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Friday, March 15

Present: Maude Hines (PSU), Bob Mason (OSU), Mary Cluskey (OSU), Candyce Reynolds (PSU), Karen Hooker (OSU), Charles Lane (SOU), Shari Carpenter (EOU), Jeff Dense (EOU), Ike Nail (WOU), Laura Zeigen (OHSU), Feng Shi (OIT) and Margie Paris for Bob Kyr (UO)

12:45 – Welcome and Introductions – Bob Mason, IFS President and Ike Nail, WOU Host
Ike welcomed IFS to the Western Oregon University (WOU) campus.

1:00 – Welcome to Western Oregon University – Mark Weiss, WOU President
President Weiss welcomed the IFS to WOU and provided some background. Previously he was the VP of Finance at WOU. He has extensive background in business and grew up as the child of immigrants in New Jersey. He feels this gives him an understanding of the underserved populations WOU and OUS serve. He has worked with all the OUS presidents and they are all concerned with the welfare of and access and affordability to education for Oregonians.

WOU currently has over 6,000 students enrolled. More of them are coming from out of state than in state, but over 50% of incoming students are Oregonians. That number used to be in the high 80% before. They are focused on being able to educate Oregonians at WOU towards the 40/40/20 goals.

There is a lot of construction happening at WOU, including the new Health and Wellness Center and renovation of the old physical education building (completed 2 years ago) and last year finished the first LEED Platinum “Live Learn” center that has (dorm?) rooms. They are slated for a new College of Education building in their recommended budget and are waiting to see if this passes through the legislative process.

Faculty work hard to interact 1-1 with the students. They invest in writing centers and support for their international students. Weiss and WOU feel these need to be in place for students to succeed. 10% per biennium has been allocated into higher education going forward (from 2007, Governor Kulongski). In 2007 they proposed a way for students and students’ families to afford higher education (Western Oregon Tuition Promise). A student entering Western, the tuition rate they pay they entered was the tuition rate they would pay for 4 years. They have seniors graduating with the lowest tuition rate in the state of Oregon, but they now have a tuition structure that concerns them that they may be pricing themselves out of the market. Affordability is a very real issue. When you graduate with $25,000-30,000 of debt and are looking for a job to pay back that debt that is very challenging.

Weiss asked if there were items he would like us to address. They have close ties to things going on in Salem. Senate President Peter Courtenay is on WOU faculty and teaches classes. During the legislative session there are things they don’t talk about. Next week will be a big week for education in Salem with a lot of testimony by presidents and other administrators. Some of the small school presidents have meetings with some of the legislators. We as small schools serve a very important mission. There is a lot going on with the hiring of Dr. Rudy Crew and the proposed formation of a department of Secondary Education, Higher Education Committee, OEB, etc. A lot of change is going on in a short period of time. People need to make sure the change that occurs is in our collective best interest (e.g. the best interest of Oregonians).
Weiss communicated (IFS) comments to WOU’s Faculty Senate and Shared Governance meeting and thought they were well stated.

WOU has 300 students internationally, about 100 from China, about 100 from the Middle East, mostly Saudi Arabia and another 100 from 10 other countries including Japan, Korea, Germany and other places. They looked for international students to add diversity to campus and also these students pay 3x the going rate of the in-state students, which helps pay for what the state does not pay and helps to temper some of the tuition increases for the in-state students.

Institutional governing boards – EOU is opposed to the idea. Weiss was not sure of the view on the WOU campus, but gave us his view. In the summer he testified at the joint legislative committee addressing this topic. Weiss has no problem with the state board of higher education had recommended: the delegation of a lot of responsibilities and authorities to local boards, still within the framework of the OUS system there would be a coordination of central services, programs and allocation of funding in a way that sustains each of the institutions. The concern now is a “food fight”.

Weiss has spoken to small school presidents in Washington State to see how governing boards are working there. It is unproductive to have universities competing with each other for funding. We have about 12-15 board members. Multiple that by 7 with turnover every year and now there are a lot of people that have to have a lot of devotion to the institutions with a steep learning curve – that costs money at each institution to sustain boards. The local boards may make sense, but Weiss did not feel it made sense at Western and did not want to use student tuition to maintain boards and board committees. Weiss did not have a problem with those institutions that wanted it (PSU, UO).

