Present: Shari Carpenter (EOU), Jeff Dense (EOU), Maude Hines (PSU), Rob Kyr (UO) (on phone), Candyce Reynolds (PSU), Feng Shi (OIT), Laura Zeigen (OHSU)

12:45 – Welcome and Introductions – Jeff Dense, IFS President-Elect and Shari Carpenter, EOU

1:15 – Meeting called to order and all welcomed.

1:15 – Melody Rose, Interim Chancellor, Oregon University System

Melody reviewed where we were at with the emerging governance structures.

SB270 moved out of their policy committees of origin. All substantive matters are supposed to be resolved in their committees of origin. Both bills moved on to Ways and Means (there is a significant fiscal impact to them and must be reviewed before they go to the floor). The Oregon University System (OUS) asked to provide fiscal analysis on the bills. Consulted with OSU, PSU, and UO to do their own analysis of what an institutional board would cost them. OUS did their own independent analysis. They still need to analyze the financial impact to the other institutions. The campuses had differences of opinion in what a board would cost between them and between them and OUS. These numbers should be considered ranges. OUS provided Ways and Means with all the information.

HB3120 – The bill that would clarify and expand the role of the HECC (Higher Education Coordinating Commission). It will use HECC as a coordinating body between OUS institutions and community colleges – things like program approval would move through the HECC. HECC is described as a coordinating effort – not one that controls everything. This bill requests that some budget be moved from OUS to HECC. OUS is doing a fiscal analysis of this. It looked like it would be movement of 5.0 FTE. This is the current version of the bill: the ultimate goal will be more steps towards another formation.

A lot of analysis has to happen on both of these bills and the work in the legislature is backlogged. Part of this is that Betsy Johnson (Senate, Scappoose) was in a car accident and certain things are awaiting her return. The session may go beyond June 30. The session can go through July 14. The Governor remains very supportive of both bills.

What is the faculty role on these bills? Melody was not sure where the bills landed in terms of faculty voting representation (for program approval, etc.) as there have been many versions of the bills. Current versions of the bills are available from the Oregon State Legislature site at [http://www.leg.state.or.us/mag/home.htm](http://www.leg.state.or.us/mag/home.htm).

Representative Michael Dembrow is very supportive of faculty representation.

Rose expressed the importance of faculty representation on the Provost’s Council and continuing to have a seat at the ASC table. The Vice Chancellor tends to be the only academic at that table. Most of the board, although enthusiastic about higher
education, does not have a background in higher education. Grant Kirby had been the representative there, but we don’t have a voice at that table right now. Melody encouraged us to figure out representation for this. IFS has talked about redoing the bylaws – even if OUS does not exist, we would form a senate of faculty from Oregon public universities. Laura mentioned and sent Melody some information on Senator Warren’s suggestion for establishing lower student loan interest rates: http://business.time.com/2013/05/10/elizabeth-warren-students-should-get-the-same-rate-as-the-bankers/; http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/08/elizabeth-warren-student-loans_n_3240407.html

Oregon has lower student loan default rates than the rest of the nation, but student loan debt is still a problem in Oregon. OUS is working on debt and affordability issues. Melody will send the date of events around this issue to Bob Mason.

OUS identified seven existing set of shared services. They have gone in-depth to one of these areas (human resources). This process took four months. They are now doing the full analysis of how it works and how it would look under a different legal consideration. OUS does not have the internal resources to do the whole analysis until after the legislative session is done.

The transition of the new structure will take time. During that time, OUS will continue to support the campuses in the way they always have during this time.

Ryan Hagerman and Drew Hagedorn are the ones who know the bills.

2:00 – Bob Davies, President, Eastern Oregon University

Davies echoed Rose’s comments that the IFS needs to attend the different universities and go to the various campuses. When you are on campus and talk with the students, there is a different sense of campus. There are a lot of small high schools that, on occasion, have the entire population of their graduating class come to EOU for college: if it wasn’t for Eastern, they would likely go to Washington or Boise State and not come back. EOU provides value for students who would otherwise not have this option. In addition, EOU has many students from the metro areas, which leads to great conversations amongst different students on campus.

