 through Dec. 30 off.

The decision doesn’t cost the university, officials say.
In fact, leaders only see the benefit of the decision, hoping it will increase morale in the new year.

Employees who are considered essential include those working at the animal hospital, research reactor or laboratories that require monitoring. Those employees are encouraged to work out another week where they could take time off to make up for it.

A Coach's Support

Minnesota football team has ended its boycott over the suspensions of 10 players accused of sexual assault, but coach’s comments in support of the team continue to draw criticism as taking sides against woman who brought complaint of gang rape.

When several members of the University of Missouri football team threatened to boycott football in protest of racial inequality last year, their coach, Gary Pinkel, drew praise from others on campus for appearing to support his players. “The Mizzou family stands as one,” he tweeted alongside a photograph of the team.

Last week, the University of Minnesota’s football coach, Tracy Claeys, posted a similar message on Twitter when his players threatened to boycott an upcoming bowl game. "Have never been more proud of our kids," Claeys wrote. "I respect their rights [and] support their effort to make a better world!" Since that message was posted, local sports columnists have questioned whether Claeys should have his contract extended, faculty members have publicly condemned his comments by calling the tweet “a terrible thing,” and a petition has called on the university to fire the coach.

"Claeys’s tweet expressing his pride in the team failed to mention or acknowledge the importance of respecting women," the petition states. "Further, it did not condemn violence, sexual assault or disrespect of women. We feel this is not at all acceptable. We believe he put the welfare of his football program above the welfare of a female student."
The reason for the stark contrast between how the two coaches’ comments were received can likely be found in what their players were protesting. While Pinkel’s players joined a growing protest movement over racism, Claeys’s players were angry over the suspension of 10 teammates who had been accused of sexually assaulting and harassing a female student. The university, of which Claeys is among the more visible employees, had conducted an investigation finding many of the charges to be valid.

“The responsible action would have been to make sure to not add any validity to that type of protest,” Dan Lebowitz, executive director of Northeastern University’s Center for the Study of Sport in Society, said. “Generally, I would be saying that the university should throw its full support behind athletes acting like leaders and making a statement on a social justice platform. This is not one of those cases.”

After the Missouri protests helped lead to the ouster of the Columbia campus’s chancellor and the university system’s president, Lebowitz and other college sports observers began to muse about how athletes could use their “economic power” to protest on behalf of social justice issues and for reforming college athletics. At a Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics meeting in May, Arne Duncan, the former U.S. secretary of education, asked college players if they would consider organizing similar boycotts over athletics issues like name and likeness rights.

In response, Rollins Stallworth, a former Stanford University football player and chair of the Pac-12 Conference’s Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, revealed that two of Stanford’s team captains boycotted football-related activities last year during summer workouts. For the third summer in a row, he said, the university was late in providing players with scholarship money for participating in the camps. The protest was not nearly as dramatic as the strike at Missouri, Stallworth said, but “seeing the effect of two of our teammates doing that and what goes on in the locker room, the discussion that happens, you can see the potential that could happen.”

College sports reformers have said a boycott of a bowl game -- which are typically among the most watched and most lucrative games in a program's season -- would be one of the most impactful ways athletes could protest their treatment or on behalf of social justice issues. The Minnesota football players said last week they would boycott the Dec. 27 Holiday Bowl game if their teammates' suspensions were not reversed.

The university did not announce a reason for suspending the 10 players, but they are believed to be related to a sex assault investigation in which police declined to bring charges. While the athletes said they were advocating for due process rights, many said the protest was sending a very different message to victims of sexual assault.
“There is deep symbolism in this act of solidarity the football players are showing with their suspended teammates that, to the many survivors of sexual assault across college campuses, is a harrowing reminder of the power associated with protectingrape culture,” Abeer Syedah, Minnesota’s student body president, told the Nation. “To survivors, this feels familiar. To those who thought about speaking up, this silences. We must believe, love, support, center and be in solidarity with survivors, especially when the power stratification is against them.”

After the players announced the end of their boycott this weekend, the university’s president said the media misinterpreted the team’s intent and that reporters “translated” the players’ support for their teammates ”into support of sexual violence."

The boycott initially attracted sympathy from many alumni and those concerned about issues of due process, but support for the university’s stance grew as details emerged about what happened to the female student, in particular after a redacted version of the university’s equal opportunity office’s report on its investigation was published online. Contrary to the team’s comments, the 80-page report shows that the football players were interviewed, their assertions were considered and they were not all judged equally responsible for what happened. The report also details why the university found that four of the players engaged in sexual assault and that others engaged in forms of harassment, such as videotaping the victim without her consent.