There is a “building lottery” in Salem. Universities can put in their construction projects. WOU put in their new College of Education building for this. WOU is at the bottom end of the cutoff. The OUS submitted about $300 million of bonding projects. The governor’s budget included $212 million of bonding monies for both OUS system and community colleges. Salem asked OUS to reevaluate all the projects and that was resubmitted. WOU’s project was above the line, but towards the bottom of the list. One of the big schools had the largest item.

Weiss was asked his view of the State Treasurer’s proposal to use tobacco money for bonds and student scholarship. The state must have some kind of limited bond capacity that we can service – will this impact the other capital construction projects? Tobacco settlement money (millions of years for some years into the future) is there. The idea is to invest those $500 million in the stock market and presumably get a return that would be much higher (8.5%, which seems high to Weiss). The tobacco money would pay for it and then there would be additional money/interest earnings to pay the debt service, with some leftover to distribute to students in loans and grants. That is, however, the same idea of how PERS is funded; the idea of investing and growing the money over time. That works fine if you don’t have losses, but that is not realistic. There are some assumptions being made about the yield on returns: the returns may not be sufficient to fund the benefit.

What are your senates and how does shared governance work? Weiss meets once a month with the chair of WOU Faculty Senate (Dr. Keller Coker) and the student body president, the staff senate president and the administrative support council – the four reps who represent the campus as a whole. Weiss tries to brief them about things going on at the university and outside the university that impact WOU and they all discuss updates from their areas so all are fully informed. This is called the shared governance meeting. Does this take the place of a faculty advisory council? The head of Faculty Senate meets with them once a month. Weiss underlined that he said his door is always open, to faculty, students, parents, community members.

1:30 p.m. - Keller Coker, WOU Faculty Senate President and Professor of Music
Coker served 6 years ago as Faculty Senate President as well. Coker spoke of the culture of WOU in
terms of faculty and administration and staff and students. Most people who find their way to Monmouth like it here. People don’t leave once they are here: Coker has been here for 13 years and replaced someone here for 38 years.

WOU is a good, mid-sized university: small enough to if you have an idea or thought you can move forward with that whether it is curriculum or administrative policy, that you can get proposals up quickly and move them through the system with what I would hope is the least amount of roadblocks and most amount of input. At the same time, WOU is big enough to take on big projects and think about big things. If new ideas could impact students in or beyond the state we are not afraid to go after those kinds of ideas. They have the only accredited popular music degree in the world (!), which was born out of looking at students’ needs and creating something in this environment that did not exist anywhere else. This was met enthusiastically by faculty, staff, and students. “We are a fairly functional family here. We like to talk about and sometimes argue about things here, but I love being a part of those conversations. We can talk about things, take a vote and move on.” They just approved a new applied baccalaureate degree after vigorous debate.

Coker invited the group to the Western Hemisphere’s Orchestra tribute to Count Basie, being performed tonight in the WOU auditorium.

Coker felt Weiss’ representation of faculty and administrative relations was accurate and said he always feels heard and Weiss is very available to listen. There is a faculty executive committee. If a curriculum meeting happens that needs to have faculty executive response or input, Coker or one of the other faculty executive committee would be included. Faculty purview is not just curriculum. Technically if the faculty said no to something the provost could still OK it. Curriculum is the main work of the Faculty Senate, but anything that affects faculty is brought to the attention of Faculty Senate. Sometimes other groups (students, others) send proposals for endorsements to Faculty Senate (e.g. things on tuition equity that just passed at the Student Senate).

Coker was not sure what the administrative council did, but Ike said that the President of the Staff Senate always makes a report at the Faculty Senate. WOU’s previous Faculty Senate last year changed it so this was voted out, but Coker was open to having anyone come present at a Faculty Senate meeting.

2:00 p.m. - Emily Plec, OSBHE Board Member and WOU Professor and Chair of Communication Studies

Faculty Senate also deliberates on policy issues that university is facing. Anything non-contractual falls to the Faculty Senate to discuss (e.g. residency requirements, etc.).

Emily is also a member of OSBHE (Oregon State Board of Higher Education). Emily feels that the IFS is one of the important bodies we share together across institutions, but it can be strong and vocal or not. She was impressed by the statement we released a few days ago regarding our future involvement with our system (blue sheet). Emily has tried to support the strengths of the system perspective. In Oregon we tend to reinvention – sometimes we lose some of the best parts of the machinery we have. She wants to work together with K-12 and community colleges with higher ed.