The small size of the institution helps create strong bonds between faculty, staff and students. EOU has about 4,000 students. A few years ago it was down to 2,500. They are now looking at programs they need to reduce or eliminate, which is difficult to do during a time the institution is growing, but necessary to continue the EOU mission to serve students in this area. They also are looking at online delivery of instruction.

The “Eastern Promise” is a program and a strategy of how they look at college readiness and how they work with communities, families, and social structures starting with students in 5th grade to develop a mind-set to go to college. If you look at a high school senior, how do you know they are college ready? A person with the personality, academic preparation and social structure to enter college and be successful and not need remedial courses. How does the individual know they will be personally driven to think about the college experience? They ask the 5th graders to close their eyes to imagine themselves and their lives in 25 years, and then think about what they are doing now and the immediate future to make that happen. They go back to the 6th graders and keep doing this through the entire high school career. They also bring in the parents and guardians and business
people, so everyone in the community is talking about how to support the community’s young people. This last year they spoke with over 6,000 students about college. This includes the community colleges and school districts: everyone is working together to meet that need.

A dual credit class is a class that a high school student takes for which the high school student gets both high school and college credit. Colleges work with high schools to bring some college classes into high school and provide high school credit as well.

EOU is watching SB270 very closely. It may make a difference in future philanthropy. The concern is that the universities have the same access to the HECC, capital projects, mission approval, etc. EOU does not want to see an institutional board that is advantaged or disadvantaged. The concept of shared services concerns EOU.

HB3120 – This bill would develop a Department of Post-Secondary Education. Developing a new bureaucracy is money that could be used to educate students. This is putting structure before strategy.

The philosophy of the distance programs is that it is the same as any classroom – the modality happens to be in a distance mechanism. EOU has 9 full majors and 18 minors online. Most of the online students are from all over Oregon. There are 16 physical locations where students can meet with advisors face to face. This helps provide services to students where they are. A lot of students do both online and on-campus classes. Anyone taking an online class can come into Shari’s classes and partake in the on-campus class sessions. This program continues to change and mature.

Teachers cannot operate with the online classes being the “overload” classes: sometimes there are way more students in the online classes than the on-campus classes. They are looking at the wage scales so they don’t have to depend on the “overload” classes to fiscally survive. They are experimenting with a farm business online program that is a hybrid in-person in Hermiston.

2:30 – DeAnna Timmerman, President, EOU Faculty Senate
DeAnna shared information about EOU’s shared governance system. The small size of EOU allows them to bring together most faculty at one time. Since 2006 they have had a Faculty Senate and a University Council. The Faculty Senate takes care of education policy and curriculum, faculty personnel, and academic standards and policy. The other committees report to the University Council, made up of three members from each unit of the campus – three faculty, three administrators/administrative faculty, three students, and three staff. This allows for a lot of conversation between the four parts of the university and for the decisions to be weighted more equally. It is an elected representative Senate, with about 18 members.

Faculty Senate Presidents serve one-year terms and senators have two-year terms. There are no term limits. There is now a support person who helps with communications between the Faculty Senate and University Council. She makes sure a policy being considered in one body is shared with the other. She also makes sure all policy changes are updated on the web site.
Shared governance role in program review. Because EOU is small, people wear multiple hats – DeAnna is FS President, but also on the bargaining team, for example. They have formal relationships and informal. They have to go through formal steps with the union in regards to any faculty or program reduction. They are supposed to release a plan to the university on May 15, including recommendations to administration of what they need to do, for long-term sustainability. This plan will be open for comment.

They have a lot of adjuncts, but only tenured faculty can be on personnel committees.

You cannot violate aspects of the contract with policy. Faculty have a huge say in how university is done, whether through the Senate, the union, or at the individual level. The Senate and union might not be on the same page, but many of the same people are on both. Jeff believes there needs to be a clear line between bargaining and educational policy, but they don’t have enough people to have a more robust governance structure.

