Present:  Mary Cluskey, OSU (phone), Jeff Dense, EOU (Skype), Bob Mason, OSU; Maude Hines, PSU; Candyce Reynolds, PSU; Margie Paris, UO; Shari Carpenter, EOU; Charles Lane, SOU; Feng Shi, OIT, Grant Kirby, OIT (Friday), Jeff Stewart, OHSU; Gail Houck, OHSU (Friday); Laura Zeigen, OHSU, note taker.

Friday, November 22

Noon – Hosted Lunch

12:45 – Call to Order, Introductions

1:00 – Wim Wiewel, President – Portland State University

Dr. Wiewel welcomed the group to PSU and spoke about PSU, which has 29,000 students and is the most diverse campus in the system. Many students are the first in their families to go to college. Two-thirds of the undergraduates admitted are transfer students. They also now have 3,000 residential students on campus. They have about 3,500 full time employees not including student employees. There are 50 buildings on 50 acres.

We have challenges facing all of us: rise in student debt, reductions in state funding, shortage of available jobs after graduation, etc. There are greater calls for accountability to show we deliver value. There also is a challenge of online learning. There has been growing national and international recognition, particularly for their programs focused on sustainability. Another area of focus is life and health sciences, partly from the partnerships with OHSU, and additional individual collaborations between faculty at both institutions. The third area of a lot of work is the “cradle to career” continuum: PSU is part of an educational pipeline and must help work with the future K-12 teachers and other educators. PSU is one of six “STRIVE” ("cradle to career") sites. There was a competition earlier this year from OEIB to fund programs like this. STRIVE agrees on key indicators along the way (e.g. reading by 3rd grade, algebra by 8th grade).

There is another program PSU is doing called “Rethink PSU” being done by the Provost’s Office. This was based on the idea of needing to rethink pedagogy and business processes since students expect a lot more services available in an online format (advising, student progress, other). Twenty-five of these programs were funded (things like credit for higher learning, MOOC projects, etc.).

PSU just announced a four-year degree guarantee. Freshmen can sign up for it and must have 45 credits a year and maintain good academic standing. If PSU did not make the right classes available in the time needed, they will work with the student to have this work. This forced all the degree programs to see if the sequencing of classes made sense and allowed students to graduate in a timely way. The departments otherwise produced clearer degree maps in response to this project.
SB 270 passage means that PSU will now have its own board, which Dr. Wiewel believes will help provide more targeted attention to PSU. There is a difference between a governing body and an advisory board. Dr. Wiewel scanned the business community about what PSU could do to procure more local support. The perception was that PSU was a state agency.

This change helps makes the region feel that they have more of a stake in the institution as a local institution and not one tied to the state.

They are still talking about the shared services and are going through a budget rebalancing effort at PSU in respond to state cuts and increases in PEBB. They are also developing a more robust program review.

**Q&A with President Wiewel**

There were questions around governance and the new HECC (Higher Education Coordinating Committee). PSU has been trying to build up the role of the senate. Faculty issues are not the same as union issues. The HECC has not yet reached out to university presidents or institutions to see what they think their role should or might be. There will be a time to figure out the relation between HECC and the individual boards. It makes sense to think about the higher education enterprise as one large enterprise.

What do you see as the greatest challenge in the development of the new School of Public Health between OHSU and PSU? Originally the difference situation for faculty members at each institution, but they have developed a model they think will work: faculty will remain at their own institution and the dean over both will be part of both. Figuring out where the faculty from the School of Community Health will live might be a challenge.

Might there be any tax reform in Oregon in the future to help in supporting education? Dr. Wiewel expressed guarded optimism for the 2015 state legislative session and was otherwise optimistic about future collaborations.

**1:30 – Sona Andrews, Provost – Portland State University**

Dr. Andrews wanted to talk about Rethink PSU and also provided an update on where we are nationally in terms of state authorization for distance education and reciprocity agreements. She was on the group for the national agreements and is currently on the WICHE committee. It is something that impacts all our institutions.