This morning she provided legislative testimony in Salem as head of the WOU Faculty Union. Emily asked for questions regarding the governor’s vision on higher education and education in Oregon. The board is still waiting for things to unfold and is still not sure what will emerge from OEIB.

Next year there may be post-secondary education department that performs OUS functions and community college coordination provides. This will have a corresponding board like the state board is to OUS. This will be some version of the HEC. Those are the two bodies unfolding in terms of the day to day office work and the governance piece, which will report up the chain to the chief education officer and his staff. There may still be a role for OUS alongside this, but that remains to be seen.
The new higher education committee (3/5 of them) are rooted in higher education and know a lot about it. They get the issues. They will not completely do away with chancellor like functions, but Emily was not sure if they will be embodied by one position. They are trying to sort out what to recommend to governor what is already working well and needs to be kept, what needs to be centralized, and what needs to go to the institutional governing boards.

Bob expressed that at OSU they are concerned about possible damage in interim if there are gaps in administration. Emily described the governor’s desired system as being loose across the system and tighter at the institutional level.

The institutional governing boards are not an end-run around the OUS, but are beholden to themselves. The State Board has made recommendations regarding how those responsibilities should be parsed out across the entities – some continuing to rest with OUS and some with institutional boards. Emily was unclear at this point if these recommendations would make it into the final form.

Emily expressed concerns about possible problems, including costs that may arise with the institutional governing boards. However, there may be increased opportunities for faculty, staff and students to participate in decision-making at those institutions. This is separate than the 40/40/20 effort – they are not necessarily connected.

Institutional boards could potentially strengthen institutional voices or do away with them. This is why Emily said they are still advocating for representative seats. Both the Faculty Senate and Staff Senate serve at the pleasure of the President and they can be disbanded without an alternative. With true shared governance, at WOU they have a faculty and staff union that would push back. It is in the unions that WOU has the most shared governance.

There are concerns about the bill [SB 270] that would do away with faculty involvement and representation on the board. The one situation where there would be a conflict of interest would be in the board was establishing faculty salary. Otherwise, Emily felt faculty could readily perform the mission given to them as a board member. Emily thought faculty representation on the state board was important for the overall discussion (e.g. including questions of graduate programs in 40/40/20 or different issues faced by the small schools). Other board members may not ask the same questions regarding curriculum proposals if there were not faculty members. It is important for faculty members to ask tough questions if programs are needed at this time. Faculty understand how policy affect the day-to-day activity in the classroom. Absence of faculty on the state board has led to cluelessness on the board. Faculty help bring the administrative/policy discussion back to the day to day level.

How does an e-campus deal with access to a university at more remote geographic locations? The more financially viable a campus is the more they are left alone to govern themselves. E-campuses can help bring in dollars. There were concerns expressed about degrees obtained totally online. E-campuses represent a lot of revenue for institutions. At the board level there is appreciation for those efforts. This is another place where faculty perspective is important. It is not just cheaper, however – there is still a lot of effort, often more, in terms of communicating and administering those courses. By having these, however, are we eroding support for the smaller campuses? Not all students are suited to this kind of instruction.

A more in-depth discussion of e-campuses (and other tools like MOOCs) and learning outcomes was suggested as a future IFS topic. Intellectual property, academic honesty and other related topics need to be discussed as well. The Governor brought up this in the City Club discussion today in Portland.

Emily encouraged people to email her questions. Michael Dembrow passed around some summary comments he had gathered re: institutional boards (UVA process example). plece@wou.edu
2:30 p.m. - SWOU Student Representative - Amanda Litzinger
Amanda spoke about the student experience at WOU. The biggest concern on campus is tuition/cost. At WOU they have had the tuition promise, so students have not been as upset about tuition increases because they have not felt it as much. As that tuition promise goes away, students are confused about what is happening and unsure how this is affecting them. Now we are starting to see more outrage on campus and students are starting to become more engaged on this issue. The ASWOU is doing a student survey on this issue.

Student incidental fees are $306/term, which is high. Students do not realize that they also have a say over that process. It is frustrating serving on the incidental fee committee and a general board and see that what is cut out of their budget is picked up by the incidental fees.

Students are reluctant to support the idea of institutional boards for fear of the branch campuses. What are the fears at the smaller institutions? It takes a few years to realize what a business university is. Students are concerned about voices being muted by an institutional board. At the state level it is fairer to all the students involved. At the institutional level it is felt by students it becomes more of a business. Is there concern about institutional boards raising tuition? With the OUS system Amanda imagines there is some reporting and decision-making. Students have a fear that students will take on even more debt to go to their local school.