2:45 – Evan Bryan, ASEOU Vice-President for Political Affairs
Evan is majoring in Philosophy, Politics and Economics and served in Representative Bill Hansell’s office.

The student group that went to Salem a few weeks ago expressed opposition to SB270 to create institutional boards and the damage it would do to coordination between campuses. They spoke with Senator Peter Courtney and Senator Mark Haas. Oregon Student Association is currently advocating for a 0% tuition freeze. At EOU they are looking at a 5% tuition increase (or see more drastic cuts). Students said they would be willing to pay more and not see certain departments cut.

EOU tries to have students on every committee, no matter how small. This has been pretty successful in getting students involved.

The Oregon Student Association (OSA) director has left and Emma Kallaway has been named the new director.

3:00 – Break

3:15 – President’s Report – Bob Mason, IFS President
The President’s Report was read.

3:30 – Campus Reports

UO
The new UO president, Michael Gottfredson, arrived and faculty feel he is doing a great job at shared governance. He has been very collaborative with the faculty and everybody. He has made clear that UO’s collaboration with all parts of the system are as essential in the future as it is in the present and was in the past. We expect IFS will continue and be as strong or stronger in whatever the new system is as “the one faculty of Oregon”.

UO Faculty Senate did their 10th year review of the standing committees. They have 43 committees or advisory groups in the system. Managing that is challenging. They will now do one every 5 years (a minor tune-up) with the more in-depth
review every 10 years. They will list the groups in a different way on the web site, so responsibilities and charges of each group are clearer. They have formed 12 working groups to look at challenging working groups. One of these is an athletics committee. Another is a transparency committee. They need to reshape these groups for the needs of the present.

The new Faculty Senate President (taking office May 23, 2013) is Margie Paris (law school). (http://law.uoregon.edu/faculty/mparis/). This will be the first under the new constitution in which they have a past president, current president, and president-elect.

Also in the 10-year review they are reviewing incentives (financial and otherwise) for committee service. They will be fine-tuning this during Margie’s administration.

In last three Summit meetings they have passed two of the policies of the university (academic freedom and freedom of speech). This last week they considered a legal services policy (who can be represented by legal representation and under what conditions). That has been postponed to May 22, but they expect it to pass. These had been worked on under LaRiviere, but he had not signed two of the three of them then, after he was fired, they had to go back to the faculty for review.

Rob Kyr testified at a meeting for the Articles of Shared Governance in the Collective Bargaining Unit. They hope to finalize this in the next year.

There are a number of other policies they have been working on. They passed a motion in which they requested the president work with the athletics department to work out how to make contributions to the academic side of the university, per previous legislation. This passed 19-4 with 4 abstentions, which they regard as a positive vote.

CBA process – senate president asks for information when this points to the Senate – is this in the constitution or somewhere with the union? The Senate passed legislation this last year asking that this constitution be written into the CBA. PSU’s points to 1996 promotion and tenure guidelines so, if they revise them, the union information will always point to 1996. People are clearer about what needs to be in the CBA regarding these two items. It has taken some time to work this out and Rob was called to testify. “Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech” was the title of the motion. “Regarding Shared Governance at the University of Oregon” (http://senate.uoregon.edu/content/regarding-shared-governance-university-oregon).

EOU

Last year, they asked Jeff (FS) to redo the promotion and tenure (P&T) handbook. Instead of extracting the one word “collegiality” out of the document (per the Redbook), they did not do anything. These changes are no longer relevant and now they have two competing documents for tenure and promotion (the contract and the criteria that are in the faculty handbook). Jeff looked at comparator institutions and looked at Oregon admin rules into the document and AUP policies – they went through 14 drafts, open forums, and finally came up for a vote on Tuesday (to faculty senate) and passed. Only two people voted against it. It is much clearer – previously it had put teaching and advising in one criterion and these were broken out. Previously there were requirements to do “x” number of publications to be in
the senate – they went with the OSU model instead – the disciplines create what the criteria area because they are the people to best understand what the expectations are in the disciplines – different between math vs. other disciplines. They are still fleshing this out.

