Interinstitutional Faculty Senate

School of Nursing Room 602
Oregon Health & Science University
Portland, OR
Saturday, January 9, 2009

Present (Senators): Joel Alexander (WOU), Sharyl Carpenter (EOU), Mark Clark (OIT), Janet Crum (OHSU), Peter Gilkey (UO), Joan Gross (OSU), Gail Houck (OHSU), Jeff Johnson (EOU), Grant Kirby (OIT), Kirsten Lampi (OHSU), Robert Mercer (PSU), Erin Moore (UO), Ron Reuter (OSU Cascades), John Rueter (PSU), Ellen Siem (SOU)

Present (Visitors/Guests/Speakers): Dalton Miller-Jones (OUS Board), Rosemary Powers (OUS Board), Robert Turner (OUS)

Alexander called the group to order at 8:25 AM.

Tri-Board Meeting Report - Turner and Gilkey (8:25-9:10 AM)
Turner reported on the Tri-Board meeting held on Thursday. It consisted of the board of the Oregon Business Council, the Board of Higher Education, and the Board of Education.

Joint Boards
The Joint Boards approved revision of the AAOT transfer degree and a statewide alignment policy for credits given for IB courses. They did not come to consensus on the IB diploma, so credit for the diploma will consist of credit for each course making up the diploma. Credits will be awarded on the same basis as now, campus to campus. Some give 45 credits for an IB diploma, so students enter as sophomores. Others give credits on student-by-student basis. This agreement is temporary for 3 years. During this period, institutions are supposed to gather data to support a decision in 3 years.

The Joint Boards approved learning outcomes and criteria for transferable general education courses, the result of 3 years of work. The most impressive thing to Turner is the list of university, OUS, and community college faculty who participated in the process. The point is to avoid having a list of courses that will and won’t transfer. If the sending institution says a course is transferable, the receiving institution can count on the course having a defined set of outcomes and list of criteria. Faculty at all 24 institutions came together.

Tri-Boards
Turner reported that the Oregon Business Council attended to participate in processes related to the work of the Learning Outcomes & Assessment Task Force. The faculty panel in the afternoon showed that learning outcomes and high-impact practices are having an effect on students, and in at least one case, practices are having the greatest effect on students in minority populations.

Gilkey reported:

- The boards heard from business community that they need people who can write, communicate clearly, and apply critical thinking to solving problems, not just trained to do something specific.
• Engaging students in seminars, etc., is expensive but really works.
• Lifelong learning is important for people who wish to move up in the workplace.

Miller-Jones passed around a document listing high-impact practices and results of a survey of businesses.

Turner visited campuses to investigate/discuss student learning outcomes and assessment. He said that faculty would like to discuss this topic with other faculty and asked us to take this forward on our campuses.

Miller-Jones asked the group: How many of us have had support in documenting learning outcomes and doing assessment? Responses included:
- On one campus, faculty are mandated to do it. Every department has an assessment coordinator.
- On another campus, people are at different stages in different colleges on the campus
- New faculty get a day-long orientation, which leads to information overload. They need more information about this topic at a different time.
- Even though it’s required for accreditation, people don’t get it and aren’t following through
- “If you just wait, it’ll go away,” is a common attitude. “It’s just a fad.”
- Some people don’t take accreditation seriously—“We know we’ll be accredited anyway.”

AACU says Oregon is a leader in learning outcomes.

**Applied Baccalaureate Program discussion (9:10-9:15 AM)**
Is this program a way for community colleges to become four-year schools? If 4-year institutions don’t design substantive applied baccalaureate programs, community colleges will do so. Community college provosts aren’t enthusiastic about a wholesale change to offer 4-year degrees.

We have an institution that already offers an applied baccalaureate: OIT. Let’s find ways for that institution to meet the needs.

The applied baccalaureate originated at OIT, because it made sense for some of their programs, but the higher education community was not enthusiastic.

**Discussion of Public Corporation (9:15-10:10 AM)**
Miller-Jones distributed a draft document summarizing issues related to public corporation proposals. Then the group discussed the various restructuring proposals extensively. Major points included:
- Concern about Perntsteiner’s statement that the OUS presidents want separate organizations rather than a single system.
- Lack of funding is the key issue. The message from the Presidents is that if we aren’t going to get adequate funding from the state, we need more independence.
- It isn’t clear exactly what the presidents want: just autonomy or an entirely separate public corporation?
- Concern that we are talking about disbanding the system of higher education in the state.
- Is there a middle ground between our current state of over-regulation and cutting ties with the state completely?
• If we have separate boards competing with each other for funding, how will we be a system anymore? Not till 2005 did all the presidents approach the Legislature in one voice, and they got a major increase in 2007. It’s important to have a system approaching the Legislature rather than individual agents.
• SB342 came about because the Legislature heard anecdotes from constituents that institutions weren’t working together. Their goal was to make it possible for students to transfer without penalty.
• We need to identify the income source. OHSU’s change was driven by a threat to their income source.
• In a time of crisis, we can do things we couldn’t normally do (Naomi Klein). This is a time when we can get what we want. Since we’re in this crisis, what do we want to see? Can we have a report from this group on how we should respond to this crisis? The working document Miller-Jones distributed can serve as a starting point.
• We should look closely at other universities who have restructured and who are often cited in this conversation (UC, UNC, UVA Health Sciences)
• What is the model? OUS becomes a public corporation? UO/OSU/PSU/regionals become 4 public corporations? Become 7?
• Nothing will change till tax structure changes
• Alexander asked the PSU senators to invite Tony VanVliet to the next IFS meeting.
• Local taxes are an option for some institutions
• Decrease in bureaucracy would be a powerful argument to the Legislature. Complying with some state regulations can be very costly. But OHSU speakers yesterday mentioned that they considered asking for relief from specific regulations but decided against that approach, because they didn’t want to start the conversation by criticizing specific agencies. If we ask for relief from specific rules and regulations, may not be perceived well politically.
• We need to be sure that whatever we deliver includes our core principles front and center, not lost in the details.
• Who is the audience for whatever we produce? Governance Committee, Legislature, Tri-Board (esp. business community), Governor.
• Concern that it could be risky to talk too much to the business community, because many of our programs are liberal arts, not focused on a career.
• How do we want to be involved? Do we want to pass a resolution now with some key points, so they can become part of the discussion right away?