People sitting on boards who are business people do want students to graduate without debt or without much debt – it is part of the national conversation now and there is awareness to keep cost down – no one is trying to get rich off of student dollars. It is decreased state funding that is part of what is creating the disparity and rise in tuition. We have a high growth rate of student attendance, but are in the bottom of level of student state support.

The question arose – what will athletics (with giant revenue streams) have to institutional boards?
Does OUS currently have any authority of what institutions do with their athletic money? There is some system control over the lottery dollars. The small schools could use more of those lottery dollars – it would really help if it was reallocated.

3:00 p.m. - IFS Position Statement Discussion
Committee chairs: Mike Hass and Michael Dembrow; Matt Donegan; OSBHE Board members; Ben Cannon; Melodie Rose (OUS)

Everyone’s changes were incorporated. There is a link to the statement on the web site:

IFS position statement – February 13, 2013
http://oregonstate.edu/senate/ifs/PDFs/FutureofEducationinOregon.pdf

At OSU, Vickie Nunemaker is the admin assistant for Faculty Senate. She hired someone who is web-knowledgeable. They are in the process of coming up with some IFS letterhead. Maude said that when she proposed the idea of a logo, she had the idea of the state of Oregon with IFS across it and in puzzle pieces that are sticking out. Maude will show us what the mock-up looks like and will email the prototypes to Laura for inclusion in the minutes.

Check your IFS listing on the white sheet (http://oregonstate.edu/senate/ifs/membership.html) and make sure your listing is accurate. Email Bob if you find something that needs to be changed. If you know your terms that would help for the web site as well.
Bob and the group praised Ike for the people he gathered together to present at this IFS meeting to help IFS get a feel for the issues and culture at WOU. Bob encouraged faculty at future hosting locations to take note!

Bob and Vickie are working on guidelines to help IFS members understand how to host an IFS meeting.

Bob provided information about how the IFS statement was received. He sent it to Senator Mike Haas, Chair of Education and Workforce Development Committee (Oregon Senate) and his aide emailed back that they shared it with the rest of the committee. Michael Dembrow, rep from Portland, [title], who spoke with us last month, wrote back and said it was great and that he shared it with his committee. Both thought it would help the conversation. Bob sent to Matt Donegan (OEIB and another board) and everyone on the state board received the statement. Melody Rose has it and has distributed it to the people in her office.

Bob also sent the statement to Ben Cannon, the governor’s aide on education policy and had a few emails back and forth with Cannon. Cannon would like to start up a dialogue and his administrative person is working with Bob regarding this. Bob will report back on this before our next meeting.

All the feedback we are getting is that “we hear you and that you want to be involved”. This statement has helped get IFS on the map as part of the discussion in higher education in Oregon. It reflects well on this so it was a good collective effort. Hopefully this is just the start of the conversation.

Please share this with your institution’s faculty leadership and institutional leadership and let them know that IFS’s intention is to have faculty and student representation on any of these boards.

The next State Board meeting is April 4, 2013 in Portland at PSU.

3:45 p.m. - President’s Report – Bob Mason

- Issues from those not attending the Saturday session?
- HB2742 [http://landru.leg.state.or.us/13reg/measures/hb2700.dir/hb2742.intro.html] – Prohibits public university from discriminating against student on basis that student was not awarded standard high school diploma or General Educational Development (GED) certificate.
  - This bill is sponsored by Sara Gelser and Peter Buckley. Sara Gelser (D), Oregon House District 16 (Corvallis and Philomath). 2013 committee assignments: Education (chair), Revenue, and Human Services and Housing. Peter Buckley (D), Oregon House District 5 (Ashland). 2013 Ways and Means Co-Chair
  - See addendum at end of agenda for query from Karen Marrongelle

Bob encouraged the IF senators to communicate back to their campuses and to provide feedback on the question Marrongelle is requesting.

- How will this impact status of non-admitted to admitted students?
- What impact will this have on time-to-degree?
- The group expressed concerns about this proposal. Melody will join us on Saturday and we will share our concerns with her and Drew Hagedorn (Tonkon Torp LLP OUS Advisor) at that time.
- There were concerns about time-sensitivity about this type of question – if there are other pieces of legislation on which feedback is needed, can we just email to our people on campus versus present to an already scheduled institutional Faculty Senate meeting or have a virtual IFS meeting over the phone or polycom unit.
Margie (per Bob) offered UO as site for a meeting in April if desired. The group was not sure if the timing would line up with anything from the legislature for which we needed to respond more quickly than our meeting in May. We could probably conduct some conversations virtually (online or phone).