The criteria are much clearer than before. It is the "personnel process and procedure handbook because it also addresses 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year reviews – under the Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs), you are supposed to put annual reviews. It is a pretty clean document – junior faculty will benefit most – it is now clear what they need to do to be promoted. The new faculty, as well, will have a clearer idea of the expectations for P&T. This was an arduous task.

EOU faculty teach 36 credits per year. Faculty need to be an integral part of any process that involves changes to the curriculum. Departments need to do cost-benefit analysis of any changes to curriculum that may impact revenue.

A revised draft Sustainability Plan is set to be released on May 15. Comments will be solicited, and a final version will be released in early June.

The Faculty Leadership Caucus (is there a web site for this?) was an opportunity to lead on individual campuses and was designed for Senate presidents to learn from other universities. The group expressed a desire to investigate the possibilities of doing another Faculty Leadership Caucus. Rob Kyr has graciously agreed to serve as point on this and offered UO to host the next meeting.

They had a recent discussion on faculty representation on institutional boards, at the conclusion of which a straw poll showed overwhelming support for faculty voting representation on boards.

In April, PSU Senate’s Presiding Officer sent a letter to Rep. Dembrow and Bob Mason on behalf of the Senate Steering Committee, which was included in the meeting packet.

Voting power would give faculty more influence and respect on the committee. What are implications of voting membership for faculty, but non-voting ex-officio position for university presidents?

PSU is also revising their promotion and tenure (P&T) guidelines. A clearinghouse of who learns from whom would be useful. Doing P&T to accommodate OARs.

The one motion that did not pass Senate for OARs was a motion put forth to give existing senior instructors more movement in terms of raises and promotion – e.g. senior instructor 1 and ask to go to senior instructor 2 – seen as a demotion.

PSU is starting collective bargaining, and administration wants to open all articles. Some in union feel admin is pushing the post-tenure review issue – giving more power to the faculty senate and less power to the union. They don’t want things that are permissible, just required, in the union contracts.

PSU has a significant number (around 50%) of union members on campus – 40%, including senate president, not getting these emails (Fair Share).

- Resolution can be on any matter
• **Legislation** has to be on academic matters
• **Policies** each policy must past and comes to Senate AFTER Provost. (new policy on policies)

Any policy goes through the flowchart. The last stop in that line is the provost. The provost signs, and then it goes to the Senate. At that point FS knows it has gone through everyone and is ready for FS to look at.

If Senate votes it down – would go into a review committee for that policy. Once FS and committee have considered alternate language, the FS votes on it and sends that version (minor or major revisions), goes to President, who has 60 days to respond. Then they work out the issues.

What if it is a policy that the President and Provost want, but the FS doesn’t. There is a provision in the constitution for situations of total disagreement/log-jam, and then the senate president has the option to present to statutory faculty. That is all instructional and tenure related faculty (and the non-tenure track faculty (nttf)). They are addressed as an entire faculty, not just through the senate. All tenure-related faculty, all career nttf, but not adjuncts. Basically all senate-eligible faculty. Used to have faculty assembly until 1995.

The strongest the faculty can be is a senate whose decisions ... in certain situations and a union that can work out a contract working together but separately. Once we have boards, however, the president is also advisory. In actual practice it is different. The FS is advisory, but it is to the president’s best interest to be collaborative and make policies everyone can follow. Votes of no confidence are the mechanism by which change can occur.

What is the role of the Faculty Senate on your campus at UO? UO went through an extensive revision.

**OIT**

OIT Faculty Senate is discussing faculty salary raises of 2-3% and to try to adjust salaries to meet those of competitor institutions.

They also are looking at pre-tenure review. The chairs feel this review is not necessary. The chairs are supposed to mentor the junior faculty to let them know expectations of the department or schools for their performance. They also have annual evaluations for junior faculty. They feel the pre-tenure review is, therefore, not necessary. The OIT Faculty Senate voted down a pre-tenure review. What if the chair does not mentor? Some are better than others at mentoring. That has impact on junior faculty. The mentor is not mandatory, but the pre-tenure review would be mandatory. Normally they have five years to have tenure. The third year the chair should organize the committee to review the individuals to let them know how they have progressed. If someone is not doing well, they should give suggestions to improve performance.