PSU had a one-time three million dollar set of money and wanted to get ideas for awards for innovative ways to work with the curriculum that would have impact at a larger institutional level. They received 162 concepts were posted and over 1/3 of faculty and staff participated in one of the proposals. Each group gave a five-minute presentation on their idea and received comments from faculty, staff and students. They then narrowed the group of ideas to a smaller sub-set and asked for more information. They funded a small number of proposals. The School of Business got three awards funded. Rethink PSU: how do we as an institution provide greater access to more students? If you go to [http://rethink.pdx.edu](http://rethink.pdx.edu) you can see the listing of all the ideas and also the proposals that were funded. Next week there will be video updates on each of the funded projects. Many projects will benefit from collaboration with other institutions.

Curricular changes go through the governance process, but the process of allowing everyone to think of ideas was very invigorating for campus.
They are looking to partner with other institutions: not every student has to take each of their students at PSU. They already have a lot of transfer students. Collectively they can bring their strengths together across institutions for particular disciplines.

SARAs: State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements. In 2010, when Congress did higher education reauthorization act, it said that states needed to comply with regulations and rules that give permission to institutions of higher education to operate in that state. There have to be these types of agreements in place for distance programs (e.g. delivery of instruction to distance students in Oregon even if the delivery is coming from an out-of-state institution). States that don’t comply with these rules run the risk of losing their federal financial aid. This was a very costly process to go to each state to obtain the authorizations (including providing all the curriculum vitaes (cvs) of faculty).

There became a national effort at reciprocity instead of each institution having to make an agreement with each state. We now have a national agreement around reciprocity that gives authority to regional compacts for creating agreements between states. PSU is in the WICHE (Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education). The compacts then enter into agreements with one another. The institutions within the state have to apply to the state SARA agreement first. Each provost must sign the document that has a set of standards by which distance education would be delivered. In a couple of years, nationwide, as long as an institution can show to their own state they have the safeguards for quality, and then we will all trust each other. This structure saves institutions a lot of effort and standardizes definitions of “physical presence”, and allows students to intern in other states, have faculty live in one state or offer classes in another state, etc. This streamlined process will also make it easier for other institutions to offer Oregon students distance courses.

**Q&A with Sona Andrews**

How would SARA and WICHE affect the Western Governors University? Under WICHE/SARA agreement, the Western Governors University would need to pass the requirements in their “home” state and their “home” state would need to pass the authorization process. There were discussions about trust. Institutions have to be accredited. There are enough safeguards in place to make this work. There may be issues that arise, but the benefit of access to students outweighs these. Assurances will be revisited. The U.S. Department of Education became involved in regards to consumer protections and being able to have consumer complaints resolved.

How will these agreements impact state universities? Should all of us in Oregon try to collaborate more in online education or will online education imperil some of the schools? How do we all collaborate? And how do we become competitive as a group of institutions, especially since there will be more opportunities from different states? PSU is looking forward to any kinds of collaboration they can have. This needs to happen from the faculty who are able to figure out what programs can happen together. PSU likes the idea of partnering with one another. PSU has institutions from outside the state interested in collaborating with each other as well.

**2:00 – Samuel Henry (OEIB) – “Issues of Equity and Quality in Higher Ed”**

Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB), Equity Lens document (PDF). He has been a strong supporter of the reorganization to K-20 in Oregon. It is time to change our intercultural behavior in education. There are four areas of equity concern: 1) broad and vigorous efforts for access including stronger accountability for better results for student of color and rural communities; 2) formal adaptation of OEIB Equity Lens; 3) a strategic plan for addressing talent pool for state’s second language speakers; 4) a more active higher
education and social support for equity issues in all of education including higher education and rural education; and 5) more interaction with pre-K and community colleges towards student success.