Do we need to have an official response to have ready for Melody for tomorrow? We would like to speak with Melody and let Karen know we spoke with Melody about our response.

Of note: It would be helpful for future meetings to give an RSVP to the site coordinator for IFS meetings so the host knows numbers for the room arrangements, dinner, etc.

From Maude: HB 2149 and SB 270 from the PSU Union – “No member of the board may be an employer of the university”. What does the group think of this? The group expressed concerns about not having representation of people (students, faculty) who policy decisions would impact. Having them on institutional boards would help inform boards about the day to day impact of their policy decisions. It is important for policy makers to understand what policies look like under implementation. Some cautioned the group to not model themselves necessarily on OHSU as all institutions are set up differently and need structures best suited to their unique situations.

Do we need to think about strategic partnerships whether we could collaborate more with AOF (Association of Faculty)? We have to be careful with them because they are a lobbyist group. The group discussed make-up of faculty associations on each campus.

Do we want to come up with our own position? Here is what we think, this is why. They have a logo! Creating a statement in response is also in line with our February 13, 2013 statement. Maude will send the AAUP statement to the group.

Does anyone know how people will get on the institutional board? With the permission of the governor? The institution forwards a slate of recommendations and the governor chooses the people. If the point of the institutional boards was to have more autonomy, how is that being or not being accomplished as this process unfolds? A faculty voice is vital to understanding what happens on the ground.

The group suggested language around a response to this and agreed we need to focus on a “we need a seat at the table” message. We also want to make sure to bring up our students. It might be challenging to coordinate with them. We are speaking for ourselves and students can speak for themselves.

We support faculty representation on the institutional boards. We need to think of ideas of why it is imperative of why we are on them and think of responses to potential objections to having us on them. “Here is why you need faculty on the board”, “feel free to talk to us at any time”. That kind of message might be well received. We liked the idea of talking points more than “we want a seat on the board.”

Do any of us have faculty on campus who work on decision-science and how better decisions are made?

Have there been comparisons between states of systems that have individual institutional boards versus states with systems? Who are our “shareholders” and our “stakeholders”? Who are the stakeholders? The stakeholders are the citizens of Oregon, the students, and the faculty, staff, employees of universities, the community at large, where our graduates will go.

There was a recommendation to obtain help for how to frame the language of this in a way that makes sense to legislators.
There are advisory boards at EOU that contains feedback from the community and businesses that provide helpful information, but they do not govern.

This statement would go to the same groups as the statement before.

5:00 – Adjourn
7:00 – Working dinner at Robert’s Landing

---

**Saturday, March 16**

8:45 – *Continental Breakfast provided*

9:00 – Approval of January 2013 Minutes
Minutes were approved.

9:15 - Logo for IFS – Maude Hines (PSU)
Maude shared a couple of logo possibilities she had obtained from a colleague at PCC. We may need to spend $20 for the logo services. The IFS does not have a budget for such things.

The group liked the logo with the hands and wondered if the school letters could be added to each arm like a tattoo. **Maude will check with her person about having a version for our next meeting.** We want the message that we are taking care of Oregon. The hands are united around a silhouette of the state.

We wondered if other states already had logos for their equivalent IFS bodies and how they graphically represent themselves.

9:30 – Campus reports
Campus reports were given.

**OHSU**
The roof has gone onto the Collaborative Life Sciences Building (CLSB) on the waterfront. The searches for new deans for the School of Nursing and School of Dentistry are in the final stages. The School of Medicine Curriculum Transformation task forces have completed their work, but work groups for inter-professional education continue. OHSU recently published their Diversity Action Plan 2013 ([http://www.ohsu.edu/xd/about/vision/center-for-diversity-inclusion/about/diversity-action-plan.cfm](http://www.ohsu.edu/xd/about/vision/center-for-diversity-inclusion/about/diversity-action-plan.cfm)). OHSU’s Faculty Senate workgroup (chaired by Chuck Allen) is working with the Education Advisory Board and Provost to assess national best practices around how faculty are valued and evaluated. The President’s Council is currently reviewing and updating the [Vision 20/20 strategic plan](http://www.ohsu.edu/xd/about/vision/center-for-diversity-inclusion/about/diversity-action-plan.cfm). There is a hiring freeze due to the unknown impacts of the current federal budget sequester.