BREAK (10:10-10:20 AM)

Campus Reports (10:20-10:25 AM)
It was suggested that we keep these short since we just gave reports a month ago, and we need to continue the restructuring discussion.

SOU: They have been outsourcing English language instruction for international students, but that made for a cumbersome visa process and was more costly. Beginning this month, SOU is providing an intensive English language program.
PSU: They have $4-5 million in increased tuition revenue. Faculty and staff took salary reductions, but tuition money wasn't used to recoup those. Instead, PSU is using the money to rebuild capacity. Where the money is spent is not based on where the money is generated.

**Continued Discussion of OUS Restructuring (10:25-11:30 AM)**

- We should be a strong voice for faculty and students. We are less credible in other areas.
- The PSU president’s principles could apply to any body, as they are not specific to educational institutions.
- We should make 2 points: Oregon will have the largest graduating class in its history, and FAFSA filings are 50% higher in the first 2 days of this year. These facts demonstrate that the state is unable to meet the higher education needs of Oregonians. Therefore some structural change is required.
- We don’t have to comment on a specific model, but we can express guiding principles that should be addressed in any model that is adopted.
- When we refer to OHSU, we should refer to academics specifically.
- We need to give input before the Board decision in March.
- We don’t want to say something so general that it’s meaningless, but general principles don’t have to be meaningless.

After this discussion, the IFS drafted the following statement, with much discussion about wording:

Whereas the high school graduating class of 2010 will be the largest in Oregon history,
Whereas requests for OR Opportunity Grant have outstripped current funds allocated for 2009-2010, and requests for 2010-2011 are already far ahead of requests at this time last year,
Whereas enrollment in Oregon higher education institutions has increased greatly and is expected to increase to ___ by 2025, and state funding has not increased proportionately but has in fact decreased
Whereas we will be unable to meet the 40/40/20 goal by 2025,

It is clear that the state of Oregon is unable under current funding and structural constraints to meet the higher education needs of Oregon citizens today nor plan effectively to meet the needs of future Oregon students, any attempts to resolve these issues must be consistent with the following core principles:
- Any restructuring of public higher education must improve the education of all OR students
- Any restructuring of public higher education must be based on a careful examination of other reorganization attempts such as what happened to the academic programs at OHSU
- Any restructuring of public higher education must strengthen the values that these individual public institutions bring to Oregon
- Faculty in general and IFS in particular need to be involved every step of the way
- Public higher educational institutions in Oregon should function collaboratively as a unified system for the benefit of Oregon

Johnson moved to approve the draft statement, subject to minor editorial changes, with the final document to be sent to the Chancellor's Office, the Governance Committee, and the Board. Rueter seconded.

Discussion:
Where will we send the final document, in addition to the bodies listed above? We will share with our faculty senates for endorsement and concurrent resolutions.
The motion passed unanimously.

Alexander will request that an IFS representative be added to the Governance Committee.

**Election of 2010 Officers, continued from last meeting (11:30-11:40 AM)**
McMullen and Kirby have been nominated for Provosts Council representative. It's important that IFS is represented at all Provosts Council meetings; should we designate an alternate? In the past, people have been solicited to serve as alternates.

Kirby was elected as the IFS representative to the Provosts Council.

The IFS expressed its appreciation to both candidates for being willing to serve.

**New Business (11:40-11:45AM)**
Powers relayed a request from the provost at Rogue Community College for collaboration/communication with IFS on shared goals.

Johnson asked that we discuss how we will use our time. In the past, when we met on individual campuses, we used Friday afternoons to present new, innovative things happening on the host campus. We will discuss this topic at our Saturday meeting in March.

Gross shared that she was approached by the Cultural and Heritage Director of the Grand Ronde Tribe, who asked IFS to support changing the OUS admission requirements to allow Native languages to fulfill language requirements. Turner reported that the new admission requirements that will be proposed include that provision. He offered to convey IFS support for that provision if we agree. Johnson suggested that she let the person know that this is already being considered, but that if IFS is to endorse the provision, we'll need more information and time to consider. Miller-Jones expressed his support for this initiative as a concrete way to acknowledge Native American cultures and communities.

Ron R. suggested an agenda item for next time. His faculty president asked him to ask IFS to talk with the Chancellor about showing unity and leadership among different institutions regarding furloughs, so there isn't disparity between institutions. That may be difficult for campuses that have unions.

**Approval of minutes from last meeting (11:45-11:48)**
Gilkey asked Crum to send the approved version of the IFS statement on restructuring for posting on the IFS web site.

Crum asked IFS members to review current and future minutes for accuracy and appropriateness.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:48 AM.