**Q&A with Samuel Henry**

Tell us more about the OEIB at a higher level. OEIB is the “what”, and groups like HECC are the “how”. They hope that the achievement compacts will start conversations across campuses, and from K-12, about how we will hold ourselves accountable.

What is the role of IFS in relation to OEIB as we move forward in new governance model? OEIB is in the process of clarifying their roles now that the legislation has been passed. There are differing interpretations of governance and structure, so they hope to clarify this. What will legislation for UO, PSU, and OSU boards really mean “on the ground” in regards to structure and governance? Henry hopes for IFS to help with picture of what post-secondary education should look like in the state of Oregon. IFS needs to have access to OEIB on a regular basis to be able to partner on these initiatives. Henry sees a formal relation with the HECC.

How is OEIB working with Oregon librarians to help develop critical thinking and research skills? There has not been a sense of leadership about what kinds of resources are the most needed for the 21st century, not from academics, but from the community and business leaders. There is a perception that because the internet is there, that libraries are obsolete. The conversation needs to be about information literacy. We have jumped on what we can measure as being the full scope of an education. We cannot necessarily easily measure critical thinking. We need conversations about the whole endeavor and how we can measure progress we are making on the whole rather than in isolation. They are working on next generation science standards. Librarians could teach the thinking processes, not just the specific tools, which will change over time.

It would be helpful to have IFS come out in support of the OEIB Equity Lens. What would be the mechanism for doing this? Increasing communication between IFS and OEIB? Henry is hoping that IFS should create a document for our vision of what could be included. There is a connection between K-12 and higher education. There is a synchronization needed across the whole enterprise across all institutions.

The hope is that somewhere along the way where there have been foundational pieces in place so we don’t have to pull back to cover foundational things that should have been covered. Henry likes the “shoreline” metaphor (versus the “pipeline” metaphor) where there are multiple access points for developing critical thinking skills, etc. We have some work to do to raise some of the issues in larger awareness. We need to create the idea that these are important to us collectively, as a society (in addition to, beyond just the economic and entrepreneurial pieces).

**2:45 – Karen Marrongelle, Oregon University System Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic Strategies**

Marrongelle asked what was on the minds of the IFS senators. We asked her to describe what is happening with OUS and the chancellor’s office.

The shared services enterprise, the legislature asked the presidents to convene to figure out a way to offer mostly business and financial services. All the institutions are legislatively mandated to participate in retirement benefits, collective bargaining and health benefits through 2015, and also instructed to try to figure out other efficiencies. The future model
will probably include some campuses providing service to the other campuses. Some of these services will be run through OSU. PSU may also offer some of these services in terms of risk and bargaining. There are about 20 employees who will continue to work under shared services enterprise, and this group will hire a director. It is written into SB 270 that no harm shall come to the smaller institutions that will not have individual institutional boards.

The office is also working closely with Ben Cannon and HECC to transition some of the coordinating functions currently done in the chancellor’s office, including program approval. Currently, programs are vetted through institutions, then Provost’s Council, then State Board. The expectation is that the Provost’s Council would still see the proposals and determine geographic and program distribution, and then pass it to the HECC. They want to make sure this does not add time to the process. Marrongelle does not anticipate that the Board would say no to a program and the HECC would say yes. The expectation even now is that any potential problems are worked out ahead of time. Marrongelle is helping HECC set up a set of questions for program approval. HECC still wants the Provost’s Council to do the majority of the vetting. The program should look very similar to how it is set up today.

After June 30, 2015 it is unclear what board will be the reporting board for the TRUs (technical and regional universities). The governing board for the TRUs will still need to exist and vet the program proposals for these institutions. Anything that will be a statewide effort from the chancellor’s office is being transferred to HECC, so there will be a reduction in staff at the chancellor’s office.

They are working on legislative advocacy for 2015 and will focus on advocating for the four regional institutions. The legal team in the chancellor’s office primarily serves the TRUs already.