The group discussed the different models of tenure and pre-tenure review at our institutions. Often, one’s peers are actually at other institutions because the areas of our expertise are so specific and no one else at the same institution has expertise in that topic. External review is important.
They also discussed having a tobacco-free campus. A committee was specifically charged to work on this. OIT is the last campus that has not yet implemented that policy. EOU is fully implementing this in the fall. The policies will not stop the students from smoking.

OIT has satellite campuses in LA Grande, Salem, and at Boeing/Seattle. They have been talking about coordinating resources at the satellite campuses through distance education. If faculty with particular expertise are at one campus, they want to use distance technologies to help share that expertise with other campuses. This will also help raise numbers of students in each class and OIT will be able to offer more courses.

OHSU
New deans for both the School of Nursing and School of Dentistry have been chosen.

Susan Bakewell-Sachs named new SON dean

Philip Marucha named new SOD dean
http://www.ohsu.edu/blogs/researchnews/2013/04/24/phillip-marucha-d-m-d-ph-d-is-new-school-of-dentistry-dean/

There is a hiring freeze due to uncertainty around future NIH funding due to the federal budget sequester.

The Multiprofessional Education (MPE) Task Force put out a survey to 2,503 OHSU faculty across the state regarding current teaching assignments in the area of the basic sciences and future willingness to expand them to be more multi-professional. Key points from the survey:

Out of the 2,503 OHSU faculty members across the state, 1,351 (52%) of faculty opened the email inviting them to participate in the survey with 701 (52% of those that acknowledged survey receipt, or 28% of all OHSU faculty) responding.

- OHSU is home to a diverse wealth of talented educators, many of whom already teach a variety of learners, utilizing a range of teaching methods, and 95% of you are willing to consider or be part of a multi-professional teaching team!
- 73% of faculty members have experience using active learning strategies; however, less than 25% have experience using online learning strategies or simulation – two teaching methods that we expect will play a key role in 21st century health care education.
- Many of you pointed out the importance of teaching topics beyond the basic sciences, and we couldn't agree more. Upcoming efforts will focus on a broader scope of education, so please watch for future surveys and requests for information.
- Faculty indicated willingness to teach students of other professions, provided there is a clear path of financial support across administrative boundaries to alleviate the faculty pressures to generate revenue.
- Succession planning appeared to be inadequate in all schools at OHSU.
• OHSU faculty members are overwhelmingly willing to teach students from different academic degree programs than their 'home' faculty school/department, and there were quite a few positive comments from faculty about interprofessional education and the importance of collaborative practice.

**IFS Logo – Maude Hines** – We need to ask for funding (about $150-200) to be able to pay the person to create the desired IFS logo for us. **Who is going to make this funding request?**

**5:15 – Adjourn**

---

**Saturday, May 11**

**8:30**
We convened at 8:30 to continue the discussion. There was discussion of governance board structures. We need to restructure our communications focused to the Ways & Means Committee in regards to wording of legislation for a collective board for the regionals.

We looked at the current versions of the Oregon State legislature House and Senate bills related to governing structures. There are a number of differences in the wording that will be synthesized/harmonized in whatever final version emerges (ex: reference to Board of Directors vs. Board of Trustees). Some of the wording has implications for how the institutional governing boards are constructed.

