Marrongelle will get the pros/cons report of different governance models to IFS.

At the January 10, 2013 Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE) meeting in Portland, IFS President Dense was informed a Board commissioned report from the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) would be released within the next few weeks. This report purportedly goes into more detail than the previous two AGB reports which centered on the pros and cons of institutional governing boards. As part of IFS testimony to OSBHE (and the preceding day, the Higher Education Coordinating Committee (HECC), President Dense respectfully requested the impending AGB report be shared with IFS in a timely fashion. President Dense also communicated with OSBHE Chair Matt Donegan that content analysis of the previous AGB reports illustrated minimal attention being placed to the role of faculty on institutional governing boards, and moreover, the role of shared governance in any new higher education governance structure. The impending AGB report will be distributed to IFS members as soon as it is available, and will be discussed at the next IFS meeting in Eugene so membership can solicit input from campuses, and provide feedback to stakeholders (OSBHE, HECC, Oregon State Legislature) in a timely fashion.

Marrongelle suggested IFS make this part of our report to the Board and also to talk with Emily Plenck (WOU) and Linda Giaffetti (OSU), our faculty representatives on the Board.

See attached comments made to HECC and OSBHE by President Dense centering on the need for more information re future of TRUs. President Dense also engaged in a dialogue with Director Plec concerning changes in the Oregon Administrative Rules regarding sabbatical leave policy. Provost Council Liaison Maude Hines has interfaced with the Academic Strategies Committee on this issue. An error in the proposed minutes of ASC’s November meeting, asking for IFS to isolate best practices in sabbatical policies, along with the implications of changes in the OARs on the new governance structure, was stricken from the record at behest of Professor Hines. Moreover, Professor Hines was able to procure an oral pledge from the Chancellor’s office of support for any research project of this magnitude in the future. Professor Dense and Director Plec pledged to continue to be in close communication as further information and legislation concerning higher education governance in Oregon became available.

Ben Cannon is very interested in better understanding how IFS can interact with HECC.

President Dense testified before HECC on January 9 in Salem. His testimony was well received, particularly by Executive Director Cannon, HECC Chair Tim Nesbitt, Commissioner Lee Ayer-Proboski, and especially Commissioner Kirby Dyess (a former OSHBE member), who highlighted the important historical role played by IFS in higher education policy. President Dense scheduled a phone conversation and in-person meeting with Executive Director Cannon before HECC’s February 13 meeting in Portland to explore the future relationship between HECC and IFS. At this juncture, Executive Director Cannon plans on having testimony from IFS a standing agenda item during future meetings, along with regular interface with IFS leadership between meetings.
ITEMS REQUIRING FOLLOW-UP FROM NOVEMBER 2013 IFS MEETING

Also ask Ben Cannon how/in what ways IFS should respond to legislation. Item will be discussed by President Dense with Ben Cannon during upcoming dialogue. Anne Teske has provided a legislative update that highlights OUS/Chancellor office legislative priorities during the upcoming February session. The document can be accessed here.

Marrongelle will ask Anna (Teske-jd) in her office as well. Marrongelle will send the AGB report and other resources to Maude to send to the group.

Chancellor Rose, Board Chair Donegan and Vice Chancellor Marrongelle agreed to forward the AGB report once it is available. Chancellor Rose and Chair Donegan pointed out that previous versions of the AGB October and November report versions made to the OSBHE Higher Education Governance Work Group were available online, and can be accessed here and here. Additionally, see the proposed University Governance Work Plan which details the steps and timeline for TRU governance decisions here.

See Dembrow’s handout on shared administrative services [link from PDF that Bob/other person has a copy of?].

See the Friday, January 17, 2014 agenda of the Joint Special Committee for the latest report here. Note that this report was generated by the TRU Presidents, and to date at this juncture I am unaware of any campus based discussions on this topic. President Dense urges IFS Senators to distribute this document to faculty governance leaders on their campuses and solicit feedback in preparation for future HECC, OSBHE and Oregon State Legislature meetings on the topic.

Again, faculty, students and staff need to see scenarios of what each option would mean and what safeguards would need to be in place for each option.