Some IFS faculty are concerned that faculty will advocate to their administration for moving one way or another regarding their own boards without understanding all the consequences regarding things like retirement, health benefits, etc. This is one of the concerns regarding shared governance. The TRUs see their choices as being on a board with OSU, being on a board with just the TRUs, or having individual institutional boards.

What are Marrongelle’s thoughts around models like the one in Colorado? A lot of this is unknown. They are thinking about flexibility but do not have a particular end in mind. Colorado represents a very robust model, but a very different organizational structure. They are trying to set up this next year as flexibly as possible to be able to respond whatever the changes are.

Who will make this decision in the end? The State Board of Higher Education and the Oregon state legislature. The university presidents have been tasked with developing sustainability plans along with each of the major governance models: (1) individual boards; 2) branch campuses; 3) consortium). The faculty at these institutions need help providing their voice to their administrations. Marrongelle will get the pros/cons report of different governance models to IFS. They will then solicit additional feedback on issues that may not have been addressed with these reports. There also concerns about different accrediting bodies for different institutions. The faculty at the TRUs are feeling pushed to make a decision by February without enough information. If regional universities go or are highly modified, it will have a huge impact on the people of that region.

Marrongelle suggested IFS make this part of our report to the Board and also to talk with Emily Pleck (WOU) and Linda Ciuffetti (OSU), our faculty representatives
**on the Board.** These Board members can be our faculty advocates. Check in with them. Marrongelle hopes and expects IFS, which she considers a good and functioning group, would continue. **Ben Cannon is very interested in better understanding how IFS can interact with HECC.** We now have a good opportunity with the new structure. Cannon will be looking for ways to reach faculty and IFS will enable him to do that.

The chancellor’s office will be reduced in staff by about 75% in the near future. The group thanked Marrongelle for her and her staff for all the work they are doing in very challenging circumstances. Marrongelle encouraged the group to call or email her if any questions come up that the group thinks she could answer.

Where should IFS currently go for legislative updates for this coming session? Marrongelle’s office can keep IFS updated through February 2014. Also, the campus offices at the large universities are hooked into the legislative session. Last legislative session their office responded to over 158 bills. Try to designate at UO, PSU or OSU one of the legislative people, to see if they will take on being the legislative information. **Also ask Ben Cannon how/in what ways IFS should respond to legislation.** Does it make sense to have an IFS person talk to the legislative people at the three big universities? **Marrongelle will ask Anna in her office as well. Marrongelle will send the AGB report and other resources to Maude to send to the group.**

**3:30 – Break**

**4:00 – Harris Foster, President – Associated Students Portland State University**

Autonomy with student fees is a large issue. The three things they are focusing on this year are 1) the financial disbursement system on campus (HigherOne) - 80%. They are doing a student survey on this. They would like to remove HigherOne from PSU; 2) Good Samaritan drug and alcohol policy. At parties with illicit drugs, etc., there is hesitation to call 911 because of loss of financial aid. When the fear is there, someone will not call. If this policy can save even one life it will be worth it. 3) They want to get a full-time coordinator at a Native American Student Center at PSU. These provide necessary services to students on campus with very specific needs. It would help to better serve the multicultural population across campus.

The whole student body is elected, except for directors and executive staff. The student elections are a way they have a lot of autonomy. They have a president, vice president, and 7 cabinet heads with specific foci and 15 others. Recent victories include the 1.5% tuition reduction at PSU, helped by testimony for others. They have completed their issue-choosing process for the Oregon university and community college campuses. At least 10% of every campus responded. Using that information, they have decided that statewide issues focus will be five specific topics. Foster felt that the students have more freedom with student fee autonomy.

The top 5 issues from the statewide survey include cultural competency for healthcare providers (creating safer spaces for people from marginalized communities), student food sovereignty, and food pantry/food security. Every time the university has a tuition increase, the university will donate 1% to the student food bank for students who are food insecure. They are doing a voter registration bill. It would give access to spaces on campus like residence halls, or whenever a student changes their address, to make sure they are still registered to vote. Currently they are banned from registering voters in residence halls. Registering more students would make students more listened to at a state level. Last year
they (the Oregon Student Association) got over 50,000 students registered throughout the state.