The report states that some athletes tried to cover up what happened or violated other parts of the student code of conduct. The Star Tribune reported Sunday that it was the report’s details -- many of them read over the weekend for the first time by football players who organized the boycott -- that broke the will of players to continue the boycott.

Despite the evolving public opinion about the protest, Claeys has doubled down on his support of the players’ actions. “This is all about due process,” the coach told reporters earlier this week. “It was all about me supporting their actions to try to improve the due process. Not just on this campus, but other campuses.”

Writing for the Washington Post, Justin Dillon and Matt Kaiser, two lawyers who have represented dozens of accused students in campus sexual assault cases, said Tuesday that the players' boycott was "a terrible blow to those who care about due process on campus."

"The problem with the Minnesota boycott isn’t really that the boycott failed," they wrote. "It’s that the Minnesota football players did not realize they’d picked the wrong case to stand up for. What Minnesota’s Title IX office found happened to the young woman in Minnesota was horrific. Assuming that report is accurate, the university’s penalties seem fair."
Neither the coach nor his team mentioned in their original public statements the woman who said she was assaulted. Claeys said this week he could have worded his earlier tweet more carefully and that he will donate $50,000 to assist efforts helping victims of sexual assault. As of last season, the coach’s contract stated that he will receive a $50,000 bonus for Minnesota playing in the bowl game.

"Coaches are in a challenging position," Eric Kaler, the university’s president, said when asked this week about Claeys's comments. "They need to support their players. They need to motivate their players. At the same time, they need to be responsible for their actions, and there are times in which those two demands put coaches in very difficult positions."

If you’re a college leader who feels micromanaged by federal regulations, a university trustee who thinks that the U.S. Department of Education has been overly intrusive in overseeing colleges’ handling of sexual-assault and discrimination cases, or a would-be education provider that is not a traditionally accredited college, you
may well like some of the approaches of the coming administration of President-elect Donald J. Trump and the Republican-controlled Congress.

On the other hand, if you’re a student stuck with debt for a program from a college that deceived you, a dean whose graduate students rely heavily on federal PLUS loans, or a professor whose courses and research touch on climate science or a host of other topics that have been demonized as "politically correct," then the next few years could be troubling.

At least that’s how some of the outlines of the new political landscape for higher education appear to be taking shape, based on recent Chronicle interviews with more than two dozen college leaders, policy advocates, and current state and federal government officials.

Besides naming Betsy DeVos as his nominee for secretary of education, Mr. Trump has said nothing publicly about his education-policy plans since the election, and the Trump transition team has been close-mouthed about its activities and intentions related to colleges.

By all reports, the only college leader to have had more than a passing conversation about higher education with Mr. Trump since the election has been Jerry L. Falwell Jr., president of Liberty University, an evangelical Christian institution in Virginia. In mid-November, Mr. Falwell met with the president-elect and his daughter Ivanka Trump ("she seemed to be very involved," he noted), Reince Priebus, the incoming White House chief of staff, and Stephen K. Bannon, the incoming chief counselor, at Trump Tower in New York City.

Mr. Falwell, who brought along his wife and the university’s financial-aid director, said that the Trump team was in the "information gathering" stage but that he used the meeting to urge the team to "reduce the micromanaging of colleges and universities," particularly around the recently issued "borrower defense to repayment" regulation, aimed at helping students who believe they had been defrauded by their college, and the stricter enforcement of Title IX rules for handling reports of sexual assaults on campuses. (Eleven days after that meeting, the Education Department’s Office for Civil Rights disclosed that Liberty is under investigation for an alleged Title IX offense, the nature of which was not made public.)

Mr. Falwell, who welcomed Mr. Trump to Liberty for a rally during the campaign and says that he declined an offer to be education secretary because he couldn’t commit to
leaving his university for more than two years, could well emerge as a pivotal figure on education policy as the administration takes shape.

From Mr. Falwell’s account, as well as interviews with policy wonks who are positioning themselves as influencers or potential office holders in the new administration, and conversations with people who are not directly in on the discussions but who bring insight and experience to their predictions, several themes and likely priorities are beginning to emerge.

Over the next few years, for example, most observers expect nuts-and-bolts higher-education policy to be shaped much more heavily by Congress than by the executive branch. But before they can even get to meaty higher-education matters, key committees (especially in the Senate) will first be occupied with the top congressional priority for Republicans: repealing and replacing the health-care law known as Obamacare.