**Oregon State Legislature web site (A-Engrossed SB 270).** The senate version of the bill transfers control to HECC. Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC).
[http://www.leg.state.or.us/13reg/measures/sb0200.dir/sb0270.a.html](http://www.leg.state.or.us/13reg/measures/sb0200.dir/sb0270.a.html)

**Oregon State Legislature web site (A-Engrossed HB 3120)**
[http://www.leg.state.or.us/13reg/measures/hb3100.dir/hb3120.a.html](http://www.leg.state.or.us/13reg/measures/hb3100.dir/hb3120.a.html)

**Oregon State Legislature web site (A-Engrossed HB 2149)**
“President of the university is the president of the faculty” – true for PSU and UO. In this version of the bill, it says that the OUS continues to exist.
[http://www.leg.state.or.us/13reg/measures/hb2100.dir/hb2149.intro.html](http://www.leg.state.or.us/13reg/measures/hb2100.dir/hb2149.intro.html)

Jeff proposed drafting a position statement to send to both the Ways & Means Committee and the leadership of both houses. We need to start communicating with the leadership in both houses now. This motion was seconded. The group discussed it and thought this was a good idea. Time is of the essence. The group agreed to try to get these messages out this week. The motion to draft a position statement to send to the leadership of the houses and co-chairs of Ways & Means was approved. We tabled the motion and will come back to it.

The Senate bill put the SBHE in charge of the regional universities as a temporary measure. We are looking for board membership of institutions that do not already have one.
We thought we would need to draft two documents: one is dealing with faculty membership on the institutional, individual governing boards and related to that is the voting aspect and the issue of classified staff on the institutional boards. Students and classified staff also represent unique perspectives and will present their perspectives directly. The other document is dealing with what happens after the governing boards are created, and how will the interests of the schools without governing boards be included in the membership of that governing body?

Do we address the concern about conflict of interest in this letter? No – it should not come from us. Ideally, Bob Mason would raise this issue with them in a conversation.

We completed the campus reports.

10:20 – Approval of March 2013 Minutes
Minutes were approved.

10:30 – Online Education Discussion – Jeff Dense and Shari Carpenter
The group discussed issues around online education at all our institutions. At PSU the distance students have a fee, which was intended to help students in online classes, but which appears to be being directed to the “ReThink” project at PSU. How do we ensure that the distance student fees go to the intended place? PSU faculty do not get similar compensation or support for online programs. Developing online classes requires an additional workload. Another related issue is that the university will own the copyright on these classes that faculty have developed. Compensation and workload are issues, particularly with requirements to make all the online content ADA compliant (requires closed captioning, transcripts, additional aspects). Many faculty need additional instructional design support to construct these classes to these standards. The online fee should be used to benefit the students who are online. It would be fairer to wrap these fees into tuition, particularly since about 80% of classes (even the in-person classes) have some online component.

How can we collaborate with online instruction knowledge, technology, and more? How can our education departments work together in the state? We should not be competing with each other. Financially, it would benefit all Oregon public universities to explore collaborations in this area.

It would be interesting to further discuss how the funding and other structures are set up at all the universities. Jeff thought we could do a survey and have a spreadsheet to share on this.

Bob – Jeff says “We have talked about this collaboration between campuses and perhaps at one of the next meetings of the Board of Higher Education, could you highlight this in your remarks to them?”

What is happening with Western Governor’s University (http://www.wgu.edu)? We tried to look at the Oregon State Legislature web site to look up legislation related to this, but the site was down.

We also discussed the evaluation of the quality and content of online classes and coordination of curriculum as a whole. EOU is looking for an instrument to evaluate online courses. How do you ensure quality in the development of an online teaching
evaluation rubric? The Cal State Chico rubric has been suggested and utilized nationally and can be changed specifically for different institutions. It would be a model from which to start. Chico’s Rubric for Online Instruction is available at http://www.csuchico.edu/roi/.

At UO they are proposing a committee on instructional technology and are looking at nationwide trends and success for instructional technology.

10:15 – Discussion/Review of IFS Bylaws
How do we leverage technology to increase participation, particularly as we move around the state? Also, what do we do about people who do not come to meetings? You used to get an email.

At PSU if a senator misses three meetings they are considered to have resigned and the person with the next highest number of votes replaces them. As a result, they have seen much higher attendance. They also switched from an opt-out voting system to an opt-in voting system. “Which of these do you want to do?” Only those people who respond affirmatively are on the ballot. PSU currently has 62 senators from all colleges across the university, with more senators from colleges with more faculty.