How do they see ASPSU interacting with the institutional board? When a decision needs to be made and students need to be consulted, they expect/hope that their student representative (Pam Campos) would consult with them (the students).

4:30 – Leslie McBride, PSU Faculty Senate President, and Mary King, PSU-AAUP President – “Shared Governance on a Unionized Campus: Challenges and Questions”

Mary King said that they worked on a document asking administration to give a more strategic sense of where the institution is going so they don’t have to be all things to all people. It did pass unanimously, but nothing has happened on it regarding follow up. They have developed the idea of joint forums of the faculty senate and the faculty union at PSU. There is a forum on Monday on financing. They have been asked to come up with plans for an 8% cut. This forum is to bring all the information together about this for all faculty.

They also are trying to be in better communication with the faculty senate about the wording in the faculty contracts.

5:00 – Adjourn for Day

Saturday, November 23

8:30 – Call to Order – Working Breakfast

9:00 – Senator Michael Dembrow

Dembrow has moved from the House to the Senate. In doing so, he had to give up his position on the House education committee. He is still on the governance committee as the Senate point person. They confirmed appointments to the university boards this week. Issues of voting rights for faculty and staff continue to be a sticking point. This was resolved on Thursday. Faculty and staff members will be able to vote. This continues what faculty already do on the State Board of Higher Ed, but is new in terms of what staff are able to do. There is a technical change that will be made in February that will be in place once the new boards start July 1, 2014.

The Joint Committee on University Governance met on Thursday. They heard reports from those working on shared administrative services. One of the desires is to mitigate the impact on the smaller schools if the larger schools pull out and still maintain economies of scale. That is what the shared services as being designed is about. All this information is available through the legislative website, committees, joint committees area.

Dembrow also had a meeting with the presidents of the regionals. If OSU, UO, and PSU pulled out of shared services with respect to PEBB and risk management, it will cost them about $10 million a year. If the legislature produces another $10 million and put it into the system, everyone would be whole, but that is not likely. There are some shared services the legislature may not allow the larger universities to pull out of. Some administrative services are being done now through the chancellor’s office and, presumably, will not need to be routed this way in the future.
The assumption that the universities have to be rated individually is a false assumption, and the governor will likely not allow them to be. The only way to solve our health care cost problems is by creating the largest pool possible. The university administrations wanted to pull out of PEBB with the assumption this would save money. However, this means the cost for those who remain will go up and that money will still come from the university budget, so will anything actually being gained by that?

The presidents have settled on an agreement. See Dembrow's handout on shared administrative services [link from PDF that Bob/other person has a copy of?]. The UO seems to be an outlier on some of these pieces of shared services. A number of services will continue to be offered jointly through Oregon State. It is a question whether UO will be part of some of the shared services. Should shared services be an opt-in sort of thing where universities can choose every couple of years, or does it need to be an opt-out. Ultimately it will take the legislature to make this decision.

The other major question they are wrestling with is the governance of the TRUs (technical and regional universities). Do they have individual boards, remain as part of the consortium, or do they attach to the larger universities as branch campuses? Originally the TRUs had until June 2015 to make this decision, but now we collectively realize we need to figure this out so there is more certainty. The regional presidents want to make this decision sooner and see legislation passed in January that would change the change to June 2014. Of critical importance is the long-term financial viability for whatever the end-result of the governance structure is. The governor's inclination is the branch campus approach if the TRUs cannot be viable on their own. Being attached to larger universities would provide some cushion for the TRUs.

Part of why the regional presidents may be bringing in the community is because of the strong resistance to being a branch campus. The concern is that, over time, certain services would transfer from the branch campus to the main campus. There would need to be safeguards in space to make sure that kind of attrition at the branch in favor of the main campus would not happen.