**PSU**
The PSU AAUP faculty union is working on two Oregon legislature Senate and House bills. The PSU Provost (Sona Andrews) came up with “Rethink PSU” to use $3 million and put out an RFP for faculty for ideas for online classes or MOOCs or alternative visions of education. These ideas are in the final stages of review. PSU is also working with a proposed new budget model involving some kind of version of RCM. They have seven (7) colleges including the Library. They are conducting three (3) Deans searches going on right now. PSU’s Faculty Senate is reviewing faculty ranks and their post-tenure review process and the resources available and incentives for this process.

**OSU**
Administration has been conducting the OSU campus climate survey. Their Diversity and Inclusion Task Force has come up with a master plan to have diversity and inclusion be part of all levels of
administrative decision-making. OSU is looking at their faculty ranks/titles for instructors. There is an idea of offering rolling 2 or 3 year fixed contracts. They also are trying to institute a “Professor of Practice”, which would not be tenure track, but be fixed term contracts. They are in the final stages of searching for a new VP of Finance and Administration. They just hired a new director for the Hatfield Marine Science Center. They also are searching for a Dean of Science. They anticipate the federal budget sequester will impact OSU, particularly in how it impacts the availability to submit NSF (National Science Foundation) grant proposals. OSU is looking at MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses).

**What are issues around diversity and e-campus?** We assume students have complete computer literacy and have access to technology, but this is not necessarily the case.

**The group decided to check in with how their institutions are implementing OARs and come to the May meeting ready to report on this.**

**Possible topic for a future IFS meeting: we need to examine the literature/research on learning outcomes related to e-learning and hybrid teaching/learning models since our institutions are jumping on using the technology. Also, how do you evaluate online teaching?**

**WOU**

There are many administrative positions in transition with interim heads right now. WOU may have the highest incidental fee structure of any public Oregon university, but it is a key part of their budget. The students vote to impose these on themselves. Sometimes that is the case at other universities: when universities cannot raise tuition they raise the incidental fees, but students cannot use financial aid to cover those expenses.

We need to get students away from thinking about “what is the right answer?” to “what is the right process?” “What is your explanation of why X did not work?” This is the critical thinking about which we are concerned.

**SOU**

Faculty members are in the prioritization evaluation process, including writing reports on their programs. They also are moving from departmental to “house” structures that includes more of a cohort experience (e.g. “Green House” would include environmental sustainability and environmental sciences). The cohort model helps identify the size of classes across the board, but this may make it more challenging to move across different majors.

**EOU**

They are looking at flattening their student affairs structure. Shari’s unit is looking for a Dean. The administrative is in a state of flux. They have a services and supplies freeze and all non-essential travel has been cancelled for the rest of the year. They just eliminated a modern languages major and religious studies minor. They are undergoing revision of their tenure and promotion handbook to bring themselves into compliance with their OARs. They are in the process of implementing DegreeWorks, a software for auditing progress to completion of a degree.

**OIT**

The Wilsonville campus has the potential to develop quickly, including the renewable energy program which currently has over 220 students. There are about 25 students in the masters renewable energy program. There is a new electronics degree at the Wilsonville campus. The Wilsonville campus programs developed will extend to the other OIT campuses. They also are discussing the idea of an e-campus and OIT faculty are examining this trend. Online degrees contribute 10% of revenue for the university. Online also allows them to enlarge their capacity with limited physical resources. They are examining faculty ranks, including instructor ranks, which are non-tenure. They want to give junior faculty an
interim evaluation (third year review) in addition to the annual reviews on their way to tenure to help give them a sense to improve their performance.

**UO**
I need information from Margie or Rob on the UO campus report.

**11:30-1:00 – Melody Rose, OUS Vice Chancellor for Academic Strategies and Drew Hagedorn, Tonkon Torp LLP OUS Advisor**

Hagedorn helps advocate for OUS in the Capitol for the capital budget and other issues related to OUS.

There are three major bills going through the legislature related to governance: 1) SB270 (institutional board bill); 2) HB bill from Rep Dembrow and Haas that is parallel to SB70; and 3) Department of Post-Secondary Education Bill that governor has sent to the OEIB.