At the Education Department itself, people and ideas from state governments and the business-management world are more likely to hold sway, rather than those from the Washington think-tank crowd, according to William D. Hansen, a deputy secretary of education under President George W. Bush. Mr. Hansen says he has been "in touch periodically on multiple fronts" with the Trump transition team regarding the department. He is now president of USA Funds, an organization whose grants and investments promote projects that help students better connect their college education with their career. The new Education Department, he says, will "inspire creativity and innovation instead of smothering it."

The voices of business leaders and other employers could also carry more weight in policy making. "That’s one category we will hear more from and should hear more from, frankly," says Lindsey M. Burke, an education-policy fellow at the Heritage Foundation, which has been advising the transition team.

Broadly speaking, "there are a lot of people who think this is an open door for new approaches in higher education," says Jeanne Allen, founder and chief executive of the Center for Education Reform, a school-choice organization. A fixture on the education scene since her days in the Reagan-era Education Department and later at the Heritage Foundation, Ms. Allen is also a vocal advocate for programs like competency-based education at colleges.

Another yet-unanswered question is how much the Republican-led policy making will veer into hot-button values issues like the debates over the teaching of Western civilization versus multiculturalism that fueled the "culture wars" of the 1980s and 1990s. The tone of the Trump-Pence campaign was often in direct opposition to the
Some observers see the potential influence of Mr. Falwell and Ms. DeVos, whose family’s philanthropy and political donations include support for organizations that oppose same-sex marriage, as a sign that policies could move in that direction.

Alexander Holt, for one, hopes it doesn’t. If the administration gets too bogged down in those "identity-politics issues," says Mr. Holt, a policy analyst at New America who considers himself a conservative, it could distract focus from needed reforms. That, he says, would be "a missed opportunity for the things that need to be done on federal student-aid policy."

But Charles Kolb, a top Education Department and White House official during the administrations of Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, says that’s not an either-or proposition. "I think you’ll see both, just like you saw under Bennett," he predicts, referring to the "content, character, and choice" agenda that William J. Bennett championed as secretary of education under President Reagan. That could translate into less focus on protecting gay students from discrimination and more attacks on colleges for creating so-called safe spaces, some of the same policies that Mr. Trump was so derisive of during his campaign.

What or who else could be In or Out in the next four years? Below, we outline our best guesses:

**OUT**

**Title IX enforcement on sexual assault.** It won’t go away completely, of course. But it’s hard to imagine the next administration adopting the same aggressive posture taken by the current Office for Civil Rights, considering the way many Republicans, would-be Trump insiders, and even some colleges feel about the office’s approach over the past several years. (Mr. Falwell, for one, says that the department has tried to turn colleges into "police departments, judges, juries, and executioner — a lot of things colleges are not equipped to do.") Ditto for protecting the rights of gay and transgender people.

**Free college.** The idea was championed during the 2016 campaign by Sen. Bernie Sanders and then by the party’s nominee, Hillary R. Clinton, so ’nuff said about that. Meanwhile, however, groups like the Campaign for Free College Tuition continue to promote it as a policy states and communities should embrace.

**Graduate PLUS Loans.** Or at least the high levels of borrowing currently allowed under this program. Such loans are considered by many Republicans (and some Democrats) as the kind of easy-money source of funding that does little to encourage
colleges to curtail their prices, especially when the borrowers can later roll their obligations into loan-forgiveness programs.

**Loan forgiveness.** Student-loan reformers had targeted such programs for curtailment even before the release last month of an attention-grabbing report from the Government Accountability Office. The report raised questions about the projected costs of the programs, which have been expanded during the Obama years. Actually, the Obama administration has proposed curtailing loan forgiveness, too. Expect the new Congress or administration to go further than the Obama proposal in limiting the amounts that could be forgiven.

**Center for American Progress.** Of all of the advocacy groups focused on higher education, this one was the most visibly tied to Democrats — a Hillary Clinton administration in waiting, as some saw it. It won’t be at the policy helm now, but it’s already begun to embrace its outsider status with a new "Resist" campaign that is opposing expected policies of the Trump administration, including the nomination of Betsy DeVos.

**Heightened federal enforcement of for-profit colleges.** The Education Department’s internal "student-aid enforcement unit" and an interagency task force were created in response to concerns about abusive recruiting practices at for-profit institutions and other poor-performing colleges. They could fall victim to changing priorities. The fate of the internal enforcement unit could be hard to track from outside the department, but the interagency task force, which involves the Education Department, the Federal Trade Commission, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the U.S. Departments of Defense, Labor, and the Treasury, has already made one high-profile enemy in Sen. John McCain, the Arizona Republican who last week called for its immediate abolition after criticizing the agencies for their treatment of the University of Phoenix.

**Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.** This body, created in the wake of the financial crisis of 2008, has sued several of the major for-profit-college companies over their student-loan programs. The bureau is disliked by many Republicans, who may now feel even more emboldened — and have the votes in the Senate — to dismantle or weaken it.

"State authorization" rules for distance education and "borrower defense" rules governing when students are entitled to have their loans discharged. Welcomed by many student groups and consumer advocates, both have been criticized by college leaders as examples of regulatory overreach. Both regulations were issued within the past few months, which could make them particularly easy to repeal under the Congressional Review Act. Ditto for newly issued rules on teacher education.
**The "gainful employment" rule.** One of the signature policies of the Obama administration, the regulation has been a key tool for cracking down on career-focused programs that saddle students with unmanageable debt relative to their earnings. Some colleges have cited the rule as a reason for their closure. It won’t be easy to repeal the regulation in full, but portions of it will be prime targets for Congress, if not the new Education Department, to eliminate.

IN

**Income-share agreements.** These financing tools, in which investors help finance students’ educations in return for a percentage of their earnings, are a trendy idea among the innovation crowd. They are especially popular in conservative circles.

**Risk sharing.** The idea that colleges should bear some of the cost when their students default on federal loans has been gaining fans in Congress. Many policy makers even see it as better than looking at default rates to determine eligibility for federal student aid. As the debates over this approach proceed, expect to see many lawmakers and others draw from eight new papers on risk sharing, published on Monday, that outline various issues and options.

**Private lending.** Not a return to the bank-based student-loan system that was fully phased out under President Obama (the subsidies paid to banks and other parties would add too much of a hit to the federal budget) — even student-loan experts like Beth Akers, a senior fellow at the free-market Manhattan Institute, says that was a "a terrible way to bring in market forces" to student lending. But with so many conservatives arguing for a greater role for "private capital" in student loans, some form of new federally sanctioned option could be on the table, perhaps even to fill the gap if PLUS Loans for graduate students are curtailed.

**Competency-based education.** Of all the ideas promoted by the "disruptive innovation" crowd, this is the one that seems to have the most bipartisan support. But a cloud now hangs over such programs because the Education Department’s Office of Inspector General, an independent arm of the agency, has questioned whether such programs run afoul of rules requiring substantial interaction between faculty members and students for programs to receive federal student aid. Critics of the Obama administration say they hope the incoming administration will do more to remove that cloud, perhaps, as one such critic, Diane Auer Jones, has proposed, by offering some legal and financial indemnifications to colleges that choose to go ahead with such programs. Ms. Jones, who has lobbied for both Princeton University and the for-profit Career Education Corporation, and served a short stint at the Education Department during the George W. Bush administration, has said she "would definitely go back" to the department for the right position there, if asked.
The Republican congressional staff. The aides who work for committees and individual members do much of the heavy lifting when it comes to forging federal laws, and with the policy locus expected to shift to Capitol Hill, the aides will be the ones in the best position to sweat — and decide — the details. (Higher-education issues aren’t always partisan, so look for some aides on the Democratic side to be key players too.)

American Enterprise Institute, Heritage Foundation, Hoover Institution, Manhattan Institute. Policy wonks at each of those right-leaning groups have already begun talking with the transition team, and their ideas are likely to be even more welcome with Republicans in charge of policy.

Federal student aid for education providers that bypass traditional accreditation. The Obama administration took steps in that direction with a program known as Equip, but many policy advocates and political leaders around the country are keen to see a lot more of the approach.

Skills training. Employer groups continue to decry the five to six million jobs going unfilled in the country because of the so-called skills gap. That alone should kick up the demand for programs that can help young people and adults get more skills. The incoming Trump administration is also likely to propose a major public-private investment in infrastructure, and as John Engler, president of the Business Roundtable, puts it, that would only deepen the "demand for skilled labor that cannot be met" right now. Lots of this training may not happen at colleges, but already some community colleges — like those in the coalition Rebuilding America’s Middle Class — are beginning to position themselves for this. For-profit colleges, too, could see opportunity here.

Jeb Bush. Sure, Mr. Trump famously mocked the former Florida governor during the campaign as "low energy" before defeating him in the primaries. But as Michael B. Horn, a writer, consultant, and education-company investor notes, Mr. Bush also has close connections to Ms. DeVos through the Foundation for Excellence in Education, which he founded and on whose board she has served. "I wonder," says Mr. Horn, "if there’s going to be some sort of back-channel there."