There is concern about not knowing all of what is involved if the TRUs do become branch campuses. The students from EOU initiated a letter expressing willingness to explore options except for branch campuses. This may be because of the ways that this option has been presented: what would it mean to a student or faculty at a particular campus to become a branch campus? At EOU, the faculty are open to discussing the branch campus concept. The culture of the faculty at different campuses may not easily meld with the faculty at the main campuses.

We all want the TRUs to survive and be healthy. Also what does it mean for the main campuses to take on administratively and financially another campus? OSU is doing this experiment already with the Bend campus. It is not easy, but not contentious. They grow and seem to be prospering. It is not like this has not been done before. 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. The faculty are not necessarily in the same place as university leadership. The legislature and relevant committees need to gauge the thinking of all on these campuses carefully. Dembrow encouraged those at SOU to reach out to Representative Buckley on these issues.

Matt Donegan, the State Board chair, was sent a request to have advice on the proper governance. Donegan set up a committee to look at this to advise the governor. They have
charged each university to do a self-analysis of how well they could perform in each scenario. They have been working with the Association of Governing Boards. **OSBHE University Governance Work Group:**

They are also figuring out the role of the chancellor’s office, which will no longer have governance over UO, OSU, and PSU as of January 1. Starting July 1, 2014 other proposals will go to the HECC. There will be an office in the HECC. Dembrow suggested having Ben Cannon at our next IFS meeting.

It is important for the state to continue to have universities regionally distributed across the state to help make education more accessible. Marketing/branding studies may need to be done to see how people in each region might perceive these changes.

**Dembrow would like the IFS to take a position on this governance question:** “take a position as IFS on this governance question. If you can go back to your campuses and establish a set of discussions around this, and then come together and take a position. Benefits and downsides, what needs to be part of the program if we go down this road?” Go back to campuses and have a set of discussions and bring information back: what they see as the benefits and downsides to each option and what needs to be part of each program.

We don’t want faculty opinions to be represented by our administration and we want to better understand the options. There will be places where the universities are aligned and not aligned in regards to the models. After reviewing the report and other documents, what else do we have to add? Identifying the faculty-based issues overall will be feasible even if all campuses cannot or will not likely come to consensus on everything.

**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.** The president’s reports will be in by the end of December. This faculty input will help move beyond the framing of the governance issues that have primarily been done through the administrators. Feng pointed out how OIT is already set up with a kind of branch campus set up that is working. Part of the success of this would be in the rebranding in how we were talking to internal and external stakeholders.

**Bob wants IFS to draft a letter of thanks to Dembrow for all of his work on these issues.**

**Bob will approach Ike, Emily and others at WOU at the same time due to the pressing timeframe.** We need to move fast since the next State Board of Higher Education meets to discuss this at their next meeting on December 10.

How would the big universities frame this discussion? Curriculum, salary structures, and absorbing another institution’s debt will be issues.

Review the following documents, which Maude forwarded, to try to determine issues from a faculty point of view. The conversation about this can be done primarily over email. IFS will split into tiny working groups to separately consider the faculty issues that these documents raise:
Deliverables: A short bullet-list of faculty issues these reports raise, not more than 1-2 pages. Jeff advised identifying 1-2 high priority/high ranked issues to suggest as part of our write-up.

Issues to look for in these documents:
- Curriculum/curricular control
- Collective bargaining/union vs. non-union faculty
- Finances
- Promotion and tenure
- Salaries

Bob will be collecting people’s thoughts? Easier to post a Google document to which all can add. Maude is setting up a Google document. Let Maude know if you don’t have access to this document after she sets it up.

Read the two documents above first to make sure the comments you are making are not already in the two documents, and the comments you are making play off what is there. Please add comments by the end of Monday. It is most important for the TRUs to put feedback here and to communicate these documents to our individual faculties.

9:45 – Approval of September 2013 Minutes

9:55 – Campus Reports (5 minutes each campus, 5 minutes for discussion; Senators are encouraged to submit a written campus report to be included with minutes).