Post-Secondary Education Bill/placeholde language – A rough draft of this should be available next week. SB270 is being discussed in terms of how to make this statute work functionally. We are likely to see revisions to the amendments for this as early as next week. It will then go to Ways and Means. What SB270 presents is “do we want a statewide board or not?” Theoretically you could have both this and institutional boards. The way the language of the bill is set up now, UO, PSU, OSU would each have their own boards, then there would be a consortium board for the smaller universities. It also would establish the roles and responsibilities, who owns the real property, etc.

OUS has an official position on institutional boards. It calls for continued coordination to meet statewide goals. There is a June 2012 official board position [OUS website]. They passed around a document showing a mapping of issues brought forth by OUS and how/if these came up in the bill as it is written.

The group expressed concerns about no faculty representation on the institutional boards. Hagedorn said Emily Pec came compelling arguments to have faculty on the boards. There are other issues of revenue bonding capability, who controls hiring, and more logistics. The start date for the new boards would be January 1, 2014.

**Now is the time to be communicating with the legislature on these issues, in particular the House Bill being put forward potentially by Rep. Dembrow.**

The group expressed concern about the governor’s ability to choose which members sit on the institutional boards and felt this cut into the autonomous role of the boards. The group also raised concerns with the proposed PERS reforms.

Go to the Oregon legislature web site to get the audio of the testimony for the institutional board bills (SB270).

Melody urged communications with OSA (Oregon Students Association) on these issues.

Melody drew a diagram of possible structures of the new system-wide governing structure. We are all collecting data in different ways and we have different rules governing this. There are opportunities to coordinate data collection and reporting across the K-20 spectrum. OUS is not a state agency, but the OEIB is. OUS employees cannot be employed by OEIB or receive retirement through them. The concern about individual institutional boards is that there potentially will be competitiveness between the institutions and that academic policy (program review, etc.) goes to OEIB. The people employed by OUS
cannot work for the Department of Post-Secondary Higher Education: there will be no Ph.D.’s in that department. It is a cultural shift. The further away from the classroom education policy gets made, the worse it is going to be. The policy will not reflect what we are doing on the ground. A lot of what is driving this is to help drive us towards coordinating more with the community colleges because the perception is we are siloed to ourselves.

OUS convenes the Provosts from the community colleges and institutions of higher education on a regular basis. There are issues of perception of “real” state agency people vs. “egghead/Ph.D./research” higher education people. Our arguments have to address these perceptions and why what we are doing is good for them. There is a perception that academia sucks resources out of the classroom.

Melody and OUS are presenting at the legislature this next Wednesday and Thursday. Wednesday, March 27 is open testimony 8:30-10 a.m. Call legislative fiscal office and let them know you are coming and get there by 8 a.m.

CCWD – Community Colleges & Workforce Development
OSAC – Oregon Student Access Committee(?) - Distribute the Oregon Opportunity Grant

12:30 – Bylaws and Constitution Sub-committee Report

12:45 – Old Business:

1. Slate of officers and elections
   o President-Elect: Jeff Dense, Grant Kirby
   o Secretary: Laura Zeigen
2. Provost’s Council Representative – discussion
3. IFS Communications
   o See the Legislative section
   o Check the Membership site and advise Bob if revisions are needed
   o Other website needs?

12:50 – New Business /Matters Arising
1:05 – Adjourn

Future Meetings

- May 10-11 - Eastern Oregon University
- September 27-28 Southern Oregon University
- November 22-23 Portland State University
Addendum

From Karen Marrongelle re: HB2742:

Could you query the IFS to get reactions to this:

We continue to actively monitor HB 2742, which prohibits public university from discriminating against student on basis that student was not awarded standard high school diploma or General Educational Development (GED) certificate. We have been in discussions with Rep. Gelser about this bill and are considering some compromise language. I want to run our current thinking by you, so that you can provide feedback on whether this is something you can live with or not.

We are trying to work out a way to accommodate students with extended or modified Oregon diplomas while having the campuses retain authority over admissions requirements (and requirements for students participating in any way in courses). This comes down to finding another way of vetting competence in the absence of using a high school diploma as a proxy for competence. We would need to put a provision in the bill that would allow for testing competence for non-admit students with a modified or extended diploma in order to take an individual class. This puts the onus on the individual instructor to vet such competence.

Another way is to allow students with modified or extended diplomas to audit courses, where no evaluation of student work takes place. Again, allowing students to audit courses is up to the individual faculty member, so this would fall into the discretion of the faculty.