At UO, they would like Deans to make official pronouncement, even if only guidelines, that connects service in an incentive-based way to P&T. They’re having difficulty because some deans can’t see their way to doing that based on needs in their areas. Net effect is that UO has trouble getting people in Senate. It’s a workload issue (conflicts with staff training, etc., since they have representation in five areas). Quorum rule based on filled seats would be helpful.

How do we get better representation as we travel to the campuses? We have 7 out of 19 representatives at this meeting. Jeff was concerned if it is worth it to travel to the different campuses if people are not going to show up. In the By-Laws, if you miss two meetings, the President will talk to the senator. There are no attendance provisions more than this in the By-Laws. Do we want to ask Melody to help provide adequate institutional support? The individual institutions do not necessarily provide the support (financial and otherwise) for this.

The meeting dates were previously set based on when the board meets, but now we are not following the board; we should be able to vote on meeting dates. **We could try doing a Doodle poll to find best dates for everyone to maximize attendance.** We also need to check with the host institutions because it is hard to book institution presidents and others. The host institution could send out the Doodle poll for the meeting at their location and send out the proposed dates that they know work for their president. By-Laws state we need to meet once a quarter during the academic year.

The more people who attend (in person or electronically), the more we can have robust discussions about all these important issues.

Do we want to try to leverage technology more for people who are not able to make it to the meeting? We could do a Google hangout and see 3-4 people at the same time.
11:30 – Election
Maude Hines was elected as the IFS Provost Council (http://www.ous.edu/about/provcouncil) representative. They meet in Portland.

11:35 – Next Steps: IFS in 2013-14
- Draft/send two position papers to legislative leadership and co-chairs of Ways & Means.
  - Paper 1: We advocate for faculty membership on boards and voting membership is better because the weight their voice will be given in conversations. Jeff will start the first draft of this and distribute to listserv.
  - Paper 2: How are regional and technical universities represented on governing boards following the break-out into individual governing boards? Jeff will start the first draft of this and distribute to listserv.
- Bob Mason will contact key legislative leaders to express awareness of conflict of interest issue in faculty representation on governing boards.
- Look at having another Faculty Leadership Caucus (Rob will take the lead on investigating this, ensuring it is not the weekend of any big athletic event).
- Bob Mason should receive information from Melody on results of the OUS analysis of student debt and affordability.
- Explore ideas for how we could collaborate in online instruction. How can we better collaborate to minimize competition between us for online courses? Jeff will draft the survey and email to the listserv. Jeff will construct a survey for us to share information on how we do online instruction at each university and send it to IFS for answers (compensation, support, technology).
- Bob will mention the idea of collaborating in online education at an upcoming meeting of the Board of Higher Education.
- Jeff will ask Melody to contact institution presidents to urge for more support to faculty senators.
- Jeff will put together a Doodle poll for future dates after the last scheduled meeting in November.
- Explore doing a Google hangout for presence of some senators at next meeting (Candyce will check into this and will gather our Google accounts to make this happen).
- Funding request for IFS logo. Not assigned at meeting.
- Other issues to address:
  - Communicate over listserv immediately after the current legislative session ends and what, if anything, we need to do over the summer regarding governing or other issues that have emerged. Jeff leaves this to Bob.

11:45 – Wrap Up
Jeff commended Laura for her detailed note taking. Rob commended Jeff for being able to participate in the meeting via the speakerphone.

Future Meetings
- September 27-28 Southern Oregon University
- November 22-23 Portland State University

Draft of paper 1:
We urge you to think seriously about the composition of the SBHE or whatever governing body: faculty, students, research administration, classified staff. We are confident they are representing themselves to you.

Linked materials related to topics within the minutes:

- Letter to ‘Chair Dembrow and Members of the Committee’ related to the future of online education
- Letter to Senate President Courtney related to opposition to SB 270 (Section 6(2)(c))
- Letter to Chair Monroe, Chair Komp and Members of the Committee related to opposition to SB 270 (Section 6(2)(c))