Senators need to email their campus reports/write-ups to Vickie Nunnemarker for her to post as part of the minutes from this meeting.

10:30 – Bylaws Revisions

We are trying to put some mechanism in the bylaws to help encourage better participation in our meetings. Jeff was in support of the two-year term, but Bob is concerned about that being too onerous and we have a hard time getting people to participate anyway. There are issues of continuance. Three years is a longer commitment. Bob would argue for the year-long terms. Sometimes also the past president is just gone. However, there is a past president role the way that the bylaws have been revised. We might be in a better situation with continuity with this structure. Also, each institution elects IFS senators in different ways and the timing is different. Also, the numbers represented by each campus are different, but it is difficult for the smaller universities to get three representatives. Would it make sense for each university to have two representatives?

It may be remiss that we do not have a Cascades Campus representative. We will maintain the status quo with the 3/2 setup for now. There needs to be more severe consequences for missing the meetings. There needs to be routes for each institution to address this so all institutions are adequately represented. Does splitting the meeting over two days impact attendance? It might, but sometimes representatives and others we want to meet with us are available one day and not the other, so having two days assists in their availability to our meetings, as well as for travel time to the campuses.
Wording from By-laws:
V. Attendance

4. Senators who are regularly absent from Senate meetings are not serving the best interests of their institutions or the Senate. Senators who miss more than one regularly scheduled meeting during an academic year will consult with the Executive Committee between their second missed meeting and the next regular meeting of the IFS on an appropriate course of action. In the event that absentee Senators do not engage in such a consultation, the President will inform appropriate parties at the Senator's home institution.

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

11:00 – Housekeeping
• Elections

The By-laws state we will elect a new slate of officers at the end of the calendar year, which is now for 2013. For the next meeting we need a slate for people willing to stand for election, we need to elect a new secretary, president-elect, and a new Provost’s Council representative. If you want to self-nominate or nominate someone else, email Bob after talking to the person. Jeff would like to continue to serve as President for a second year unless others want to do this. He thinks this will provide continuity in IFS activities given the current legislative issues.

• Future meetings discussion
   • 2014 Scheduling: hosts and sites

The Portland meeting is usually better attended than the other ones. Do we want to continue to go to the different campuses if there is not great attendance? That also is an undue burden on the PSU reps. It would be good for the HECC to charter us into continued existence. If so, perhaps they could help provide travel monies for IFS meetings.

If we primarily rotate between PSU, OSU, WOU, and UO it helps create more convenience for all, but it is still a long way for more of us to travel further. If the OIT representative is from the Wilsonville campus, that could be included in the Willamette Valley campus rotation. The travel is part of the issue with people showing up. If the meetings came to PSU more, there possibly could be a pot of money for meetings. OHSU also could be part of the rotation.

What about asking HECC for meeting space (in Salem) if not money?
We would/could meet most of the time at HECC in Salem potentially. Senator Dembrow getting statutory status for our group is important.

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

• Mission Statement
   • The Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS) represents the faculty of Oregon's public universities. As a dedicated partner in higher education shared governance, we are committed to applying our collective expertise to ensuring the quality of higher education in Oregon. The decades-long heritage of IFS is grounded in a collaborative spirit of information sharing, timely
communication, transparency, and protecting the best interest of our most valuable resource: our students.

- **Virtual Review**
  - Maude has the notes for the feedback received on the pluses and minuses of doing virtual reviews. There were better quality reviewers since they have to read everything in advance. There was a cost savings. The reviewers said it was a positive experience and that there was time to be reflective. The downside was that they didn’t get to know them or have the chance for casual chats through which certain pieces of good information can be obtained. This mirrored our conversation in Ashland on virtual review. Our discussion was on all programs, but they are primarily just looking at new fully online programs.

- **Sabbatical Leave Draft**

- **Matters Arising**

12:15 – Adjourn