IFS will be in a position to respond to proposed changes in higher education governance once (1) the impending AGB report is released, (2) The OSBHE Governance and Policy Committee formulates a recommended proposal for the entire board to consider, (3) the Oregon State Legislature deliberates on the issue during the upcoming February session. However, please note ‘the devil is in the details’ and much of the policy minutiae may not be contemplated until the 2015 legislative session; and (4) OSBHE’s April 4 meeting where they have scheduled to take action on the TRU governance issue. In discussions with various stakeholders, the following four scenarios with regard to action on this issue have emerged

- OSBHE can utilize their statutory authority under SB 270 to authorize institutional governing boards for the TRUs.
- OSBHE can recommend a course of action to the Oregon State Legislature on the institutional board issue for the TRUs.
- OSBHE can utilize their statutory authority under SB 270 to authorize institutional governing boards for some of the TRUs but not others. This course of action may be linked to further exploration of the affiliate governance model.
- OSBHE can ‘punt’ the issue to other stakeholders, including HECC.
Given the process of bargain and compromise that is integral to the policy process, other scenarios may emerge as the February legislative session gains traction. President Dense is committed to engaging with stakeholders on a continual basis, and moreover, sharing information in order to best position IFS to respond to what will be significant changes to the higher education landscape in Oregon.

**Dembrow encouraged those at SOU to reach out to Representative Buckley on these issues.**

Representative Buckley will be serving as Co-Chair of the Joint Interim Special Committee on University Governance and Operations (SB 270). Senator Dembrow and OEIB (faculty) member Samuel Henry will also be serving on this Special Committee, along with OSBHE Chair Matt Donegan. The Committee will convene its first meeting of the session Friday, January 17, when they will discuss an update on shared services and a governance proposal for the Technical and Regional Universities (TRUs). Meeting materials, including financial projections by each TRU, previously circulated AGB reports on institutional governing boards, history of fund balances at each TRU, and the “President’s Report” re shared services model, have been posted [here](#). Note that the governance proposal has not been posted as of this morning (1/14/14). President Dense advises these materials, especially the governance proposal, be discussed at January IFS meeting, with a response formulated and presented to the Committee during the February session.

**Dembrow suggested having Ben Cannon at our next IFS meeting.**

Given heavy agenda for January meeting, suggest inviting HECC Executive Director Cannon to a future meeting. President Dense suggest dovetailing HECC meeting with a IFS meeting in Salem area (WOU). President Dense advises inviting HECC Executive Director Cannon to a meeting prior to the OSBHE April 4 meeting, which has been targeted by the Board as the date for a decision on the TRU institutional board issue.

**Dembrow would like the IFS to take a position on this governance question.**

This should be one of the key agenda items during the January IFS meeting. President Dense will forward the TRU governance proposal once it is available, and urges members to analyze the proposal prior to the January meeting.

**Jeff suggested that IFS talk with faculty at all the campuses and have them talk to each other instead of just relying on the governance report. IFS senators, particular at the four TRUs, were tasked with going back to their campuses to gather input on this issue so IFS can draft a position statement. It would be helpful to have this position statement completed by late December or early-mid January for Dembrow’s use prior to the next legislative session.**

Conversations among campus faculty indicated the need for more information in order to provide an informed response to the governance options being discussed. While the impending AGB report should prove beneficial to a certain extent, there is a high likelihood that the Oregon State Legislature will request a more in-depth report on the issue from the Legislative Fiscal Office. President Dense will endeavor to make this report available to IFS as soon as it is available.
Bob wants IFS to draft a letter of thanks to Dembrow for all of his work on these issues.

President Dense will be in continual communication with Senator Dembrow before and during the February session. Senator Dembrow has indicated a willingness to attend January’s IFS meeting, either in person as his schedule permits, or electronically on Saturday morning. It is important that IFS continue to cultivate a strong working relationship with Senator Dembrow and his colleague Representative Buckley, in order to ensure a strong legislative voice.

We will vote on the by-laws next meeting after reading it.

A copy of the proposed IFS By-Laws, including a collaboratively drafted Mission Statement, to be voted on at the January IFS meeting can be found here.

If you want to self-nominate or nominate someone else, email Bob after talking to the person.

Please forward nominations to me at your earliest convenience. Please be advised that I would like to remain IFS President through 2015. The ‘heavy lifting’ with regard to changes in the higher education governance structure in Oregon will be undertaken during the 2015 legislative session, and I am working diligently to ensure IFS is a key player in the future formulation and implementation of higher education policy that serves the best interest of faculty and students.

What about asking HECC for meeting space (in Salem) if not money?

President Dense will inquire as to space and funding in upcoming discussions with HECC Executive Director Cannon. Additionally, President Dense will interface with OEIB Chair Golden on the same issue.

The group was agreed that the next IFS meeting will be January 31 and February 1, 2014 at University of Oregon.

It is essential that all current OUS member institutions have their IFS Senators in attendance at January’s meeting in Eugene. There are several significant issues confronting the future of IFS that will require an informed response from IFS in a timely fashion. Additionally, we will endeavor to schedule IFS issues for the remainder of 2014. Please be advised that a February meeting, which could conceivably be conducted electronically, may be necessary, given developments during the upcoming legislative session.